### Basics I: single bunch



-quadrupole vibration (fast orbit feedback)

-*cavity pitch* / RF coupler (static and time dependent, steering and feedback)

### Basics II: single bunch



Single-bunch energy spread + lattice chromaticity results in single-bunch emittance growth



Cannot be corrected by steering / fast feedback correction

<u>Allowable emittance growth</u> defines *how often* trajectory needs to be corrected (along the linac)

## **Compare Quadrupole Vibrations**

- 100 nm RMS quadrupole vibration in Main Linac
- Results in ~1 sigma oscillation at end of linac
- ~2 nm emittance growth (cf 30 nm) considered OK
- 100 nm RMS  $\Rightarrow$  equivalent 20 V RMS transverse field
  - @5GeV worst case
- Assuming 300 µr RMS cavity pitches, 26 cavities per quad, then
  - $θ = \frac{1}{2} \times 300 \mu r \times 32 MV/\sqrt{26} ≈ 1 kV → <u>~1-2% RMS stability</u>$
  - spec on *individual cavities*, not vector sum
    - cavity pitches assumed uncorrelated and random
- Note emittance growth scales as  $\theta$

# Our (LLRF) Problem



Ideal: flat cavity fields across beam pulse.

All bunches see "same" kick.

Pulse-to-pulse (5Hz) stability still needs to be ~1% RMS

Reality: individual cavity gradients change over the pulse

vector sum held constant to 10<sup>-3</sup>

### Comments

- RMS stability specified
  - Depends on how 'mean' is defined (steering)
  - helps a little but not much!



- Beam dynamics people also need to look at coupler kicks
  - these will also have "slopes"
- Mitigation:
  - How well can LLRF people do?
  - Impact on emittance  $\rightarrow$  number of 'fast correction' stations in linac
    - currently only one foreseen at end of linac
  - (Ideas about transverse deflecting cavities in ML)
  - Review mechanical alignment and what can be achieved
    - remote adjustment / beam based alignment possibilities

Cost versus performance