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## Conclusion on triplet lengths

- We took into account the new constraints Ezio set for triplet lengths and gradients:
- L<=4.2 m for Q1/Q3
- triplet gradient allowed to exceed 130T/m by $\approx 1-2 \%$
- We found layout and optics solutions that are compatible with:
- triplet gradients <132.6 T/m and L* of 23 m or 24 m
- updated interconnection lengths
- with degraded (5-10\%) $\beta^{*}$ reach and $\approx 1-2 \%$ integrated luminosity loss and with he magnetic lengths of:
- L=4.2 m for Q1a/Q1b and Q3a/Q3b
- L=7.15 m for Q2a/Q2b
- Need definition of L* in order to finalize the layout and define new position of the BPM (coordinated by integration, instrumentation and coll./exp. interface).
- The final optics and triplet strengths will be optimized and finalized once the layout is frozen.
- For more information see the following contribution: indico.cern.ch/event/371767/contribution/3/material/slides/1.pptx


## Layouts sketches

Forbidden areas $\pm 60 \mathrm{~cm}$, assuming best
conceivable electronics.

HL 1.1

Ls 24


Ls 23


- Both layouts, in particular the one for $L^{*}=24 \mathrm{~m}$, degrade BPM distance from LR encounters.
- BPMs need more than $\pm 60 \mathrm{~cm}$ (up to $\pm 1.5 \mathrm{~m}$ with LHC electronics) to cope with bunch trains thus impacting the effectiveness of any IP orbit feedback relying on BPMs.


## Backup

## Integrate Luminosity vs $\beta^{*}$

$\beta^{*}$ acts on virtual luminosity and HL-LHC scenarios are most sensitive to levelled luminosity and beam currents (burn-off and levelling times dominates).

| E <br> $[\mathrm{TeV}]$ | N <br> $\left[10^{11}\right]$ | $\mathrm{L}_{\text {lev }}$ <br> $\left[10^{34}\right.$ <br> $\left.\mathrm{cm}^{-2} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}\right]$ | $\mathrm{L}_{\text {virt } \beta^{*}=15 \mathrm{~cm}}$ <br> $\left[10^{34}\right.$ <br> $\left.\mathrm{cm}^{-2} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}\right]$ | $\mathrm{L}_{\text {int }} /$ day <br> $\beta^{*}=15 \mathrm{~cm}$ <br> $\left[f \mathrm{fb}^{-1}\right]$ | $\mathrm{L}_{\text {virt }} \beta^{*}=18 \mathrm{~cm}$ <br> $(-13.3 \%)$ <br> $\left[10^{34} \mathrm{~cm}^{-2} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}\right]$ | $\mathrm{L}_{\text {int/ }} / \mathrm{day}$ <br> $\beta^{*}=18 \mathrm{~cm}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | 2.2 | 5 | 20.1 | 3.17 | 17.4 | $-1.73 \%$ |
| 7 | 2.2 | 7.5 | 20.1 | 4.07 | 17.4 | $-2.88 \%$ |
| 7 | 1.9 | 5 | 15.0 | 2.93 | 13.0 | $-2.55 \%$ |
| 7 | 1.9 | 7.5 | 15.0 | 3.63 | 13.0 | $-4.3 \%$ |

$\beta^{*}$ not very sensitive for $L_{\text {int }}$ with nominal parameters, at the same time:

- relatively risk free and
- relative impact of $\beta^{*}$ on $L_{\text {int }}$ increases for lower beam current.


## Layout variants and $\beta^{*}$ reach

| Case | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{L}^{*} \\ & \text { [m] } \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{Q} 1}$ <br> [T/m] | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{Q} 2} \\ & {[\mathrm{~T} / \mathrm{m}]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{Q} 3} \\ & {[\mathrm{~T} / \mathrm{m}]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{Q} 1 / 3} \\ & {[\mathrm{~m}]} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{Q2a} / \mathrm{b}} \\ & {[\mathrm{~m}]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \beta_{\text {pre }}^{*} \\ & {[\mathrm{~cm}]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \beta^{*}{ }_{\text {max }} \text { at } \\ & \beta^{*}{ }_{15 \mathrm{~cm}} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HL1.1 | 23 | 139.8 | 139.8 | 139.3 | 4.0 | 6.8 | 44 | +0\% |
| L* 24 | 24 | 128.9 | 130.2 | 130.4 | 4.2 | 7.15 | 48 | +8.2\% |
| L* 23 | 23 | 132.1 | 130.5 | 130.6 | 4.2 | 7.15 | 48 | +4.3\% |
| Ls 24 split ${ }^{1}$ | 24 | 132.2 | 129.4 | 129.6 | 4.2 | 7.15/2 | 49 | +12\% |
| Ls 23 split ${ }^{1}$ | 23 | 132.3 | 129.3 | 129.6 | 4.2 | 7.15/2 | 48 | +7.8\% |

${ }^{1}$ Backup plan for Q2a and Q2b for which 65 cm inter-distance is assumed. Not considered to be likely.

The gradient values will be still fine tuned in the range of $\pm 0.3 \mathrm{~T} / \mathrm{m}$ for the final layout to optimize crab cavities voltage and D2-Q4 aperture.

If needed $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{Q} 2}$ can be chosen to 7.2 m to approach the old target of $130 \mathrm{~T} / \mathrm{m}$ at cost $<1 \%$ in $\beta^{*}{ }_{\max }$.

## Tunability in Q4: L*=24m option






## Tunability in Q4: L*=23m option






## BPM specifications for orbit and optics

| Aperture diameter [mm] | $>98(\mathbf{Q 1}) />1.18$ (others) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Precision in orbit mode | $<1.5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ |
| Accuracy for finding collisions with 1\% Luminosity | $<30 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ |
| Longitudinal alignment accuracy | 1 mm |
| Maximum linearity error after calibration in turn-by-turn mode | $<0.5 \%$ |
| Maximum non-reproducibility of the triplet and correctors transfer <br> functions | $<10^{-4}$ |
| Bunch population range [p/bunch] | $10^{9}-2.2 \times 10^{11}$ |


| Optimum position w.r.t. parasitic encounters | Sensitivity to missing BPM | Suggested locations for optics measurements | Beta function $\left(\beta_{x, y} \beta_{y, x}\right)[\mathrm{km}]$ (for impendence effects) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1downstream (best position) | TAS-Q1a (highest sensitivity) | Q2a-Q2b (most critical) | TAS-Q1a (3.1, 3.1) (smallest beta, smallest effect) |
| Q1b-Q2a | Q1b-Q2a | Q3b-CP | Q1b-Q2a (4.6, 10) |
| CP-D1 | Q2a-Q2b | TAS-Q1a | Q2b-Q3a (13.5,13.5) |
| Q2a-Q2b | Q2b-Q3a | Q1b-Q2a | D1 downstream (16.6, 7.1) |
| TAS-Q1a | Q3b-CP | Q2b-Q3a | CP-D1 (18.8, 7.5) |
| Q3b-CP | CP-D1 | CP-D1 | Q2a-Q2b (20.4, 5.3) |
| Q2b-Q3a (worst position) | D1 downstream (lower sensitivity) | D1 downstream (least critical) | Q3b-CP (20.6, 7.9) (larger beta, largest effect) |

See WP2 TL meetings on 23/5/2014 at https://indico.cern.ch/event/315532/material/minutes/1.docx

