### *Corrector Orbit Dipoles (CODs) Analysis*

#### Georgios Kourkafas technical student TE-MPE-PE

under the supervision of M Koratzinos and the guidance of R Schmidt 16/07/10

### *Trip of orbit corrector magnets and effects on the beam*

#### *Outline*

- Checked two cases where a corrector tripped
	- 1) MCBV.12L4.B1 at fill: #1034
	- 2) MCBV.17L1.B1 at fill: #1035
- We have looked at the current of the correctors, calculated the resulting kick and estimated the losses that such a kick produces using a simple model.

•60A superconducting

- •Time constant: 55s (indicated 99s /130s)
- •Nominal magnetic field: 2.93T
- •Length: 0.647m
- Kourkafas Georgios 3 •Operating temperature: 1.9K

#### *Corrector MCBV.12L4.B1*

- Time and date of event: 12/4 at 9:14
- ⚫ Operating current : 5.37A
- Magnet kick: 16.6 µrad
- ⚫ Intensity falls 10% losses indicated by the BLMs in point 7.



#### *Data during loss*

Corrector current with scaled BLM signals (first losses observed at 3.5A)

BLM signals in IP7 (maximum losses at: 0.56A)



#### *Data during loss*

#### Temperature around IP7 remains unchanged

#### Vertical orbit RMS increases to 0.9mm



#### *Beam at collimators*

⚫ Calculated emittance from wire scanning:  $\epsilon$ =e\*/(βγ)=3.18E-10m (1.5h before event)

#### • Optics set to collision



$$
\Delta x_{co}(s) = \frac{\sqrt{\beta(s)}}{2\sin \pi Q} \sum_{i} \theta_{i} \sqrt{\beta(s_{i})} \cos (\Psi(s) - \Psi(s_{i}) + \pi Q)
$$



*Event progression*



### *Progression with 20% increased emittance*



### *Progression with an σ/3 offset*



## *Logged intensity vs. calculated intensity from BLM losses*



#### *Corrector MCBV.17L1.B1*

- Time and date of event: 13/4 at 9:33
- ⚫ Operating current : 3.94A
- Magnet kick: 12.2 µrad
- ⚫ Intensity remains unchanged no losses detected



#### *Beam at collimators*

• Calculated emittance from wire scanning: ε=e\*/(βγ)=5.3Ε-10m (2h before event)

#### • Optics set to collision



*Event progression*



## *Distribution of MCB operating current during fill*



#### *Conclusions*

- Trips of MCB correctors, operated at expected currents, can potentially cause significant losses in the intensity.
- We have analyzed two cases and have found good agreement between what is observed and what we would expect from a simple calculation of losses.

Orbit corrector analysis in the cycle

# Motivation

- An unnecessary (and undetected) closed bump in the machine is potentially dangerous.
- Understand how the CODs behave during the different phases of the cycle of the machine.
- How reproducible is the corrector currents from fill to fill?
- Is there a way to find abnormal COD values (for example, a forgotten closed bump/a misbehaving BPM) by comparing the COD currents between different fills?
- Ultimate goal: Can a (software) interlock be devised to guard against unwanted closed bumps?

## **INJECTION ANALYSIS**

(4 fills between 13/6 - 17/6)

### Injection features

#### Timeseries Chart between 2010-06-14 18:27:02 and 2010-06-14 21:15:18 (LOCAL TIME) .<br>YMBB UA23 RCBXH1L2:IMEAS → RPMBB UA23 RCBXH2 L2:IMEAS → RPMBB UA23 RCBXH3L2:IMEAS → RPMBB UA23 RCBXV1.L2:IMEAS → RPMBB UA23 RCBXV2.L2:IMEAS → RPMBB UA23 RCBXV3L2:IMEAS → RPMBB UA27 RCBXH1 R2:IMEAS → RPMBB UA27 RCBXH2 R2 RPMBB.UA27.RCBXH3.R2:IMEAS -- RPMBB.UA27.RCBXV1.R2:IMEAS -- RPMBB.UA27.RCBXV2.R2:IMEAS -- RPMBB.UA27.RCBXV3.R2:IMEAS .<br>RPMBB.UA83.RCBXH1.L8:IMEAS — RPMBB.UA83.RCBXH2.L8:IMEAS — RPMBB.UA83.RCBXH3.L8:IMEAS — RPMBB.UA83.RCBXV1.L8:IMEAS RPMBB.UA83.RCBXV2.L8:I\_MEAS -- RPMBB.UA83.RCBXV3.L8:I\_MEAS NO. Hor 14-Jun-2010 20h 14Jun-2010 21h

