Optics Measurements, Corrections and Modelling for

High-Performance Storage Rings workshop (OMCM

The DAONE experience

Catla Milardi

June 20th : 22nd 2011,

Outline

- DA *P*NE Main Rings
- Beam Position diagnostics
- Optics Measurements
- Closed Orbit steering and correction
- $\Box \sigma_v$ tuning and control
- Betatron Coupling analysis and minimization

Main Rings magnetic layout

General aspects:

Double ring collider Compact magnetic layout No periodicity All magnetic elements are independently powered 4 wigglers in each ring 8 dipoles, 4 different kinds each ring, not negligible fringing fields Cross talk between e+ and e- ring Cross talk between e+ and e- ring Off axis orbit in the low-beta quadrupoles due to horizontal crossing angle at the IP Detector solenoidal field (KLOE and FINUDA) strongly affecting ring optics

 $2001 \div 2007$ Two 10 meter long IRs common to the colliding

beams Non-linear terms in the wiggler field almost halved

2007 \div 2011 One IR and complete beam separation 50 cm apart from the IP Crab-Waist collision scheme





DA ONE BPMs



BPM acquisition system



Pickup details: Button electrodes 10 mm diameter 50 Ω matched impedance 4.2 pF capacitance



BPM transfer function obtained by: Numerical simulation Bench measurement then used to compensate pickup nonlinearities in the range +/- 20 mm

In 2006 4 additional BPMs acquisition systems based on LIBERA modules have been added on each ring

recovery after a major Shutdown	Not yet stored beam •Trajectory •Central rev frequency •Tune	Not available in present system	1000 0 1000
machine studies	Turn by turn (non linear terms)	Dedicated tracking system	S = 1000 - 10000 - 10000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 10
	√Beta phase advance	Dedicated system	€ 10 ⁴
normal operation	Closed orbit	Improved resolution	
	Tune	Dedicated system	Qx

BPM resolution versus beam current

each point is averaged on 100 orbit



For the Bergoz system: $\delta x \sim 0.01 \text{ mm}$ above $\langle I \rangle_{\text{treshold}}$ $\langle I \rangle_{\text{treshold}} = \frac{3.1 \text{ mA (round, diagonal, rect, wiggler)}}{2.1 \text{ mA (dipole, interaction region)}}$

Measured Response Matrix

$$z_{i} = \frac{\sqrt{\beta_{i}\beta_{j}}}{2\sin(\pi\nu)}\cos\nu(|\phi_{i} - \phi_{j}| - \pi) \qquad z = x, y$$

From Correctors

- orbit correction
- closed bump calculation
- corrector strength reduction
- understand & improve machine linear-model
- dispersion function control
- coupling evaluation

From Quadrupoles

• beam based alignment

 $i=1..n_c$ $n_c=29$ for CHV $n_c=51$ for QUADs $j=1..n_{mon}$ $n_{mon}=44$

$$A^{H} = \begin{vmatrix} A^{HH} & 0 \\ 0 & A^{HV} \end{vmatrix}$$

$$A^{V} = \begin{vmatrix} 0 & A^{VV} \\ A^{VH} & 0 \end{vmatrix}$$

Closed Orbit correction & Beam Steering by measured Response Matrix

- Global Orbit Correction
- Corrector strength reduction

$$z = A \Delta I$$

 $(\overline{z} + A\overline{I_0}) = A\overline{I}$

Equations are least square solved by Singular Value Decomposition

 Best Corrector useful in identifying power supply faults & drifts

$$I_{j} = \frac{\sum_{i} z_{i} A_{ij}}{\sum_{i} A_{ij}^{2}}$$

	Response Mat file path §//u2/dcu/space/datafileu/RSM/p	_v_v		Load GV BSM Load	
V - R+ -	Displacement (nm) D	isplacement admutt(m)			
	20 21.0000t 20 2	48.1900	314000	Chill Mahara Tabla 161	
ainanuniusEdr	Sin roomen.2		1.62220E-1	0 CVVPS104 8.18	
e)	1.00000E-4	Get Dump	elgenvalue	1 CVVPS105 - 83 2 CVVPS106 - 86	
epsLoc	DOCODOE+0 PICK CHV		Are Hanopope-0	3 CVVPS201 .78	
				Write File	
			setpoint out i	of CHV win or CHV MAX	
				A [A] lost [A] Inin [A] In	nax (/
			-55		
			\$0	0.000 0.000 0.000	
1.5-			Seit	0 2022 2022 0000	
1.5-			Conected On	a aca aca co o	
1.5-			Const Corrected Ont	0 000 2002 2000	
1.5 1.0- 0.5-			Ditut Corrected Ont	0 2002 2002 0000	

