Linear colliders
@ CERN

Steinar Stapnes – CERN

Jan 15th - 2025

Outline

- LC general considerations
- ILC - in Japan
- CLIC - at CERN
- Brief: C^3 and HALHF, energy recovery options
- LC options at CERN, consider ILC technology as starting point, ESPP inputs

Strategies, past and future

ESPP update 2018-19:

- Higgs factory next – project studies
- FCC feasibility study
- R&D on technologies and projects

Snowmass 2021-23 provided(s) an opportunity for formulating new ideas, updated reports, overviews and summaries – for the US and worldwide.
Many ideas, from mature to concepts.

Report of the Snowmass'21
Collider Implementation Task Force

Thomas Roser (chair)[1], Reinhard Brinkmann[2], Sarah Cousineau[3], Dmitri Denisov[1], Spencer Gessner[4], Steve Gourlay[5], Philippe Lebrun[6], Meenakshi Narain[7], Katsunobu Oide[8], Tor Raubenheimer[4], John Seeman[4], Vladimir Shiltsev[9], Jim Strait[9], Marlene Turner[5], and Lian-Tao Wang[10]

[1]Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY 11973, USA
[2]DESY, 22607 Hamburg, Germany
[3]Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37830, USA
[4]SLAC National Laboratory, Menlo Park, CA 94025, USA
[5]Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA
[6]ESI Archamps, 74160 Archamps, France
[7]Brown University, Providence, RI, 02912, USA
[8]KEK, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-0801, Japan
[9]Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, IL 60510, USA
[10]University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637, USA

August 15, 2022

Abstract

The Snowmass'21 Implementation Task Force has been established to evaluate the proposed future accelerator projects for performance, technology readiness, schedule, cost, and environmental impact. Corresponding metrics has been developed for uniform comparison of the proposals ranging from Higgs/EW factories to multi-TeV lepton, hadron and *ep* collider facilities, based on traditional and advanced acceleration technologies. This report documents the metrics and processes, and presents evaluations of future colliders performed by Implementation Task Force.



Proposal Name (c.m.e. in TeV)	Collider Design Status	Lowest TRL Category	Technical Validation Requirement	Cost Reduction Scope	Performance Achievability	Overall Risk Tier
FCCee-0.24	II					1
CEPC-0.24	II					1
ILC-0.25	I					1
CCC-0.25	III					2
CLIC-0.38	II					1
CERC-0.24	III					2
ReLiC-0.24	V					2
ERLC-0.24	V					2
XCC-0.125	IV					2
MC-0.13	III					3
ILC-3	IV					2
CCC-3	IV					2
CLIC-3	II					1
ReLiC-3	IV					3
MC-3	III					3
LWFA-LC 1-3	IV					4
PWFA-LC 1-3	IV					4
SWFA-LC 1-3	IV					4
MC 10-14	IV					3
LWFA-LC-15	V					4
PWFA-LC-15	V					4
SWFA-LC-15	V					4
FCChh-100	II					3
SPPC-125	III					3
Coll.Sea-500	V					4

https://arxiv.org/pdf/2208.06030.pdf

The challenge for the EPSS update:



CLIC mature, studied for CERN

ILC very mature, in Japan, also possible at CERN

C3 progressing fast, HALHF new concept, Energy Recovery concept(s)

LC at CERN

Reminder: a LC can be upgraded in length and technology

LC general considerations - reminder



Energy/Lum upgraded e+e-

“Higgs-factory” e+e-

LHC followed by HL LHC

Today 2040 ~2050-55 Time

Start with mature technology, can expand in length and/or technology



Increased luminosity with energy, e.g. 1-3 x 10^{34} $cm^{-2}s^{-1}$ for Higgs factories at 250 GeV, 6 x 10^{34} at 3 TeV.

Higher energies “natural” – 3 TeV studied (for CLIC), but many TeVs challenging:

- Power increases with energy and luminosity
- Reach up to 50km
- Higher energy means smaller beams and increasingly important beam-beam effects.



LC physics opportunities - reminder

arXiv:2206.08326



e+e- colliders show very comparable performance for standard Higgs program, despite quite different assumed integrated luminosities => longitudinal beam polarization an important factor for LCs

- several couplings at few-0.1% level: Z, W, g, b, τ
- some more at ~1%: γ, c

A physics-driven, polarised operating scenario for a Linear Collider

- **250 GeV, ~2ab-1:**
    - precision Higgs mass and total ZH cross-section
    - Higgs -> invisible (Dark Sector portal)
    - basic ffbar and WW program
    - optional: WW threshold scan
- **Z pole, few billion Z's: EWPOs 10-100x better than today**
- **350 GeV, 200 fb-1:**
    - precision top mass from threshold scan
- **500…600 GeV, 4 ab-1:**
    - Higgs self-coupling in ZHH
    - top quark ew couplings
    - top Yukawa coupling incl CP structure
    - improved Higgs, WW and ffbar
    - probe Higgsinos up to ~300 GeV
    - probe Heavy Neutral Leptons up to ~600 GeV
- **800…1000 GeV, 8 ab-1:**
    - Higgs self-coupling in VBF
    - further improvements in tt, ff, WW, ….
    - probe Higgsinos up to ~500 GeV
    - probe Heavy Neutral Leptons up to ~1000 GeV
    - searches, searches, searches, …

