# CLIC *(and* *room temperature RF)*

Frank Tecker – CERN

- Introduction
- Room temperature RF cavities
- CLIC (Compact Linear Collider)
- CTF3 (CLIC Test Facility)



# Preface

- Complex topic - Don't panic!
- Approach:
  - Explain the fundamental effects and principles that leads to differences between SuperConducting (SC) and normal conducting (NC) technology
  - I will not go much into technical details
  - Try to avoid formulae as much as possible
- Goal: You understand
  - Basic principles
  - The driving forces and limitations in NC linear collider design
  - The basic building blocks of CLIC
- Ask questions at any time! Any comment is useful! (e-mail: tecker@cern.ch)

# CLIC – in a nutshell

- Compact
  Linear
  Collider




- e+/e- collider for up to 3 TeV
- Luminosity $6 \cdot 10^{34} \mathrm{cm}^{-2}\mathrm{s}^{-1}$ (3 TeV)
- Normal conducting RF accelerating structures
- Gradient 100 MV/m
- RF frequency 12 GHz
- Two beam acceleration principle for cost minimisation and efficiency
- Many common points with ILC, similar elements, but different parameters

# Part 1

- ‘warm’ RF technology basics:
  - A linear collider at higher energy
  - Normal conducting RF structures
    - Gradient limits
    - Pulsed surface heating and Fatigue
    - Breakdown mechanism and phenomenology
  - Frequency choice
  - Wakefields and damping
  - Pulse train formats
  - Differences ‘warm’ and ‘SC’ RF collider

# Part 2




- CLIC scheme and CTF3:
  - CLIC layout at different energies
  - CLIC two-beam acceleration scheme
  - CLIC drive beam generation
    - Bunch train combination
    - Fully loaded acceleration
  - Demonstrations at the CLIC Test Facility CTF3
  - RF power production
  - CLIC main beam generation and dynamics
  - CLIC damping rings
  - CLIC alignment and stability

# Path to higher energy




- Collider History:
  - Energy constantly increasing with time
  - Hadron Collider at the energy frontier
  - Lepton Collider for precision physics

- LHC will restart 2015 at 13 TeV cms
- High energy e-/e+ storage ring excluded by synchrotron radiation
- Build Linear Collider to complement LHC physics

# TeV e+e- physics

- Higgs physics
  - LHC has discovered ‘Higgs-like’ particle
  - LC explore its properties in detail
- Supersymmetry
  - LC will complement the LHC particle spectrum
- Extra spatial dimensions
- New strong interactions
- . . .

=> a lot of new territory to discover beyond the standard model

- Energy can be crucial for discovery!









- “Physics at the CLIC Multi-TeV Linear Collider” CERN-2004-005
  http://cdsweb.cern.ch/record/749219/files/CERN-2004-005.pdf
- “ILC Reference Design Report – Vol.2 – Physics at the ILC”
  www.linearcollider.org/rdr

# CLIC CDRs published




**Vol 1: The CLIC accelerator and site facilities** (H.Schmickler)

- CLIC concept with exploration over multi-TeV energy range up to 3 TeV
- Feasibility study of CLIC parameters optimized at 3 TeV (most demanding)
- Consider also 500 GeV, and intermediate energy range
- Complete, presented in SPC in March 2011, in print: https://edms.cern.ch/document/1234244/




**Vol 2: Physics and detectors at CLIC** (L.Linssen)

- Physics at a multi-TeV CLIC machine can be measured with high precision, despite challenging background conditions
- External review procedure in October 2011
- Completed and printed, presented in SPC in December 2011 http://arxiv.org/pdf/1202.5940v1




**Vol 3: "CLIC study summary"** (S.Stapnes)

- Summary and available for the European Strategy process, including possible implementation stages for a CLIC machine as well as costing and cost-drives
- Proposing objectives and work plan of post CDR phase (2012-16)
- Completed and printed, submitted for the European Strategy Open Meeting in September http://arxiv.org/pdf/1209.2543v1

In addition a shorter overview document was submitted as input to the European Strategy update, available at: http://arxiv.org/pdf/1208.1402v1

# Linear Colliders - Energy

- Historical background: 2004 – ILC-TRC review
  - Evaluation of linear collider (LC) projects (NLC/JLC, TESLA and CLIC)
  - Decision for Superconducting Accelerator Technology for LC with $E_{cm}$ = 0.5-1 TeV
- Consequences:
  - End of competition between normal conducting and SC schemes
  - Concentration of R&D on superconducting ILC scheme

- What about if interesting physics needs $E_{cm}$ >> 0.5-1 TeV ???
  LHC results will determine the required energy!
  - LC size has to be kept reasonable (<50km?)
    gradient >100 MV/m needed for $E_{cm}$ = 3 TeV
  - SC technology excluded, fundamental limit ~60 MV/m (excess of $H_{critical}$)
  - Normal conducting RF structures, but not trivial either!
  - => CLIC study for multi-TeV linear collider

# Achieved SC accelerating gradients

- Recent progress by R&D program to systematically understand and set procedures for the production process
- reached goal for a 50% yield at 35 MV/m by the end of 2010
- 90% yield at 28 MV/m exceeded in 2012
- Tests for higher gradient ongoing
- limited certainly below 50 MV/m






# Normal conducting structures

- Higher gradients (>50 MV/m) reachable with normal conducting accelerating structures

- But! Compare to advantages of SC RF cavities:
  - Very low losses due to tiny surface resistance
  - High efficiency
  - Long pulse trains possible
  - Favourable for feed-backs within the pulse train
  - Standing wave cavities with low peak power requirements
  - Lower frequency => Large dimensions and lower wakefields

- => Important implications for the design of the collider

# Traveling wave structures

- NC standing wave structures would have high Ohmic losses
- => traveling wave structures







- RF 'flows' with group velocity $v_G$ along the structure into a load at the structure exit
- Condition for acceleration: $\Delta\varphi = d \cdot \omega / c$ ($\Delta\varphi$ cell phase difference)
- Shorter fill time $T_{fill} = \int 1/v_G \, dz$ - order <100 ns compared to ~ms for SC RF

- Fields established after cavity filling time (not useful for beam)
- Steady state: power to
  beam, cavity losses, and (for TW) output coupler
- Efficiency:

$$\eta_{RF \to beam} = \frac{P_{beam}}{\underbrace{P_{beam} + P_{loss} + P_{out}}_{\approx 1 \text{ for SC SW cavities}}} \frac{T_{beam}}{T_{fill} + T_{beam}}$$

- => long pulse length favoured
- NC TW cavities have smaller filling time $T_{fill}$
  => Second term is higher for NC RF
- Typical values SC: $\eta = 0.6$
  NC: $\eta = 0.3$

# Limitations of Gradient $E_{acc}$

- Surface magnetic field
  - Pulsed surface heating => material fatigue => cracks
- Field emission due to surface electric field
  - RF break downs
  - Break down rate => Operation efficiency
  - Local plasma triggered by field emission => Erosion of surface
  - Dark current capture
    => Efficiency reduction, activation, detector backgrounds
- RF power flow
  - RF power flow and/or iris aperture apparently have a strong impact on achievable $E_{acc}$ and on surface erosion. Mechanism not fully understood

