

MInternational UON Collider Collaboration

Summary of High-energy Complex

by Antoine CHANCE (CEA) On behalf of HEC WG Friday 21 May 2021



Scope of the HEC WG



A. Chance, 1st Muon Community Meeting, zoom, 20-21/05/2021



Programme HEC 20/05/2021

https://indico.cern.ch/event/1030726/timetable/#all.detailed

- Joined session with magnet people in HEC room 20/05/2021 14:00
 - Overview of magnet needs for a vFFA for a skew collider ring (Shinji Machida, STFC/RAL)
 - Overview of magnet needs for a RCS (J. Scott Berg, BNL)
 - Overview of magnet needs for a muon collider (Christian Carli, CERN)
- Joined session with RF and BD in RF room 20/05/2021 16:10
 - Low Energy acceleration: Linac & RLA (Alex Bogacz, JLAB)
 - High Energy acceleration (J. Scott Berg, BNL)
- Joined with MDI and RPOT in MDI room 17:15
 - Neutrino hazard & mitigation (Nikolai Mokhov)
 - Mitigation methods from machine side (Christian Carli)
 - Movers in the arcs (Helene Mainaud Durand)
- Joined with BD in HEC room 18:20
 - Needs in simulation tools for a vFFA (Jean-Baptiste Lagrange, STFC)

A. Chance, 1st Muon Community Meeting, zoom, 20-21/05/2021



Programme 21/05/2021

https://indico.cern.ch/event/1030726/timetable/#all.detailed

- Session HEC 09h30 in HEC room
 - Lattice design for the collider and critical aspects (Christian Carli, CERN)
 - Exotic option for the HE complex: vFFA and collider lattice with skew QPs (Shinji Machida, STFC/RAL)
 - Preparation of the HEC summary + R&D list

A. Chance, 1st Muon Community Meeting, zoom, 20-21/05/2021



Low energy acceleration Status: Linac + RLA

- Included in the MAP design.
- <u>Mature design exists for the Linac + RLA</u>. Needs for smaller RF frequency in the linac because of longer pulse (compression during acceleration)
- Next step: optimization of the design (injection energy into the RCS).
- Coherent design: 5 passes using Tesla technology. May push to 7 passes.







R&D for the linac + RLA RF cavities

- Why is it important? This is the key component to accelerate the muons as fast and efficiently as possible.
- What are the key issues? Beam loading, wakefields.high-gradients
- What do we need before next ESPPU:
 - What others will do: development of SRF cavity technology and cavity/coupler efficiency
 - What we need to do:
 - To optimize the design (optimum injection energy into the RCS/vFFA for the operating cost).
 - Deep study of the longitudinal and transverse beam loading and coherent wake field effects, BBU, and so on.
- Which resources are needed
 - RF people to evaluate, optics + beam dynamics experts



Rapid Cycling Synchrotron

- Included in MAP studies.
- 2 concepts: « conventional » RCS and/or hybrid RCS (alternating dipoles of 1.5 T + fixed SC dipole).

Sample scenario (courtesy: J. Scott Berg)

| Injection Energy (GeV) | 63 | 303 | 750 |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|
| Extraction Energy (GeV) | 303 | 750 | 1500 |
| Circumference (m) | 5210 | 5210 | 9361 |
| Fixed Dipole Length (m) | | 1103 | 2358 |
| Ramped Dipole Length (m) | 4229 | 3126 | 5240 |
| Turns | 13 | 25 | 23 |
| Time (ms) | 0.23 | 0.43 | 0.72 |
| Cavity Power (kW) | 950 | 950 | 530 |



Rapid Cycling Synchrotron

- Included in MAP studies.
- 2 concepts: « conventional » RCS and/or hybrid RCS (alternating dipoles of 1.5 T + fixed SC dipole).
- Several challenges:
 - Magnets. Very short cycling time. Needs very stable power converters + high efficiency: can be a cost killer on operating (up to 1 GW peak power to be delivered).
 - **RF**. High peak current. High beam loading.
 - **Beam dynamics**. longitudinal emittance preservation + chromaticity to be corrected?
- Good compromise to be found on the cycling: low decay but high voltage and higher Eddy currents.



