Specifics of the BESSY II 0.3Hz Orbit Correction System

J. Feikes, K. Holldack, P. Kuske, R. Müller

BESSY – Berlin, Germany

IWBS⁰² – December 2002 – Spring 8

Slow Orbit Control in General

Data Conditioning

- BPM: Validity Check, Weighting
 Correctors: Boundary Conditions, Resolution, Limits
- Solvers
 - Methods (Micado, SVD...)
 - Implementation, Packages
- Apply Procedures
 - Principles, Error Handling, Ramping Algorithm, Crosstalk with other Systems, Aliasing

Roland Müller BESSY

Orbit Control @ Light Sources

Objectives:

- Minimize RMS orbit deviation
- Reproduce position/angle at any experimental station, minimal jitter

Problem: 3rd generation sources exceed design values by 1 order :

> Resolution of components, sources of perturbation, noise are all down to the same order of magnitude (μm, μrad)

Roland Müller BESSY

Outline / Topics addressed

- Cure of insufficient I/O Resolution
- Path Length, Constant Beam Energy
- Second Order Phenomena
- Selection of Corrector Scheme, Target Orbit
- Role of XBPMs

Roland Müller BESSY

Insufficient I/O Resolution



Upgrade to Coarse/Fine Board

Possible solutions: Reduced dynamic range of correctors Less corr. (SVD -> **MICADO** when stability reached) Analyze ideal SVD result w.r.t. available set points Upgraded to 24 bit (PS noise ~ 19 bit)



Comparison: I/O, Beam Response



Roland Müller BESSY



Horizontal Orbit/Path Length

- RF change modifies energy -> undulator spectrum is shifted
- Thermal drifts change circumference -> Path length has to be adjusted with RF
- Different strategies for RF as n+1 corr:
 - iterative: dispersion (RF), SVD with n dipoles
 - extended: SVD with n+1 corr
 - boundary condition <Hcorr> =0 (in SVD terms) to preserve energy

Observations/Work-around

- Frequency drift/ corr. strength built up (weeks).
- Certain combined changes of RF / hor. correctors keep BPM pattern constant (short-cut path) but modify energy.
 Solution: all HB=0 and <HS1> small (!)





Roland Müller BESSY

Second Order Effects + Cure

- Growing values of neighboring HS4 correctors.
- Boundary condition <HSx>=0 distributes large <HS4PxT1R> values to finite <HS1>: energy shift.
- Solution: HS4 of sector T1 excluded from `low mean value' condition, ΔE/E < 10⁻⁴ restored for ON and OFF.



Consequences / Questions:

No Choice of hor. SVD Cut Off Factor
 Soft SVD (50% eigenvectors) distribute residual

perturbation around the ring within a few days.

Cure: full inversion (all eigenvectors)

How to Evaluate/Compare:

empirical `multi-patched' global system

Scaling with number of exceptions?

 Hard to test/analyze: user shifts are the only realistic, long-term experiments.

Problem of all local `DC' drift sources

Roland Müller BESSY

Contrast: Local Perturbation

Difference frequency of vertically acting LHe recondensor is seen by orbit correction. Despite soft SVD (50% EV): perturbation stays local.

Small, AC?



Roland Müller BESSY

Number/Partitioning of Correctors

- Pro small number:
 - noise induced by corr. increases as sqrt(n).
 - correctors mostly at identical phase positions.
- Pro large number:
 - local perturbations not distributed around ring.
- Partitioning:
 - ID-feed-forward table creation:
 - MD shift: change gap, correct via internal coil offset, transfer results to improved set-point table, repeat...
 - User mode: gap changes drive internal coils, orbit correction uses only ring dipoles, ID corrector offset = 0
 - Including ID coil offset values into the orbit correction would give a better RMS, but ... we don't do it.

Optimal Target Orbit

- Beam-Based Alignment reference orbit is the (unreachable) physical optimum.
- Golden orbit is the best achievable: New reference, RMS deviation ~0
 - Initially more noise: sign reversal of eigenvector phases randomly achieves better RMS, but slightly larger local variation.
 - Residual perturbations move to a finite RMS: when should a golden orbit be redefined?
 - Less sensitive against HW failure (no orbit jump due to new sum composition)

Roland Müller BESSY

Optimal Target Orbit

- Verification of malfunction sensitivity
 - Hor., Ver. Corrector, BPM excluded.
- How to start:
 - Full inversion after shutdown (100% eigenvectors)?
 - Improved reproducibility?
 - How fast does this orbit relax? We don't dare to test!



XBPM Target: Pilot Experiment

Local Feedback on Photon BPM Signal Corrector 0.272 -OFF OFF ON ON 0.270 resolution 0.268 Position [mm] 0.266 now 24 bit 0.264 0.262 ◆1µm BPM 0.260 **XBPMH9** 0.258 new limit 0.256 -0.1370^{12:08} 12:12 12:16 12:18 12:10 12:14 12:20 XBPM -0.1375 signals -0.1380 Setpoint [A] VS1P1D5R -0.1385 allow to -0.1390 -0.1395 take -0.1400 --0.1405 advantage -0.1410 -0.1415 of steerer 12:12 12:18 12:08 12:10 12:14 12:16 12:20 Time of Day [h] resolution

Roland Müller BESSY

Future: XBPM-aware methods

- XBPM signal in principle more sensitive
- XBPM signals depend on RF-BPM preconditioning and ID parameters
- Possible scenario:
 - correct with RF-BPM to the resolution limit
 - switch to XBPM when ready, supervised by RF-BPM signals
 - On `degradation' RF-BPM based correction is resumed, XBPM consistency supervisor

Roland Müller BESSY

Conclusion

- Methods commonly used do not properly match all detailed needs.
- Tailored localized corrections required.
- Empirical procedures cured our recent problems.
- No metric to quantify improvement against trade off, alternative approaches.
- Long term behavior of ad hoc patchwork unclear/hard to predict
- Effects on experiment vary: beam lines, operation mode, detector...
- Option: weighted global system

Roland Müller BESSY