# Pulsed surface heating - Fatigue











- Magnetic RF field heats up cavity wall
- Extension causes compressive stress
- Can lead to fatigue

# Fatigue curves




$H_{peak}$
↕
$\Delta T$
↕
$\sigma$

Candidates: **Cu-OFE (C10100), CuZr (C15000), GlidCop Al-15**




- High number of cycles limits to smaller stresses
- 20 years operation => ~$10^{10}$ cycles!
- Limits maximum $\Delta T$ and peak magnetic field

# Pulsed surface heating

- Pulsed surface heating proportional to
  - Square root of pulse length
  - Square of peak magnetic field
- Field reduced only by geometry, but high field needed for high gradient
- Limits the maximum pulse length => short pulses (~few 100ns)

$$\Delta T = \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0}{2\pi}\,\frac{\omega t_P}{\sigma\,\lambda\,\rho\,c_H}}\,\hat{H}^2$$

$\Delta T$ temperature rise, $\sigma$ electric conductivity

$\lambda$ heat conductivity, $\rho$ mass density

$c_H$ specific heat, $t_P$ pulse length

$\hat{H}$ peak magnetic field

$$\hat{H} = \frac{g_H}{377\,\Omega} E_{acc}$$

$g_H$ geometry factor of structure design

typical value $g_H \approx 1.2$

**Numerical values for copper**

$$\Delta T \approx 4\cdot 10^{-17}\left[\frac{\mathrm{K\,m^2}}{\mathrm{V^2}}\right]\sqrt{t_P\, f}\; E_{acc}^2$$

$$\Delta T_{\max} \approx 50\ \mathrm{K}$$

$$t_P < \left(\frac{\Delta T_{\max}}{4\cdot 10^{-17}}\right)^2 \frac{1}{f\, E_{acc}^4}$$

# Frequency scaling of RF pulse length limits

(for a typical accelerating structure geometry)




Hans Braun




from S.Fukuda/KEK

- Pulses with breakdowns not useful for acceleration
- Low breakdown rate needed



- Breakdown events characterised by
  - always
    - disappearance of transmitted power
    - reflection of incident power
    - emission of intense bursts of fast electrons ($E_{Kin}$~100 keV)
    - acoustic shock wave (can be detected with accelerometer)
    - build up time ~ 20 ns
  - often
    - fast rise of gas pressure
    - emission of visible and UV light,
      light pulse longer than incident RF pulse (~ few ms)
    - emission of positive ions ($E_{Kin}$~few 100 eV),
      pulse longer than incident RF pulse (~ few ms)
- usually no precursor signals !

# Structure conditioning

- Material surface has some intrinsic roughness (from machining)
- Leads to field enhancement $E_{\text{peak}} = \beta E_0$
  ® field enhancement factor




- Need conditioning to reach ultimate gradient
  RF power gradually increased with time

from S.Doebert




- RF processing can melt field emission points
  - Surface becomes smoother
  - field enhancement reduced
  - => higher fields
    less breakdowns

# BD Rate at Different Conditioning Time




- After conditioning:
  - Higher fields reachable for constant BDR
  - Lower breakdown rate at a given field

Faya Wang

# Breakdown-rate vs gradient

- Higher breakdown rate for higher gradient




C. Adolphsen /SLAC

# Breakdown-rate vs pulse length

- Higher breakdown rate for longer RF pulses




- Summary: breakdown rate limits pulse length and gradient

# Conditioning limits







- More energy: electrons generate plasma and melt surface
- Molten surface splatters and generates new field emission points!
  => limits the achievable field
- Excessive fields can also damage the structures
- Design structures with low $E_{surf}/E_{acc}$
- Study new materials (Mo, W)




Damaged CLIC structure iris



# Frequency choice for NC RF

- Shunt impedance $R_s \propto f^{1/2}$ (higher acceleration, as $R_s$=V²/P)
- RF peak power $P_{rf} \propto 1/f^{1/2}$
- Stored energy $E \propto 1/f^{2}$
- Filling time $T_{fill} \propto 1/f^{3/2}$
- Structure dimensions $a \propto 1/f$
- Wakefields $W_{\perp} \propto f^{3}$

- The choice of frequency depends on the parameters above (cost issues!)
- Higher frequency is favourable for NC structures if you can manage the wakefield effects
- Actual frequency also depends on availability of RF power sources (high power klystrons up to ~17 GHz)

# A real life frequency choice

- Many more parameters in collider design
  - Take beam dynamics (BD) into account
  - Bunch charge and distance (wakes!), cell geometry, fields, efficiency,...



# CLIC: Why 100 MV/m and 12 GHz ?

- Optimisation - figure of merit:
  - Luminosity per linac input power
- Structure limits:
  - RF breakdown – scaling ($E_{surf}$<260MV/m , $P/C\tau^{1/3}$ limited)
  - RF pulse heating ($\Delta T$<56°K)
- Beam dynamics:
  - emittance preservation – wake fields
  - Luminosity, bunch population, bunch spacing
  - efficiency – total power
- take into account cost model

**after > 60 * $10^6$ structures:**
**100 MV/m 12 GHz chosen,**
**previously 150 MV/m, 30 GHz**




A.Grudiev

# Power requirements – Klystron linac

- Accelerating field: $E_{acc} = g\, E_0, \quad \text{with} \quad g_{Typical} \approx 0.6$
  (transit time, field geometry)
- Stored e.m. energy: $$W_{Linac} \approx \frac{\pi}{2} \varepsilon_0\, L\, \frac{E_{acc}^2}{g^2} \left(2.405\, \frac{c}{\omega}\right)^2 J_1(2.405)^2$$

$$\approx 140000 \left[\frac{\mathrm{J\,m}}{\mathrm{V^2 s^2}}\right] \frac{L\, E_{acc}^2}{f^2} \propto \frac{V\, E_{acc}}{f^2}$$

- Peak power:
  (neglecting beam power)

$$P = -\frac{\omega}{Q} W \quad \text{power lost,} \quad Q \approx \frac{7 \times 10^8}{\sqrt{f}\,[\mathrm{s}^{1/2}]} \quad \text{(typical value for Cu)}$$

$$\approx \frac{2\pi\, f^{\frac{3}{2}} [\mathrm{s}^{1/2}]}{7 \times 10^8} W \quad \approx 0.0013 \left[\frac{\mathrm{J\,m}}{\mathrm{V^2 s^{3/2}}}\right] \frac{V\, E_{acc}}{\sqrt{f}}$$

- Example (for 1 TeV centre-of-mass energy):

  $V = 1$ TV  $E = 50$ MV/m  $L = 20$ km  $f = 3$ GHz

  => $W = 0.8$ MJ  $P = 1.2$ TW  $P' = 60$ MW/m

- Would need 20000 60 MW klystrons, Not very practical!
  => higher frequency, pulse compression (NLC/JLC), drive beam (CLIC)

# RF pulse compression

- NC structures: short pulses of very high power needed
- Klystrons produce longer pulses and are power limited
- Way out: transform long RF pulses into shorter with higher power







NLCTA pulse compressor: up to 500 MW



# NLC Linac RF Unit

- Output pulses of 8 klystrons phase modulated and combined
- Depending on phase combination, power takes a different path
- Long klystron pulses are converted into shorter pulses



# RF structures: transverse wakefields




- Bunches induce wakefields in the accelerating cavities
- Later bunches are perturbed by these fields
- Can lead to emittance growth and instabilities!!!

