Summary of FONT beam stabilisation results at ATF

R. Ramjiawan, D.R. Bett, P.N. Burrows, C. Perry.
FONT, John Adams Institute, University of Oxford

LCWS 2019, Sendai

Tuesday, 29th October 2019

Outline

Background

- Introduction to the ATF2
- (Feedback On Nanosecond Timescales) FONT system

Intra-train, dual-phase upstream feedback system

- Performance of a stripline BPM feedback system

Results of IP BPM resolution studies

- Method of resolution estimation
- Best BPM resolution results

Results of feedback studies

- 1-BPM feedback
- 2-BPM feedback

Summary

Accelerator Test Facility

Accelerator Test Facility

- The Accelerator Test Facility (ATF2) at KEK develops technology and techniques needed for future linear colliders.
- The ATF2 has a low emittance beam and a final focus which is a prototype for the ILC and CLIC. The facility has two primary goals:
  - **Goal 1: Small beam size** (37 nm)
  - **Goal 2: Beam stabilisation** (nm-level)
- Typically configured for trains of two bunches with 280 ns separation as this gives high bunch-to-bunch position correlation.
- FONT have extraction line and IP feedback systems.



G. White *et al., Phys. Rev. ST Accel. Beams*, vol. 112, p.034802, (2014)

Extraction-line feedback system

Extraction-line feedback system

- The beam position is measured using two 12 cm stripline BPMs (P2 and P3).
- Low-latency processing electronics allow for a bunch calculation to be determined on the timescale of the bunch spacing (150 – 300 ns).
- Difference (Δ) and sum (Σ) signals are combined to produce signal $\frac{\Delta}{\Sigma}$, which is proportional to the transverse bunch offset.
- The bunch position correction is then applied by stripline kickers K1 and K2.
- Recent upgrades to the BPMs have increased the single-shot, real-time position resolution of the system to ~150 nm for a beam charge of 1.3 nC.



Feedback results

- Intra-train feedback was performed on trains of two bunches separated by 274.4 ns.
- Feedback was operated in an interleaved mode to allow for a direct comparison between feedback *off* and *on*.
- Feedback achieved **position** stabilisation from:
  - 1.69 ± 0.09 μm to $\mathbf{165 \pm 8}$ **nm** at P2.
  - 1.68 ± 0.08 μm to $\mathbf{200 \pm 10}$ **nm** at P3.
- Using a model of the ATF2 beamline, transfer matrices can be calculated in order to infer the stabilisation at the IP of:
  - 7.8 ± 0.4 nm to $\mathbf{0.86 \pm 0.04}$ **nm**
  - Factor of 3 reduction in the angle jitter when propagated to the IP.





Bunch positions propagated to the IP.

Bunch-to-bunch position correlation



- The plots above show the bunch-2 positions plotted against the bunch-1 positions with feedback off and on, demonstrating a reduction in the correlation from ~99% to close to 0%.
- The feedback system also achieved **angle** stabilisation between P2 and P3 from:
  - 1.26 ± 0.06 µrad to **107 ± 5 nrad**.

IP feedback system

FONT IP Feedback System









- C-band cavity Beam Position Monitors - IPA, IPB and IPC.
- All with decay times between 20 and 25 ns.
- Mounted on piezo-mover systems to allow for alignment of BPMs with beam in *x*, *y* and also to adjust the pitch.

- Two-stage processing electronics: down-mix and process cavity signals.
- Produces two signals at baseband: I and Q which contain beam position and angle information.

- FONT 5A digital board with Virtex-5 Field Programmable Gate Array (FPGA).
- ADCs to digitise I and Q waveforms at 357 MHz.
- DACs to provide analogue output to drive kicker.

- Stripline kicker and specialised amplifier (provided by TMD Technologies Ltd) used to provide feedback correction.
- Amplifier provides ±30 A of current to drive the kicker, with a fast rise time of 35 ns to reach 90% of peak output.

