Summary WG8: Beam Diagnostics, Instrumentation and Technical Systems

Graham Blair Hermann Schmickler Manfred Wendt

Thanks to all presenters, contributors and the audience!





Seven sessions

- Four sessions dedicated to beam diagnostics, instrumentation and technical systems (what is NOT a "technical system"?)
- Three joint sessions with CLIC Drive Beam / CTF3, Low Emittance Transport, and MDI.
- 24 presentations, ~10-20 participants in the sessions.
- No surprise: Many presentations CLIC specific, but: some talks on ATF, ILC and general LC diagnostics & technologies

This summary

- Cannot cover all presentations
- Some presentations were already summaries of many complex R&D activities! (summary of summaries)
- Now in somewhat chronologic order:

IWLC



1- First iteration on requirements from Beam Dynamic – first iteration in 2008
 - Full set of specifications: More than 200kms of beamlines requiring > 50 000 instruments



iic CLIC/CTF3 BPMs

Drive Beam BPM (Steve Smith)

- Integrated with quad
- Simple stripline BPM, need ~40000!
- <1 µm resolution (single bunch, nom. charge)
- Detailed analysis, incl. read-out electronics & wakepotentials!





- Main Beam BPM (CERN/Fermilab)
 - WG-loaded cavity BPM, plus reference resonator.
 - <50 nm temporal resolution
 - <50 nsec time resolution (low-Q)</p>
 - Design adapted to CTF3 bunch frequencies: 15 GHz resonators



First RF Measurements



WG-Coupled Signals





- ILC Cold Cavity BPM
 - Dipole (BPM) & monopole (REF) read-out
 - Prototype finalized ("warm" dimensions)
 - RF characterization underway
 - ILC cryomodule compatible (type III+ or IV)
- ATF damping ring BPM read-out R&D
 - Analog / digital system w. integrated CAL
- Resolution: <10 μm (TBT), <0.5 μm (NB)

10/22/2010



CLIC Beam Profile: ODR





- Thibaut Lefevre: Optical Diffraction Radiation
 - Simpler (and cheaper!) than laser wire
 - Impact parameter vs. beam energy
 - Sensitivity & photon yield vs. beam energy (need to go to soft-X/UV range for 1 µm resolution)
 - R&D activities in collaboration with CESR-TA







- Toshiaki Tauchi: ATF2 Diagnostics R&D
- FONT feedback system: beam jitter reduction 2.1 -> 0.4 μm
- Laser wire: 3.5 µm resolution!
- Four OTR systems with < 2µm resolution.
- S-Band & C-Band cavity BPMs
 C-Band performance:
 200-400 nm resolution with attenuators
 25 nm resolution without attenuator!
- S-Band tilt monitor
 30 nrad expected resolution
- Shintake IP Laser interferometer first measurements: ~300 nm resolution
- IP cavity BPM
 <10 nm resolution (world record!)
 Goal: 2 nm

BUT (joint session with MDI):

 CLCI IP BPMs require 13 pm resolution (?!) (for 10 sec integration time) this BPM also needs BbB capability









Laura Corner: Fiber lasers

- Photonic crystal fibers: large core, single mode
- Good spatial quality (M²<1.1), <2 nm spectral spread, high power, low jitter, etc.
- Burst mode amplification up to 100 µJ
- Anne Dabrowski: Long. Diagnostics
 - Technology choices vs. location
 (Streak camera, EOS, CDR, RF detector)
 - Bunch length vs. bunch profile
 - (Personal remark: RF deflector?)
- Rogelio Tomas Garcia: BDS specs
 - CLIC BDS layouts, diagnostics requirements, etc., & polarization measurements

Consideration on the Conceptual Phase Stabilisation System

D. Schulte for the phase stabilisation team

Main to Drive Beam Tolerance	Drive Beam Tolerances	Sensitivity
2% luminosity loss for -Gradient error of 10 ⁻³ -Phase error of 0.3° -Main beam current stability of 0.1-0.2%	Need to stabilise Drive Beam -Current – 7.5 10 ⁻³ -Bunch length – 1%	-Phase jitter from DR: 0.2° @ 1GHz -Phase jitter of BC1: 0.08° @ 4 GHz -Phase jitter of BC2 : 0.2° @ 12GHz: -Phase error from DB accelerator: : 0.05° @ 1GHz



Phase Reference

- We have two options to provided a distributed phase reference system in the main linac
 - use the outgoing main beam
 - X-FEL-like system
 - or a combination
- Decision needs to be based on further input from hardware performance
 - both seem to not be too far

Amplifiers for CLIC Drive Beam Phase Correction

Philip Burrows, John Adams Institute, Oxford University for Colin Perry



It can be done – but looks very expensive !

4 kickers at each bend, 250kW peak power amplifier to each kicker, 56 amplifier modules / amplifier *amplifier cost:* £75K per 250kW amplifier *** *This is all very very approximate* *** 768 amplifiers total, 200MW total peak power: - **SYSTEM COST:** £60M (perhaps +/-£30M)

CLIC Fine Timing System

Update on specifications

Javier Serrano

In scope

- Recap usual timing performance specification methods.
- Cast (some) existing requirements into this language.