- Effect depends on $a/\lambda$ ($a$ iris aperture) and structure design details
- transverse wakefields roughly scale as $W_\perp \propto f^3$
- less important for lower frequency:
  Super-Conducting (SW) cavities suffer less from wakefields
- Long-range minimised by structure design

# Accelerating structure developments








- Structures built from discs
- Each cell damped by 4 radial WGs
- terminated by SiC RF loads
- Higher order modes (HOM) enter WG
- Long-range wakefields efficiently damped



# Dipole mode detuning

Structure parameters can be varied along structure keeping synchronous frequency for accelerating mode constant but varying synchronous frequencies of dipole modes







Ideal is a Gaussian weighting of frequency distribution, but finite number of cells leads always to re-coherence after some time !

# Damping and detuning

- Slight random detuning between cells makes HOMs decohere quickly
- Will recohere later: need to be damped (HOM dampers)




C. Adolphsen / SLAC

# Accelerating Structure Results

- RF breakdowns
  can occur
  => no acceleration
  and deflection



- Goal: 3 $10^{-7}$/m
  breakdowns
  at 100 MV/m loaded gradient
  at 230 ns pulse length
- latest prototypes (T24 and TD24) tested (SLAC, KEK and CERN)
- => TD24 reached 106 MV/m at nominal CLIC breakdown rate (without damping material)
- Undamped T24 reaches 120MV/m



# NC RF structures - Summary

- Traveling wave structures
  - Short RF pulses ~few 100ns (still as long as possible - for efficiency)
- Higher frequency preferred (power reasons)
  - Smaller dimensions and higher wakefields
  - Careful cavity design (damping + detuning)
  - Sophisticated mechanical + beam-based alignment
- Higher gradients achievable
  - Limited by
    - Pulsed surface heating
    - RF breakdowns
    - Structure damage
- Klystrons not optimal for high power short pulses
  => RF pulse compression and Drive Beam scheme

# Accelerating gradient

- Superconducting cavities have lower gradient (fundamental limit) with long RF pulse
- Normal conducting cavities have higher gradient with shorter RF pulse length



# Bunch structure

- SC allows long pulse, NC needs short pulse with smaller bunch charge




The different RF technologies used by ILC , NLC/JLC and CLIC require different packaging for the beam power

# Warm vs Cold RF Collider

- Normal Conducting
- High gradient => short linac ☺
- High rep. rate => ground motion suppression ☺
- Small structures => strong wakefields ☹
- Generation of high peak RF power ☹

- Superconducting
- long pulse => low peak power ☺
- large structure dimensions => low WF ☺
- very long pulse train => feedback within train ☺
- SC structures => high efficiency ☺
- Gradient limited <40 MV/m => longer linac ☹ (SC material limit ~ 55 MV/m)
- low rep. rate => bad GM suppression ($\Sigma_y$ dilution) ☹
- Large number of e+ per pulse ☹
- very large DR ☹

# Comparison ILC - CLIC

| | | ILC | CLIC | remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **No. of particles / bunch** | **$10^9$** | **20** | **3.7** | **CLIC can’t go higher because of short range wakefields** |
| **Bunch separation** | **ns** | **370** | **0.5** | **Short spacing essential for CLIC to get comparable RF to beam efficiency, but CLIC requirements on long range wakefield suppression much more stringent**<br><br>**forces detectors to integrate over several bunch crossings** |
| **Bunch train length** | **⌠s** | **970** | **0.156** | **One CLIC pulse fits easily in small damping ring, simple single turn extraction from DR.**<br><br>**But intra train feedback very difficult.** |
| **Charge per pulse** | **nC** | **8400** | **185** | **Positron source much easier for CLIC** |
| **Linac repetition rate** | **Hz** | **5** | **50** | **Pulse to pulse feedback more efficient for CLIC**<br>**(less linac movement between pulses)** |
| **©$\Sigma_x$ , ©$\Sigma_y$** | **nm** | **10000, 40** | **660, 20** | **Because of smaller beam size CLIC has more stringent requirements for DR equilibrium emittance and emittance preservation**<br>**(partly offset by lower bunch charge and smaller DR)** |

# Parameter comparison

| | SLC | TESLA | ILC | J/NLC | CLIC |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Technology** | NC | Supercond. | Supercond. | NC | NC |
| **Gradient [MeV/m]** | 20 | 25 | 31.5 | 50 | 100 |
| **CMS Energy E [GeV]** | 92 | 500-800 | 500-1000 | 500-1000 | 500-3000 |
| **RF frequency $f$ [GHz]** | 2.8 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 11.4 | 12.0 |
| **Luminosity $L$ [$10^{33}$ cm$^{-2}$s$^{-1}$]** | 0.003 | 34 | 20 | 20 | 23 |
| **Beam power $P_{beam}$ [MW]** | 0.035 | 11.3 | 10.8 | 6.9 | 4.9 |
| **Grid power $P_{AC}$ [MW]** | | 140 | 230 | 195 | 270 |
| **Bunch length $\sigma_z^*$ [mm]** | ~1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.11 | 0.07 |
| **Vert. emittance $\gamma\epsilon_y$ [$10^{-8}$m]** | 300 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2.5 |
| **Vert. beta function $\beta_y^*$ [mm]** | ~1.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.11 | 0.1 |
| **Vert. beam size $\sigma_y^*$ [nm]** | 650 | 5 | 5.7 | 3 | 2.3 |

Parameters (except SLC) at 500 GeV

# Part 1 - Summary

- Normal Conducting traveling wave structures for higher gradients
  - High peak power RF pulses needed
  - Limited by
    - Pulsed surface heating
    - RF breakdowns
    - Structure damage
  - Short RF pulses ~few 100ns (still as long as possible - for efficiency)
  - Klystrons not optimal for high power short pulses
    => RF pulse compression and Drive beam scheme
  - Higher frequency (X-band) preferred (power reasons)
    - Smaller dimensions and higher wakefields
    - Careful cavity design (damping + detuning)
    - Sophisticated mechanical + beam-based alignment
- Important implications on the design parameters of a linear collider

# Part 2 – now!

- CLIC scheme and CTF3:
  - CLIC layout at different energies
  - CLIC two-beam acceleration scheme
  - CLIC drive beam generation
    - Bunch train combination
    - Fully loaded acceleration
  - Demonstrations at the CLIC Test Facility CTF3
  - RF power production
  - CLIC main beam generation and dynamics
  - CLIC damping rings
  - CLIC alignment and stability





