# The SB2009 machine parameters from GDE@DESY December '09 

Mikael Berggren ${ }^{1}$

${ }^{1}$ DESY, Hamburg

ILD optimisation, 9 Dec 2009

## Introduction

At last week's GED meeting at DESY, among many other topics, Brian Foster presented the current official machine parameters of the SB2009 proposal. Jim Clarke also presented the present idea on the positron source.

This is a summary of
http://ilcagenda.linearcollider.org/getFile.py/access?contribId=14 \&sessionId=5\&resId=1\&materialId=slides\&confId=4255
and
http://ilcagenda.linearcollider.org/getFile.py/access?contribId=8
\&sessionId=1\&resId=1\&materialId=slides\&confId=4255
(All slides are stolen from these talks)
ift
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## Beam Parameters

|  | RDR |  |  | SB2009 w/o TF |  |  |  | SB2009 w TF |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CM Energy (GeV) | 250 | 350 | 500 | 250.a | 250.b | 350 | 500 | 250.a | 250.b | 350 | 500 |
| $\mathrm{Ne}-\left({ }^{*} 0^{10}\right)$ | 2.05 | 2.05 | 2.05 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2.05 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2.05 |
| $\mathrm{Ne}+\left({ }^{*} \mathbf{1 0}^{10}\right)$ | 2.05 | 2.05 | 2.05 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2.05 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2.05 |
| nb | 2625 | 2625 | 2625 | 1312 | 1312 | 1312 | 1312 | 1312 | 1312 | 1312 | 1312 |
| Tsep (nsecs) | 370 | 370 | 370 | 740 | 740 | 740 | 740 | 740 | 740 | 740 | 740 |
| F (Hz) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 5 | 5 |
| $\gamma \mathrm{ex}\left({ }^{*} 10^{-6}\right)$ | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| $\gamma \mathrm{y}$ ( ${ }^{*} 10^{-6}$ ) | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| $\beta \mathrm{x}$ | 22 | 22 | 20 | 21 | 21 | 15 | 11 | 21 | 21 | 15 | 11 |
| $\beta \mathrm{y}$ | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| $\sigma \mathrm{z}$ (mm) | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| $\sigma x$ eff ( $\left.{ }^{*} 10^{-9} \mathrm{~m}\right)$ | 948 | 802 | 639 | 927 | 927 | 662 | 474 | 927 | 927 | 662 | 474 |
| $\sigma y$ eff ( ${ }^{* 10} 0^{-9} \mathrm{~m}$ ) | 10 | 8.1 | 5.7 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 7.4 | 5.8 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 5.0 | 3.8 |
| $\mathrm{L}\left(\mathbf{1 0}^{34} \mathbf{c m}^{-2} \mathbf{s}^{\mathbf{- 1}}\right)$ | 0.75 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 0.2 | 0.22 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 0.25 | 0.27 | 1.0 | 2.0 |

- The major difference between SB2009 and the RDR is the luminosity at 250 GeV . See later.


## Energy Spread Assumptions

- Energy spread at the entrance to the main linac is $1.5 \%$ at 15 GeV for RDR and $1.08 \%$ at 15 GeV for SB2009 ( N Solyak)
- No growth due to linac etc
- In RDR case e+ are generated by e- at 150 GeV
- e- are either accelerated or decellerated after the undulator to achieve their required energy at the IP
- In SB2009, energy of e- is variable in the undulator
- 125 to $250 \mathrm{GeV} @ 5 \mathrm{~Hz}$ operation or
- 150 GeV @ 2.5 Hz operation
- Length of undulator is varied (modules are switched on/off) to keep yield at $1.5 \mathrm{e}+\mathrm{e}$ -


## Questions

2. Beam parameters should include electron/positron beam energy spread.

| dE/E in \% | 250 GeV CM | 350 GeV CM | Official 500 GeV CM |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| RDR, electrons | 0.272 | 0.194 | 0.136 |
| RDR, positrons | 0.180 | 0.129 | 0.09 |
| SB09, electrons | 0.220 | 0.218 | 0.207 |
| SB09, positrons | 0.130 | 0.093 | 0.065 |

Based on energy spread of 1.08\% in SB2009 and $1.5 \%$ in RDR at 15 GeV .
Electrons passing the undulator emit SR added in quadrature to inherent energy spread.

