

# High intensity MDs and operational experience

X. Buffat, C. Bracco, Y. Dutheil, L. Giacomel, M. Hofstettler, C. Lannoy, S. Kostoglou, E. Maclean, L. Mether, C.E. Montanari, N. Mounet, K. Paraschou, T. Persson, S. Redaelli, B. Salvant, G. Sterbini, R. Tomas, F. van der Veken, F. Velotti, C. Zannini



HL-LHC Collaboration meeting 09.10.2024

### Content

- Some important milestones
- Beam induced heating
- Injection losses
- Beam stability and losses at top energy
- Beam-beam impact on the collimation hierarchy
- Conclusion



Physics with with 1.6-10<sup>11</sup> p/b → Limited by beam induced heating in non-conforming RF modules. Limitation lifted for operation next year by exchanging modules during the YETS.



- Physics with with 1.6-10<sup>11</sup> p/b → Limited by beam induced heating in non-conforming RF modules. Limitation lifted for operation next year by exchanging modules during the YETS.
- Full cycle with 1 high intensity train (36b, 1.8·10<sup>11</sup> p/b) in MD. Limited by dump window until Run 4.



- Physics with with 1.6-10<sup>11</sup> p/b → Limited by beam induced heating in non-conforming RF modules. Limitation lifted for operation next year by exchanging modules during the YETS.
- Full cycle with 1 high intensity train (36b, 1.8-10<sup>11</sup> p/b) in MD. Limited by dump window until Run 4.
  - $\rightarrow$  Next milestones : Physics with 1.8.10<sup>11</sup> p/b, collisions of 12b trains with 2.3.10<sup>11</sup> p/b



- Physics with with 1.6-10<sup>11</sup> p/b → Limited by beam induced heating in non-conforming RF modules. Limitation lifted for operation next year by exchanging modules during the YETS.
- Full cycle with 1 high intensity train (36b, 1.8.10<sup>11</sup> p/b) in MD. Limited by dump window until Run 4.
  - $\rightarrow$  Next milestones : Physics with 1.8·10<sup>11</sup> p/b, collisions of 12b trains with 2.3·10<sup>11</sup> p/b
- Injection of trains of 2x48b (tot 348b) with 2.3-10<sup>11</sup> p/b in MD, but not fully ready for operation See B. Karlsen-Baeck

→ Next milestone : Beam quality preservation with  $2.3 \cdot 10^{11}$  p/b (losses at start of the ramp). Injection of longer trains (HL-LHC baseline : 4x72b per injection) in MDs ( $2.3 \cdot 10^{11}$  p/b) and potentially in operation ( $1.8 \cdot 10^{11}$  p/b)



 Main consequences of large electromagnetic fields in surrounding components:

- Vacuum spikes
- Vacuum degradation
- Damage
- Abnormal temperature readings
- Large temperature that prevents injection
  - $\rightarrow$  Intensity limitation

(TCLD, TDI, vacuum modules, LHCb VeLO) (BGI, TDIS, TOTEM) (BSRT, TDI, BGI, vacuum modules, ALFA) (2-beam collimators) (MKI, collimators)

(vacuum modules)



 Main consequences of large electromagnetic fields in surrounding components:

- Vacuum spikes
- Vacuum degradation
- Damage
- Abnormal temperature readings
- Large temperature that prevents injection
  - → Intensity limitation

(TCLD, TDI, vacuum modules, LHCb VeLO) (BGI, TDIS, TOTEM) (BSRT, TDI, BGI, vacuum modules, ALFA) (2-beam collimators) (MKI, collimators)

(vacuum modules)

# • Beam induced heating issues can come from:

- Unknowns and non-conformities in newly installed elements (TCLD, TDIS in 2023)
- Increase in beam/bunch intensity (BSRT, MKI, BGI, vacuum modules)
- Slow degradation of already installed equipment (TDI, vacuum modules?)