Beyond collider:

- ILCX – e.g. beam-dump experiments, dark sector physics, light dark matter, strong QED (ILCX workshop)
- Test and R&D beams for detector and accelerator studies



From J.List/M.Peskin

Higgs Factory Detector Concepts



Key requirements from Higgs physics:

- **p_t resolution** (total ZH x-section)
  $\sigma(1/p_t) = 2 \times 10^{-5}\ \mathrm{GeV}^{-1} \oplus 1 \times 10^{-3} / (p_t \sin^{1/2}\theta)$
- **vertexing** (H → bb/cc/ττ)
  $\sigma(d_0) < 5 \oplus 10 / (p[\mathrm{GeV}] \sin^{3/2}\theta)\ \mu m$
- **jet energy resolution** (H → invisible) 3-4%
- **hermeticity** (H → invis, BSM) $\theta_{min} = 5$ mrad
  (FCCee: ~50mrad)

Determine to key features of the **detector**:

- **low mass tracker:**
  eg VTX: 0.15% rad. length / layer)
- **calorimeters**
  - **highly granular,** optimised for particle flow
  - or dual readout, LAr, …

≈ CMS / 40

≈ CMS / 4

≈ ATLAS / 2

≈ ATLAS / 3

For LCs, bunches inside trains

- at ILC: Δt_b = 554 ns; f_{rep} = 5 -10 Hz
- at CLIC: Δt_b = 0.5 ns; f_{rep} = 50-100 Hz

The lower collision rate enables

- passive cooling only => low material budget
- triggerless operation





From J.List

General goals for LCs:

Energy reach and flexibility:

- Physics opportunities from Z-pole to 1-2 TeV (maybe more later on)
- One can adapt – with limitations – cost, power versus E and L
- Allows to adapt to development in physics

Footprint, power and cost:

- Lower cost to get to Higgs and top than a circular machine
- Power similar to LHC, or lower, for initial configuration
- Footprint similar to LHC, CE cost risks therefore manageable

Provide many opportunities and increased flexibility for the future:

- Does not determine footprint of future energy frontier machines (hadrons and muon), and it has its own upgrade opportunities.
- Encourage accelerator and detector R&D in all these areas

ILC – general updates and implementation in Japan, with some considerations for a CERN implementation (more later)

The ILC250 accelerator facility



Undulator based polarized positron source


International Linear Collider (ILC) (Plan)

Euro-XFEL
Operation started from 2017
-100 cryomodules
-800 cavities
-17.5 GeV (Pulsed)

LCLS-II + HE (under construction)
-35 + 20 cryomodules
-280 + 160 cavities
- 4 + 4 GeV (CW)

ILC
-900 cryomodules
-8,000 cavities
-250 GeV (Pulsed)

SHINE (under construction)
-75 cryomodules
-~600 cavities
- 8 GeV (CW)

LCLS-II




Quantity	Symbol	Unit	Initial	$\mathcal{L}$ Upgrade	Z pole	Upgrades		
Centre of mass energy	$\sqrt{s}$	GeV	250	250	91.2	500	250	1000
Luminosity	$\mathcal{L}$	$10^{34}\mathrm{cm}^{-2}\mathrm{s}^{-1}$	1.35	2.7	0.21/0.41	1.8/3.6	5.4	5.1
Polarization for e^-/e^+	$P_-(P_+)$	%	80(30)	80(30)	80(30)	80(30)	80(30)	80(20)
Repetition frequency	f_{rep}	Hz	5	5	3.7	5	10	4
Bunches per pulse	n_{bunch}	1	1312	2625	1312/2625	1312/2625	2625	2450
Bunch population	N_{e}	10^{10}	2	2	2	2	2	1.74
Linac bunch interval	Δt_{b}	ns	554	366	554/366	554/366	366	366
Beam current in pulse	I_{pulse}	mA	5.8	8.8	5.8/8.8	5.8/8.8	8.8	7.6
Beam pulse duration	t_{pulse}	μs	727	961	727/961	727/961	961	897
Average beam power	P_{ave}	MW	5.3	10.5	1.42/2.84$^{*)}$	10.5/21	21	27.2
RMS bunch length	σ^*_{z}	mm	0.3	0.3	0.41	0.3	0.3	0.225
Norm. hor. emitt. at IP	$\gamma\epsilon_{\mathrm{x}}$	μm	5	5	5	5	5	5
Norm. vert. emitt. at IP	$\gamma\epsilon_{\mathrm{y}}$	nm	35	35	35	35	35	30
RMS hor. beam size at IP	σ^*_{x}	nm	516	516	1120	474	516	335
RMS vert. beam size at IP	σ^*_{y}	nm	7.7	7.7	14.6	5.9	7.7	2.7
Luminosity in top 1 %	$\mathcal{L}_{0.01}/\mathcal{L}$		73 %	73 %	99 %	58.3 %	73 %	44.5 %
Beamstrahlung energy loss	δ_{BS}		2.6 %	2.6 %	0.16 %	4.5 %	2.6 %	10.5 %
Site AC power	P_{site}	MW	111	128	94/115	173/215	198	300
Site length	L_{site}	km	20.5	20.5	20.5	31	31	40

Parameters and plans for luminosity and energy upgrades are available, including information about relevant SCRF R&D for such upgrades at (Snowmass input)

Increasing the number of bunches in a train, and adjusting to a CERN running year

ILC in Japan has a certain run-plan, but one can easily consider higher luminosities and higher energies earlier.