- Develop technology for linear e+/e- collider with the requirements:
  - $E_{cm}$ should cover range from ILC to LHC maximum reach and beyond => $E_{cm}$ = 0.5 – 3 TeV
  - Luminosity > few $10^{34}$ $cm^{-2}$ with acceptable background and energy spread
    - $E_{cm}$ and $L$ to be reviewed once LHC results are available
  - Design compatible with maximum length ~ 50 km
  - Affordable
  - Total power consumption < 500 MW
- Present status: Demonstrated the key feasibility issues and documented in a CDR (3 Volumes) (possibly Project Implementation Plan by 2017-22)

# CLIC Collaboration

## 29 Countries – over 70 Institutes



Accelerator collaboration

Detector collaboration

Accelerator + Detector collaboration

# CLIC main parameters

| | |
|---|---|
| Center-of-mass energy | 3 TeV |
| Peak Luminosity | $6 \cdot 10^{34}$ cm$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ |
| Peak luminosity (in 1% of energy) | $2 \cdot 10^{34}$ cm$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ |
| Repetition rate | 50 Hz |
| Loaded accelerating gradient | 100 MV/m |
| Main linac RF frequency | 12 GHz |
| Overall two-linac length | 42 km |
| Bunch charge | $3.7 \cdot 10^{9}$ |
| Beam pulse length | 156 ns |
| Average current in pulse | 1 A |
| Hor./vert. normalized emittance | 660 / 20 nm rad |
| Hor./vert. IP beam size before pinch | 45 / ~1 nm |
| Total site length | 48.3 km |
| Total power consumption | 589 MW |

- High acceleration gradient
  - "Compact" collider – total length < 50 km
  - Normal conducting acceleration structures
  - High acceleration frequency (12 GHz)
- Two-Beam Acceleration Scheme
  - High charge Drive Beam (low energy)
  - Low charge Main Beam (high collision energy)
  - => Simple tunnel, no active elements
  - => Modular, easy energy upgrade in stages

CLIC TUNNEL CROSS-SECTION

5.6 m diameter







Drive beam - 101 A, 240 ns from 2.4 GeV to 240 MeV

Main beam – 1 A, 156 ns from 9 GeV to 1.5 TeV

- Like a HV transformer:
  input: low voltage – high current
  output: high voltage – low current
- Here:
  input ('Drive Beam'):
  low energy (GeV) – high current
  output ('Main Beam'):
  high energy (TeV) – low current
- Transformer 'core':
  waveguides with RF waves







Main beam – 1 A, 156 ns
from 9 GeV to 1.5 TeV

Drive beam - 101 A, 240 ns
from 2.4 GeV to 240 MeV

# Why not using klystrons?

- Reminder: Klystron
  - narrow-band vacuum-tube amplifier at microwave frequencies (an electron-beam device).
  - low-power signal at the design frequency excites input cavity
  - Velocity modulation becomes time modulation in the drift tube
  - Bunched beam excites output cavity




- We need: - high power for high fields
  - short pulses (remember: break-downs, surface heating)
- Many klystrons
  - ILC: 560 10 MW, 1.6 ms
  - NLC: 4000 75 MW, 1.6 μs
  - CLIC: would need many more ☹ $£€¥ ☹
- Can reduce number by RF pulse compression schemes

- **Drive beam like beam of gigantic klystron**

# CLIC Test Facility CTF II




## Dismantled in 2002, after having achieved its goals :

- Demonstrate feasibility of a two-beam acceleration scheme
- Provide high power 30 GHz RF source for high gradient testing (280 MW, 16 ns pulses)
- Study generation of short, intense e-bunches using photocathode RF guns
- Demonstrate operability of μ-precision active-alignment system in accelerator environment
- Provide a test bed to develop and test accelerator diagnostic equipment

# CLIC Test Facility CTF II



# CLIC – overall layout 3 TeV



# CLIC – layout for 500 GeV

- only one DB complex (with 2x RF pulse length compared to 2 DB complexes)
- drive beam time delay line (1st half of pulse sent there)
- shorter main linac



# CLIC Layout at various energies

## 0.5 TeV Stage




## 1 TeV Stage




## 3 TeV Stage



# CLIC main parameters

| Center-of-mass energy | CLIC 500 GeV | | CLIC 3 TeV | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Beam parameters | Conservative | Nominal | Conservative | Nominal |
| Accelerating structure | 502 | | G | |
| Total (Peak 1%) luminosity | $0.9 (0.6)\cdot10^{34}$ | $2.3 (1.4)\cdot10^{34}$ | $2.7 (1.3)\cdot10^{34}$ | $5.9 (2.0)\cdot10^{34}$ |
| Repetition rate (Hz) | 50 | | | |
| Loaded accel. gradient MV/m | 80 | | 100 | |
| Main linac RF frequency GHz | 12 | | | |
| Bunch charge$10^9$ | 6.8 | | 3.72 | |
| Bunch separation (ns) | 0.5 | | | |
| Beam pulse duration (ns) | 177 | | 156 | |
| Beam power/beam MWatts | 4.9 | | 14 | |
| Hor./vert. norm. emitt ($10^{-6}/10^{-9}$) | 3/40 | 2.4/25 | 2.4/20 | 0.66/20 |
| Hor/Vert FF focusing (mm) | 10/0.4 | 8 / 0.1 | | 4 / 0.1 |
| Hor./vert. IP beam size (nm) | 248 / 5.7 | 202 / 2.3 | 83 / 1.1 | 40 / 1 |
| Hadronic events/crossing at IP | 0.07 | 0.19 | 0.75 | 2.7 |
| Coherent pairs at IP | <<1 | <<1 | 500 | 3800 |
| BDS length (km) | 1.87 | | 2.75 | |
| Total site length km | 13.0 | | 48.3 | |
| Wall plug to beam transfert eff | 7.5% | | 6.8% | |
| Total power consumption MW | 129.4 | | 415 | |

