FCC Lepton Collider Design

Frank Zimmermann

CERN Academic Training

Filtration Plant, 4 February 2016

many thanks to M. Aiba, R. Assmann, S. Aumon, E. Belli, M. Benedikt, A. Blondel, A. Bogomyagkov, M. Boscolo, O. Brunner, H. Burkhardt, A. Butterworth, Y. Cai, R. Calaga, F. Cerutti, A. Doblhammer, O. Etisken, A. Faus-Golfe, A. Ferrari, K. Furukawa, C. Garion, E. Gianfelice, S. Glukhov, G. Guillermo, B. Haerer, B. Holzer, P. Janot, M. Jimenez, J. Jowett, R. Kersevan, I. Koop, M. Koratzinos, L. Lari, E. Levichev, R. Martin, L. Medina, V. Mertens, M. Migliorati, S. Ogur, K. Ohmi, K. Oide, J. Osborne, Y. Papaphilipou, P. Piminov, R. Rossmanith, G. Rumolo, A. Saa Hernandez, J. Seeman, D. Shatilov, D. Shwartz, S. Sinyatkin, M. Sullivan, M.A. Valdivia, J. Wenninger, U. Wienands,...

*Work supported by the **European Commission** under Capacities 7th Framework Programme project EuCARD-2, grant agreement 312453, and the HORIZON 2020 project EuroCirCol, grant agreement 654305*

Outline

- e^+e^- collider landscape & lessons learnt
- FCC-ee baseline parameters
- synchrotron radiation
- FCC-ee optics
- luminosity optimization
- polarization, energy calibration & mono-chromatization

e^+e^- collider landscape & lessons learnt

Future Circular Collider Study
GOAL: CDR and cost review for the next ESU (2018)

International FCC collaboration (CERN as host lab) to study:

- ***pp*-collider (*FCC-hh*)**
  → main emphasis, defining infrastructure requirements

~16 T ⇒ 100 TeV *pp* in 100 km

- **80-100 km infrastructure** in Geneva area
- **e^+e^- collider (*FCC-ee*) as potential intermediate step / as a possible first step**
- *p-e* (*FCC-he*) option, HE-LHC …



CepC/SppC study (CAS-IHEP) 54 km (baseline)
e^+e^- collisions ~2028; *pp* collisions ~2042



FCC–ee physics requirements

A. Blondel, J. Ellis , C. Grojean, P. Janot, et al.

- ***beam energy range from 35 GeV to ≈200 GeV***
- ***highest possible luminosities*** *at all working points*
- physics programs / energies:

  Z (45.5 GeV) Z pole, 'TeraZ' and high precision M_Z & Γ_Z

  W (80 GeV) W pair production threshold, high precision M_W

  H (120 GeV) ZH production (maximum rate of H's)

  t (175 GeV): $t\bar{t}$ *threshold, H studies*

  more (α_{QED} etc.)
- possibly *H* (63 GeV) direct *s*-channel production with **monochromatization**
- **some polarization up to ≥80 GeV** for beam energy calibration

LEP/LEP2: highest energy so far



circumference 27 km
in operation from 1989 to 2000
maximum c.m. energy 209 GeV
maximum synchrotron radiation power 23 MW

LEP energy close to FCC-ee target
+ record synchrotron radiation with ~MeV photons

KEKB & PEP-II: high current, high L



performance of high-current high-luminosity e^+e^- factories conservatively predicted

I_{e+}=1.6 A, I_{e-}=1.2 A

P_{SR} ~ 5 MW

C = 3 km

I_{e+}=3.2 A, I_{e-}=2.1 A

P_{SR} ~ 8 MW

C = 2.2 km

KEKB & PEP-II: top-up injection



first colliders with top-up injection (constant current, no transients, continuous optics tuning,…)



J. Seeman

J. Seeman

average luminosity ≈ peak luminosity

similar results from KEKB

exploiting lessons from past e^+e^- colliders



combining successful ingredients of recent colliders → extremely high luminosity at high energies

FCC-ee baseline parameters

FCC-ee luminosity per IP



crab-waist crossing for flat beams



regular crossing

P. Raimondi, et al.



crab waist -

vertical waist position in *s* varies with horizontal position *x*

- allows for small $\beta_y{}^*$ and for small $\varepsilon_{x,y}$
- and avoids betatron resonances (→higher beam-beam tune shift)