If starting with ILC technology at CERN for a LC this will certainly be considered.

From J.List (link)



Higgs run ~8 years

Doubling the frequence to 10 Hz (~200 MW). Note that in all cases a luminosity ramp up is foreseen



Higgs run 5 years

Some recent ILC developments - I





SRF	WPP	1	Cavity production	√		√	√	√			√	√	√				√	√	√		√	√		√	√	
	WPP	2	CM design	√				√				√			√	√	√	√	√			√		√	√	
	WPP	3	Crab cavity			√	√							√					√			√	√		√	√
Sources	WPP	4	E-source			√						√							√		√			√		
	WPP	6	Undulator target				√												√	√			√			
	WPP	7	Undulator focusing				√												√	√			√			
	WPP	8	E-driven target	√		√												√	√							
	WPP	9	E-driven focusing	√														√	√							
	WPP	10	E-driven capture	√															√					√		
	WPP	11	Target replacement	√																						
Nano-beams	WPP	12	DR System design	√	√				√	√		√							√				√	√		
	WPP	14	DR Injection/extraction	√					√										√				√	√		
	WPP	15	Final focus	√			√		√		√							√			√			√		
	WPP	16	Final doublet	√	√													√								
	WPP	17	Main dump	√			√					√														

Above: ILC Technology Network (ITN), interest/capability matrix from 28 labs/universities

WPP	1	Cavity production
WPP	2	CM design
WPP	3	Crab cavity
WPP	4	E- source
WPP	6	Undulator target
WPP	7	Undulator focusing
WPP	8	E-driven target
WPP	9	E-driven focusing
WPP	10	E-driven capture
WPP	11	Target replacement
WPP	12	DR System design
WPP	14	DR Injection/extraction
WPP	15	Final focus
WPP	16	Final doublet
WPP	17	Main dump

Promoting the technological development of the International Linear Collider: Twenty-eight research institutes participated in the ITN Information Meeting

Topics

2023/11/16

European ITN studies are distributed over five main activity areas:

ML related tasks

- SRF and ML elements: Cavities and Cryo Module, Crab-cavities, ML quads and cold BPMs (INFN, CEA, DESY, CERN, IJCLAB, UK, CIEMAT, IFIC)

Sources

- Pulsed magnet and wheel/target (Uni.H, DESY, CERN)

Damping Ring including kickers

- Low Emittance Rings (UK)

ATF activities, final focus and nanobeams

- ATS and MDI (UK, DESY, IJCLAB, CERN, IFIC)

Implementation

- Dump, CE, Cryo – follow up efforts at CERN
- Sustainability, Life Cycle Assessment (CERN, DESY, CEA, UK groups)
- EAJADE started (EU funding) (DESY, UK, CEA, CNRS, IFIC, INFN, UHH, CERN)

Some recent ILC developments - II

Re-evaluate CFS costs for ILC in Japan

- Mountainous site -> mostly sloped access tunnels
- CE based on NATM tunnelling method (blast and spayed concrete)

Includes design updates from TDR/ILC-250

- Some tunnel and cavern extensions for latest acc. and utility designs

Re-evaluated to 2024 National Cost Estimating Standards



Cost matrix, updating SCRF and CFS (~75%), escalation and currency updates for the rest (~25%)


Basic model of ILC community (setting design codes)

Vision2035

Sustainable community development that coexists with forests and nature

- Community of appropriate size (200-300 units)
- All wooden
- Green garden community

● Town Center
- Commercial facility
- Hotel
- Business center

● Local production and local consumption of energy

■ 4th generation district heat supply
- Solar heat plan
- Unused biomass heat use
- Unused waste heat recovery

Evolving City Planning for the Next Generation

● Growth management of community (Returning development profits to the community)

● Incorporate cutting-edge technologies (Society 5.0/ICT · AI)
- Healthcare · Mobility
- Robot service / guidance

Areas where ILC-related companies, medical care, education, robotics, AI technology, etc. are concentrated

■ Next generation mobility area
- ● Fully automatic operation (Level 4 or more)
- ● eVTOL takeoff and landing
- Seamless transportation and logistics
- People flow / logistics interlocking service

Old city Area (local community)
- Efforts to foster exchange between communities
- Improve regional brands in the old city

The ILC implementation is extensively studies in Japan, civil engineering, integration locally, environmental impacts, etc