 Main consequences of large electromagnetic fields in surrounding components:

- Vacuum spikes
- Vacuum degradation
- Damage
- Abnormal temperature readings
- Large temperature that prevents injection
  - $\rightarrow$  Intensity limitation

(TCLD, TDI, vacuum modules, LHCb VeLO) (BGI, TDIS, TOTEM) (BSRT, TDI, BGI, vacuum modules, ALFA) (2-beam collimators) (MKI, collimators)

(vacuum modules)

# • Beam induced heating issues can come from:

- Unknowns and non-conformities in newly installed elements (TCLD, TDIS in 2023)
- Increase in beam/bunch intensity (BSRT, MKI, BGI, vacuum modules)
   Slow degradation of already installed againment (TDL vacuum modules)
- Slow degradation of already installed equipment (TDI, vacuum modules?)



 Main consequences of large electromagnetic fields in surrounding components:

- Vacuum spikes
- Vacuum degradation
- Damage
- Abnormal temperature readings
- Large temperature that prevents injection
  - $\rightarrow$  Intensity limitation

(TCLD, TDI, vacuum modules, LHCb VeLO) (BGI, TDIS, TOTEM) (BSRT, TDI, BGI, vacuum modules, ALFA) (2-beam collimators) (MKI, collimators)

(vacuum modules)

- Beam induced heating issues can come from:
  - Unknowns and non-conformities in newly installed elements (TCLD, TDIS in 2023)
  - Increase in beam/bunch intensity (BSRT, MKI, BGI, vacuum modules)
     Slow degradation of already installed equipment (TDL vacuum modules)
  - Slow degradation of already installed equipment (TDI, vacuum modules?)

## Towards HL-LHC parameters

- Increase of at least a factor 2 of beam-induced heat deposition (at constant bunch length)
- Several unexpected issues may come up on the way to HL-LHC parameters (many new equipments)
- Improved control of bunch length put in place this year will help



## Beam induced heating status

equipment	Problem	2011	2012	2015	2016	2017 and 2018	2022	2023	2024	2025
Vacuum modules	Damage	VMTSA spring gone, RF fingers melting	VMTSA removed		Spring on VMSI gone	Spring on VMSI gone again	vacuum spikes in 5R4	ID212 Spring gone, RF fingers melting	Intensity limited to 1.6E11 p/b	Elliptical bellows still there
TDIS	Damage	Beam screen bent	Beam screen bent	non- conformity with hBN material	vacuum behavior with 55mm gap, could be e- cloud related			Abnormal temperature signals	Signals more normal on spare TDIS	
МКІ	Wait for injection or reduce intensity			Beam screen upgrade and non conformity solved			Temperature interlocks increased with experience	Temperature interlocks increased with experience	Temperature interlocks increased with experience	
Collimators	Few dumps			Non conformity solved. TCTVB removed			TCLD vacuum spikes		TCLD vacuum spikes	
TOTEM	Beam screen regulation at the limit	Q6R5 affected by TOTEM	Q6R5 affected by TOTEM	Upgrade of the valves + TOTEM check						
Roman pots (ALFA and AFP)	Risk of damage and outgassing	ATLAS-ALFA close to limit	ATLAS-ALFA close to limit	New design for ATLAS- ALFA + cooling			AFP pots are getting close to 50 C	Cooling improved		
BSRT	Deformation suspected		Mirror damage	New design + cooling						
BGI	Vacuum increase			To be followed up	BGI heats up and damaged	BGIs removed				
LHCb Velo	Vacuum spikes						vacuum spikes			
→ Main worry is vacuum modules for 2025, all ID212 modules removed Main worry is vacuum modules for 2025, all ID212 modules removed Main worry is vacuum modules for 2025, all ID212 modules removed Main worry is vacuum modules for 2025, all ID212 modules removed Main worry is vacuum modules for 2025, all ID212 modules removed Main worry is vacuum modules for 2025, all ID212 modules removed Main worry is vacuum modules for 2025, all ID212 modules removed Main worry is vacuum modules for 2025, all ID212 modules removed Main worry is vacuum modules for 2025, all ID212 modules removed Main worry is vacuum modules for 2025, all ID212 modules removed									2	

