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## Rational

- Two concerns exist
- A klystron-based machine can more easily demonstrate the basic RF unit
- A klystron-based machine may be cheaper at lower energies
- Want to address these issues with no prejudice
- Focus on 500 GeV machine since this is the point where concerns are most relevant


## Strategy

- Use current CLIC 500 GeV design and simply replace the drive beam with klystrons
- Minimal changes
- May not be the optimum klystron based design
- Optimise the CLIC 500GeV design for klystron, using heavily damped structures and remaining compatible with up-grade
- We limit ourselfs to structures which have been developed in the process of the CLIC 500 GeV optimisation
- Full optimisation of CLIC for klystrons
- Not done
- Significant amount of work
- Obviously profit from JLC-X/NLC work


## Luminosity Comparison to NLC

|  |  | CLIC 500 GeV | NLC (TRC II) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Luminosity | $10^{34} \mathrm{~cm}^{-2} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Beam Power | MW | 9.62 | 12.8 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Horizontal/vertical emittance | nm | $2400 / 25$ | $3600 / 40$ |
| Particles per bunch | $10^{9}$ | 6.8 | 7 |
| Bunches per pulse |  | 354 | 192 |
| Repetition rate | Hz | 50 | 120 |

$$
L \propto \frac{N^{2}}{4 \pi \sigma_{x} \sigma_{y}} n_{b} f_{f} \propto \frac{N}{\sigma_{x}} \frac{1}{\sigma_{y}} P_{\text {beam }}
$$

Lower beam current per luminosity is due to smaller vertical emittance in CLIC

Smaller horizontal emittance in CLIC allows to run at smaller bunch charges beamstrahlung fixes optimum $\mathrm{N} / \sigma_{\mathrm{x}}$

## RF Comparison to NLC

|  |  | CLIC <br> 500 GeV | NLC <br> (TRC II) | NLC <br> later |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Loaded gradient | $\mathrm{MV} / \mathrm{m}$ | 80 | 50 | 52 |
| Structure length | mm | 230 | 900 | 600 |
| Energy gain per structure | MV | 18.4 | 45 | 31.2 |
|  | MW | 74.2 | 75 | 54 |
| Structure input power |  |  |  |  |
|  | GW | 4.03 | 1.666 | 1.89 |
| Inst. input RF power per GeV | ns | 242 | 400 | 400 |
| RF pulse length | ns | $354 \times 0.5$ | $192 \times 1.4$ | $192 \times 1.4$ |
| Number of bunches / spacing | A | 2.2 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Beam current in pulse |  |  |  |  |
| RF input energy / pulse / GeV | J | 975 | 666 | 666 |
| CLIC-ACE February 3rd, 2011 |  |  |  |  |

## Replacing Drive Beam with Klystrons

# NLC/GLC Linac RF Unit (One of 2232 for 500 GeV cms Energy) 



Eight 0.6 m Accelerator Structures ( $65 \mathrm{MV} / \mathrm{m}$ Unloaded, $52 \mathrm{MV} / \mathrm{m}$ Loaded)

## NLC Initial Baseline Design

- 75 MW Klystron (approx 2000 per LINAC)
- Solenoid focussing (25kW per klystron)
- 55\% efficiency
- 0.0002 duty cycle ( $120 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.6 \mu \mathrm{~s}$ )
- Average RF output power of klystron 14.4 kW
- 1 kW heater power per klystron
- Line type modulator
- Pulse transformer 20\% wasted power with rise and fall time
- Thyratron switch, 600 W per thyratron
- Overall Power Requirement per Klystron/Modulator
- 55.3 kW
- $246 \mathrm{MW} /$ two linac (2264 klystrons)
- This technology is known and works

NLC Baseline Design circa 2002

- 75 MW Klystron (approx 2000 per LINAC)
- ppm periodic permanent magnet focussing (no solenoids)
- 55\% efficiency
- 0.0002 duty cycle ( $120 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1.6 \mu \mathrm{~s}$ )
- Average RF output power of klystron 14.4 kW
- 1 kW heater power per klystron
- Solid State Modulator (1 per two klystrons)
- Pulse transformer $20 \%$ wasted power with rise and fall time
- Overall Power Requirement per Klystron/Modulator(0.5)
- 37.5 kW (would at 50 Hz be 16.2 kW )
- 167 MW/two linacs
- Klystron development was not finished, some problems with pulse width and high rep rate, peak power achieved
- Modulators
- Many iterations were done on different types of solid state switches, but still with pulse transformer. Only recently can we confidently say that this technology is properly developed
- This will be our baseline, even if work is needed to fully demonstrate it