To be shown

ILC250nCost-Update Evaluation

– update-ay180112, for MEXT-TDR-WG-180120 → ILC-Cost-Update-2024

Confidential

Progress Year-base Unit [MILC]-	ILC500 (TDR) 2012-base [MILC]	ILC250 2012-base [MILC]	ILC250-2017-base JP-CFS ([Oku-JPY]	Escalation & design-update [factor]	ILC250-2024-base JP-CFS [OkuJPY]
Year of work ~ report	*2012 ~ 2013*	2017 TDR-base	2017 New JP-CFS Design	[2012-2024]	[2024]
Acc. Tech. **(except for SRF)**	**1,390**	**1,196**		To be reported	
SRF Tech. (CM, HLRF, Cryog,)	**4,221**	**2,340**		To be reported	
CFS:CF		706	To be reported	To be reported	
CFS:CE		1,014	To be reported		To be reported
CFS-Total		**1,720**	To be reporte		
Sum	**7,985**	**5,256**			

[MILC]

[Oku-JPY]

From report by A.Yamamoto (LINK)



Comments on the ILC250 Cost-Update 2024

- The ILC250 cost increase of **~60%+** (in overall), in 2017 – 2024.
- It may be caused by the following origins:
  - **General (for all Conv. Acc., SRF, and CFS):**
    - Increase of **30 – 50 %** because of **inflation** from 2017 to 2024,
  - **SRF (specific):**
    - Increase of **8 ~ 10 %** because of the **1/3 mass production, resulting unit cost-up**
    - Increase of **10 ~ 20 %** because of integration of **averaged cost** in 2024, instead of cheapest cost in TDR, and **design updates and/or production cost changes**.
  - **CFS (specific):**
    - Increase of 20 – 40 % because of design update in JP specific site,
    - dynamic change of exchange rates (in particular between USD/.EU and JPY)
    - Significant, material (Cu, SUS etc.) cost increase,

For CERN (in progress):

- Redo CE costing (see later)
- Redo CF costing (EL, CV, etc)
- Use 2024 costing for all components in their respective currencies, and change to CHF with exchange rate (not PPP)
- Cost second IP

1 CHF = 1.10 $

CLIC at CERN

The Compact Linear Collider (CLIC)







Accelerating structure prototype for CLIC: 12 GHz (L~25 cm), 100 MV/m

- **Timeline:** Electron-positron linear collider at CERN for the era beyond HL-LHC
- **Compact:** Novel and unique two-beam accelerating technique with high-gradient room temperature RF cavities (~20’500 structures at 380 GeV), ~11km in its initial phase
- **Expandable:** Staged programme with collision energies from 380 GeV (Higgs/top) up to 3 TeV (Energy Frontier)
- **CDR in 2012** with focus on 3 TeV.
- **Project Implementation Plan in 2018** with focus on 380 GeV for Higgs and top.

Luminosities studies 2019-22, and continued

- Luminosity margins and increases
  - Initial estimates of static and dynamic degradations from damping ring to IP gave: 1.5 x 10^{34} cm^{-2} s^{-1}
  - Simulations give 2.8 on average, and 90% of the machines above **2.3 x 10^{34} cm^{-2} s^{-1}**
  - A "perfect" machine will give : 4.3 x 10^{34} cm^{-2} s^{-1}
  - In addition: **doubling the frequency (50 Hz to 100 Hz) would double the luminosity**, at a cost of ~55% and ~5% power and cost increase
- Z pole performance, 2.3x10^{32} – 0.4x10^{34} cm^{-2} s^{-1}
  - The latter number when accelerator configured for Z running (e.g. early or end of first stage)
- Gamma – Gamma collision luminosity spectrum on the right (example with 190 GeV e-beams)

These numbers are already included (but 100 Hz only mentioned in passing, not in tables) in the Snowmass report 2021. See link of previous slides.



The CLIC project

O. Brunner^a, P. N. Burrows^b, S. Calatroni^a, N. Catalan Lasheras^a, R. Corsini^a, G. D'Auria^c, S. Doebert^a, A. Faus-Golfe^d, A. Grudiev^a, A. Latina^a, T. Lefevre^a, G. Mcmonagle^a, J. Osborne^a, Y. Papaphilippou^a, A. Robson^e, C. Rossi^a, R. Ruber^f, D. Schulte^a, S. Stapnes^a*, I. Syratchev^a, W. Wuensch^a

^a CERN, Geneva, Switzerland, ^b John Adams Institute, University of Oxford, United Kingdom, ^c Elettra Sincrotrone Trieste, Italy, ^d IJCLab, Orsay, France, ^e University of Glasgow, United Kingdom, ^f Uppsala University, Sweden

April 4, 2022

Abstract

Submitted to the Proceedings of the US Community Study on the Future of Particle Physics (Snowmass 2021)

The CLIC ESPP update – I

Guidelines:

Preparing “Project Readiness Report” as a step toward a TDR

Assuming ESPP in ~ 2025-6, Project Approval ~ 2028, Project (tunnel) construction can start in ~ 2030.