5 / 15

## Beam induced heating status

equipment	Problem	2011	2012	2015	2016	2017 and 2018	2022	2023	20	024	2025	
Vacuum modules	Damage	VMTSA spring gone, RF fingers melting	VMTSA removed		Spring on VMSI gone	Spring on VMSI gone again	vacuum spikes in 5R4	ID212 Spring gone, RF fingers melting	Intensity limited to 1.6E11 p/b		Elliptical bellows still there	
TDIS	Damage	Beam screen bent	Beam screen bent	non- conformity with hBN material	vacuum behavior with 55mm gap, could be e- cloud related			Abnormal temperature signals	Signa norn spar	gnals more normal on spare TDIS		
МКІ	Wait for injection or reduce intensity			Beam screen upgrade and non conformity solved			Temperature interlocks increased with experience	Temperature interlocks increased with experience	Temp inte increa expe	New intensity limit at 2.2.10 <sup>11</sup> p/b with remaining smaller modules		
Collimators	Few dumps			Non conformity solved. TCTVB removed			TCLD vacuum spikes		TCLD sp			
TOTEM	Beam screen regulation at the limit	Q6R5 affected by TOTEM	Q6R5 affected by TOTEM	Upgrade of the valves + TOTEM check						The	ey will be	e e
Roman pots (ALFA and AFP)	Risk of damage and outgassing	ATLAS-ALFA close to limit	ATLAS-ALFA close to limit	New design for ATLAS- ALFA + cooling			AFP pots are getting close to 50 C	Cooling improved		exchanged during LS3.		
BSRT	Deformation suspected		Mirror damage	New design + cooling								
BGI	Vacuum increase			To be followed up	BGI heats up and damaged	BGIs removed						
LHCb Velo	Vacuum spikes						vacuum spikes					
→ Main worry is vacuum modules for 2025, all ID212 modules removed Main worry is vacuum modules for 2025, all ID212 modules removed Main worry is vacuum modules for 2025, all ID212 modules removed No limitation during operation No limitation during operation										5 / 15		

Injection losses

Suffered from injection losses in 2022/23 (hybrid, 236b / inj)See. S. Morales → Cause(s) not clearly identified (strong year-toyear and fill-to-fill fluctuations, beam-to-beam differences)





Injection losses

## Suffered from injection losses in 2022/23 (hybrid, 236b / inj)see. S. Morales → Cause(s) not clearly identified (strong year-toyear and fill-to-fill fluctuations, beam-to-beam

differences)

 $\rightarrow$  New BLMs and new Matching of the TL with updated transfer function for the quads should help the situation







Injection losses

## Suffered from injection losses in 2022/23 (hybrid, 236b / inj)see. S. Morales → Cause(s) not clearly identified (strong year-to-

→ Cause(s) not clearly identified (strong year-toyear and fill-to-fill fluctuations, beam-to-beam differences)

 $\rightarrow$  New BLMs and new Matching of the TL with updated transfer function for the quads should help the situation

Current operation with short trains (108b / inj) offers large operational margin

 $\rightarrow$  Need tests in MD and in operation with longer trains at injection : Consider few weeks with hybrid scheme in 2025 ?



 $\geq$ 



### Losses in ADJUST

Beam losses in ADJUST were close to dump levels See S. Morales





### Losses in ADJUST

Beam losses in ADJUST were close to dump levels See S. Morales → Clear correlation with tail population See. S. Kostoglou





## Losses in ADJUST

- Beam losses in ADJUST were close to dump levels See S. Morales → Clear correlation with tail population See. S. Kostoglou
- Chromaticity and octupole requirement are set by flat-top (w/o head-on) and the DA is limited only once in collision.
  - $\rightarrow$  Need to quantify experimentally the link between the DA drop and the losses in ADJUST





The existence of a 'sweet spot' for chromaticities between 15 and 20 units was demonstrated experimentally





The existence of a 'sweet spot' for chromaticities between 15 and 20 units was demonstrated experimentally





The existence of a 'sweet spot' for chromaticities between 15 and 20 units was demonstrated experimentally