## Pulse Compression Efficiency







## Efficiency

Consider drive beam based machine up to roughly twice as efficient

But more work to be done at 500 GeV drive beam based CLIC

- some inconsistencies between Igor and Bernard

Need to include other systems in comparison

- e.g. magnets of drive beam complex

| Efficiency [\%] | NLC | CLIC | achieved |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Modulator | 70 | 70 | 60 |
| Klystron | 55 | 55 | $53-56$ |
| SLED II | 81 | 65 | $(78)$ |
| Waveguide | 92 | 92 | 77 |
| total | 28.3 | 23 | 19.5 |


|  | Design | ready | Drive |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Modulator | $90^{*}$ | $86 ?$ | beam |
| Klystron | 70 | 66 |  |
| Waveguide 1 GHz | 95 |  | *strongly |
| depends |  |  |  |
| on rise |  |  |  |
| Structure | 97 | 95.3 | and fall <br> time |
| Power extraction | 87 |  |  |
| Waveguide 12 GHz | 99 | 98 | 11 |
| total | 50 |  |  |
| CLC-ACE February 3rd, 2011 |  |  | 11 |

## Klystron Number

- We use

$$
N_{\text {klystron }}=1.1 \frac{E_{c m} n_{b} N}{\eta_{R F \rightarrow \text { beam }} \eta_{k l y s t r o n \rightarrow \text { structure }} G_{\text {sled }} P_{\text {klystron }} \tau_{R F}}
$$

- No parameter adjustment for
- Integer number of structures per klystron pair
- Integer compression factor
- To be done done once we fix a design
- But will not change the conclusions very much
- Will adjust other parameters a bit, e.g. klystron power, RF pulse length
- 7200 klystrons for CLIC 500 baseline


## Wall Plug Power

$$
P_{\text {linac }}=N_{\text {klystron }} \frac{1.6 \mu s P_{\text {klystron }} f_{r}}{\eta_{\text {modulator }} \eta_{k l y s t r o n}} \approx 15.6 \mathrm{~kW} \frac{f_{r}}{50 H z}
$$

- Drive beam CLIC 500
- Average total RF input power 24.3MW
- Wall plug 53.5MW (Igor), 89MW (Bernard)
- Klystrons-based CLIC 500
- Average total RF input power 24.3MW
- 112 MW wall plug (7200 klystrons)
- NLC
- Average total RF input power 47.3MW
- Wall plug 167MW (4464 klystrons)


## Semi-optimised Structure

## Reminder: 500 GeV Structure Choice

- Structure has been optimised for luminosity per unit power
- Figure of merit: $L_{b x} / N \eta_{\text {RF--beam }}$
- Larger emittances than at 3 TeV have been assumed
- Upgrade potential has been included by requiring
- Structure length be 23 or 48 cm
- i.e. a 500 GeV structure replaces 1 or 23 TeV -structures
- RF pulse length be 240 or 480 ns
- 240 ns for 23 cm long structures
- i.e. for 48 cm long structures the drive beam decelerator can be 2 times longer
- Input power per structure is similar to 3TeV
- Did not quite make it but came close

Luminosity at 500 GeV

Short range wake limits bunch charge


Calculate:

Bunch charge $N(G, a, f)$
Luminosity $\mathrm{L}_{0.99}(\mathrm{G}, \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{f})$

Limit on long-range wake at second bunch

Depends on assumptions on

- emittances
- beta-functions

Figure of Merit


## Cost Calculation

- Klystron-based machine has some cost reduction
- No drive beam generation complex
- No drive beam turn-arounds
- No decelerators
- But some cost increase
- Second tunnel is needed for klystron, modulators and pulse compressors
- Klystrons, modulators, pulse compressors etc.
- Do not yet have a cost comparison of klystron-based vs. drive beam based machine
- More work needed
- But we have an estimate of the relative linac cost for the klystron-based machine
- Allows to identify the best klystron-based machine


## Cost versus Gradient

Klystron based 500 GeV CLIC


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { —— } 2 \pi / 3 \text { : } N_{s}=\text { free, } L_{s}>200 \mathrm{~mm}, t_{p}=\text { free } \\
& —-2 \pi / 3: N_{s}=6, L_{s}=230 \mathrm{~mm}, t_{p}=242 \mathrm{~ns} \\
& \text { - }-2 \pi / 3: N_{s}=6, L_{s}=480 \mathrm{~mm}, t_{p}=242 \mathrm{~ns} \\
& -2 \pi / 3: N_{s}=6, L_{s}=480 \mathrm{~mm}, t_{p}=483 \mathrm{~ns} \\
& -\mathrm{CLIC} \%_{\mathrm{G}}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{p}}=242 \mathrm{~ns} \\
& -\mathrm{CLIC} \%_{G}{ }_{\mathrm{G}} \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{p}}=483 \mathrm{~ns} \\
& --\Delta-5 \pi / 6: N_{s}=\text { free, } L_{s}>200 \mathrm{~mm}, t_{p}=\text { free } \\
& --\Delta-5 \pi / 6: N_{s}=6, L_{s}=230 \mathrm{~mm}, t_{p}=242 \mathrm{~ns} \\
& \text {-- }-5 \pi / 6: N_{s}=6, L_{s}=480 \mathrm{~mm}, t_{p}=242 \mathrm{~ns} \\
& --\Delta-5 \pi / 6: N_{s}=6, L_{s}=480 \mathrm{~mm}, t_{p}=483 \mathrm{~ns}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Linac Cost versus Luminosity per Power