These algorithms are unaffected from:

- model imperfection
- corrector calibration constant
- offset in BPMs alignment
- overall offset in orbit readout

Best Orbit at DAΦNE

Closed Orbit Correction and steering magnet strength minimization to:

- Point out errors in the magnetic layout
- Reduce non-linear contributions to the beam optics (ϵ_x , α_c , τ)
- Keep beam dispersion under control
- Minimize transverse coupling (ϵ_v , κ)
- reduce background hitting the experimental detector and ameliorate scrapers efficiency

Orbit can be made as small as desired, however the most suitable value for operation is obtained iteratively by global, local correction and steering magnet strength minimization.



Bare orbit minimization by element alignment

 $Z_{bare} = Z_{beam} - Z_{\Sigma Steers}$

- A large bare orbit indicates always alignment problems
- Misalignment errors are identified by fitting the measured bare orbit with the machine model

In the example:

Bare orbit has been reduced in both rings by repositioning the outer electromagnetic QUADS in the FINUDA IR

After alignment:

- strengths of the steering magnets adjacent to the IR2 section are considerably reduced
- bare orbit is significantly reduced and is comparable in the two rings



Twiss function measurement & ring optics

 $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ measurements performed by:

varying the quadrupole strength (42 QUADs per ring)

- Correcting the closed orbit variation, if any
- the β value precision depends on the accuracy of the tune measurement, possible systematic errors in the quadrupoles calibration are neglected

Optics measurements (β_1 , β_2 , ν_1 , ν_2 , η_{x_i} , η_{x_i} , ξ_{x_i} , ξ_y) are used for model optimization

The model is used for:

- optics computation
- measurements analysis
- lifetime computation
- dynamic aperture studies
- background, beam-beam and e-cloud simulations



[m]

β -function evaluation by measured Response Matrix

$$R_{ij} = \frac{\sqrt{\beta_i \beta_j}}{2 \sin(\pi \nu)} \cos \nu(|\phi_i - \phi_j| - \pi)$$
$$i=1 \dots n_{BPM} = 44$$
$$j=1 \dots n_{CHV} = 29$$
$$n_{BPM} + n_{CHV} = 73$$

 β can be evaluated in automatic and fast way at all BPMs and CHVs The equation system given by the R matrix is solved iteratively by using SVD numerical technique The procedure starts from an initial set of ($\beta_i \phi_i$) and ($\beta_i \phi_i$) and stops when v converges to the

measured value Ambiguity in the β determination can be avoided by imposing equal β at a couple of adjacent BPM and CHV



β_x compared with the MAD model (e⁻ ring)

β_v compared with the MAD model (e⁻ ring)



DEAR run (2002)

Original DEAR IR: IR^{DEAR} ($Q_F Q_D Q_F$) $\beta_x^* = 4.4 \text{ m}$ $\beta_v^* = 0.04 \text{ m}$





100 contiguous bunches in collision for the first time



The KLOE IR is going to be modified according the DEAR one

Parasitic Crossings in the DAFNE IR1 (KLOE run 2005)

In the original DAFNE IRs the beams experienced 24 Long Range Beam Beam interactions



computed orbit deflection due to 24 LRBB interactions for the positron bunch colliding against 10 mA electron bunches.





