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- Unlike single or multi-turn extraction, the slow-extraction process is **intrinsically lossy**:
  - We cannot (yet!) create a clear temporal or spatial separation in the beam to extract cleanly
  - In fact, most FT experiments **don’t want temporal structure** in the beam!

- Beam loss from slow-extraction is **unavoidable**, and has to be **controlled** and **optimized**:
  - Induced activation in Long Straight Section 2 (LSS2) increases in direct proportion to the beam loss on the septum
The slow-extraction scheme

- Beam deliberately excited using a **third-order resonance** and large amplitude particles extracted with a thin **electrostatic septum** [ES]:
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- Beam deliberately excited using a third-order resonance and large amplitude particles extracted with a thin electrostatic septum [ES]:

\[ \begin{align*}
E_x &= -220 \text{ kV} \\
\end{align*} \]
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The slow-extraction scheme

- Beam deliberately excited using a **third-order resonance** and large amplitude particles extracted with a thin **electrostatic septum** [ES]:

![Diagram of slow-extraction scheme]

- Losses (~%) from beam impact on wire
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The slow-extraction scheme

- Beam deliberately excited using a **third-order resonance** and large amplitude particles extracted with a thin **electrostatic septum [ES]**:

- Resonant tune $[Q = 26.666...]$ swept across the tune spread of the beam by varying the QF current: $\frac{\Delta p}{p} \propto -\Delta Q$

  momentum spread, tune

  - $\Delta p = 4.8$ s

Schottky measurement during spill, courtesy of T. Bohl
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The slow-extraction scheme: LSS2

- Extraction geometry designed in 1970’s and largely unchanged:
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The slow-extraction scheme: LSS2

- Extraction geometry designed in 1970’s and largely unchanged:

The electrostatic septum: ES

To TT20 and NA

W-Re wires 60 – 100 μm

5 tanks ≈ 20m

Trajectories for third-integer resonant slow extraction in LSS2 (Q26.666…)
Since restarting after LS1 some of the highest proton (p) fluxes have been extracted to the North Area in ≈10 years.
POT delivered and requested

- Since restarting after LS1 some of the highest proton (p) fluxes have been extracted to the North Area in ≈10 years.
- High intensity requests from NA are continuing into 2016...
POT delivered and requested

• Since restarting after LS1 some of the highest proton (p) fluxes have been extracted to the North Area in ≈10 years
• High intensity requests from NA are continuing into 2016...
• Future experimental proposals request as much as 4E19 p/yr over 5 years:
  – Same as delivered to CNGS (so OK for SPS) but a fast and almost loss-free extraction process was used (2x 10.5 μs spills per 6 s)
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**SPS Losses and Activation Working Group (SLAWG)** was formed to investigate and follow-up the increase in activation during 2015
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- Stability of the QF circuit (ripple and glitches) is seriously affecting the NA spill quality [5]
  - The slow-extraction is a resonant process and it amplifies the smallest imperfections in the machine:
  - e.g. spill intensity variations can be explained by ripples in the current (mains: $n \times 50$ Hz) at the level of a few ppm!

- Interventions on extraction hardware in activated area
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- FT cycle now included in **SPS Quality Control** application:
  - Online **monitoring** of the per proton extraction losses
  - **Interlocked** thresholds (SIS)
  - **Re-alignment** of the ES when loss levels rises significantly (monthly)

- Spill now controlled by **feed-forward on main QF circuit** with Autospill application (servo feed-back removed):
  - Beam trajectories in the North Area far more stable [6]

- **SLAWG** meets regularly to discuss on-going issues related to SPS slow-extraction:
  - Reporting to IEFC [7]
  - Actively working on a longer term strategy for loss mitigation

- **Collaboration with UA9** formed to investigate the use of crystals for slow-extraction at the SPS:
  - First MD was successfully carried out in July, with a second planned in October
Spill quality

- Low frequency noise on the QF power supply reduces the effective spill length for experiments:

A recent example of a relatively good spill with large n x 50 Hz components and another noise source at 10 Hz [8]
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- RP limits for personnel are becoming **stricter**, with good reason!
  - If machine activation is not reduced, longer cooling times will have to be accepted for interventions on the extraction equipment: **impact on machine availability**

- Interventions in high radiation areas are necessary [9]:
  - **Remote handling**: employed for first time in 2016, has to be the future direction
  - Steep learning curve in 2016: **dose taken reduced by factor 2**
  - Number of interventions is **ultimately limited** by dose taken by trained personnel (< 2 mSv/yr/person) and has to be shared with interventions across CERN complex

- Remote handling in LSS2

  - ES tank 4 exchange, 9 Feb 2016: 3.3 mSv (collective dose)
  - ES tank 2 exchange, 19 Feb 2016: 1.7 mSv (collective dose)
Impact of future POT requests