#### Normally CODs remain constant during injection



#### **ENERGY RAMP ANALYSIS**

(4 fills between 13/6 - 17/6)

## CODs during ramp





### **SQUEEZE ANALYSIS**

(5 fills between 26/4 - 19/5)

# COD current vs. Quad current for 5 fills



 $-1.00$ 

#### **STABLE BEAMS ANALYSIS**

(11 fills between 24/6 – 5/7)

# Analysis

- We look at data from all CODs (1061) during stable beams mode
- During a fill there is normally no significant change. We have looked at different times during a fill, especially after an intensity drop.
- We then calculate the kick variation during different fills.
- 11 recent fills have been analyzed (fills 1179 1199)

# Largest – smallest kick (11 fills) of all CODs during stable beams



# Kick difference in respect to position - grouped by plane/beam

1.40E-05 1.20E-05 Difference in Kick (rad) **Difference in Kick (rad)** 1.00E-05 8.00E-06  $\bullet$ 6.00E-06 4.00E-06 2.00E-06 0.00E+00 0 5000 10000 15000 20000 25000 30000 **Position (m)**

**H1 CODs**





**V2 CODs**



### Progression



#### Seems to be a bump that has been taken out

## Case study for Closed Bump

#### Orbit simulation of the case





# Simulation of the closed bump using intermediate magnet



# Orbit logged from BPMs



# Conclusions

- We have noted typical COD behavior during the different phases of the cycle.
- A close observation and analysis of the CODs can reveal abnormal behavior and maybe detect potentially unsafe operation.
- Possible development: a tool that indicates and warns on potential problems.

### The end

#### Thanks for you attention

#### **EXTRA SLIDES**

### **SQUEEZE ANALYSIS**

(5 fills between 26/4 - 19/5)

## Quad current during squeeze





**RQ7.R1B2**  $\longrightarrow$  Reference quad (monotonic)

Quad current same in every fill (RQ4-RQ8)

Squeezing steps (β\* in m):  $11 - 9 - 7 - 5 - 3.5 - 2.5 - 2$ 

#### COD current during squeeze



Reference COD's

**MCBCV7.R1B2**

#### **MCBYHS4.L1B2**



#### COD statistics during squeeze

**MCBC Kick MCBY Kick**

**MAX**

**MAX**



### COD current vs. Quad current

**MCBCV7.R1B2 MCBYHS4.L1B2**

![](_page_39_Figure_2.jpeg)

## For 5 different fills

![](_page_40_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### **ENERGY RAMP ANALYSIS**

(4 fills between 13/6 - 17/6)

### COD current during ramp

![](_page_42_Figure_1.jpeg)

Example COD's

**MCBCH5.R1B1**

0.00

5.00

10.00

15.00

**COD Current (A)**

COD Current (A)

20.00

25.00

30.00

![](_page_42_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Figure_5.jpeg)

#### MCBX magnets

**MCBXV1.L1**

**MCBXH3.R1**

![](_page_43_Figure_3.jpeg)

# Kick of MCBX magnets during ramp as a function of dipole current

![](_page_44_Figure_1.jpeg)

### MCBY magnets

**MCBYV4.R1B1**

![](_page_45_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Figure_3.jpeg)

# Kick of MCBY magnets during ramp as a function of dipole current

![](_page_46_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### MCBC magnets

**MCBCH8.R1B2**

**MCBCV10.R1B1**

![](_page_47_Figure_3.jpeg)

# Kick of MCBC magnets during ramp as a function of dipole current

![](_page_48_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Formula of the kick of an orbit corrector

$$
\theta = 2 \cdot \sin^{-1} \left( \frac{L}{2\rho} \right)
$$

where:  
\n
$$
\rho = \frac{p}{B \cdot e} = \frac{E \cdot \beta}{c \cdot B \cdot e}
$$
\n: bending radius

E : current energy<br>B: magnetic field (propotional to magnet current)<br>L : magnet length

# Calculated displacement for worst case scenario (b=200, cos=1)

#### **MCBCV7.R1B2**

- 0.98 mm
- 3.26 sigma

#### **MCBYHS4.L1B2**

- 2.12 mm
- 7.68 sigma

[Difference due to large beta in this magnets (3 times higher)]