CERN-2024-nnn-M
31 December 2024

ORGANISATION EUROPÉENNE POUR LA RECHERCHE NUCLÉAIRE
CERN EUROPEAN ORGANIZATION FOR NUCLEAR RESEARCH

THE COMPACT LINEAR COLLIDER (CLIC)
READINESS REPORT

GENEVA
2024

Several important changes:

- Energy scales: 380 GeV and 1.5 TeV with one drivebeam
- Present 100 Hz running at 250 GeV and 380 GeV (i.e. two parallel experiments, two BDSs) – some increased cost and increased power wrt to one IP
- New run plan, 10+10 year for two stages (380 -> 1500 GeV) – with ramp-ups
- Several updates on parameters (injectors, damping rings, drive-beam) based on new designs, results and prototyping (e.g. klystrons, magnets) - however no fundamental changes beyond staying at one drivebeam
- Technology use examples, including more on use of them in other projects (e.g. alignment, instrumentation, X-band RF is small linacs)
- Update costing and power – interplay between inflation and CHF
- Life Cycle Assessments
- More detailed prep phase planning (next 5-7 years)

Project summary for Snowmass already include some of these changes, i.e. luminosity improvements, 100 Hz study is mentioned, the power is updated for 380 GeV: LINK

The CLIC ESPP update - II





Table 1.1: Key parameters of the CLIC energy stages.

Parameter	Unit	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3
Centre-of-mass energy	GeV	380	1500	3000
Repetition frequency	Hz	50	50	50
Nb. of bunches per train		352	312	312
Bunch separation	ns	0.5	0.5	0.5
Pulse length	ns	244	244	244
Accelerating gradient	MV/m	72	72/100	72/100
Total luminosity	1×10^{34} cm^{-2}s^{-1}	2.3	3.7	5.9
Lum. above 99 % of $\sqrt{s}$	1×10^{34} cm^{-2}s^{-1}	1.3	1.4	2
Total int. lum. per year	fb^{-1}	276	444	708
Main linac tunnel length	km	11.4	29.0	50.1
Nb. of particles per bunch	1×10^{9}	5.2	3.7	3.7
Bunch length	µm	70	44	44
IP beam size	nm	149/2.0	~60/1.5	~40/1
Final RMS energy spread	%	0.35	0.35	0.35
Crossing angle (at IP)	mrad	16.5	20	20

Add:
- 250 GeV parameters
- 100 Hz running for both 250 and 380 GeV

3 TeV: refer to earlier reports









C3 and other options,
stand-alone but currently not site specific,
or now also being considered as upgrades of initial facility

C^3 Accelerator Complex





Cahill, A. D., et al. *PRAB* 21.10 (2018): 102002.

8 km footprint for 250/550 GeV CoM ⟹ 70/120 MeV/m

Large portions of accelerator complex compatible between LC technologies

- Beam delivery / IP modified from ILC (1.5 km for 550 GeV CoM), compatible w/ ILC-like detector
- Damping rings and injectors to be optimized with CLIC as baseline

Snowmass paper: https://arxiv.org/pdf/2203.07646.pdf

Scenario	C^3 -250	C^3 -550	C^3 -250 s.u.	C^3 -550 s.u.
Luminosity [x10^{34}]	1.3	2.4	1.3	2.4
Gradient [MeV/m]	70	120	70	120
Effective Gradient [MeV/m]	63	108	63	108
Length [km]	8	8	8	8
Num. Bunches per Train	133	75	266	150
Train Rep. Rate [Hz]	120	120	60	60
Bunch Spacing [ns]	5.26	3.5	2.65	1.65
Bunch Charge [nC]	1	1	1	1
Crossing Angle [rad]	0.014	0.014	0.014	0.014
Single Beam Power [MW]	2	2.45	2	2.45
Site Power [MW]	~150	~175	~110	~125

C^3 recent developments and immediate plans



Demonstrate fully engineered cryomodule

- ~50 m scale facility
- 3 GeV energy reach

QCM:

- Delivery of prototype quarter cryomodule (QCM) expected Fall 2024
- Address Gradient, Vibrations, Damping, Alignment, Cryo, etc



C^3 Main Linac Cryomodule
9 m (600 MeV/ 1 GeV)





C^3 Prototype One Meter Structure

High power Test at Radiabeam



Alignment and Vibrations

System level optimization essential for achieving performance

RF Structure Optimization

3.55 mm iris radius
$2.0 = E_{max}/E_{acc}$
$1.23 = H_{coup}/H_{wall}$

Electric Field

Magnetic Field

M. Shumail, Z. Li

Vibration Measurements and Analysis

Z. George, V. Borzenets, A. Dhar, D. Palmer

Two-Phase Fluid Simulations

FAMU-FSU College of Engineering

K. Shoele

Precision Short and Long Range Alignment

H. Van Der Graaf

100 nm resolution
Approved effort to test cold

https://arxiv.org/pdf/2307.07981.pdf

Main Linac Beam Dynamics

White (C^3), Schulte (CLIC)

Alignment Parameters	Units	Value
Raft Components	μm	5
Short Range (~10m)	μm	30
Long Range (>200m)	μm	1000
Structure Vert. Vibration	μm	9
Quad Vert. Vibration	nm	15
BPM Resolution	μm	0.1
BPM-Quad Alignment	μm	2

From talk of E.Nanni – NIKHEF July 2024 (LINK)



Beam Dynamics and Luminosity Studies

Studies ongoing towards ensuring target luminosity

Emittance Preservation with HOM Suppression

H. Xu et al., LANL

Damped / Damped-Detuned Spectrum

Wei-Hou Tan, Zenghai Li

Compatible with ILC-like Detector

Ntounis, Gray, Vernieri

The pair background envelopes for C^3 are well contained within the beam-pipe.