# LC comparison at 500 GeV

| Center-of-mass energy | NLC 500 GeV | ILC 500 GeV | CLIC 500 GeV Conservative | CLIC 500 GeV Nominal |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total (Peak 1%) luminosity | $2.0\ (1.3)\cdot10^{34}$ | $2.0\ (1.5)\cdot10^{34}$ | $0.9\ (0.6)\cdot10^{34}$ | $2.3\ (1.4)\cdot10^{34}$ |
| Repetition rate (Hz) | 120 | 5 | 50 | |
| Loaded accel. gradient MV/m | 50 | 33.5 | 80 | |
| Main linac RF frequency GHz | 11.4 | 1.3 (SC) | 12 | |
| Bunch charge$10^9$ | 7.5 | 20 | 6.8 | |
| Bunch separation ns | 1.4 | 176 | 0.5 | |
| Beam pulse duration (ns) | 400 | 1000 | 177 | |
| Beam power/linac (MWatts) | 6.9 | 10.2 | 4.9 | |
| Hor./vert. norm. emitt ($10^{-6}/10^{-9}$) | 3.6/40 | 10/40 | 3 / 40 | 2.4 / 25 |
| Hor/Vert FF focusing (mm) | 8/0.11 | 20/0.4 | 10/0.4 | 8/0.1 |
| Hor./vert. IP beam size (nm) | 243/3 | 640/5.7 | 248 / 5.7 | 202/ 2.3 |
| Soft Hadronic event at IP | 0.10 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.19 |
| Coherent pairs/crossing at IP | <<1 | <<1 | <<1 | <<1 |
| BDS length (km) | 3.5 (1 TeV) | 2.23 (1 TeV) | 1.87 | |
| Total site length (km) | 18 | 31 | 13.0 | |
| Wall plug to beam transfer eff. | 7.1% | 9.4% | 7.5% | |
| Total power consumption MW | 195 | 216 | 129.4 | |

# CLIC – overall layout 3 TeV




CR combiner ring
TA turnaround
DR damping ring
PDR predamping ring
BC bunch compressor
BDS beam delivery system
IP interaction point
dump

# Two-beam acceleration

*Counter propagation from central complex*

Instead of using a single drive beam pulse for the whole main linac, several ($N_S$ = 24) short drive beam pulses are used

Each one feed a ~880 m long sector of two-beam acceleration (TBA)




R.Corsini

Counter flow distribution allows to power different sectors of the main linac with different time bins of a single long electron drive beam pulse

The distance between the pulses is $2\ L_s = 2\ L_{main}/N_S$ ($L_{main}$= single side linac length)

**The initial drive beam pulse length $t_{DB}$ is given by twice the time of flight through one single linac**

so $t_{DB} = 2\ L_{main} / c$, 140 µs for the 3 TeV CLIC

**This is the required RF pulse length of the drive beam klystrons.**

# Drive beam time structure











**Bunch charge: 8.4 nC, Current in train: 100 A**

# CLIC scheme

- Very high gradients possible with NC accelerating structures at high RF frequencies (30 GHz → 12 GHz)
- Extract required high RF power from an intense e- “drive beam”
- Generate efficiently long beam pulse and compress it (in power + frequency)

‘few’ Klystrons
Low frequency
High efficiency

Power stored in
electron beam

Power extracted from beam
in resonant structures

Accelerating Structures
High Frequency – High field



Long RF Pulses
$P_0$ , $\nu_0$ , $\tau_0$

Electron beam manipulation
Power compression
Frequency multiplication

Short RF Pulses
$P_A = P_0 \times N_1$
$\tau_A = \tau_0 / N_2$
$\nu_A = \nu_0 \times N_3$

# Again a ‘transformer’!

- But this one in time domain
- Input: Long beam pulse train
  low current
  low bunch frequency
- Output: Short beam pulse trains
  high current
  high bunch frequency
- => high beam power

Drive beam time structure - initial




140 μs train length - 24 x 24 sub-pulses
4.2 A - 2.4 GeV – 60 cm between bunches

Drive beam time structure - final




24 pulses – 101 A – 2.5 cm between bunches

# Drive beam generation basics

- Efficient acceleration

Full beam-loading acceleration in traveling wave sections




- Frequency multiplication

Beam combination/separation by transverse RF deflectors



# Beam combination by RF deflectors



# Beam separation by RF deflectors



# Delay Loop Principle

- **double repetition frequency and current**
- parts of bunch train delayed in loop
- RF deflector combines the bunches ($f_{defl}$=bunch rep. frequency)
- Path length corresponds to beam sub-pulse length



# RF injection in combiner ring (factor 4)

- combination factors up to 5 reachable in a ring

$C_{ring} = (n + \frac{1}{4})\,\lambda$




$C_{ring}$ has to correspond to the distance of pulses from the previous combination stage!



## Combination factor 5




***CTF3 - PRELIMINARY PHASE 2001/2002***

**Successful low-charge demonstration of electron pulse combination and bunch frequency multiplication by up to factor 5**







Streak camera image of beam time structure evolution



# CTF3 preliminary phase (2001-2002)

RF injection in combiner ring

Combination factor 4




Streak camera images of the beam, showing the bunch combination process

A first ring combination test was performed in 2002, *at low current and short pulse*, in the CERN Electron-Positron Accumulator (EPA), properly modified

# Lemmings Drive Beam



Alexandra Andersson

# CLIC Drive Beam generation



# CLIC Test Facility CTF 3

- demonstrate Drive Beam generation
  (fully loaded acceleration, bunch frequency multiplication 8x)
- Test CLIC accelerating structures
- Test power production structures (PETS)



# CTF3 Evolution

- 2003 Injector + part of linac
- 2004 Linac + 30 GHz test stand
- 2005 Delay Loop
- 2006/07 TL1 + Combiner Ring
- 2008/09 New photo-injector, TL2 + CLEX









# Fully loaded operation

- efficient power transfer from RF to the beam needed

"Standard" situation:

- small beam loading
- power at structure exit lost in load







"Efficient" situation:

- high beam current
- high beam loading
- no power flows into load
- $V_{ACC} \approx 1/2\ V_{unloaded}$

- Disadvantage: any current variation changes energy gain

$$\frac{dV/V}{dI_{beam}/I_{beam}} = -\frac{I_{beam}}{I_{opt}}$$

at full loading, 1% current variation = 1% voltage variation

- Requires high current stability
- Energy transient
  (first bunches see full field)




Time resolved beam energy spectrum measurement in CTF3




- Requires continuous bunch train

# CTF3 linac acceleration structures

Dipole modes suppressed by slotted iris damping (first dipole's Q factor < 20) and HOM frequency detuning




- 3 GHz $2\pi/3$ traveling wave structure
- constant aperture
- slotted-iris damping + detuning with nose cones
- up to 4 A 1.4 μs beam pulse accelerated
  no sign of beam break-up

# Full beam-loading acceleration in CTF3




- Measured RF-to-beam efficiency 95.3%
- Theory 96%
  (~ 4 % ohmic losses)





# CTF3 Delay Loop

# Delay Loop operation






- 1.5 GHz sub-harm. bunching system
- 1.5 GHz RF deflector



# Sub-harmonic bunching system

## Fast phase switch from SHB system (CTF3)



3 Traveling Wave Sub-harmonic bunchers, each fed by a wide-band Traveling Wave Tube




*Streak camera image*







$8.5 \cdot 666$ ps = 5.7 ns

# Delay Loop – full recombination




beam before the DL

beam after the DL

- 3.3 A after chicane => < 6 A after combination (satellites)

# CTF3 combiner ring



# Combiner ring status

- factor 4 combination achieved with 15 A, 280 ns (without Delay Loop)




| | |
|---|---|
| CL.SVBPM0402S | -4.56877 |
| CL.SVBPM0502S | -4.03190 |
| CT.SVBPM0515S | -3.74760 |
| CL.SVBPM1590S | -3.87000 |
| CR.SVBPI0130S | -15.09200 |

