Kees Scheidt
Diagnostics Group
Accelerator & Source Division

the new ESRF low-emittance Storage Ring, the BPMs and the (Fast) Orbit Correction systems



DEELS Workshop June 15-16 2015 Barcelona

congratulations to the Tri-Campeones !

football is . . .
love love love ....

I ♥ DEELS

consolation to
the losers !

OUTLINE

The Low-Emittance Ring : motivation
constraints & time-schedule
challenges & difficulties

Diagnostics upgrade (?) : more BeamLoss Detectors → all (128) should be both fast & sensitive
more BPMs (from 7 to 10 per cell) : but NOT better . . .
emittance monitors (X-ray pinhole) : see talk Friederike
FOC and current monitors : "*copy-paste*" today's versions

BPMs in details : Buttons : results & surprises on prototypes, C-f-T in process
Blocks : 2 geometries
RF connections & accessibility aspects
Electronics :
- recuperate the existing Liberas-Brillance (today >6years)
- add a sufficiently good system . . . for the extra BPMs

↓

Spark ERXR :
some preliminary tests

Motivation :

reduce the **horizontal** emittance from **4nm** to **0.15nm**



beam-line experiments can benefit from an increase in brilliance

Also, the coherence (the coherent fraction, in hor.plane) will increase

LOW-EMITTANCE RING AT THE ESRF



when : 2019 → the full year to dismantle the old ring and to install the new

major constraint : keep all X-ray beamlines at the same location

and : keep all Users happy until last day (19th dec 2018)

Proposed material release plan

Compliance with the clearance levels defined in the Council Directive 2013/59/EURATOM

Surface dose measurements (indistinguishable from background)

$$\sum_{all\ isotopes}\frac{AS_i}{SE_i} \le 1$$

guaranteed for 1 cm^3 hotspots.



ESRF LOW-EMITTANCE RING : THE CHALLENGES : GIRDERS & TRANSPORT

too heavy for our overhead cranes !
need to be wheeled into position …



CHALLENGES : A TOTAL OF 14 *COMPLEX* VACUUM CHAMBERS PER CELL



two examples shown



LOW-EMITTANCE RING : CHALLENGES : THE MAGNETS AND TOLERANCES



132 Dipoles



99 Dipole-quadrupoles



66 Octupoles

> 1000 Magnets to procure & handle in < 3 years



528 Quadrupoles



196 Sextupoles



100 Correctors

BPMS & FOC : COPY & PASTE + SOME NEW ELECTRONICS

Reminder of today's systems : **today's FOC :**

7 BPMs (Liberas) per cell
3 Fast Steerers per cell

all in a dedicated 10KHz (Fast) network for the FOC with dedicated broadcasting protocols, FOC processors Tango-servers, timing network, additional nodes, etc.

New Architecture : **10 BPMs per cell**

→ **4 new electronics (but not Fast)**

→ **6 Liberas (from today)** → **new* FOC** → **3 Fast steerers**

6 Slow steerers

*** new = old - 1 Lib./cell** → **32 extra spares**

FAST & SLOW ORBIT CORRECTION : 6 LIBERAS & 4 SPARKS PER CELL

X-ray beam stability for users will be identical to that of today

6 Liberas : Fast & Slow

4 Sparks : only Slow

Libera

Spark



WP-7 DIAGNOSTICS & FEEDBACKS : 6 LIBERAS & 4 SPARKS IN THE CELL

4 new electronics per cell = 128 units in the Ring :

a candidate : Spark ERXR is an upgrade from the 75 Sparks used in the new Booster BPM

- Variable RF attenuators
- PLL (software)

compared to Liberas these Sparks have NOT implemented :

- Fast-10KHz output,
- Interlock,
- Post-Mortem,
- Hi-stability / self-calibration mechanism (RF-mux + DSC)

yet, their natural stability / reproducibility (24hrs drift etc.) is expected within +/- 2 um [see measurements]

both have full functionality for Turn-by-Turn measurements (injection & lattice studies)
both have same sensitivity and noise characteristics [to be confirmed]

still to be added : nm output, 32bit DDC processing, offset-tune (Aug.2015)

Libera vs **Spark** :

how to compare what ?