LIFETRACK simulation



- •2 current currying windings (wires) installed at both ends of the KLOE interaction region (IR)
- It's necessary to separate the beams as close as possible after the IP



Working point & nonlinearities compensation tuning during II FINUDA run (Nov 06 ÷ May 07)

$$v_x^- = 0.000 v_x^+ = .1090$$

 $v_y^- = .1560 n_y^+ = .1910.$

•Improve peak luminosity •Iimit beam-beam blow-up at high currents During e⁻ beam injection $\Delta v^{+}_{x,y} = 0.0005 \div 0.0015$ $\Delta k^{+}_{3} = 5. \div 15 \text{ A}$ double the e+ beam llifetime









Octupole variation affects: •c₁₁ •dynamic aperture •ξ"

DA DE optics with negative momentum compaction (KLOE run 2004÷2006)

- Bunch lengthening with current is considerably reduced
- Head-tail instability occurs for $\xi_{x,y} > 0$, the ring can be operated without or with very weak sextupoles
- Beam-beam is in general less harmful and the beam is in general more stable



A strong correlation has been observed between the longitudinal microwave instability and the vertical size blow-up

e- Vertical Size Blow-up with large α_c



- Single bunch (beam) effect
- It is correlated with the longitudinal microwave instability treshold:

Threshold scales
$$\approx \sqrt{\frac{1}{V_{RF}}} \propto 1.27$$

- It is relevant for the e- ring having higher coupling impedance
- The threshold is higher for higher momentum compaction

It is necessary to reduce the ring impedance

σ_y tuning

High luminosity cannot be achieved without a careful control of the $\sigma_{\!v}$ parameter

$$\sigma_{y} = \sqrt{\varepsilon_{y}\beta_{y} + \eta_{y}^{2}\sigma_{p}^{2}} \qquad \varepsilon_{y} = \varepsilon_{0}\frac{\kappa}{1+\kappa}$$

Dominant source of σ_v are:

- large vertical orbit
- vertical dispersion
- transverse betatron coupling due to:
 - experimental solenoid
 - roll errors in quadrupoles
 - vertical orbit distortion in sextupoles
- vacuum chamber impedance

Vertical Dispersion minimization

y =

Correcting orbit and dispersion at the same time by using orbit and dispersion dependence on the **steering magnets** and on the **skew quadrupoles** current

$$\overline{y} = K\Delta \overline{I}_s$$

BPM $i=1 \dots n_m = 44$ Corrector $j=1 \dots n_c = 29$ Skew Quadrupole $N_s = 10$

Vertical Dispersion minimization

Correcting orbit and dispersion at the same time using orbit and dispersion dependence on the steering magnets



Vertical Dispersion control & Main rings tuning

Closed Orbit Correction and steering magnet strength minimization help in:

- Finding errors in the magnetic layout
- Reducing the effect of non-linear contributions to the beam optics

Sextupoles alignment to avoid unexpected contribution to linear optics



Dispersion evolution before (red MRp_29_11_2010) and after (green MRp_23_5_2011) closed orbit optimization and sextupole alignment

Wiggler measurement

The non-linear components of the WIGEL101 field are evaluated by measuring the beam tune shift dependence on the horizontal displacement bump at its place after switching off the sextupoles in that sector





- Δv_x and Δv_y exhibit an evident linear behaviour excluding the presence of any octupole-like or higher component in the magnetic field
- A small sextupole-like dependence is observed in Δv_y only, probably originated in the nearby dipoles included in the bump



2004

Published

K ³ [m ⁻³]	Year
800	2001
360	2004
0	2011

C. Milardi, 42nd Scientific Committee, 6-7 June 2011

κ correction @ DAΦNE

FINUDA IR



- ∫B δl = 2.4 Tm
- 2 superconductive compensator solenoids •
- 4 permanent magnet QUADs •
- 4 electromagnetic QUADs •
- Independent QUADs rotation
 - KLOE solenoids off (IP₁)
 - ε_x = .34 μ

 $\Delta x \sim 13 \ \sigma_x \ @ \ 1^{st} \ par. \ cros.$ 100 consecutive bunches (1 bucket 2.7 ns)

• low-
$$\beta$$
 @ FINUDA IP₂
 $\beta_{x}^{*} = 2.33 \text{ m}$
 $\beta_{y}^{*} = .024 \text{ m}$
 $\theta_{x}^{*} = .021 \text{ rad}$

The main part of residual transverse coupling has been corrected by rotating the QUADs in IR2

