CLIC Final Focus Systems and Tuning

Hector Garcia Morales[1,2], Rogelio Tomas Garcia[2], Andrea Latina[2]

[1]Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Barcelona
[2]CERN, Geneve

25th June 2012

LCWS12 INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON FUTURE LINEAR COLLIDERS

Outline

1. CLIC Final Focus System
2. Final Focus Schemes
   - Local Chromaticity Correction Scheme
   - Traditional Correction Scheme
   - CLIC $\sqrt{s} = 3$ TeV FFS
   - CLIC $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV FFS
3. Final Focus Tuning
   - Tuning algorithm
   - Tuning CLIC $\sqrt{s} = 3$ TeV
   - Tuning CLIC $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV
4. Conclusions

CLIC Final Focus

- The generation of the nanometer IP spot size requires strong focusing.
- The main task of the Final Focus System (FFS) is to focus the beam to such small sizes.
- The chromatic aberrations of the beam transport in the FFS region need to be canceled with sextupoles and higher order multipoles.
- There exist two distinct approaches for the design of Final Focus Systems.
  - The traditional design contains two sections dedicated to the chromaticity correction,
  - The newer local chromaticity approach proposed by P.Raimondi and A.Seryi where the sextupoles are placed within the Final Doublet, allowing a shorter system.

Local Chromaticity Correction Scheme

Current CLIC FFS is based in the local chromaticity correction, initially regarded as a way to reduce the cost of the tunnel construction.





However, recent studies reveal that the current CLIC FFS poses severe challenges when considering realistic imperfections.

Traditional Chromaticity Correction Schemes

- The chromaticity is compensated in dedicated chromatic correction sections (CCX and CCY).
- Sextupoles in high dispersion and high betas regions.
- The geometric aberrations generated by the sextupoles are canceled using a $-I$ transformation between them.
- It is a relatively simple system for design and analysis.



Limitations *a priori* of the Traditional scheme

- The separate functionality of the lattice makes the traditional scheme longer.
- Relatively large β-functions and high dispersion functions which increase the length of the system and result in tighter tolerances.
- The non-local correction generates high-order aberrations which limit the momentum bandwidth.

CLIC $\sqrt{s} = 3$ TeV Traditional vs Local

Parameter	Units	Traditional	Local
Beam energy	GeV	1500	1500
Last drift L^*	m	3.5	3.5
L_{FFS}	m	1460	450
Beta function β_x/β_y	mm	6.9/0.068	6.9/0.068
Linear beam size σ_x^0/σ_y^0	nm	40/0.7	40/0.7
Nonlinear beam size σ_x^5/σ_y^5	nm	70/1.56	40.52/1.10
Total Luminosity L	$10^{34}\mathrm{cm}^{-2}$	3.11	5.06
Peak Luminosity $L_{1\%}$	$10^{34}\mathrm{cm}^{-2}$	1.25	1.71
Placet w/o synch σ_x/σ_y	nm	69.8/1.39	40.4/1.11
Placet w synch σ_x/σ_y	nm	71.6/3.22	48.5/2.69

Table: Parameters of the CLIC Final Focus $\sqrt{s} = 3$ TeV at the IP

CLIC $\sqrt{s} = 3$ TeV Luminosity bandwidth





- Traditional scheme correction limited by the length of the system.
- Local correction scheme presents more luminosity and wider luminosity bandwidth.

CLIC $\sqrt{s} = 500$ TeV Traditional vs Local

Parameter	Units	Traditional	Local
Beam energy	GeV	250	250
Last drift L^*	m	4.3	4.3
L_{FFS}	m	658.5	553
Beta function β_x/β_y	mm	9.25/0.057	9.32/0.059
Linear beam size σ_x^0/σ_y^0	nm	213.0/1.71	214.5/1.72
Nonlinear beam size σ_x^5/σ_y^5	nm	242.6/2.13	221.9/2.49
Total Luminosity L	$10^{34}\mathrm{cm}^{-2}$	1.07	1.27
Peak Luminosity $L_{1\%}$	$10^{34}\mathrm{cm}^{-2}$	0.65	0.77
Placet w/o synch σ_x/σ_y	nm	245.9/4.16	223.5/2.54
Placet w synch σ_x/σ_y	nm	246.9/3.43	223.5/2.49

Table: Parameters of the CLIC Final Focus $\sqrt{s} = 500$GeV at the IP

CLIC $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV Luminosity bandwidth





- Traditional scheme correction does not present length constraints.
- Vertical beam size correction in local scheme is constrained by the 3 TeV lattice.
- Local correction scheme presents, also in the low energy case, more luminosity and wider luminosity bandwidth.