# Drive beam generation achieved

- combined operation of Delay Loop and Combiner Ring (factor 8 combination)
- ~26 A combination reached, nominal 140 ns pulse length
- => **Full drive beam generation**, main goal of 2009, **achieved**






# CLEX (CLIC Experimental Area)




- tests for power production, deceleration and two-beam studies

# Test Beam Line TBL




- High energy-spread beam transport decelerate to 50 % beam energy
- Drive Beam stability
- Stability of RF power extraction total power in 16 PETS: 2.5 GW
- Alignment procedures

PETS design





5 MV/m deceleration (35 A)
165 MV output Power






2 standard cells, 16 total

PETS development: CIEMAT
BPM: IFIC Valencia
and UPC Barcelona

# Probe Beam Injector - CALIFES

**Responsibility of IRFU (DAPNIA)**
**CEA, Saclay, France**

180 MeV
bunch charge 0.6 nC
number of bunches 1 - 64






A. Mosnier

# Two-Beam Test Stand - TBTS



UPPSALA UNIVERSITET



# Two-beam acceleration in CTF3

- maximum probe beam acceleration of 31 MeV measured
- => **gradient ~145 MV/m**









# Comparison CLIC - CTF3

| | CTF3 | CLIC |
|---|---|---|
| Energy | 0.150 GeV | 2.4 GeV |
| Pulse length | 1.2 µs | 140 µs |
| Multiplication factor | 2 x 4 = 8 | 2 x 3 x 4 = 24 |
| Linac current | 3.75 A | 4.2 A |
| Final current | 30 A | 100 A |
| RF frequency | 3 GHz | 1 GHz |
| Deceleration | to ~50% energy | to 10% energy |
| Repetition rate | up to 5 Hz | 50 Hz |
| Energy per beam pulse | 0.7 kJ | 1400 kJ |
| Average beam power | 3.4 kW | 70 MW |

- Still considerable extrapolation to CLIC parameters
- Especially total beam power (loss management, machine protection)
- Good understanding of CTF3 and benchmarking needed

# Drive beam generation summary

- Conventionally generate a long beam pulse with the right bunch structure (fill every 2nd RF bucket and switch between even and odd buckets every time of flight $T_{DL}$ in the Delay Loop)
- Fully loaded acceleration: Efficiently accelerate long beam pulse
- Bunch interleaving: Delay parts of the pulse and interleave the bunches in a Delay Loop and Combiner Ring(s)
- => the long pulse (low frequency and low current) is transformed into shorter pulses of high current and high bunch repetition frequency



# Drive Beam Combination Steps

$f_{beam} = 4 * 3 * 2 * f_{initial}$




Oleksiy Kononenko

# Drive Beam time structure




=> see homework

C.Biscari

# CLIC – power generation




| | |
|---|---|
| CR | combiner ring |
| TA | turnaround |
| DR | damping ring |
| PDR | predamping ring |
| BC | bunch compressor |
| BDS | beam delivery system |
| IP | interaction point |
| (red/green square) | dump |

# CLIC decelerator

- High current drive beam induces RF fields in special structures
- Particles will be decelerated
- Adiabatic UN-damping increases transverse oscillations
  => emittance growth along the decelerator







- Sector length trade-off from beam dynamics, efficiency, and cost
- CLIC values: decelerate from 2.37 GeV to 237 MeV => 10%

# Deceleration and beam transport

- 24 decelerator sectors per main linac
  - Each sector receives one drive beam pulse of 240 ns, per main beam pulse
  - Up to S=90% of the initial particle energy is extracted within each pulse leading to an energy extraction efficiency of about 84%
  - after short transient => steady state with large single bunch energy spread



# CLIC decelerator

- Goal: transport particles of all energies through the decelerator sector: in the presence of huge energy spread (90%)
- Tight FODO focusing (large energy acceptance, low beta)
- Lowest energy particles ideally see constant FODO phase-advance μ~90º, higher energy particles see phase-advance varying from μ~90º to μ~10º

- Good quad alignment needed (20μm)
- Good BPM accuracy (20μm)
- Orbit correction essential
  - 1-to-1 steering to BPM centres
  - DFS (Dispersion Free Steering) gives almost ideal case



# Power extraction structure PETS



- must extract efficiently >100 MW power from high current drive beam
- passive microwave device in which bunches of the drive beam interact with the impedance of the periodically loaded waveguide and generate RF power
- periodically corrugated structure with low impedance (big a/λ)
- ON/OFF mechanism








The power produced by the bunched ($\omega_0$) beam in a constant impedance structure:

Design input parameters PETS design

$$P = I^2 L^2 F_b^2 w_0 \frac{R/Q}{4 v_g}$$

P – RF power, determined by the accelerating structure needs and the module layout.
I – Drive beam current
L – Active length of the PETS
$F_b$ – single bunch form factor (≈ 1)

# Power Extraction Structure (PETS)



The PETS comprises eight octants separated by the damping slots. Each of the slots is equipped with HOM damping loads.
This arrangement follows the need to provide strong damping of the transverse modes.

PETS parameters:

- Aperture = 23 mm
- Period = 6.253 mm ($90^0$/cell)
- Iris thickness = 2 mm
- R/Q = 2258 Ω
- group velocity $v_g$ = 0.453
- Q = 7200
- P/C = 13.4
- E surf. (135 MW)= 56 MV/m
- H surf. (135 MW) = 0.08 MA/m ($\Delta$T max (240 ns, Cu) = 1.8 $C^0$)




To reduce the surface field concentration in the presence of the damping slot, the special profiling of the iris was adopted.



I. Syratchev

# 12 GHz PETS test assembly

8 bars, as received from VDL

PETS octants assembly



PETS equipped with the power couplers and electronic ruler with pick-up antenna for the phase advance measurements.







I. Syratchev

# 12 GHz TBTS PETS final assembly





I. Syratchev

# Simulation of RF Power Transfer

time: 0 0.0 ns

Accelerating structure

- The induced fields travel along the PETS structure and build up resonantly



PETS structure

**Low group velocity requires simulations with 100k time steps**

**T3P models realistic, complex accelerator structures with unprecedented accuracy**

Arno Candel, SLAC

# Present PETS status (12 GHz)

- achieved 150 MW @ 266ns in RF driven test at SLAC
- up to >250 MW peak power beam driven at CTF3 (recirculation)
- model well understood









# CLIC two-beam Module layout

Standard module




**Total per module**
8 accelerating structures
8 wakefield monitors

4 PETS
2 DB quadrupoles
2 DB BPM

**Total per linac**
8374 standard modules

- Other modules have 2,4,6 or 8 acc.structures replaced by a quadrupole (depending on main beam optics)
- Total 10462 modules, 71406 acc. structures, 35703 PETS