DAΦNE: "crab waist" collisions

DAΦNE Peak Luminosity



M. Zobov

2016 baseline parameters

parameter	FCC-ee			CEPC	LEP2
energy/beam [GeV]	**45**	**120**	**175**	**120**	105
bunches/beam	90000	770	78	50	4
beam current [mA]	1450	30	6.6	16.6	3
luminosity/IP x 10^{34} $cm^{-2}s^{-1}$	**70**	**5**	**1.3**	**2.0**	0.0012
energy loss/turn [GeV]	0.03	1.67	7.55	3.1	3.34
synchrotron power [MW]	100			103	22
RF voltage [GV]	0.08	3.0	10	6.9	3.5
rms bunch length (SR,+BS) [mm]	1.6, 3.8	2.0, 2.4	2.1, 2.5	2.1, 2.6	12, 12
rms emittance $\varepsilon_{x,y}$ [nm, pm]	0.09, 1	0.61, 1	1.3, 2.5	6, 18	22, 250
longit. damping time [turns]	1320	72	23	39	31
crossing angle [mrad]	30	30	30	0	0
beam lifetime [min]	251	75	62	61	434

FCC-ee: 2 separate rings **CEPC: single beam pipe like LEP**

FCC-ee top-up injection

beside the collider ring(s), a booster of the same size (same tunnel) must provide beams for top-up injection to sustain the extremely high luminosity

- same size of RF system, but low power (~ MW)
- top up frequency ≈0.1 Hz
- booster injection energy ≈5-20 GeV
- bypass around the experiments



synchrotron radiation

curved orbit of e^- in magnetic field



Accelerated charge → Electromagnetic radiation

L. Rivkin

arc synchrotron radiation (SR) 1

energy loss per turn $U_0 = \frac{e^2}{3\epsilon_0}\frac{\gamma^4}{\varrho}$

$$\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\boldsymbol{\rho}} = \frac{\boldsymbol{eB}}{\boldsymbol{p}} \qquad U_0[\mathrm{keV}] = 88.46\,\frac{E[\mathrm{GeV}]^4}{\rho[\mathrm{m}]}$$

$\propto E^4/m^4 \propto \gamma^4$

numerical values for electrons

→ **RF voltage**

synchrotron radiation power

$$P_{SR} = \frac{2U_0 I_b}{e}$$

$\propto E^4/m^4 \propto \gamma^4$

electrons: P_{SR} = 23 MW for LEP, 100 MW for FCC-ee
protons: $P_{SR} = 0.01$ MW for LHC, 5 MW for FCC-hh

→ **RF power**

critical (typical) photon energy $E_{\gamma,c} = \frac{3}{2}\hbar c\frac{\gamma^3}{\rho}$ → **shielding**

electrons: $E_{c,\gamma}$ ~ 1 MeV for LEP and FCC-ee;
protons: $E_{c,\gamma}$ ~40 eV LHC, ~4 keV FCC-hh

arc SR– heat & shielding

	PEP-II	SPEAR3	FCC-ee Z	FCC-ee H
E [GeV]	9	3	45.5	120
I [A]	3	0.5	1.45	0.03
ρ [m]	165	7.86	11000	11000
linear power [W/cm]	101.8	92.3	7.2	7.2

SR heat per meter much lower than for many operating rings



N. Kurita, U. Wienands, SLAC

FLUKA geometry layout for half FODO cell, dipole details, preliminary absorber design incl. 5 cm external *Pb* shield

option of discrete absorbers

L. Lari, F. Cerutti, A. Ferrari, A. Mereghetti

SR shielding





H. Burkhardt difficult for $E_\gamma \geq 100$ keV, *n* production for $E_\gamma \geq 1$ MeV

synchrotron radiation in the IR



weak bends and
SR masks for LEP



IR SR fans for one
FCC-ee optics

H. Burkhardt, A. Bogomoyagkov

arc synchrotron radiation 2

radiation damping of transverse and longitudinal motion
→beam shrinkage

$$\tau_{||} = \tau_x/2 = (C/c)E/U_0$$

electrons: $\tau_{||}$~ 3 ms for LEP, 20 ms FCC-ee at 240 GeV cm
protons: $\tau_{||}$~13 h for LHC, 0.5 h FCC-hh

equilibrium emittance due to balance of radiation damping and quantum excitation

$$\varepsilon_x = C_q \gamma^2 l_b^3 F/\rho^3$$

l_b: length of half cell

→ cell length

$$C_q = \frac{55}{32\sqrt{3}}\frac{\hbar c}{mc^2} \approx \begin{cases} 4 \times 10^{-13}\ \text{m for electrons} \\ 2 \times 10^{-16}\ \text{m for protons} \end{cases}$$