See C3 talks at ECFA Workshop on e+e- Higgs/EW/Top Factories

https://agenda.infn.it/event/34841/

Opportunities to Collaborate: DR, Bunch Compressor, BDS, ...



HALHF: A Hybrid, Asymmetric, Linear Higgs Factory

Source: **Foster, D'Arcy & Lindstrøm**, preprint at arXiv:2303.10150 (2023)

- Overall length: ~3.3 km ⇒ **fits in ~any major particle-physics lab**
  - Length dominated by e⁻ beam-delivery system

New concept, aiming for pre-CDR (LINK)

- 500 GeV for electrons with plasma acceleration
- 31 GeV positrons with RF based linac, used also to provide electron drivebeam for the plasma acceleration
- Reach 250 GeV collision energy, luminosity 10^{34}

Asymmetric technologies, energies and bunch charges

Small footprint, lower cost

Several key plasma acc. challenges:
Multi-staging, emittances, energy spread, stabilities, spin polarisation preservation, efficiencies, rep rate, plasma cell cooling and more

Conventional beam(s) challenges:
Positron production, damping rings, RF linac, beam delivery system

Experimental challenges with asymmetric beams

Energy recovery options, potentially very large luminosities but early stage of development



Twin LC with energy recovery



Figure 3-10. *Conceptual layout of the ERLC.*



Figure 12: Schematic view of the new HALHF baseline, using a cool-copper positron linac. The red sections relate to electrons, blue to positrons and green to photons.



Figure 13: Schematic view of the new HALHF baseline with the fall-back warm positron linac. Other details as in the caption to Fig. 12.

LC “vision”

Also as option at CERN

An adaptable e+e- LC facility at CERN

A LC facility can be extended in length for higher energies, using the same or improved versions of the same technology, e.g. as suggested for ILC, CLIC, C3 and HALHF.

- It is also possible and realistic to change to more performant (usually higher gradient) technologies in an upgrade, e.g. from ILC to CLIC or C3, maybe even plasma and energy recovery based solutions
- The physics at higher energies – Higgs sector and extended models with increased reach and precision, top in detail well above threshold, searches and hopefully new physics – will open for a very exciting long term e+e- programme
- Such a programme can run in parallel with future hadron and/or muon colliders that can be developed, optimised and implemented as their key technologies mature
- It keep options open, provides flexibility, encourages and motivates R&D across a broad range of technologies and potential future colliders/accelerator/detector technologies

ESPP inputs – I

Higgs factory focussed studies	**Project input (the traditional way)** **See earlier slides**
ILC	ILC in Japan (JAHEP/ILC-Japan and IDT)
CLIC	CLIC at CERN
C3	Project study, focus on next phase
HALHF	Project concept, pre-CDR
Energy recovery	Project concepts and plans

ESPP inputs – II

For a LC at CERN, what would be the possible options to start with – keeping in mind technology changes can be envisaged ?

The challenge for the EPSS update:



LC at CERN

New approach for this ESPP (facility and community approach) – with three key inputs to the ESPP
Common LC physics paper covering from 90 GeV to 1000 GeV or even above. Include also non collider programme (see slide 5). Serves also the projects on previous page.
Starting with ILC technology, look at energy and luminosity extension options with improved SFR, or CLIC, C3, plasma and Energy Recovery technologies
Implementation of the above at CERN in footprint studied for CLIC (and ILC back in the TDR days), with two BDS, and experimental area at Prevessin, and considerations of upgrade options.

ESPP inputs – III

Why consider SRF as starting point ?



- Very detailed and mature technical design and industrialisation, several FEL linacs build and being operated.

- Can be upgraded in Energy and Luminosity.

- Worldwide interest in technology.

- Large technology interest in Europe (EUXFEL and several other projects), and leading industries in Europe.
  - Could it be exploited to reduce load on CERN during the HL period (lab support outside for cryomodules for example) ?
  - Can this be turned into schedule advancement ?

Cost and Personnel estimates – Higgs factories

Project Cost *(no esc., no cont.)*	4	7	12	18	30	50
FCCee-0.24						
FCCee-0.37						
ILC-0.25						
ILC-0.5						
CLIC-0.38						

Figure 8: The ITF cost model for the EW/Higgs factory proposals. Horizontal scale is approximately logarithmic for the project total cost in 2021 B$ without contingency and escalation. Black horizontal bars with smeared ends indicate the cost estimate range for each machine.



Figure 5: Explicit labor for several large accelerator projects vs. project value.

One FTEy estimated to 200kUS$.

The estimates above from the Snowmass process includes personnel costs (usually kept separate in European project estimates, e.g. ILC and CLIC). Typically ~2 M$ on top.

Interesting to note that FCC-ee 250 estimated with this method at is 14-19 B$, in reasonably good agreement with FCC-ee mid term report.