- The existence of a 'sweet spot' for chromaticities between 15 and 20 units was demonstrated experimentally
  - It is linked to the suppression of odd headtail modes by the non-linearity of the RF





- The existence of a 'sweet spot' for chromaticities between 15 and 20 units was demonstrated experimentally
  - It is linked to the suppression of odd headtail modes by the non-linearity of the RF





- The existence of a 'sweet spot' for chromaticities between 15 and 20 units was demonstrated experimentally
  - It is linked to the suppression of odd headtail modes by the non-linearity of the RF
- Currently we operate with a significant margin in chromaticity (20 units), we could operate with a lower chromaticity (closer to the threshold) if the control is sufficient





- The existence of a 'sweet spot' for chromaticities between 15 and 20 units was demonstrated experimentally
  - It is linked to the suppression of odd headtail modes by the non-linearity of the RF
- Currently we operate with a significant margin in chromaticity (20 units), we could operate with a lower chromaticity (closer to the threshold) if the control is sufficient

 $\rightarrow 17$  units / 150A could be tested operationally in 2025/2026





## Experience with BTF, AC-KFC and Schottky

Tested new tools for chromaticity measurement in operational conditions at flat top, squeeze and collision (excitation on one bunch with full circulating beam)

- No losses or emittance growth
- Excellent signal, but post processing requires further improvement





## Experience with BTF, AC-KFC and Schottky

Tested new tools for chromaticity measurement in operational conditions at flat top, squeeze and collision (excitation on one bunch with full circulating beam)

- No losses or emittance growth
- Excellent signal, but post processing requires further improvement
- A new method based on ADT-AC dipole and head-tail measurement was tested a flat top but lead to beam degradation that needs to be understood







## Experience with BTF, AC-KFC and Schottky

Tested new tools for chromaticity measurement in operational conditions at flat top, squeeze and collision (excitation on one bunch with full circulating beam)

- No losses or emittance growth
- Excellent signal, but post processing requires further improvement
- A new method based on ADT-AC dipole and head-tail measurement was tested a flat top but lead to beam degradation that needs to be understood
- Chromaticity measurement based on Schottky signal are promising but remains challenging at flat top see K. Lasocha @ LBOC 22.10.2024







Chromaticity and octupoles in collision are constrained by the stability of non-colliding bunches (same as flat top).

 If needed their brightness could be reduced to allow for optimisation of the colliding bunches' quality preservation



- Chromaticity and octupoles in collision are constrained by the stability of non-colliding bunches (same as flat top).
  - If needed their brightness could be reduced to allow for optimisation of the colliding bunches' quality preservation

Chromaticity is also constrained by e-cloud instabilities with 'low' bunch intensities  $(\sim 10^{11} \text{ p/b})$ 



- Chromaticity and octupoles in collision are constrained by the stability of non-colliding bunches (same as flat top).
  - If needed their brightness could be reduced to allow for optimisation of the colliding bunches' quality preservation
- Chromaticity is also constrained by e-cloud instabilities with 'low' bunch intensities  $(\sim 10^{11} \text{p/b})$
- In 2024 after TS, the chromaticity was reduced systematically during the fast part of β\* levelling and kept low in collision (→ 6 units)



- Chromaticity and octupoles in collision are constrained by the stability of non-colliding bunches (same as flat top).
  - If needed their brightness could be reduced to allow for optimisation of the colliding bunches' quality preservation
- Chromaticity is also constrained by e-cloud instabilities with 'low' bunch intensities  $(\sim 10^{11} p/b)$
- In 2024 after TS, the chromaticity was reduced systematically during the fast part of  $\beta^*$  levelling and kept low in collision ( $\rightarrow 6$  units)



RPMBB.UA43.RSF1.A34B2:I\_MEAS



- Chromaticity and octupoles in collision are constrained by the stability of non-colliding bunches (same as flat top).
  - If needed their brightness could be reduced to allow for optimisation of the colliding bunches' quality preservation
- Chromaticity is also constrained by e-cloud instabilities with 'low' bunch intensities  $(\sim 10^{11} p/b)$
- In 2024 after TS, the chromaticity was reduced systematically during the fast part of  $\beta^*$  levelling and kept low in collision ( $\rightarrow 6$  units)





