Dynamic Simulations unsing PLACET

D. Schulte

Introduction

- Studies in 2006 concentrated on static alignment and tuning
- Dynamic effects are very important in ILC and CLIC
 - \Rightarrow started to prepare simulation tools
 - \Rightarrow preliminary results
- Main difference between CLIC and ILC
 - ILC has large time interval between pulses, instable beam-beam collisions but intra-pulse feedback
 - CLIC has smaller time interval between pulses, more stable beam-beam collisions, but intra-pulse feedback
 - in ILC most effects are expected from the BDS
 - in CLIC main linac is also important, stabilisation of elements is used

Integrated Dynamic Luminosity Simulations

- Before the integration, each subsystem should be studied seperately
 - feedback systems
 - impact of dynamic effects on correction procedure
- Different componenets that need inclusion
 - RTML
 - ILC: lattice available, correction procedure not complete, feedback need definition
 - CLIC: developing lattice
 - main linac
 - ILC: lattice available, conceptual correction procedure, conceptual feedback, needs full study and adaptation to real lattice
 - CLIC: lattice available, conceptual correction procedure, conceptual feedback, needs full study
 - BDS
 - ILC: lattice available, correction procedure needs to be adopted and cross checked, are working on feedback systems/adopt from others
 - ILC: lattice available, correction procedures being worked out, feedback needs to be defined

Overview of Talk

- We are still in a starting phase
- Some results on
 - impact of dynamic effects on main linac alignment
 - main linac feedback
 - impact of jitter on luminosity
 - feedback in BDS

Simplified Simulations of ILC Main Linac Quadrupole Jitter



Luminosity Loss Enhancement

- ⇒ Luminosity loss is enhanced with respect to expectation from emittance growth
- \Rightarrow Offset optimisation does not improve beam-beam feedback a lot
- \Rightarrow But angle optimisation does
- \Rightarrow For larger emittance growth loss enhancement is reduced



ILC Main Linac Quadrupole Jitter



 \Rightarrow Emittance growth is larger than in old lattice since more quadrupoles and smaller beta-functions

ILC Full Lattice Simulations



- \Rightarrow Significant emittance growth due to jitter in first part of linac
- \Rightarrow Much worse than simplified lattice
- \Rightarrow Need to verify automatic translation but expect result to be correct

Impact of BDS

- Additional emittance growth can be expected in BDS
 - \Rightarrow an intra-pulse feedback at the end of the linac should help
- Simplified model of intra-pulse feedback used in simulation
- \bullet Observed growth

	end of linac	IP no traj. feedb.	IP with traj. feedb.
linac	1.7nm	2.3nm	1.8nm
und.	0.6nm	1.2nm	0.7nm

- \Rightarrow Intra-pulse feedback helps somewhat
- \Rightarrow Little additional emittance growth in BDS
- But need to include collimators

Main Linac Quadrupole Jitter in CLIC



 $\sigma_{\text{quad}}\,[\text{nm}]$

Jitter Tolerance



 \Rightarrow Luminosity loss for 1nm jitter $\approx 1.25\%$

- Stabilisation has been demonstrated to better than 1nm with comercial equipment
- Pulse-to-pulse luminosity jitter already from beam-beam simulation

Quadrupole Jitter in CLIC BDS



 \Rightarrow Stability of 0.5nm for quadrupoels and 0.1nm for final double quadrupoles

Main Linac Feedback Options

- Local (cascaded) feedback
 - could use special equipment
 - relatively large residual emittance growth
- Permanent one-to-one (implemented as few-tofew)
 - acceptable for long time
 - mover steps can become quite small
 - \Rightarrow need to find algorithm to solve this
- MICADO style correction
 - converges as one-to-one
 - typically larger step sizes
- Adaptive alignment
 - local algorithm



- Perfect one-to-one alignment after ATL-type ground motion
 - simplified lattice used
 - \Rightarrow no significant growth before a month
- But dynamics of alignment not modelled

Results



- Local feedback, MICADO and few-to-few correctin used after $3\times 10^5 {\rm s}$ of ATL-type ground motion
- \Rightarrow Residual growth for local feedback
- \Rightarrow Should use full ground motino model



Impact of Corrector Step Size



Iteration

Dynamic Effects During Alignment

- Dispersion free steering uses beams at different energies to align quadrupoles
- They can be obtained using different gradients or bunch compressor settings
- Beam jitter during alignment fakes dispersion
 - either accept
 - or try to fit incoming beam trajectory
 - or use different energies within single pulse
- Simulations done using simplified ILC lattice
- Nominal misalignments are used
 - 1.5% RMS gradient jitter from RF unit to RF unit
 - 5% RMS random scale error of BPMs
- Needs to be redone with full lattice

- Small energy difference used
 - gradient difference 1%
 - first two units are off
 - \Rightarrow alignment of first six quadrupoles not treated

Emittance Growth

- Dispersion tuning knobs used at beginning and ending of linac
- Resulting emittance growth depends on weight on trajectory difference
- Incoming beam trajectory is fit using two BPMs before the correction bin
- \Rightarrow Fit of incoming beam pushes to low weigths on differences
- \Rightarrow Better fit procedure could be developed



• Propose to use bunches at different energies from a single pulse (as suggested for CLIC)

Quadrupole Jitter

- Very large quadrupole jitter of 500nm added
- \Rightarrow Procedure with no fit suffers most
- \Rightarrow Fit of incoming beam helps a bit
- \Rightarrow Use of different energies in single pulse is best
- \Rightarrow But could try better fit
- \Rightarrow Recommend to use energy difference within a single pulse
- correction can be performed with stable machine
- if spread can be reduced (better BPM resolution/averaging) or test bunches are used (after main pulse) one could align during luminosity operation



Full Integration of Feedback (ILC Example)

- Studies just started
- Quite time consuming
- Example:
 - use only BDS and beam-beam
 - PLACET and GUINEA-PIG
 - assume all bunches in a pulse are equal
 - use ground motion of noisy site (model C) for a given time
 - run 49 pulses with orbit feedback only orbit feedback is not optimised
 - run beam-beam feedback using BPMs
 no luminosity optimisation feedback included
 - run next pulse using initial beam-beam feedback as starting value

Results for 100s



Results for 1000s



- \Rightarrow Luminosity loss with time seems not too dramatic
 - orbit feedback not yet optimised
- \Rightarrow Pulse-to-pulse luminosity variations would make tuning knobs quite slow
 - Stabilisation of elements will help
 - Or choice of a quiet site
 - Further studies with
 - more cases
 - intra-pulse luminosity optimisation
 - improved orbit feedback
 - pulse-to-pulse luminosity optimisattion
 - inclusion of main linac and RTML

Conclusion

- The tools to perform integrated simulations of dynamic effects have been largely provided
 - integration of PLACET and GUINEA-PIG
- Started to define the feedback strategy
 - probably MICADO in the main linac (but more tests)
- Started to investigate impact of dynamic effects on beam-based alignment
 - seems not desastreous
 - studied simple way to recude impact of effects
- \Rightarrow Need to run many cases and verify results