Costs for ILC and CLIC (and others) are currently being re-costed and updated to 2023-24, including currency changes and price escalations. We will see if they also agree reasonably well with the Snowmass estimates shown above (so far reasonable)

Costs

Cost exercises and international reviews:

- ILC TDR 2012-13, 500 GeV primarily (LINK)
- CLIC CDR 2012-13, 3 TeV primarily and 500 GeV (LINK)
- ILC in Japan 2017-18, 250 GeV, reviewed within LCC (LINK)
- CLIC PiP 2018, 380 GeV primarily (LINK)

Updates and review recently done for ILC 19-20.12.2024 (slides 12-13)



For the ESPP – concerning starting with ILC technology at CERN:

- Updated: ILC in Japan with updated technology results, updated CFS (CE and conv. systems, SRF) – discussed on slide 12-13
- CERN implementation: CE costs based on CLIC and other CERN projects, same main linac footprint, change in number of shafts, add larger underground DR, remove drivebeam CE and turn arounds, slightly different BDS dimensions and cavern sizes



To be shown

ILC250nCost-Update Evaluation

Confidential

– update-ay180112, for MEXT-TDR-WG-180120 → ILC-Cost-Update-2024

Progress Year-base Unit [MILC]-	ILC500 (TDR) 2012-base [MILC]	ILC250 2012-base [MILC]	ILC250- 2017-base JP-CFS ([Oku-JPY]	Escalation & design-update [factor]	ILC250- 2024-base JP-CFS [OkuJPY]	
Year of work – report	*2012 ~ 2013*	2017 TDR-base	2017 New JP-CFS Design	[2012-2024]	[2024]	
Acc. Tech. (except for SRF)	1,390	1,196		To be reported		
SRF Tech. (CM, HLRF, Cryog.)	4,221	2,340		To be reported		[MILC]
CFS:CF		706	To be reported	To be reported		
CFS:CE		1,014	To be reported		To be reported	[Oku-JPY]
CFS-Total		1,720	To be reporte			
Sum	7,985	5,256				

Comments on the ILC250 Cost-Update 2024

- The ILC250 cost increase of **~60%+** (in overall), in 2017 – 2024.
- It may be caused by the following origins:
  - **General (for all Conv. Acc., SRF, and CFS):**
    - Increase of **30 – 50 %** because of **inflation** from 2017 to 2024,
  - **SRF (specific):**
    - Increase of **8 ~ 10 % because of the 1/3 mass production, resulting unit cost-up**
    - Increase of **10 ~ 20 %** because of integration of **averaged cost** in 2024, instead of cheapest cost in TDR, and **design updates and/or production cost changes**.
  - **CFS (specific):**
    - Increase of 20 – 40 % because of design update in JP specific site,
    - dynamic change of exchange rates (in particular between USD/.EU and JPY)
    - Significant, material (Cu, SUS etc.) cost increase,

From report by A.Yamamoto (LINK)

For CERN (in progress):

- Redo CE costing (see later)
- Redo CF costing (EL, CV, etc)
- Use 2024 costing for all components in their respective currencies, and change to CHF with exchange rate (not PPP)
- Cost second IP

1 CHF = 1.10 $


Price Indices for Machinery and Equipment, Jan 2012=100





Cost – I (currently being updated)

Cost exercises and international reviews:

- CLIC CDR 2012-13, 3 TeV primarily and 500 GeV (LINK)
- CLIC PiP 2018, 380 GeV primarily (LINK)

Machine has been re-costed bottom-up in 2017-18

- Methods and costings validated at review on 7 November 2018 – similar to LHC, ILC, CLIC CDR
- Technical uncertainty and commercial uncertainty estimated

Domain	Sub-Domain	Cost [MCHF] Drive-Beam	Cost [MCHF] Klystron
Main Beam Production	Injectors	175	175
	Damping Rings	309	309
	Beam Transport	409	409
Drive Beam Production	Injectors	584	—
	Frequency Multiplication	379	—
	Beam Transport	76	—
Main Linac Modules	Main Linac Modules	1329	895
	Post decelerators	37	—
Main Linac RF	Main Linac Xband RF	—	2788
Beam Delivery and Post Collision Lines	Beam Delivery Systems	52	52
	Final focus, Exp. Area	22	22
	Post-collision lines/dumps	47	47
Civil Engineering	Civil Engineering	1300	1479
Infrastructure and Services	Electrical distribution	243	243
	Survey and Alignment	194	147
	Cooling and ventilation	443	410
	Transport / installation	38	36
Machine Control, Protection and Safety systems	Safety system	72	114
	Machine Control Infrastructure	146	131
	Machine Protection	14	8
	Access Safety & Control System	23	23
Total (rounded)		**5890**	**7290**

CLIC 380 GeV Drive-Beam based: 5890^{+1470}_{-1270} MCHF;

CLIC 380 GeV Klystron based: 7290^{+1800}_{-1540} MCHF.

