ESS Warm linac meeting – July 6<sup>th</sup> 2011 Laboratori Nazionali del Sud (INFN), via S. Sofia 62, Catania

# 1.6.4 MEBT: basic considerations, achievements and criticalities

I.Bustinduy | ESS-Bilbao



**1.Basic considerations:** a MEBT matches RFQ output into the DTL input, both transversely and longitudinally. The beam must be re-bunched to maintain the required longitudinal parameters





- **1.Basic considerations:**
- 4 quads and 1 2 *buncher* would be sufficient
- if **Chopper**, 2 matchings are required: RFQ to chopper, chopper to DTL
- if **Diagnostics**, require some space.

2.Achievements Buncher EM design **Tuner considerations** Coupler design Quad design LLRF definition **Optics/Layout preliminary definition** 



## 2a.Buncher EM design:

Starting from model *buncher\_01*, a multivariable nonlinear constrained optimization process has started.

The algorithm uses Matlab<sup>©</sup> for optimization functions and SUPERFISH/COMSOL<sup>©</sup> as eigenvalue solver.

The number of parameters (of the 2D buncher geometrical definition) to be optimized varies from 4 to 6. Optimization problem aims at maximizing ZTT with non-linear constrains f=352.2 MHz kilpatric $\leq$ 1.4.





### 2a.Buncher EM design:

0.7 0.72 0.74 0.76 0.78

gap (cm)

0.7 0.72 0.74 0.76 0.78

gap (cm)

0.7 0.72 0.74 0.76 0.78

gap (cm)

 $7.4470 \le ZT^2 \le 8.3440 \text{ [M}\Omega/\text{m}\text{]}$  $1.3738 \le \text{Kilpatrick} \le 1.4613$  $20.7170 \le Z \le 24.0430 \text{ [M}\Omega/\text{m}\text{]}$ 

~140hrs.



0.7 0.72 0.74 0.76 0.78

gap (cm)

## 2a.Buncher EM design:

Figure of merit	SUPERFISH	COMSOL 2D	COMSOL 3D
Frequency [MHz]	352.19	352.19	352.19
Q	26415	26410	26440
Z [MΩ/m]	<b>[MΩ/m]</b> 24.043		24.063
<b>ZT</b> <sup>2</sup> [MΩ/m]	<b>Γ² [MΩ/m]</b> 8.344		8.377
TTF	0.5809	0.5900	0.5900
Es,max [MV/m]	25.35	25.92	29.176
Power loss [W] (½ Cu cav)	4794	4781	4775



 Fields normalized to

 E<sub>0</sub>T = 0.5 MV/m

 Kilpatrick:
 1.37488

 <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> Cavity length:
 160.00mm

## **2b.Buncher tuner design:**

Different plunger tuner configurations are being considered. EM simulations use model *buncher\_01* as test-bench for design, operating at nominal power.

The estimated power loss in the plunger is also computed to define cooling conditions.



## **2b.Buncher coupler design**

The **power coupler** for the buncher cavity is being designed using electromagnetic codes.

The optimum taper design to guarantee 50 Hz matching and ceramic window thickness are obtained from this study.



## **Elliptical Cavity with couplers**



The Resonating mode has similar field components than the bunching cavity.

Two couplers have been inserted into an elliptical cavity to **check the inductive coupling** provided by the loops.

### **Elliptical Cavity with couplers**



## **2c.Buncher cooling**

Power loss obtained with model *buncher\_01* provides heat source input for a heat transfer solver and the temperature field map in the copper volume is obtained for the operating conditions of the cavity. Cooling is being designed based on this information.







### or MEBT

#### ts used in similar MEBTs



#### SNS MEBT Quadrupole



## **2d.Quadrupoles for MEBT**

	Energy (MeV)	Length (m)	# Quadrupoles	Types
SNS	2.5	3.64	14	32 mm ø, 41 T/m, 61 mm $l_{eff}$ , 45 mm iron 42 mm ø, 29 T/m, 66 mm $l_{eff}$ , 45 mm iron
LINAC4	3	3.9	11	20 mm ø, 1.7 T/m, 255 mm l <sub>eff</sub> 44 mm ø, 4.3 T/m, 155 mm l <sub>eff</sub> 28 mm ø, 38 T/m, 56 mm l <sub>eff</sub> 28 mm ø, 12 T/m, 82 mm l <sub>eff</sub>
RAL FETS	3	3.2 to 4.6	11	28 mm ø, 9 to 33 T/m, 70 mm $l_{eff}$
J-PARC	3	3	8	From 13 to 37.5 T/m, 60 mm $l_{eff}$
CSNS	3	3	8	From 12 to 33 T/m, 60 mm $l_{eff}$

Summary of the MEBTs quadrupoles



## **2e.RF Interfaces for MEBT: LLRF**

- Based on the IQ Demodulation (0-IF frequency)
  - RF frequency too high for direct sampling of the cavity fields and waveguide coupler signals
  - Narrow bandwidth
  - Easier implementation of the I and Q loops
  - Analog solution provides a wider bandwidth, short group delay, and cheaper than digital solution
- LLRF composed of three different loops:
  - Amplitude loop
  - Phase loop
  - Tuning loop
- Klystron polar loop considered as a separate part of the LLRF



Amplitude and phase loops



- RF signal demodulated to IQ components
- IQ comp. compared with reference levels
- PI regulation depending on the error signal
- Phase shift to compensate the loop delay



• FPGA program for the amplitude and phase loops





Tuner Loop



RF signal demodulated to

• FPGA program for the tuning loop







### **LLRF** measurements

Test Set-up





### LLRF measurements

- Transient fields into the cavity and  ${\rm I}_{\rm fwd}$  component

Parameter	Specification	Measured
Pulse Frequency	50 Hz	49.64 Hz
Pulse Width	250 – 2000 µs	1988 µs
Duty Cycle	1.25 – 10%	9.88 %
Settling Time	< 100 µs	2 – 10 µs



### LLRF measurements

Temperature Room & Cavity field stability





# **2f.Optics**

Aperture ø20 mm Gradients 8-23 T/m Effective length 70 mm



- 3 Bunchers
- 1 Fast Chopper
- 1 Beam Dump



## 2g.Diagnostic Elements



#### measure:

emittance/Courant-Snyder parameters beam distribution



### **3.criticalities** DTL input data missing Emittance budget missing Aperture definition missing Fast/Slow Chopper undefined

