WP1: FCCee injector linacs status report

Alexej Grudiev on behalf of the WP1

29/08/2024

New baseline layout (4 AS/module, 4 bunches@100 Hz)





RF design studies in HE-linac

- RF parameters updated for new baseline
- Bunch to bunch energy spread compensation has been studied. It can be reduced to the level below the single-bunch energy spread. <0.1%
- Beam loading is increased at lower gradient in the new baseline up to 2.5% for the 4th bunch.
- Same method is used to compensate beam loading energy spread to the level <0.1% for a given bunch intensities
- Accelerating voltage for 4 bunches is ~4% lower compared to 1 bunch. This must be accommodated in the new baseline:
 - ~ 4% longer linac

. . .

• Longer RF pulse length: 3 us -> 4 us



Beam dynamics in e- and HE-linac

- Static effects in the new baseline have been studied. Emittance growths is acceptable:
 - e-linac, $\Delta \epsilon$ =0.3 mm.mrad for a/l = 0.15, $\Delta \epsilon$ =**1.2 mm.mrad** for a/l = 0.12
 - HE-linac, $\Delta \epsilon$ =**0.6 mm.mrad** for a/l = 0.12, (ϵ_v =1mm.mrad after DR)
- Dynamic effects:
 - - e-linac: 1.4 for a/l = 0.15, 2.7 for a/l = 0.12 (is it OK ?)
 - HE-linac is very small ~1 due to BNS-like damping
 - Multi-bunch jitter amplification in
 - HE-linal is well below 1.1, very good
 - e-linac is twice higher ~1.3, still good since we have DR
- Still several questions to be addressed before final design:
 - Jitter at the DR extraction? Extraction kicker?
 - Requirements for e-linac: DR or p-production target? What is more critical? What are the beam parameters?
 - Can the small aperture AS a/l=0.12 be used in the e-linac?
 - Can we rely on the damping in HE-linac? Need to do more parametric stidies





Beam dynamics in p-linac

- New baseline (14MV/m) is compared to the old (20 MV/m):
 - Positron yield is very similar: 3.35 vs 3.2. No cuts for DR acceptance
- Similar losses in the chicane. New one with larger aperture is under design
- Solenoidal focusing up to 1 GeV, we will investigate the impact of shorter solenoid section on the positron yield
- Energy compressor is not included yet. We need the EC design from WP4 as well as acceptance of the <u>DR@2.86GeV</u>

• At PL exit (without DR acceptance cuts)





Positron yield: 3.35

New specification on the required bunch spacing granularity in the FCCee collider: 2.5 ns -> 5 ns



CERN 1211 Geneva 23 Switzerland

٠

••

Minutes of the 152nd Coordination Group Meeting and joint 41st Technical Coordination Group Meeting

Written by Frank Zimmermann

Date: 9 August 2024

Location: 30/6-019 and Zoom

Indico: https://indico.cern.ch/event/1408235

Participants: W. Bartmann, M. Benedikt, O. Brunner, P. Charitos, P. Craievich, F. Eder, A. Grudiev, K. Hanke, P. Janot, R. Losito, E. Tsesmelis, T. Watson, G. Wilkinson, F. Zimmermann

7 AoB

A. Grudiev commented that, for FCC-ee, a linac RF frequency of 3 GHz had been excluded at some past review since it ruled out bunch spacing changes in steps of 2.5 ns.

F. Zimmermann and **M. Benedikt** replied that 3 GHz would be fine, and that spacings equal to multiples of 5 ns would offer sufficient flexibility for the operational scenarios.

- 5 ns granularity (bunch spacing = N*5ns) means that the RF frequency in the injector linacs can be harmonics of 200 MHz
- This opens the possibility to use **3 GHz** RF frequency instead of 2.8 GHz in the e- and HE- linacs
- Unfortunately, due to un-availability of resources we will have to stay at 2.8 GHz for the feasibility report and change to 3 GHz only next year
- The exact RF frequency is 400.8*15/2 = **3006 MHz.** It is not exactly the commercial EU S-band frequency: **2998.5 MHz**
- The difference is **7.5 MHz** which is not negligible compared to the typical high power klystron bandwidth and has to be addressed:
 - Injecting on the BR slightly off centre of the bucket: up to few sigma_z depending on the number of bunches: injection oscillation at the flat bottom, stability. ?
 - Using HEC to adjust the bunch spacing after HE-linac: large R56 and/or energy spread. ?
 - Operating at 3006 MHz, still much better than 2.8GHz: use of existing (narrow band) hardware is limited