- We must **improve the extraction efficiency** by more than a factor 3 to keep an **ES exchange** intervention within reasonable RP limits (below **ALARA III** [10]):
  - As projected by our rule-of-thumb... for a flux of $4\times10^{19}$ p/yr
  - ... allowing a 1 week of cool-down period before intervention
  - ... and neglecting the build-up of the background from longer lived isotopes
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- We must **improve the extraction efficiency** by more than a **factor 3** to keep an **ES exchange** intervention within reasonable RP limits (below **ALARA III** [10]):
  - As projected by our rule-of-thumb...for a flux of 4E19 p/yr
  - ...allowing a 1 week of cool-down period before intervention
  - ...and neglecting the build-up of the background from longer lived isotopes

- Otherwise, cool-down times will have to be **longer** and will impact machine availability

- Bear in mind that **during 2015** we would have had to wait **1 month** with the above assumptions:
  - Able to wait 3 months into the YETS, but not to be repeated...!
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- Removing sensitivity of slow-extraction to super-cycle changes:
  - Exploitation of a calibrated SPS B-train will be indispensable
- Implementation of a dynamic extraction bump:
  - Moving beam in LSS2 (and not the ES) to compensate for machine imperfections
- Diffusers (low-Z scatterer placed upstream of the ES wires)
- Application of crystals to aid or replace electrostatic septum:
  - In collaboration with UA9, we are actively studying the application of a crystal to shadow the wires of the ES septum
  - Longer term plans for crystal capable of replacing ES
- New ES hardware: shorter first ES, low Z components...
- Phase-space density reduction:
  - separatrix folding, SPS optics, massless septum, e-lens, ...
- Doctoral student in TE-ABT since March 2016
Collaboration between TE-ABT and UA9

- Shadowing the ES septum wires using an upstream crystal to coherently channel particles away from the wires and into the septum gap [11,12]
- First (non-local) tests could be made relatively soon (2018?) with a crystal installed in LSS4:

  \[ \Delta \mu \approx \pi \]

\[ \Delta x' \approx 150 \mu \text{rad} \]

- Challenge: transporting channeled beam to target (or dump)

LSS4 crystal location
Identified (extraction bumpers)
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- Shadowing the ES septum wires using an upstream crystal to coherently channel particles away from the wires and into the septum gap [11,12]
- First (non-local) tests could be made relatively soon (2018?) with a crystal installed in LSS4:

Preliminary studies show a promising loss reduction:

 Particle density at ES:

- **nominal**
- **crystal**
- **ES**

Mathematical expressions and plots are shown to illustrate the results.
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- Shadowing the ES septum wires using an upstream crystal to coherently channel particles away from the wires and into the septum gap [11,12]
- First (non-local) tests could made relatively soon (2018?) with a crystal installed in LSS4:

Preliminary studies show a promising loss reduction:

![Graph showing particle density at ES](attachment:graph.png)
Summary

• Slow extraction is **only way** to give a 1 second spill, but is intrinsically lossy (**few %** of beam)
• Delivering $4E19$ pot/yr via LSS2 slow extraction needs **factor 3 - 4 reduction** in local activation
• Working group (**SLAWG**) established in 2016 and actively tackling the issue (already for today’s beams)
• **Promising beam loss reduction options exist** and are being actively studied
• SPS instrumentation, stability and reproducibility have to **improve** in parallel
Thank you for your attention!
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Mandate of SLAWG

- Analyse and document historical and current beam losses in SPS and TT20 as a function of beam type and year
- Define key reference interventions with WDP and reasonable cooldown times as a function of activation level
- Follow up improvements in SPS logging and surveillance tools
- Propose target interlock levels for losses per proton for LSS2 slow extraction
- Deploy surveillance SW to interlock beams for excessive extraction losses
- Study short and long-term methods to improve extraction, transport and splitting losses
- Liaise with LIU and CONS projects for common developments/improvements
- Analyse required p.o.t. requests from NA experiments and define implications for SPS operation
- Periodically report status and results to IEFC
SPS Quality Check (QC)

- Factor ≈ 2 increase in activation went unnoticed because the per cycle extracted beam intensity was lower, compared to 2012, but the duty factor higher.