- Chromaticity and octupoles in collision are constrained by the stability of non-colliding bunches (same as flat top).
  - If needed their brightness could be reduced to allow for optimisation of the colliding bunches' quality preservation
- Chromaticity is also constrained by e-cloud instabilities with 'low' bunch intensities  $(\sim 10^{11} \text{p/b})$
- In 2024 after TS, the chromaticity was reduced systematically during the fast part of  $\beta^*$  levelling and kept low in collision ( $\rightarrow 6$  units)



RPMBB.UA43.RSF1.A34B2:I\_MEAS



- Chromaticity and octupoles in collision are constrained by the stability of non-colliding bunches (same as flat top).
  - If needed their brightness could be reduced to allow for optimisation of the colliding bunches' quality preservation
- Chromaticity is also constrained by e-cloud instabilities with 'low' bunch intensities  $(\sim 10^{11} p/b)$
- In 2024 after TS, the chromaticity was reduced systematically during the fast part of  $\beta^*$  levelling and kept low in collision ( $\rightarrow 6$  units)

 $\rightarrow$  Few vertical instabilities with offset beams in either IP1 and 5. No Showstopper, yet it shows that the e-cloud instability threshold is not far



Experience with negative polarity of the octupoles

There is an interest to change the polarity of the octupole for the full cycle to optimise the DA in collision See S. Kostoglou



## Experience with negative polarity of the octupoles

- There is an interest to change the polarity of the octupole for the full cycle to optimise the DA in collision See S. Kostoglou
  - Over the years, a series of MDs were realised in this configuration, but we lack operational experience





## Experience with negative polarity of the octupoles

- There is an interest to change the polarity of the octupole for the full cycle to optimise the DA in collision See S. Kostoglou
  - Over the years, a series of MDs were realised in this configuration, but we lack operational experience
  - Next MD block: lifetime optimisation with e-cloud at injection and negative octupole polarity
- $\rightarrow$  Operating the LHC in 2025/26 with the negative polarity would provide valuable experience though the gain in performance might remain marginal







Beam-beam and collimation hierarchy : Linear Linear effects from beambeam interactions seem well under control

 $\Delta \beta_x / \beta_x$ 

 $\Delta \beta_y / \beta_y$ 





# Beam-beam and collimation hierarchy : Linear Linear effects from beambeam interactions seem well under control

 $\Delta \beta_x / \beta_x$ 

 $\Delta \beta_y / \beta_y$ 

 They still eat a fraction of the primarysecondary retraction in high intensity operation but not in low intensity loss maps





### Beam-beam and collimation hierarchy : Linear Linear effects from beam-Offset Y [um] beam interactions seem well under control

 $\Delta \beta_x / \beta_x$ 

- They still eat a fraction of the primarysecondary retraction in high intensity operation but not in low intensity loss maps
- Estimates for HL\* (No significant difference expected for the new baseline, should be reviewed for low Xing angle scenario)  $\Delta \beta_y / \beta_y$ 
  - Orbit <  $0.6\sigma$
  - β-beat @  $6-8\sigma < 15\%$
  - Coupling  $< 2.5 \cdot 10^{-4}$





### Beam-beam and collimation hierarchy : Linear Linear effects from beam-Offset Y [um] beam interactions seem well under control

- They still eat a fraction of the primarysecondary retraction in high intensity operation but not in low intensity loss maps
- Estimates for HL\* (No significant  $-0^{-1}$ difference expected for the new baseline, should be reviewed for low Xing angle scenario)  $\Delta \beta_y / \beta_z$ 
  - Orbit <  $0.6\sigma$
  - β-beat @  $6-8\sigma < 15\%$
  - Coupling  $< 2.5 \cdot 10^{-4}$