Rapid Cycling Synchrotron Magnets and power supplies

- Why is it important? The shorter the cycling is, the more muons we can keep. High efficiency is of the utmost importance to keep the operating cost at a reasonable level.
- What are the key issues? Efficiency + power supply reproducibility and stability.
- What do we need before next ESPPU:
 - What others will do: development of HTS pulsed magnets, stable and efficient power supplies
 - What we need to do: to complete a parametric model of the RCS including magnet consumption (cycling for instance), to make a lattice design, to check if sextupoles are required, to give a tolerance table on the power supplies and field quality, magnet protection from decay
- Which resources are needed
 - Magnet people to evaluate, optics people (first lattice design)
- RCS is in fact a RC **pulsed** Synchrotron



Rapid Cycling Synchrotron RF

- Same thing as for the linac + RLA
 - We need high efficiency and high gradient cavities.
 - Beam loading issues.
 - Can benefit from other developments on other machines.





- New concept. Not included in MAP studies.
- Big advantage: fixed field + isochronicity (revolution period undependent on energy).
- <u>Promising alternative to the RCS</u>, <u>especially at low energy</u> when we are the most demanding in cycling.
- Needs:
 - Large aperture in the magnets (100 mm x 700 mm) + special 3D maps ($B \propto \exp(n y)$).
 - **Special simulation issues**: orbit finding tools (some codes are already functioning), fully coupled optics, space charge issues (short arcs + long pulses), time-dependent wakefields.
 - Theoretical developments
 - Realistic design/feasibily studies before next ESPPU + timeline
- Possible synergy with other projets (short synchrotrons or spallation source).



vFFA Demonstration path

- First demonstation with n.c. dipole under studies.
- Possible synergy with ISIS spallation source programme

| | 1st n.c. prototype | 12 MeV proton | 1.2 GeV proton | 1.5 TeV muon |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Aperture (H) x (D) | 600 mm x 220 mm | 700 mm x 300 mm | 700 mm x 300 mm | 700 mm x 200 mm |
| Length | 1.0 m | 0.5 ~ 1.0 m | 2 ~ 3 m | 10 ~ 20 m |
| Max field | ~ 0.01 T | ~ 3 T | ~ 6 T | ~ 9 T |
| Gradient, m | 1.3 /m | 1.3 /m +/- 25% | 1.3 /m +/- 25% | 6.8 /m |
| High/low field ratio | 2 | 2 | 2 | ~ 30 |

- - - -



Collider

- Consistent lattice exists, from MAP project (3 TeV c.m). On the repository.
- A lot of challenges: neutrino hasard, MDI, magnet protection from decays, global lattice (instrumentation, injection/extraction, absorbers, RF, interaction region, correction systems...).
- New first lattice is ongoing a study (zero momentum compaction, smaller betatron function) in a racetrack configuration.
- MDI/radioprotection needs:
 - Inner triplet. Needs large apertures to insert shielding.
 - To absorb the decayed particles in the arcs. Vacuum compatibility. Cryogenics efficiency.
 - Tools to integrate deposited power (FLUKA support + new materials for absorbing)
 - Non linearities, non linear effects of momentum compaction, chromaticty correction (local or global?)



Collider

- To mitigate the neutrino hasard in the arcs :
 - The distance between dipoles (zero dipole field region) should be as short as possible.
 Combined function magnets (like MAP) would be a great help: Higher dipole component + smaller Qpole component. Some design exists with a quadrupole inside a dipole..
 - Open midplane dipoles do not seem to be the solution (Qpole kick near the gap does not help and deflects some decayed particles to the coils).
 - « wobbling » option. Interesting proposal by slowly moving the magnets to modify the emission angles of the neutrino beam. But several challenges: magnet stability, cryogenics, alignment and stability, other components as beam pipes and vacuum components, reproducibility, vertical dispersion
 - Other idea?



Collider alternative with skew quadrupole

- Alternative proposal for the arcs: using skew quadrupole component.
 - Enable wobbling of the orbit.
- Needs:
 - combined magnets (skew quadrupoles against normal component before)
 - Realistic design/feasibily studies before next ESPPU + timeline





Collider R&D needs

Lattice design:

- To add multipole errors to give tolerance table for the magnets including power supplies
- Integrated lattice (with insertions) and beam dynamics studies including collective effects (see BD group)

Combined functions magnets:

- Should be able to tune independently the different multipole components
- Needs a scaled prototype.
- Mechanical wobbling option:
 - Needs a demonstrator to test the stability and reproducibility.
- Needs alignment and stability tolerance
- Testbench for full remote alignment system.



Non Collider Collaboration

Thank you for attention