BPM Signal Processing

- Separate cavities for the extraction of the monopole and dipole modes.
- The extracted monopole mode has to first order only charge dependence.
- The extracted dipole mode has charge and position dependence.
- These high-frequency signals need down-mixing and mixing to produce a baseband signal proportional to only the bunch offset.



BPM Signal Processing



1st stage processing electronics – downmix to 714 MHz

Dipole cavity signal: 6.4 GHz signal dependent on vertical position and charge, is frequency down-mixed using an LO at 5.7 GHz.

***Reference cavity signal**:* charge dependent, 6.4 GHz signal is frequency down-mixed using the same LO at 5.7 GHz.

2nd stage processing electronics – downmix to baseband

Down-mixed dipole and reference signals at 714 MHz are mixed in-phase to produce the baseband ***I* signal**.

They are mixed in-quadrature to produce the baseband ***Q* signal**.

Figure from N. Blaskovic, DPhil. thesis

Sample integration

- **Single sample**: only a single sample of each of the *I* and *Q* waveforms are used.
- **Sample integration**: integration over a multi-sample window is used (up to 15 samples).
- System latency of **230 ns** when integrating 15 samples.
- The *I* and *Q* signals are charge normalised and combined to produce a position signal:

$$y = \frac{1}{k}\left(\frac{I}{q}\cos\theta_{IQ} + \frac{Q}{q}\sin\theta_{IQ}\right),$$

where k and θ_{IQ} are determined through calibration.



Example I signal waveform, in two bunch operation.

BPM Resolution

Calculating the Resolution

- The known beam transport through the three BPMs means the position at any BPM can be **predicted** using the positions of the beam at the other two BPMs.
- Bunch position is both **predicted** and **measured** at a BPM, the difference between the two is the residual which is calculated for many consecutive triggers. The resolution is defined as the standard deviation of the residuals.

$$\text{residual} = y_{\text{pred}} - y_{\text{meas}}$$

$$\text{resolution} = \text{std}(\text{residual})$$



BPM resolution

- Resolution improves by more than a factor of two using sample integration.
- Estimations of the resolution with sample integration are more stable and consistent between data sets as single-sample fluctuations are averaged over.
- Resolution of ~20 nm can be reproducibly achieved with integration.



	Single-sample	11-sample
Resolution	46.9 ± 1.7 nm	19.0 ± 0.4 nm

Feedback results

1-BPM Feedback Results

Best results demonstrated for 1-BPM feedback mode with stabilisation at IPC.



	Position jitter (nm)	
Bunch	Feedback off	Feedback on
1	109 ± 11	118 ± 8
2	119 ± 12	50 ± 4

Ten-sample integration window.

- Feedback **off** correlation: **84%**
- Feedback **on** correlation: **−26%**

Stabilisation below 55 nm was reproducible.

Shows significant improvement over single-sample performance: 74 nm.

2-BPM Feedback Results

Best results demonstrated for 2-BPM feedback mode, with stabilisation at IPB.





	Position jitter (nm)	
Bunch	Feedback off	Feedback on
1	106 ± 16	106 ± 16
2	96 ± 10	41 ± 4

Five-sample integration window.

- Feedback **off** correlation: **92%**
- Feedback **on** correlation: **41%**

The correlation is not fully removed - feedback gain set too low; higher gain may offer better performance (up to **25 nm**).

Shows significant improvement over single-sample performance: 57 nm.

Summary

- Low-latency dual-phase feedback was performed using the upstream system demonstrating local stabilisation to **~200 nm**.
- Improvements to the IP feedback firmware allow for the use of an integrated period of the BPM waveform. Integration is shown to improve the useable BPM resolution from ~**45 nm** to ~**20 nm**.
- This was tested with two different feedback modes:
  - 1-BPM feedback showed stabilisation to **50 ± 4 nm**.
  - 2-BPM feedback showed stabilisation to **41 ± 4 nm**.

  Both of these results show a significant improvement over the best feedback performance with single-sample operation.

Thank you for listening