G.Riddone

# CLIC two-beam Module







- Alignment system, beam instrumentation, cooling integrated in design

G.Riddone

# CLIC – main beam generation



# Main beam Injector Complex



# Crucial for luminosity: Emittance

- CLIC aims at smaller beam size than other designs
- Implications:
  - Generate small emittance in the Damping Rings
  - Transport the beam to the IP without significant blow-up
  - Wakefield control
  - Very good alignment
  - Precise instrumentation
  - Beam based corrections and feed-backs



# Damping Ring emittance



# Damping Rings – damping time

initial emittance
(~0.01 m rad for e⁺)

$$\varepsilon_f = \varepsilon_{eq} + (\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_{eq})\, e^{-2T/\tau_D}$$

final emittance

equilibrium
emittance

damping time

- for e+ we need transverse emittance reduction by few $10^5$
- ~7-8 damping times required
- transverse damping time: $t_D = \dfrac{2E}{P}$ $\qquad P = \dfrac{2}{3}\dfrac{r_e c}{\left(m_o c^2\right)^3}\dfrac{E^4}{r^2}$ $\qquad \boxed{\tau_D \propto \dfrac{\rho^2}{E^3}}$

  $\mathcal{D} \approx 1$

LEP: $E$ ~ 90 GeV, $P$ ~ 15000 GeV/s, $\tau_D$ ~ 12 ms

# Damping rings

- $\tau_D \propto \dfrac{\rho^2}{E^3}$ suggests high-energy for a small ring. But
  - required RF power: $$P_{RF} \propto \frac{E^4}{\rho^2} \times n_b N$$
  - equilibrium emittance: $$\varepsilon_{n,x} \propto \frac{E^2}{\rho}$$ limit E and ρ in practice
- DR example:
  - Take $E \approx 2$ GeV
  - $\rho \approx 50$ m
  - P = 27 GeV/s [28 kV/turn]
  - hence $\tau_D \approx$ 150 ms - we need 7-8 $\tau_D$ !!! ⇒ store time too long !!!
- Increase damping and P using wiggler magnets

# Damping Rings

- Bare ring damping time too long
- Insert wigglers in straight sections in the damping ring




- Average power radiated per electron with wiggler straight section

$$P = c\,\frac{\Delta E_{\mathrm{wiggler}} + \Delta E_{\mathrm{arcs}}}{L_{\mathrm{wiggler}} + 2\pi\rho_{\mathrm{arcs}}}$$

$\Delta E_{\mathrm{wiggler}}$ energy loss in wiggler

$\Delta E_{\mathrm{arcs}}$ energy loss in the arcs

$L_{\mathrm{wiggler}}$ total length of wiggler

- Energy loss in wiggler:

$$\Delta E_{\mathrm{wiggler}} \approx \frac{K_\gamma}{2\pi} E^2 \left\langle B^2 \right\rangle L_{\mathrm{wiggler}} \text{ with } K_\gamma \approx 8\cdot 10^{-6}\,\mathrm{GeV}^{-1}\mathrm{Tesla}^{-2}\mathrm{m}^{-1}$$

$\langle B^2 \rangle$ is the field square averaged over the wiggler length

# CLIC Pre-Damping Rings

- Most critical the $e^+$ PDR
  - Injected $e^+$ emittance ~ 2 orders of magnitude larger than for $e^-$
    i.e. aperture limited if injected directly into DR
- PDR for $e^-$ beam necessary as well
  - A "zero current" $e^-$ beam (no IBS) would need ~ 17ms to reach equilibrium in DR (very close to repetition time of 20ms – 50 Hz)
- 398m long race-track PDRs with 120m of wigglers
  - Target emittance reached with the help of conventional high-field wigglers (PETRA3)
  - Wiggler Parameters: $B_w$=1.7 T, $L_w$=3 m, $\lambda_w$=30 cm
  - 15 TME arc cells + 2 Disp.Suppr. + 2 matching sections per arc, 10 FODO cells in each straight section
  - Transverse damping time $\tau_{x,y}$=2.3 ms
  - e+ emittances reduced to ©∑ = 18 mm.mrad

Pre-Damping Ring input

| Parameter | Unit | $e^-$ | $e^+$ |
|---|---|---|---|
| Energy (E) | GeV | 2.86 | 2.86 |
| No. of particles/bunch (N) | $10^9$ | 4.4 | 6.4 |
| Bunch length (rms) ($\sigma_z$) | mm | 1 | 10 |
| Energy Spread (rms) ($\sigma_E$) | % | 0.1 | 8 |
| Hor./vert. emittance ($\gamma\varepsilon_{x,y}$) | mm. mrad | 100 | 7000 |




Fanouria Antoniou

# CLIC damping ring layout




- Total length 421m (much smaller than ILC), beam pulse only 47m
- Racetrack shape with
  - 96 TME arc cells (4 half cells for dispersion suppression)
  - 26 Damping wiggler FODO cells in the long straight sections

# CLIC damping rings

- Two rings of racetrack shape at energy of 2.86 GeV
- Arcs: 2.36 m long cells straight sections: FODO cells with 2m-long superconducting damping wigglers (2.5T, 5cm period) total length of 421 m
- chromaticity is controlled by two sextupole families.
- Transverse damping time $\tau_{x,y}$=1.88 ms
- Final normalized emittance:

  $\gamma\varepsilon_x$ = 400 nm.rad,   $\gamma\varepsilon_y$ = 4.5 nm.rad

| Parameters | Value |
|---|---|
| Energy [GeV] | 2.86 |
| Circumference [m] | 420.56 |
| Coupling | 0.0013 |
| Energy loss/turn [MeV] | 4.2 |
| RF voltage [MV] | 4.9 |
| Natural chromaticity x / y | -168/-60 |
| Momentum compaction factor | 8e-5 |
| Damping time x / s [ms] | 1.9/ 0.96 |
| Dynamic aperture x / y [$\sigma_{inj}$] | 30 / 120 |
| Number of dipoles/wigglers | 100/52 |
| Cell /dipole length [m] | 2.36 / 0.43 |
| Dipole/Wiggler field [T] | 1.4/2.5 |
| Bend gradient [1/m$^2$] | -1.10 |
| Max. Quad. gradient [T/m] | 73.4 |
| Max. Sext. strength [kT/m$^2$] | 6.6 |
| Phase advance x / z | 0.452/0.056 |
| Bunch population, [$10^9$] | 4.1 |
| IBS growth factor | 1.4 |
| Hor./ Ver Norm. Emittance [nm.rad] | 400 / 4.5 |
| Bunch length [mm] | 1.6 |
| Longitudinal emittance [keVm] | 5.5 |

# Alignment + Stabilisation

- Acceptable wakefield levels from beam dynamics studies have been used already in the structure design stage
- Alignment procedure based on
  - Accurate pre-alignment of beam line components (O(10μm))
    - accelerating structures 14 μm (transverse tolerance at 1σ)
    - PETS structures 30 μm
    - quadrupole 17 μm
  - Beam-based alignment using BPMs with good resolution (100nm)
  - Alignment of accelerating structures to the beam using wake-monitors (5μm accuracy)
  - Tuning knobs using luminosity/beam size measurement with resolution of 2%
- Quadrupole stabilisation (O(1nm) above 1Hz)
- Feedback using BPMs resolving 10% of beam size (i.e. 50nm resolution)

