Beam Stabilization using Energy Compression System in SPring-8 Linac

SPring-8 Linac

Japan Synchrotron Radiation Research Institute (JASRI)

Takao Asaka

Stability of the rf equipment

Phase of klystron drive system -> Adjustment of the air conditioner 10deg./4°C (10hrs periodical) -> <1deg./1°C Phase of the klystron -> Continuous regulation type of cooling system 2.4deg./3°C (27min periodical) -> <0.5deg./0.5°C Fluctuation of the klystron beam voltage -> Adjustment of deQing circuit 0.3% (rms) -> 0.04% (rms)

Stability of the beam energy

Stability of the beam current

>20% -> 1.9% (rms)

Stability of the beam energy

>1% -> 0.06% (rms)@4hrs, 0.03% (rms)@10min

Energy Compression system

Stability of the beam energy

0.03% (rms) -> 0.01% (rms)

Beam parameter and rf system of the SPring-8 linac

	Synchrotr	on	New SUBARU
Pulse width	40 nsec	1 nsec	1 nsec
Peak current	~ 140 mA	~ 2 A	~ 200 mA
Beam energy (Maximum)	1.2 GeV	1.2 GeV	1 GeV
Energy spread	± 0.8 %	± 0.3 %	± 0.2 %
Normarized emittance (90%)	$<240 \ \pi \ mm \ mrad$	$<160 \ \pi \ mm \ mrad$	$<200 \ \pi \ mm \ mrad$
Bunch length	15 ~25 psec	15 ~25 psec	15 ~25 psec



Beam loading at the accelerating structure

Accelerating structure	$2\pi/3$ mode constant gradient
Total number	25
Operation frequency	2856 MHz
Number of cell	81
Shunt impedance	54 M Ω/m
Unloaded Q	13500
Effective length	2.88 m
Filling time	610 nsec
Input power (usual operation)	35MW



Compression factor of ECS

Energy acceptance of the synchrotron	: ±1.0 %
Energy acceptance of the New SUBARU	: ±0.2 %
The required time jitter of the synchrotron	: ±100 psec
The required time jitter of the New SUBARU	: ±50 psec

Beam timing jitter (rms) : 6.8 psec

Bunch length	: 20psec -> 50 psec	
Energy spread	: 1 % -> 0.5%	
	<pre>@beam current @beam pulse width</pre>	: 5A : 1nsec

Compression factor : 25 deg./%

Energy compression diagram



Energy stabilization & control by ECS



Stability of the excitation current for chicane magnet< 1e-4</th>Stability of the phase of ECS< 0.5 deg. (rms)</td>

Simulation of the energy compression



Beam pulse width: 1nsecBeam current: ~5A (peak to peak)Energy spread:±0.3% with ECS

Phase shift : < 3deg.

Energy compression System (ECS)



Optical transition radiation (OTR) monitor@1 GeV chicane section ($\eta = -1 m$) (Al + Kapton foil target) + ϕ 80 mm telecentric lens + Random shutter camera



Kapton foil thickness : 12.5 μm Vacuum evaporation : 0.4 μm (aluminum)

Deterioration in the emittance with OTR monitor 5e -8 ~ 3e -7 m rad -> 5e -7 m rad@1 GeV

Injection beam current beam loss : negligible

OTR monitor at chicane section

SPring-8 Linac



Energy stabilizaton : 0.06% (rms)

Block diagram of the RF system for ECS



Characteristics of the PLL for the Drive line of ECS



Stability of the high power rf component for ECS



Beam test of ECS



Measurement of the beam energy stability



SPring-8 Linac

The installation of the ECS were completed in summer of 2000.

As results of rf measurement of ECS, it could operated with the phase stability of 0.5deg. (rms). The energy stability with ECS reached to 0.01% (rms).

In operation of long time, energy stability improves from 0.06% to 0.01% by using the ECS.

Stability of the energy and energy spread in accelerator facilities

SPring-8 Linac

SLC Linac	0.03% (jitters(rms)), without feedback control [1]	
	1.5% (day - night) [2, 3]	
	-> rf amplitude and phase as the source of drift	
KEK 8 GeV Linac	0.1% (jitters(p-p)) [4]	
MIT/Bates 1 GeV Linac	0.4% -> 0.01% (rms) with feedback control [5]	
SPring - 8 1 GeV Linac	>1% -> 0.01% (rms) with ECS	

[1]	E. J. Soderstrom, G. S. Abrams, A. J. Weinstein,
	in Proceedings of the 1989 Particle Accelerator Conference, Cicago, IL, 1989.
[2]	F.J. Decker, R. Akre, M. Byne, Z. D. Farkas, H. Jarvis, K. Jobe,
	R. Koontz, M. Mitckell, R. Pennacchi, M. Ross and H. Smith,
	in Proceedings of the 1995 Particle Accelerator Conference, Dallas, TX, 1995.
[3]	F.J. Decker, R. Akre, R. Assmann, K.L.F. Bane, M.G. Minty, N. Phinney and W.L. Spence,
	in Proceedings f the 1997 Particle Accelerator Conference, Vancouver, BC, 1997.
[4]	. Enomoto,
	in Proceedings of the 2000 European Particle Accelerator Conference, Vienna, Austria, 2000.
[5]	D.H. Barkhuff, S.P. Wells, T. Averett, D.H. Beck, E.J. Beise, D. Cheever, G. Dodson, S. Kowalski,
	R.D. McKeown, B.A. Mueller, M. Pitt, D. Spavde, C. Tschalaer and A. Zolfaghari.

Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A 450 (2000) 187-193.