$F \approx 3$ for standard arc optics (90 deg FODO cell)

increase of emittance with energy is compensated by large radius (ρ) and short cell length (l_b)

transverse emittances



Y. Papaphilippou

power considerations

continually supplying circulating beam with

P_{SR}=100 MW power (SR losses) requires

wall-plug power $P_{wall}=P_{SR}/\eta$

with η=conversion efficiency wall-plug → beam

FCC target: $\eta \geq 50\%$

(achieved at PEP-II and LEP)

note: cw RF systems for storage rings are more efficient than those for pulsed linacs

coherent synchrotron radiation (CSR)?

at wave lengths $\lambda > 2\pi\sigma_z \sim 0.012\ \mathrm{m}\ (\mathrm{or}\ E_\gamma < 0.1\ \mathrm{meV})$
all e^- in an FCC-ee bunch could radiate coherently

$$P_{SR,coh} \approx N_b P_{SR}$$

at smaller wave lengths still portions of the bunch could radiate coherently ("microbunching instability")

large bending radius and vacuum chamber suppress CSR effects

FCC-ee vacuum chamber (full width *w*, height *h ~6 cm*)

suppresses radiation at* $\lambda > 2\sqrt{\frac{h^2 w}{\rho}} \approx 0.00028\ \mathrm{m}$ $(\mathrm{or}\ E_\gamma < 4\ \mathrm{meV})$

*Y. Derbenev et al., DESY TESLA FEL 95-05, 1995

coherent instabilities?

main impedance sources:
100-km vacuum chamber, RF cavities

beam energy higher than LEP, injection synchrotron
tune higher, bunch charge lower
→ no TMCI instability, but **μ-wave instability threat**

coupled bunch instabilities driven by cavity modes

e-cloud instability could appear in e^+ ring
(antechamber to absorb photoelectrons)

and…

M. Migliorati, N. Mounet, K. Ohmi, G. Rumolo

transverse resistive-wall instability

growth rate ~$1/\Delta Q_\beta$, sensitive to fractional tune ΔQ_β ;

for example: $Q_\beta = 50.05 \rightarrow \tau_{\mathrm{inst}} \sim 0.6$ ms w. 9 cm Al pipe

natural damping time $\tau_{\mathrm{SR}} \sim 0.88$ s (2640 turns)



Smaller fractional tune is preferred to alleviate the transverse resistive wall instability.



M. Migliorati

beamstrahlung – a new limit at 175 GeV

- hard photon emission at the IPs, '*Beamstrahlung*', can become lifetime / performance limit for large bunch populations (N), small hor. beam size (σ_x) & short bunches (σ_s)

$$\tau_{bs} \propto \frac{\rho^{3/2}\sqrt{\eta}}{\sigma_s}\exp(A\eta\rho) \qquad \frac{1}{\rho} \approx \frac{N r_e}{\gamma \sigma_x \sigma_s}$$

η : ring energy acceptance

lifetime expression by V. Telnov, modified version by A. Bogomyagkov et al



ρ : mean bending radius at the IP (in the field of the opposing bunch)

- for acceptable lifetime, ρ×η must be sufficiently large
  - *flat beams (large σ_x) !*
  - *bunch length !*
  - *large momentum acceptance: aiming for* ***≥1.5% at 175 GeV***
    - LEP: <1% acceptance, SuperKEKB ~ 1.5%

J. Wenninger, et al

FCC-ee optics

arc optics & sawtooth tapering



arc FODO
cell length
50 m

(LEP 50 m)

double ring and magnet tapering
remove energy sawtooth due to SR

Comparison:
8 RF w/o tapering
2 RF with
tapered dipoles



Sandra Aumon,
Bastian Härer,
Andreas Doblhamer,
Bernhard Holzer

FCC consistent machine layouts

FCC-hh



FCC-ee 1, FCC-ee 2,
FCC-ee booster (FCC-hh footprint)



Closed optics solutions for full ring for both machines available

FCC-ee layouts with space for booster

K. Oide



SR fans in the interaction region (IR)



weak bends and asymmetric optics to soften SR photons emitted towards detector

A. Blondel, H. Burkhardt, M. Koratzinos, K. Oide

final focus chromaticity



spot size increase due to (uncorrected) chromaticity,

$$\frac{\Delta\sigma_y^*}{\sigma_{y0}^*} = \xi\delta_{rms}$$

$$\sigma_{y0}^* \equiv \sqrt{\beta_y^*\varepsilon_y}, \qquad \xi \approx \frac{l^*}{\beta^*}$$

FCC-ee IR optics – two variants

with required momentum acceptance and dynamic aperture

both feature crab waist optics & local chromatic correction

Interaction Region: KO v. 51-14

K. Oide



synchroton radiation $E_{\gamma,c}$≤100 keV, 2 sextupoles: vert. chromatic correction + “virtual” crab waist