Tuning the FFS

Static misalignments and unwanted beam position monitor offsets induce emittance dilution that can reduce the performance of a linear collider.

- CLIC Traditional and Local FFS
- $\sqrt{s} = 3$TeV, $\sqrt{s} = 500$GeV,
- Integrated simulations: BBA+Tuning Knobs
- PLACET for tracking and Guinea-Pig for Luminosity calculations
- Initial random misalignment: $\sigma = 10\mu$m RMS (x, y) for all elements
- BPM resolution: 10nm
- Corrector Block: BPM+Quadrupole+Corrector

Although extensive experience on Final Focus alignment has been gained at SLC and FFTB the tiny beamsize at the IP of CLIC require the development of new more sofisticated algorithms.

Alignment procedure. (A. Latina algorithm)

- Multipoles OFF:
  - 1:1 correction

$$\begin{pmatrix} b_x \\ b_y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} R_{xx} & 0 \\ 0 & R_{yy} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \theta_x \\ \theta_y \end{pmatrix}$$

  - DFS

$$\begin{pmatrix} b \\ \omega_1(\eta - \eta_0) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} R \\ \omega_1 D \\ \beta I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \theta_x \\ \theta_y \end{pmatrix}$$

- Multipole-Shunting
- Multipole Knobs
- Multipoles ON:
  - DFS

$$\begin{pmatrix} b \\ \omega_1(\eta - \eta_0) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} R \\ \omega_2 D \\ \beta I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \theta_x \\ \theta_y \end{pmatrix}$$

  - Multipole Shunting
  - Multipole Knobs

Before tuning...

Response matrices

- Orbit measurement via tracking.
- Optics: R_{12} elements.

Take into account:

- Nonlinearities and Synchrotron radiation.

Weights

- 5 free parameters: (gain1, gain2, ω_1, ω_2, β)
- Tuning method
  - Fix gains.
  - Scan β.
  - Simplex on (ω_1, ω_2) average on 40 seeds.

Knobs

- Tuning Knobs are calculated using SVD:
  - Beam covariances vs. 5 sextupole positions.
  - 10 Knobs are computed.
- Only 6 out of 10 Knobs ares used.
- Brent minimization algorithm.



Results 3TeV

We can compare the luminosity gain after each step:

1: 1:1

2: DFS

3: Multipole Shunting

4: Knobs

5: DFS

6: Multipole Shunting

7: Knobs



We see a luminosity reduction after second DFS but a total recovering

Tuning results 3 TeV



Tuning results 3 TeV



Results 500GeV

We can see again the evolution of the luminosity atfer each step:

1: 1:1

2: DFS

3: Multipole Shunting

4: Knobs

5: DFS

6: Multipole Shunting

7: Knobs



We see that non optimal second DFS reduces luminosity gain without

Tuning results 500GeV



Tuning results 500GeV



Conclusions

Results

- We have compared the traditional and local chromaticity correction schemes for both CLIC 3 TeV and CLIC 500 GeV.
- Local chromaticity correction looks better correcting nonlinear effects, luminosity and luminosity bandwidth.
- We have tested the Tuning algorithm for different lattices successfully and two energies $\sqrt{s} = 3$ TeV and $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV.
- Tuning turns out to be really complex and sofisticated.
- The convergence after the first pass in all cases seems to be good.

- For $\sqrt{s} = 3$ TeV and after only a first iteration, the alignment of the traditional FFS seems to work better but with lower absolute luminosity.
- For $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV and after only a first iteration, the alignment of the local FFS seems to work better than traditional scheme.
- We cannot give a global conclusion for tuning. More time for detailed studies.

Further studies

- Introduce a new free parameter β_2 for second DFS and optimize it.
- Figure out why align-mlutpoles does not work properly for low energy lattices.
- Second, third and more passes to see the final convergence of the algorithm.
- Optimize main algorithm to find the best combination.
- Identify and understand some pattern that rules the tuning procedure.