Civil Engineering

CE studies for LC at CERN:

- CLIC, up to 3 TeV. Contract with Amberg Engineering for CDR in 2012-2013.
- ILC up 1 TeV. Contract with Amberg for the TDR in 2012-13.
- CLIC up to 3 TeV, TOT (layout tool) with ARUP, for Project Implementation Report 2018
- Update on-going, ILC up to 500 GeV, CLIC to 1.5 TeV, in both cases ~30km, using Geoprofiler layout tool
- Injectors and experimental areas on Prevessin site ("CERN land")











Power and energy



Power at 250-380 GeV in the 100-200 MW range for the projects above

With a running scenario on the right this corresponds to 0.6-1.2 TWh annually

CERN is currently consuming 1.2 – 1.3 TWh annually

CERN "standard" running scenario used to convert to annual energy use



Includes studies of overall designs optimisation to reduce power, SRF cavities (grad,Q), cryo efficiency, RF power system (klystrons, modulators, components), RF to beam efficiencies, permanent magnets, operation when power is abundant, heat recovery, nanobeam and more.
Recent overview (LINK)

Sustainability: Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)



ARUP

System boundaries

Before use stage [A0-A5]	Use stage [B1-B8]	End of life stage [C1-C4]	Benefits and Loads beyond the system boundary [D]
A0 Preliminary studies	B1 Use	C1 Deconstruction/ Demolition	Reuse Recycling
A1 Raw material supply	B2 Maintenance	C2 Transport for Disposal	*Benefits and loads of additional infrastructure functions*
A2 Transport	B3 Repair	C3 Waste Processing for recovery	
A3 Manufacture	B4 Replacement	C4 Disposal	
A4 Transport to works site	B5 Refurbishment		
A5 Construction process	B6 Operational Energy Use		
	B7 Operational Water Use		
	B8 User utilisation of infrastructure		

Materials: A1–A3

Transport & construction activities: A4–A5

BS EN 17472:2022

What is the carbon intensity of energy in ~2050 (operation):

- 50% nuclear and 50% renewable give ~10-15g/kWh, to optimistic ?
- France summer-months are today ~40g/kWh
- Reductions predicted (LINK)

Figure 6.14 ▷ Average CO_2 intensity of electricity generation for selected regions by scenario, 2020-2050



IEA. CC BY 4.0.

CO_2 intensity of electricity generation varies widely today, but all regions see a decline in future years and many have declared net zero emissions ambitions by around 2050

Next working on the machine parts, on top of the CE estimate

LCA report for **Civil Engineering**: LINK

Addressing the Civil Engineering impact



ARUP

Linear Collider Options

1. CLIC Drive Beam
5.6m internal dia. Geneva.
(380GeV, 1.5TeV, 3TeV)

2. CLIC Klystron
10m internal dia. Geneva.
(380GeV)

3. ILC
Arched 9.5m span. Japan.
(250GeV)

Reference: CLIC Drive Beam tunnel cross section, 2018

Reference: CLIC Klystron tunnel cross section, 2018

Reference: Tohoku ILC Civil Engineering Plan, 2020



Towards Carbon Accounting with LCA

- example for CLIC, also (being) done for ILC, C3, HALHF, FCC -

This plot (blue part) is for 11 km of tunnel, scales with length, injectors will add to this

Next working on machine parts (orange), here assumed hardware and infrastructure = equal civil engineering impact.

Most likely this is optimistic, i.e. orange and light blue parts will be higher



Work in progress – this example is closest to the CLIC drive-beam parameters, detectors and computing (and travels) not considered

More power (here 0.7 TWh) or more carbon (here assumed 12g/kWh) will increase this quickly

- 🟨 CE upgrade: tunnel lengthening if needed important, should do better than today (concrete etc)
- 🟩 Decommissioning: not estimated, important for upgrades if parts are removed, and end of life
- 🟦 Acc upgrade: should be able to improve for raw materials, processing and assembly
- ⬜ Com&Operation: Energy use (~0.7 TWh annually) times carbon load (50% nuclear plus 50% renewables), improve with time
- 🟧 Accelerator: Here equal to tunnel - to be done, materiel and design choices, responsible purchasing, in progress
- 🟦 CE: From ARUP study, roughly 11-12 kton/km

Some additional points

- A LC starting with SRF will be proposed for CERN, with upgrade considerations (E,L, length and technologies), and CLIC will be proposed with some changes wrt to 2018 (also an upgrade option)

- US participates fully in ILC IDT WGs and costing, increased US engagement in ITN highly welcome
- Ongoing collaborative work within C3 (US led) including common studies CLIC-C3-ILC, HALHF (and Energy Recovery concepts)
- In the LC vision framework further R&D on all these technologies highly encouraged (both for initial implementation with SRF and upgrades)
- LC vision activities ongoing including US, much more in the extended meeting at CERN 8
- 10.1.2025 to prepare ESPP inputs: https://indico.cern.ch/event/1471891/overview

Thanks – most of the slides/information from:

S.Michizono, B.List, IDT and ILC colleagues, CLIC team, J.List, A.Robson, E.Nanni and the C^3 team, the HALHF team, ARUP, the Snowmass Implementation Task Force (names on page 2 of the report, chair T.Roser), many more home.cern