Interaction Region: AB v. 8-1 ($\beta_x^* = 1$ m, $\beta_y^* = 2$ mm)

A. Bogomyagkov



synchrotron radiation $E_{\gamma,c}$≤400 keV, 5 sextupoles: hor.+ vert. chromatic correction + crab waist

dynamic aperture

$\beta^*_{x,y} = (0.5\ \mathrm{m}, 1\ \mathrm{mm})$

K. Oide

$E_{\mathrm{beam}} = 45.6$ GeV
3,000 turns

$E_{\mathrm{beam}} = 175$ GeV
50 turns





adequate dynamic aperture on- and off-momentum

- Sextupoles must be optimized at each beam energy.
- 3,000 turns are enough to determine the aperture at 45.6 GeV (long. damping = 1,500 turns).
- ±2% acceptance is not necessary for beamstrahlung, but may be useful for synchrotron injection.
- The on-momentum peak of the transverse aperture is recovered due to weaker radiation.

β_y* evolution over 40 years



entering a new regime for ring colliders –
SuperKEKB will pave the way towards $\beta^* \leq 2$ mm

SuperKEKB: extremely low β*

I_{e+}=3.6 A, I_{e-}=2.6 A

P_{SR} ~ 13 MW
C = 3 km

beam commissioning starting this year



K. Oide et al.

top up injection at high current
β_y* =300 μm (FCC-ee: 1 mm)
lifetime 5 min (FCC-ee: ≥20 min)
$\varepsilon_y/\varepsilon_x$ =0.25% (similar to FCC-ee)
off momentum acceptance (±1.5%, similar to FCC-ee)
***e*⁺ production rate** (2.5x10^{12}/s, FCC-ee: <1.5x10^{12}/s (*Z* cr.waist)

SuperKEKB goes beyond *FCC-ee*, testing all concept

luminosity optimization

luminosity scaling: larger *E* & ρ



$$e\,f\,k\,N = \text{beam current} \propto \frac{1}{E^4}$$

$$L = \frac{f\,k\,N^2}{4\pi\sigma_x\sigma_y} F\,H$$



H ≤ 1

Hour-glass

F ≤ 1

Crossing angle



$$\xi_y \propto \frac{\beta_y^* N}{E\sigma_x\sigma_y} \le \xi_y^{\max}(E)$$

Beam-beam parameter

$$L \propto \frac{\rho P_{SR}}{E^3}\frac{\xi_y}{\beta_y^*}$$

σ = beam size

k = no. bunches

f = rev. frequency

N = bunch population

P_{SR} = synch. rad. power

β^* = betatron fct at IP (beam envelope)

J. Wenninger

luminosity scaling: damping

- beam-beam parameter ξ measures strength of field sensed by the particles in a collision
- beam-beam parameter limits are empirically scaled from LEP data (4 IPs)



$$\xi_y \propto \frac{\beta_y^* N}{E \sigma_x \sigma_y} \leq \xi_y^{\max}(E)$$

$$\xi_y^{\max}(E) \propto \frac{1}{\tau_s^{0.4}} \propto E^{1.2}$$

R. Assmann & K. Cornelis, EPAC2000



FCC-ee vs LEP

x4

x4.5

$$L \propto \frac{\rho P_{SR}}{E^{1.8}} \frac{1}{\beta_y^*}$$

<x2

x1/25-1/50

→ **extremely high luminosity**

J. Wenninger, R. Assmann, S. White, K. Ohmi, D. Shatilov, et al.

beam-beam simulations





analytical estimates confirmed by simulations





simulated beam-beam limit much higher for crab-waist schemes !

K. Ohmi, D. Shatilov

polarization,
energy calibration,
and mono-chromatization

polarization

two primary interests:

accurate energy calibration using resonant depolarization ⇒ measurement of M_Z, Γ_Z, M_W

- *appealing feature – δM_Z, $\delta \Gamma_Z$ ~ 0.1 MeV, δM_W ~ 0.3 MeV*

physics with longitudinally polarized beams

- *transverse polarization must be rotated into the longitudinal plane using spin rotators (see e.g. HERA)*



scaling from LEP observations :

polarization expected up to the WW threshold !