1) **T-b-T data (1MHz BW)**
   sensitivity (for ultra-low currents)

2) ~~**FA-data (10KHz)**~~ not available (Spark)

3) **Dec64 data (5KHz)**

4) **Short term stability (sec. - min.)**

5) **Longer term stability (e.g. 10hours)**

Libera vs **Spark** :

Phase/Space* plots from Turn-by-Turn data (at 0.1mA, **single-bunch**)





25m RF cable,
standard DDC

3m RF cable,
Time-Domain-Processing

*** poor man's**

SPARK VS LIBERA : NOISE, DRIFT, REPRODUCIBILITY



but NOT (yet) available :
- SA-output
- nanometer results
- 32 bit processing
- offset-tune

yet available :
32 bit on the TDP a,b,c,d

read-out on both :

the 30ms DD64 buffers (a,b,c,d),
at 4 sec interval,
over many hours,

then calculate noise & drift (K=10)

SPARK : NO OFFSET TUNE YET, BUT …. POOR MAN'S OFFSET-TUNING



SPARK & LIBERA : ADC IN 4 BUNCH MODE



data from Libera with standard DDC

data from Spark with TDP, but filter fully open (304)

Libera
16 bit (65K)
13dB attenuator

Spark
14 bit (16K)
26dB attenuator

SPARK & LIBERA : DRIFT OVER 10 HRS (4 BUNCH FILLING MAY 2015)







10hrs



10hrs

Current variation : 43 to 27mA, decay of 37%

SPARK : DRIFT IN 13 MINS (4 BUNCH FILLING MAY 2015)



Spark :

rms X = 43 nm

rms Z = 123 nm

?



Libera :

rms X = 67 nm

rms Z = 73 nm

SPARK : NOISE IN 30 MILLISEC (4 BUNCH FILLING MAY 2015)

6um



6um



30ms

Spark :

rms X = 334 nm

rms Z = 315 nm

Libera :

rms X = 723 nm

rms Z = 1000 nm

Libera vs **Spark** :

how to compare what ?

1) **T-b-T data (1MHz BW) sensitivity (for ultra-low currents)** → **Spark** at least as good, probably better (depending on use)

2) ~~**FA-data (10KHz)**~~

3) **Dec64 data (5KHz)** → **Spark** at least as good

4) **Short term stability (sec. - min.)** → **Spark** at least as good

5) **Longer term stability (e.g. 10hours)** → **Spark** drifts with beam-current but +/- 1um for 37% decay

very long time-drifts or non-reproducibility not (yet ?) observed

when injecting from 0 to full nominal current (e.g. 200mA) then Liberas take care of attenuation changes & calibration, with Sparks you have to calibrate yourself . . .

BPM BUTTONS

prototype tests fully satisfactory

C-f-T document is written

soon to be launched

delivery (1500 units) expected by end 2015

total costs < 400 KEuros



1500 { 600 with 6mm
900 with 8mm }

BPM BLOCKS



Kx= 4.7
Kz= 7.4

BPM no.
4 5 6 7

H & **V** distances between the center of the 4 buttons



Kx= 6.5
Kz= 16.4 . . .

BPM no.
1 2 3 8 9 10

<u>WHERE IS THE CHARGE</u> IN THAT BIG "OMEGA" BPM ???



with courtesy to G.Rehm (DLS, UK)

geometry of the BPM nos. 1, 2, 3 & 8, 9, 10



using only
A B C D

Kx = 6.5
Kz = 16.4 !!

using the
up & down

Kz = 4.9 !!

BPM GEOMETRY , MAPPING, BUTTON DIAMETER

mapping is done, optimization of button diameters (for RF signal strength)

BIG
6/10





small
4/10





with courtesy to G.Rehm, DLS

NO HEATLOAD (RF-TRAPPED MODES) ISSUES MEASURABLE ! !





but <u>strange offsets</u> observed on the 3 BPMs



installed in Aug. 2014





Kx = 6.5
Kz = 12.4


Side-view
60mm
2 buttons
(A & B)
up
down
2 buttons
(C & D)
Z results :
+0.8mm ??
0mm
-0.8mm ??

protruding & retracted buttons

non-parallelism of the internal chamber shape with respect to the external side (and beam) 0.2mm / 120mm



Z results : +0.8mm 0mm -0.8mm

+1mm due to "button effect"
-0.2mm due to "non-parallel wall/beam effect"

-1mm due to "button effect"
+0.2mm due to "non-parallel wall/beam effect"

rough estimation of the **effect** of
a protruding button on its RF-signal pick-up sensitivity

(Eric, using the CST-tool)



cut-up this chamber and measure the real 12 protruding / retraction values



that was done :
all is understood & fine



consequences of mechanical tolerances (on button only) for the Electrical Offsets of the BPM Block



for the big-omega geometry (Kv=16.4)

248um rms ** vertical offset

supposing that the mechanical errors are distributed fully randomly

**** a few stations may have >4 rms i.e. >1mm**

BPM BLOCKS , SUPPORT & FIXATION

longitudinally free



BPM BLOCKS , SUPPORT & FIXATION

BPM – CH01

fully fixed



ESRF today :

we can get our hands in





NSLS-2


ALBA

MAX-4



this cable installation will be done BEFORE installation
of the vacuum chamber into the magnets
and can, in principle, NOT be manipulated after that



diag = fun !



thank you for your attention !

join us !

ESRF | The European Synchrotron