## $\rightarrow$ Compatible with baseline 1.5 $\sigma$ retraction



\*X. Buffat, et al., CERN-ACC-NOTE-2018-0036 A. Ribes Metidieri, et al., CERN-ACC-NOTE-2019-0037

0.1

 $\Delta \beta_x / \beta_x$ 



In the presence of beam-beam (and chromaticity), the transverse DA is mostly limited for off-momentum particles

> → Such **transverse** losses are strongly impacted by **dispersion in IR7.** They do not appear in loss maps which are either transverse or off-momentum, but not both simultaneously



Horizontal tune,  $Q_x$ 



In the presence of beam-beam (and chromaticity), the transverse DA is mostly limited for off-momentum particles

> → Such **transverse** losses are strongly impacted by **dispersion in IR7.** They do not appear in loss maps which are either transverse or off-momentum, but not both simultaneously



Horizontal tune,  $Q_x$ 



In the presence of beam-beam (and chromaticity), the transverse DA is mostly limited for off-momentum particles

 $\rightarrow$  Such **transverse** losses are strongly impacted by **dispersion in IR7.** They do not appear in loss maps which are either transverse or off-momentum, but not both simultaneously

 Particles trajectories at these large amplitudes can be heavily distorted by specific resonance. Corrections are envisaged but require further studies See E. Maclean



Horizontal tune,  $Q_x$ 



In the presence of beam-beam (and chromaticity), the transverse DA is mostly limited for off-momentum particles

 $\rightarrow$  Such **transverse** losses are strongly impacted by **dispersion in IR7.** They do not appear in loss maps which are either transverse or off-momentum, but not both simultaneously

 Particles trajectories at these large amplitudes can be heavily distorted by specific resonance. Corrections are envisaged but require further studies See E. Maclean





### Summary Beam induced heating remains a major concern when increasing the bunch intensity and installing new equipments

→ Exposing issues early is key in avoiding down time during high luminosity production



#### Summary

Beam induced heating remains a major concern when increasing the bunch intensity and installing new equipments

→ Exposing issues early is key in avoiding down time during high luminosity production Measures were implemented to mitigate operational issues encountered with losses during injection of high intensity trains

 $\rightarrow$  Operational experience with long (hybrid) trains is desirable



#### Summary

Beam induced heating remains a major concern when increasing the bunch intensity and installing new equipments

- → Exposing issues early is key in avoiding down time during high luminosity production Measures were implemented to mitigate operational issues encountered with losses during injection of high intensity trains
  - $\rightarrow$  Operational experience with long (hybrid) trains is desirable
- Low tail population and good DA at the start of collision are key to maintain losses under control

→ Impedance reduction (see L. Giacomel, B. Lindstrom), tune, chromaticity and detuning control, negative polarity of the octupoles



### Summary

Beam induced heating remains a major concern when increasing the bunch intensity and installing new equipments

- → Exposing issues early is key in avoiding down time during high luminosity production Measures were implemented to mitigate operational issues encountered with losses during injection of high intensity trains
  - $\rightarrow$  Operational experience with long (hybrid) trains is desirable
- Low tail population and good DA at the start of collision are key to maintain losses under control

→ Impedance reduction (see L. Giacomel, B. Lindstrom), tune, chromaticity and detuning control, negative polarity of the octupoles

- Loss mechanisms breaking the collimator hierarchy and linked to beambeam effects were observed
  - Linear effects are under control, but can eat part of the margin. Other effects can be shadowed when validating the machine at low intensity.
  - Transverse losses of off-momentum particles are not covered by present betatron+offmomentum loss maps scheme.



#### Distorted trajectories (K. Paraschou, et al., @ LBOC 04.06.2024)



Phase space distortion happens when you get close to resonances.

\* Footprint was not simulated with the exact 2024 configuration, but remains qualitatively similar.



**Trajectory of the single particle** 



15 /

15

5

Synchrotron oscillations + chromaticity brings particles to the 3Qy resonance which heavily distorts the phase space.

Before reaching  $5\sigma$  at the TCP, particle reaches a larger maximum position in TCSG.