 for $E_{y}=40 / 25 \mathrm{~nm}$

## Structure Parameters

| Case | 2 | 3 | 5 | basel. | NLC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average accelerating gradient: $\left\langle\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{a}}\right\rangle$ [MV/m] | 57 | 67 | 57 | 80 | 52 |
| rf phase advance: $\Delta \boldsymbol{\phi}\left[^{\circ}\right]$ | 120 | 120 | 150 | 150 | 150 |
| Average iris radius/wavelength: $\langle a\rangle / \lambda$ | 0.145 | 0.14 | 0.16 | 0.145 | 0.17 |
| Str. Length: / [mm] | 480 | 480 | 480 | 229 | 600 |
| Bunch separation: $\boldsymbol{N}_{\text {s }}$ [rf cycles] | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 16 |
| Bunch population: $N$ | $5.49 \times 10^{9}$ | $4.95 \times 10^{9}$ | $7.01 \times 10^{9}$ | $6.8 \times 10^{9}$ | $7 \times 10^{9}$ |
| Number of bunches in a train: $\boldsymbol{N}_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ | 382 | 335 | 337 | 354 | 190 |
| Pulse length: $\tau_{p}$ [ns] | 242 | 242 | 242 | 242 | 400 |
| Input power: $P_{\text {in }}$ [MW] | 76 | 84 | 89 | 74.2 | 54 |
| Max. surface field: $E_{\text {surf }}{ }^{\text {max }}$ [MV/m] | 215.6 | 260 | 260 | 250 |  |
| Max. temperature rise: $\Delta \mathrm{T}^{\text {max }}[\mathrm{K}]$ | 27.6 | 43 | 42 | 56 |  |
| Structure efficiency: $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ [\%] | 49.5 | 41.9 | 48 | 39.6 | ~31 |
| Figure of merit: $\eta L_{b \times} / N$ [a.u.] | 3.41 | 2.79 | 3.81 | 3.3 | 1.7/2.15 |
| Relative lumi in peak @ $50 \mathbf{H z}$ | 0.73 | 0.55 | 0.94 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Number of 75MW-klystrons per linac | 2520 | 2358 | 2934 | 3600 | 2232 |
| Number of structures per klystron | 4.4 | 4 | 3.75 | 4.5 | 4 |
| Power / two linacs [MW] | 78.6 | 73.6 | 91.4 | 112 | 167 |
| Linac cost [arb. units] | 5107 | 4559 | 5521 | 5443 | ? |

## Structure Parameters

| Case | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | basel. | NLC |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G [MV/m] | 57 | 67 | 57 | 80 | 52 |
| Str. Length: [mm] | 480 | 480 | 480 | 229 | 600 |
| $\Delta \mathrm{z}[\mathrm{RF}$ cycles] | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 16 |
| Bunch population: $\mathrm{N}\left[10^{9}\right]$ | 5.49 | 4.95 | 7.01 | 6.8 | 7 |
| Bunches per train: $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | 382 | 335 | 337 | 354 | 190 |
| Pulse length: $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{p}}[\mathrm{ns}]$ | 242 | 242 | 242 | 242 | 400 |
| Input power: $\mathrm{P}_{\text {in }}[\mathrm{MW}]$ | 76 | 84 | 89 | 74.2 | 54 |
| Structure efficiency: $\eta[\%]$ | 49.5 | 41.9 | 48 | 39.6 | $\sim 31$ |
| Figure of merit: $\eta \mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{bx}} / \mathrm{N}$ | 3.41 | 2.79 | 3.81 | 3.3 | $1.7 / 2.15$ |
| Rel. lumi in peak @ 50 Hz | 0.73 | 0.55 | 0.94 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Klystrons per linac | 2520 | 2358 | 2934 | 3600 | 2232 |
| Power / two linacs [MW] | 78.6 | 73.6 | 91.4 | 112 | 167 |
| Linac cost [arb. units] | 5107 | 4559 | 5521 | 5443 | $?$ |

## Future

- Documenting the current status
- Report is being prepared
- Some inconsistencies need to be fixed
- E.g. power efficiency
- Establish some cost model for 500 GeV
- Also needed for drive beam based machine
- Based on CLIC cost evaluation
- Further work once we have a scenario for CLIC energy staging
- Emittances at 500 GeV have strong impact on structure choice
- Upgrade will place many constraints


## Conclusion

- Using current CLIC 500 design with klystrons requires 7200 klystrons
- Prediction for wall plug to RF efficiency could indicate that drive beam is twice more efficient
- But needs careful detailed evaluation on drive beam side
- RF to beam efficiency is about $33 \%$ larger than for NLC structure due to heavy damping
- Reducing the gradient to reduce the klystron number leads to about 5000 klystrons
- But cost cannot be reduced strongly (<20\% for main linac)
- The cost for the different options does not seem to vary very strongly
- Error of the model is still large
- Comparison of cost klystron vs. drive beam remains to be done