- FT cycle now included in SPS QC application:
  - Online monitoring of the per proton extraction losses
  - Interlocked thresholds (SIS)
  - Regular re-alignment of the ZS during dedicated MD

Recent normalised extraction losses (averaged over the year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPS QC monitoring application after first ZS alignment in 2016
SPS Autospill [6]

- Servo quad feedback with intensity measured in extraction line disconnected to improve trajectory stability in transfer line:
  - Shot-to-shot orbit variations amplified by servo quad
  - Feedback sensitive to cycle-to-cycle intensity variations
  - Small dimension of NA62 target in 2015 sensitive to steering errors
- Instead, feed-forward on current in main quadrupole (QF) circuit using Autospill application:

  Symmetry measured on T4 target:
  
  - Servo feedback: 1 Dec 2014
  - SMQ feed-forward: 1 Oct 2015

  Symmetry (at target): 100% = centred
QF Glitches

- Small current glitches ($\Delta I \sim 1$ in 2000 A) observed recently during slow extraction: sporadic and, to date, without explanation
- Glitches of $\Delta I/I \sim 10^{-3}$ seriously disrupt the slow-extraction process

Glitch on 2nd October 2015

Glitch on 24th April 2016
QF Glitches

- Small current glitches ($\Delta I \sim 1$ in 2000 A) observed recently during slow extraction: sporadic and, to date, without explanation
- Glitches of $\Delta I/I \sim 10^{-3}$ seriously disrupt the slow-extraction
- Under investigation!

A classic glitch event on 9th July 2015: current sharply increases before regulation loop kicks in

Scope installed on SMQ to trigger acquisition to diagnose source of glitch
ALARA III (see 88\textsuperscript{th} IEFC, 2013, H. Vincke)

https://edms.cern.ch/document/1296520/1
ALARA III (see 88th IEFC, 2013, H. Vincke)

- ALARA limits:
  - 5 mSv collective dose per intervention
  - 1 mSv individual dose per intervention
  - Hard limit dose to individual is 2 mSv/yr

Waiving of the ALARA committee meeting

Circumstances

- Repetitive intervention
  - A procedure has been worked out under which circumstances a waiving of the ALARA committee meeting could be possible
  - Generic DIMRs should be worked out and approved a priori in an ALARA committee meeting.

- Urgent maintenance/repair
  - ‘Urgent ALARA committee’ decision
  - No ‘formal (physical)’ ALARA committee meeting required
  - Generic DIMRs for standard maintenance/repair should be worked out and approved a priori in an ALARA committee meeting.
SPS orbit stability (LHC cycle at extraction)

- Drifts of ~ mm observed over months (July to October 2015) [4]
Peak at ZS extracted and plotted as function of p.o.t. for that year
Collaboration with UA9

MEMORANDUM

To: Walter Scandale, Chairperson of the UA9 Collaboration

From: Frédéric Bordry, Director for Accelerators and Technology

cc: Paul Collier, Head of the Beams Department
José Miguel Jiménez, Head of the Technology Department
Roberto Saban, Head of the Engineering Department
Brennan Goddard, TE-ABT Group Leader

Subject: Slow extraction assisted by bent crystals in the SPS

Following the interest generated by the Proposal for Investigating Slow Extraction Assisted by Bent Crystals in the SPS, I would like to ask the support of the UA9 collaboration both for the studies and for the developments of hardware and software which these might entail.

Needless to say, the beam time required for the validation of the concept will be taken from
Dynamic Economy at SPS

SPS Ring

a) Dynamic economy

The main power supply and RF power will execute a modified (energy saving) function if the BCT does not detect the beam after the first injection.

- MPS staying at injection energy.
- All ring circuits staying at Imin.
- All transfer line circuits without TT10 staying at Imin.

If the FGCs receive a trigger dynamic eco.
The FGCs staying at the injection energy and play a smooth function to reach the last configurable point and to keep the same magnetic history.

*We can force the pulse by hand to do some check.*

Bent crystals for UA9

Quasimosaic crystal
- Bent along (111) planes
- Minimal length a few tenths of mm
- Non-equidistant planes d1/d2 = 3

Strip crystal
- Bent along (110) planes
- Minimal length ~ 1 mm
- Equidistant planes

Crystals
- Dislocation-free silicon crystals plates or strips
  - for optimal channeling efficiency
    - short length (few mm)
    - moderate bending radius 45 ÷ 70 m
- Mechanical holders with large C-shape frame imparting the main crystal curvature
  - Strip crystal: (110) planes are bent by anticlastic forces
  - Quasimosaic crystal: (111) planes are bent by 3-D anticlastic forces through the elasticity tensor
- Expected crystal defects:
  - Miscut: can be ≈100 μrad, but negligible effect if good orientation is applied
  - Torsion: can be reduced down to 1 μrad/mm ➔ UA9 data in the SPS North Area
  - Imperfection of the crystal surface: amorphous layer size ≤ 1 μm

Multi-crystals as a septum

- Multi-crystal arrays using volume reflection proposed as septa:
  
  \[ \approx 130 \text{mm} \]

Crystal parameters:
- thickness \( 1-4 \text{ mm} \)
- \( CH \) deflection angle \( 60-150 \mu\text{rad} \)
- \( MVR \) deflection angle \( \approx 60 \mu\text{rad} \)
- open area \( \leq 5 \times 20 \text{ mm}^2 \)