LEP like calibration up to the W threshold

R. Assmann



integer spin resonances are spaced by 440 MeV:

energy spread should remain below ~ 60 MeV

A. Blondel, M. Koratzinos, S. Mane, U. Wienands, J. Wenninger,..

polarization build up

transverse polarization build-up (Sokolov-Ternov) is slow at *FCC-ee* (large bending radius ρ)

build-up is ~40 times slower than at LEP

wigglers may lower τ_p to ~12 h, limited by $\sigma_E \leq 60$ MeV and power

due to power loss the wigglers can only be used to pre-polarize some bunches (before main injection)



≈ OK for energy calibration (few % P sufficient)

longitudinal polarization: levels of ≥ 40% required on both beams; excellent resonant compensation needed

expected to be difficult, requires spin rotators or snakes, most likely only possible at lower intensity and luminosity

SLIM, PETROS, SITF etc. simulations

A. Blondel, U. Wienands, E. Gianfelice, J. Jowett, R. Rossmanith, J.Wenninger

energy calibration

at *Z* and *W:* frequent resonant-depolarization measurements with non-colliding bunches

- ✓ much better resolution than at LEP, few tens of keV
- ✓ measurement of energy spread?
- ✓ extrapolation from average to individual IPs
- ✓ OR: injecting polarized beam

at higher energies, *H* and $t\bar{t}$:

- ✓ use physics measurements
- ✓ other? (laser back scattering / spectrometer?)
- ✓ OR: injecting polarized beam

A. Blondel, I. Koop, M. Koratzinos, N. Muchnoi, et al.

Spectrometer with Compton scattering



Access to the beam energy: $E_0 = \frac{\Delta\theta}{\theta} \times \frac{m^2}{4\omega_0}$

Nikolai Muchnoi

injecting polarized beam & free spin precession

120 GeV



ν_0=272.325

I. Koop

preserving polarization in the booster



Spin rotation by 180^0 around the longitudinal axis

crossing 100's of resonances like in RHIC

spin tune

$$\nu_s = \gamma\left(\frac{g-2}{2}\right)$$

integer spin resonances $n\nu_s = p$
every 440 MeV for e^-
i.e. need to cross about 400 resonances till 175 GeV;
every 520 MeV for p
e.g. about 500 resonance crossings for RHIC 250–GeV p's

I. Koop

mono-chromatization at 2x63 GeV?

direct *s* channel Higgs production $e^+e^- \rightarrow H$

rms beam energy spread at 63 GeV ~30 MeV
total width of SM Higgs Γ ~ 4 MeV

effective collision energy spread is decreased by introducing opposite-sign IP dispersion

$$\frac{\sigma_W}{W} = \sqrt{\frac{2\varepsilon_x}{\left(\frac{D^*_x{}^2}{\beta^*_x} + \frac{\varepsilon_x}{\sigma_\epsilon{}^2}\right)}}$$



first proposed by A. Renieri (1975); historical studies for VEPP4, SPEAR, LEP, τ-c factory;never tested experimentally

reducing cm energy spread x1/10 w/o loss of luminosity?!
implementation for crab-waist scheme?

summary

SR effects of LEP
high currents of KEKB and PEP-II
top-up of KEKB and PEP-II
crab waist of DAFNE
low β_y* of SuperKEKB
***e*⁺ source** of KEKB
cryo availability of LHC
spin gymnastics of RHIC (?)

FCC-ee

individual parameters mostly relaxed compared with those in "demonstrator machines"

baseline **luminosity performance predicted w confidence**; further increases possible

optics footprint matched to the hadron collider layout

FCC-ee would bring the **tunnel**, the **infrastructure**, the **time** needed for high-field magnet production, and possibly also an even stronger **physics motivation** (and precise target energy) **for FCC-hh**

"An e^+-e^- storage ring in the range of a few hundred GeV in the centre of mass can be built with present technology..." "...the most useful project on the horizon."

B. Richter, 1976

NIM 136 (1976) 47-60

…surely great times ahead!



spare slides

chromaticity in selected FF systems

project	status	β_y^* [mm]	l^*[m]	l^*/β_y^*	σ_y^* [nm]	
LEP	measured	50	3.7	74	3200	*circular*
LHC	measured	600	23	38	16000	
KEKB	measured	6.0	2.4	400	940	
FCC-hh	**design**	**1100**	**46**	**42**	**7000**	
S-KEKB	**design**	**0.3**	**1.5**	**5000**	**50**	
FCC-ee	**design**	**2.0**	**2.2**	**1100**	**50**	
CepC	**design**	**1.2**	**1.5**	**1250**	**150**	
SLC	measured	2.0	2.2	1100	500	*linear*
FFTB	measured	0.167	0.4	2400	70	
ATF2	measured	0.1	1.0	10000	~40	
ILC	**design**	**0.4**	**3.5**	**8750**	**6**	
CLIC	**design**	**0.09**	**3.5**	**39000**	**1**	

limits on collider spot size