Fine tuning is performed using skew QUADs

Betatron coupling correction

- local correction
 - by minimizing the coupling term of the measured Response Matrix by the IRs QUAD rotations $\Delta \phi_i$ j=1..8

$$M\Delta\phi = C^{meas}$$

$$M^{mod} = \frac{\partial y_{m_1}}{\partial k_{h_1}\partial \phi_1} \cdot \cdot \cdot \frac{\partial y_{m_1}}{\partial k_{h_1}\partial \phi_8} = \frac{\partial y_{m_1}}{\partial k_{h_1}}$$

$$M^{mod} = \frac{\partial y_{m_{aBPM}}}{\partial k_{h_{n\,kick}}\partial \phi_1} \cdot \cdot \frac{\partial y_{m_{aBPM}}}{\partial k_{h_{n\,kick}}\partial \phi_8} = C^{meas} = \frac{\partial y_{m_{aBPM}}}{\partial k_{h_{n\,kick}}\partial \phi_{n}}$$

$$C^{meas} = \frac{\partial y_{m_{aBPM}}}{\partial k_{h_{n\,kick}}\partial \phi_{n}} \cdot \cdot \cdot \frac{\partial y_{m_{aBPM}}}{\partial k_{h_{n\,kick}}\partial \phi_8} = \frac{\partial y_{m_{aBPM}}}{\partial k_{h_{n\,kick}}\partial \phi_8}} = \frac{\partial y_{m_{aBPM}}}{\partial k_{h_{n\,kich}}\partial \phi_8}} = \frac{\partial y_{m_{n\,kich}}\partial \phi_8}}{\partial k_{h_{n\,kich}}\partial \phi_8}} = \frac{\partial y_{m_{n\,kich}}\partial \phi_8}}{\partial k_{h_{n\,kich}}\partial \phi_8}} = \frac{\partial y_{m_{n\,kich}}\partial \phi_8}}{\partial k_{h_{n\,kich}}\partial \phi_8}} = \frac{\partial y_{m_{n\,kich}}\partial \phi_8}}{\partial$$

- linear system solved by SVD
- after few iteration 40% reduction in rms (Cmeas)

global correction by SKEW QUADs

 σ_{y} (KEK) = .3 mm σ_{y} (PEP) > .4 mm



The new KLOE-2 IR with the *Crab-Waist* collision scheme



Coupling correction

• $\int_{KIOF} B \cdot dI$ canceled by 2 antisolenoids for each beam

 $\int B \cdot dl = 2.048$ [*Tm*] \rightarrow $I_{KLOF} = 2300 . [A]$ KLOE $I_{comp} = 86.7[A]$ B

$$dl = \pm 1.024 \qquad [Tm] \rightarrow$$

com

To achieve coupling compensation also for off-energy particles

Fixed QUAD rotations *K* is expected to be lower than for KLOE past $K_{\text{KLOE1}} = 0.2 \div 0.3 \%$

	Z from the IP [m]	Quadrupole rotation angles [deg] Anti-solenoid current [A]
PMQDI101	0.415	0.0
PMQFPS01	0.963	-4.48
QSKPS100	2.634	used for fine tuning
QUAPS101	4.438	-13.73
QUAPS102	8.219	0.906
QUAPS103	8.981	-0.906
COMPS001	6.963	72.48 (optimal value 86.7)

EUCARD



C. Milardi, EuCARD 1st ANNUAL MEETING, 13-16 April 2010 RAL, Oxfordshire-UK

Betatron coupling analysis

- •Transverse beam dynamics in presence of coupling is described by two normal modes
- normal modes when projected on the x-y plane are represented by an ellipse with a given eccentricity and tilt
- In this graphs the normal mode tilts computed from the ring model are compared with the corresponding values obtained from the measured steering magnet response matrices





twiss3_e_Nom_MatrRis17_5_11





Vertical beam-beam Luminosity scan





Vertical beam-beam *Luminosity scan* (SIDDHARTA run)



SIDDHARTA was a small detector without solenoidal field !!

Conclusions

The DAΦNE model has been essential in: Setting up Collisions with:

Two low-beta Low-beta in 1 IR and detuning the second one FINUDA DEAR KLOE SIDDHARTA KLOE-2 KLOE-2 with the solenoidal detector off

computing several optics configuration

Detuning alternatively one of the two IRs Changing beam emittance Tuning crossing angle and β in the IR High momentum compaction Negative momentum compaction



All those studies paved the way to the many progressive upgrades implemented on DAFNE during the past years

Acknowledgment

I like to thank: A. Stella, A. Drago, M. Preger, P. Raimondi, D. Alesini, M. Zobov