- Site dependent ground motion with decreasing amplitude for higher frequencies



# Ground motion: ATL law

- Need to consider short and long term stability of the collider
- Ground motion model: ATL law

$$\langle \Delta y^2 \rangle = ATL$$

$A$ range $10^{-5}$ to $10^{-7}$ $\mu m^2$/m/s

$A$ site dependent constant

$T$ time

$L$ distance

- This allows you to simulate ground motion effects
- Relative motion smaller
- Long range motion less disturbing



# Stability Studies

Vertical spot size at IP is ~ 1 nm *(10 x size of water molecule)*

Stability requirements (> 4 Hz) for a 2% loss in luminosity

| Magnet | horizontal | vertical |
|---|---|---|
| Linac (2600 quads) | 14 nm | 1.3 nm |
| Final Focus (2 quads) | 4 nm | 0.2 nm |

Need active damping of vibrations

CERN vibration test stand

## Vertical stabilization of a CLIC prototype quadrupole




**RMS vibrations above 4 Hz**

| | Quad [nm] | Ground [nm] |
|---|---|---|
| Vertical | **0.43** | **6.20** |
| Horizontal | **0.79** | **3.04** |
| Longitud. | 4.29 | 4.32 |




**CLIC prototype magnets stabilized to the sub-nanometre level !!**

***Above 4 Hz:*** **0.43 nm** on the quadrupole instead of **6.20 nm** on the ground.

*Stefano Redaelli*

*(World record in magnet stability)*

# Ok, this is good. But is it ***stable***?




**Quadrupole vibrations kept below the 1 nm level**
over a period of 9 consecutive days!

*Stefano Redaelli*

# Beam Delivery System

- many common issues as for ILC
- diagnostics, emittance measurement, energy measurement, …
- collimation, crab cavities, beam-beam feedback, beam extraction, beam dump



# CLIC detectors

- Different time structure of the beam has to be taken into account detectors have to integrate over several bunch crossings
- changes for multi-TeV collisions
(first vertex layer moved out, calorimeter deeper ($9X_0$,…)

- ILC/CLIC collaboration, profiting from ILC developments
- SiD and ILD detector concepts have been adapted to CLIC
- Linear Collider Detector project at CERN focuses on physics and detector issues for both ILC and CLIC

http://cern.ch/lcd



# Other issues

- Many similar issues as ILC
  - Collimation
  - Final focus system
  - Beam-beam effects
  - Detector background
  - Extraction of post collision beams
  - Beam instrumentation
  - Feed-backs
  - Efficiency!
  - …

# CLIC/ILC Collaboration

- Developing common knowledge of both designs and technologies on status, advantages, issues and prospects for the best use of future HEP
- Preparing together the future evaluation of the two technologies by the Linear Collider Community made up of CLIC & ILC experts

- Technology and parameters are quite different
- => Collaboration in working groups on subjects with strong synergy between CLIC and ILC:
  1) Civil Engineering and Conventional Facilities
  2) Beam Delivery Systems & Machine Detector Interface
  3) Detectors
  4) Cost & Schedule
  5) Beam dynamics & Beam Simulations
  6) Positron Generation
  7) Damping Ring
  8) General Issues
- Participation of CLIC experts to ILC meetings and ILC experts to CLIC meetings and several common workshops

# CLIC - Future Planning

## 2012$16&Development&Phase&

Develop a Project Plan for a staged implementation in agreement with LHC findings; further technical developments with industry, performance studies for accelerator parts and systems, as well as for detectors.

## 2017$22&Prepara8on&Phase&

Finalise implementation parameters, Drive Beam Facility and other system verifications, site authorisation and preparation for industrial procurement.

Prepare detailed Technical Proposals for the detector-systems.

## 2023$2030&Construc8on& Phase&&

Stage 1 construction of a 500 GeV CLIC, in parallel with detector construction.

Preparation for implementation of further stages.










## &2016$17&Decisions&

On the basis of LHC data and Project Plans (for CLIC and other potential projects), take decisions about next project(s) at the Energy Frontier.

## 2022$23&Construc8on&Start&

Ready for full construction and main tunnel excavation.

## &2030&Commissioning&&

From 2030, becoming ready for data-taking as the LHC programme reaches completion.

# CLIC near CERN







Tunnel implementations (laser straight)




Central MDI & Interaction Region

# CONCLUSION

- A Lepton Linear Collider as the next HEP facility would complement LHC at the energy frontier
- Energy range < 1 TeV accessible by ILC
- CLIC technology based on
  - normal conducting RF structures at high frequency
  - two-beam scheme

only possible scheme to extend collider beam energy into Multi-TeV energy range

- Very promising results but technology not completely mature yet
- CLIC-related key feasibility issues demonstrated
- CLIC Conceptual Design Report published

- possible future LHC physics discoveries (>2015) will tell which way to go …

# Documentation

- General documentation about the CLIC study: http://CLIC-study.org
- CLIC on INDICO http://indico.cern.ch/categoryDisplay.py?categId=1068
- CLIC Physics + Detector http://cern.ch/LCD
- CLIC scheme description:
  http://preprints.cern.ch/yellowrep/2000/2000-008/p1.pdf
- CERN Bulletin article:
  http://cdsweb.cern.ch/journal/CERNBulletin/2012/47/News%20Articles/1493549
- CLIC Test Facility: CTF3 http://ctf3.home.cern.ch/ctf3/CTFindex.htm
- Int. Linear Collider Workshop 2013 (most actual information)
  http://agenda.linearcollider.org/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=6000
- EDMS http://edms.cern.ch/nav/CERN-0000060014
- CLIC technological challenges (CERN Academic Training)
  http://indico.cern.ch/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=a057972
- CLIC ACE (advisory committee meeting)
  http://indico.cern.ch/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=58072
- CLIC meeting http://cern.ch/clic-meeting
- CLIC notes http://cdsweb.cern.ch/collection/CLIC%20Notes

# Acknowledgements

- First of all: THANK YOU!
  For being so brave to follow all this lecture (I hope!) ☺

- Thanks to everyone from whom I picked some material:

  Chris Adolphsen, Markus Aicheler, Alexandra Andersson, Fanouria Antoniou, Barry Barish, Caterina Biscari, Hans Braun, Arno Candel, Roberto Corsini, Jean-Pierre Delahaye, Steffen Döbert, Alexey Dubrovskiy, Brian Foster, S. Fukuda, Günther Geschonke, Alexej Grudiev, Samuli Heikkinen, Oleksiy Kononenko, Alban Mosnier, Yannis Papaphilippou, Stefano Redaelli, Germana Riddone, Louis Rinolfi, Daniel Schulte, Igor Syratchev, Helga Timkó, Rogelio Tomas, Faya Wang, Walter Wuensch, S. Yamaguchi

  *+ everyone I forgot*