## ir IIL

## Questions



Electron Energy Loss

- Loss due to SR emission in undulator
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## Questions

3. We would like to understand the effect on backgrounds/luminosity spectrum for SB2009 with vs without traveling focus.

|  | RDR |  |  | SB2009 w/o TF |  |  |  | SB2009 w TF |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Par/E | 250 | 350 | 500 | $250 . \mathrm{a}$ | $250 . \mathrm{b}$ | 350 | 500 | $250 . \mathrm{a}$ | $250 . \mathrm{b}$ | 350 | 500 |
| $\mathbf{\delta E} \%$ | 0.6 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 4.1 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 3.6 |
| Npairs $^{*}$ <br> $\mathbf{1 0}^{\mathbf{3}}$ | 97 | 156 | 288 | 48.7 | 97.4 | 214 | 494 | 57.4 | 115 | 255 | 596 |
| $\mathbf{L}$ | 0.75 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 0.2 | 0.22 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 0.24 | 0.27 | 1.0 | 2.0 |
| $\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{1 \%} \mathbf{)} / \mathbf{L}$ | 0.97 | 0.92 | 0.83 | 0.98 | 0.96 | 0.88 | 0.73 | 0.94 | 0.89 | 0.77 | 0.72 |

Npairs is an analytical estimate - Guineapig etc many be different by many 10 s of $\%$.

Schematic Layout


Normal Operation


Positron Yield


## Switched Mode



Number of Positrons per Bunch

## SB2009



RDR


## Parameters

| Parameter | RDR | SB2009 | Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Positrons per bunch at the IP | $2 \times 10^{10}$ | 1 to $2 \times 10^{10}$ (see Figure 4.4 .3 for details) |  |
| Bunches per pulse | 2625 | 1312 |  |
| Pulse repetition rate | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 5(125 \text { to } 250 \mathrm{GeV}) \\ & 2.5(50 \text { to } 125 \mathrm{GeV}) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Hz |
| Positron energy (DR Injection) | 5 | 5 | GeV |
| DR transverse acceptance | 0.09 | 0.09 | m-rad |
| DR energy acceptance | $\pm 0.5$ | $\pm 0.5$ | \% |
| Electron drive beam energy | 150 | 125 to 250 | GeV |
| Electron energy loss in undulator | 3.01 | 0.5 to 4.9 <br> (see Figure 4.4.5 for details) | GeV |
| Undulator period | 11.5 | 11.5 | mm |
| Undulator strength | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Active undulator length | 147 (210 after polarisation upgrade) | 231 (maximum, not all used when $>150 \mathrm{GeV}$ ) | m |
| Field on axis | 0.86 | 0.86 | T |
| Beam aperture | 5.85 | 5.85 | mm |
| Photon Energy (1 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ harmonic) | 10 | $\begin{gathered} 1.1(50 \mathrm{GeV}) \text { to } \\ 28(250 \mathrm{GeV}) \end{gathered}$ | MeV |
| Photon beam power | 131 | 102 at 150 GeV (less at all other energies) | kW |
| Target material | Ti - 6\%Al - 4\%V | Ti-6\%Al - 4\%V |  |
| Target thickness | 14 | 14 | mm |
| Target power adsorption | 8 | 8 | \% |

## Polarisation

- This is the polarisation before any sort of upgrade



## Repeat of JC's Answer

- "Despite the questions of feasibility, the conventional positron source remains very interesting in order to maximize yield and therefore luminosity" - Jim Brau
- There are no indications that the conventional source will ever outperform the undulator based source in terms of number of positrons generated per bunch
- If the reduction in e+/bunch at below 150 GeV is of such major concern then the undulator should be placed at the 150 GeV location (as it was in the RDR) so that 2 E 10 @ 5 Hz is always available


## Comments and Conclusions

- The 500 GeV parameters $\equiv$ Nick Walker's talk @ ALCPG.
- The 250 GeV parameters somewhat different from previous, un-official, numbers from Andre Seryi.
- Number of pairs quoted looks different (double !) from our GuineaPig, but also does for RDR ?
- Positron source:
- Work is going on.
- No estimate of cost-savings from moving the ondulator given.
- Our concerns are taken seriously.
- We are promised to get parameters for all of SB2009, except the odulator move.
- As side-remark from me: What about asymmetric running ? Eg. $E_{e^{-}}=150 \mathrm{GeV}$ and $E_{e^{+}}=104.2 \mathrm{GeV}$ gives $E_{c m s}=250 \mathrm{GeV}$.
- My feeling was that the outcome might well be that the ondulator stays at the 150 GeV point.
- Look at the slides for more information:
http://ilcagenda.linearcollider.org/conferenceDisplay.py?confld=4255