'Relevant technologies'

Low noise oscillators

Many promising options for both master oscillator and VCO on receiving side. See e.g. F. Ömer İlday's talk in CLIC09.

Fiber link stabilization

Proposed schemes guarantee noise of master oscillator up to the kHz region (limited by speed of light in fibers). Two types, pulsed and CW, have gone under 50 fs but not over 25 km.

'First Clients'

Drive beam RF system

Drive beam phase jitter $< 0.02^{\circ}$ at 1 GHz (\approx 50 fs).

Inter-beam synchronization using kickers

Similar requirements. See D. Schulte's talk.

Beam-based pulse-to-pulse feedback

Need for coherent time-tagged data. Precision tbd.

'Limitations'

Phase noise Power Spectral Density (PSD)

Lower limit

Perturbations below \sim 5 Hz can be corrected through pulse-to-pulse feedback.

Upper limit

Set by the active element with the highest bandwidth (kickers, cavities...). Currently estimated to lie in the MHz region.



CLIC Two-Beam Module







- Five talks
 - Alexander Samoshkin: Integration
 - Germana Riddone: Prototyping for CTF3
 - Cedric Garion: Vacuum system
 - Michele Modena: Magnets
 - Marc Vanden Eynden: Data acquisition & control
- Very advanced design status (impressive!)
 - Many design details and solutions presented
 - Very compact, complex mechanics
 - Extremely tight tolerances!
 - Solutions for assembly and installation
 - Need low-power data acquisition concept.



- Joint session WG7+8
- Four presentations with focus on:
 - Alignment
 - Helene Mainaud-Durand: Pre-Alignment Studies
 - Thomas Touze: Metrological Reference Network
 - Stabilization
 - Kurt Artoos: Status and plans
 - Christophe Collette: Hard or Soft? (active dampers)



Experimental results very promising

For stabilization (on left), for active pre-alignment (on right)





• Two presentations:

IIL

- Marc Ross: ILC MPS
- Micheal Jonker: CLIC MPS
- Remarkable discussion
 - Neither beam energy (multi GeV), nor beam power (multi MW), but: power density is destructive
 - CLIC main beam: 10000 x "safe beam"
 - Needs passive and active protection systems, pilot bunch concept, AND: A balanced beam-line design!

Single pulse damage in 1.4 mm Cu





THANK YOU!

:lr

İİL





Backup

Requirements and steps towards feasibility

For stabilization (on left), for active pre-alignment (on right)



Strategy...

For stabilization (on left), for active pre-alignment (on right)



Development of very good know-how

For stabilization (on left), for active pre-alignment (on right)



Passive vs Active vibration isolation



Only active isolation can provide both:

- Isolation in a broad frequency range between 1Hz and 20 Hz
- Dynamic stiffness for robustness to disturbances and compatibility with alignment

[1]

Conditions:

- Measure the vibrations
- Process the signal in real time
- Apply small dynamic forces



Comparison		
Very Soft (1 Hz)	Soft (20 Hz)	Stiff (200 Hz)
 Pneumatic actuator Hydraulic actuator 	 Electromagnetic in parallel with a spring Piezo actuator in series with soft element (rubber) 	• Piezoelectric actuator in series with stiff element (flexible joint)
COMPARISON		
+ Broadband isolation - Stiffness too low - Noisy 10/22/2010	+ Passive isolation at high freq. + Stable - Low dynamic stiffness - Low compatibility with calignment.an.d:AEva, 21 October 201	+ Extremely robust to forces + Fully compatible with AE + Comply with requirements - Noise transmission - Strong cout WILC2010



Still a lot to do...

For stabilization (on left),

for active pre-alignment (on right)

Conclusions

Alternative studies for TDR

Determination of the position of the components:

- → In collaboration with NIKHEF : development of alternative solutions (laser beam)
 - \circ $\,$ Design of a short range / long range solution adapted for CLIC requirements $\,$
 - Integration of the short range solution on the two beam module prototype
 - Inter-comparison of the long range solution in TT1 / TZ32 tunnels

Re-adjustment:

ightarrow Validation of the concept of articulation point with cam movers

Other studies (in order to reduce the number of sensors):

- → Study of a mono-girder (DB & MB components)
- → Study of longer girders
- Development of low cost WPS sensors with FOGALE Nanotech (technical specification under definition)

Development of a Laser Alignment Multipoint Based: LAMBDA project



22

- With STRATEGY STIFF stabilisation support based on parallel piezo actuator structure:
- We DEMONSTRATED in a model and on test benches

the **technical feasibility** to stabilise better than the required level at 1Hz in two d.o.f., from levels that were characterised in a running accelerator in a deep tunnel (LHC). This **with commercially available components**.

- □ We demonstrated **nano positioning** in two d.o.f.
- We have a concept design of the stabilisation support based on the validated actuator pair with flexural hinges.
- Compatible with module requirements and alignment and robust against external forces 10/22/2010
 IWLC2010 WG8 Summary

Helene MAINAUD DURAND