ORBIT DISTORTION AT TRANSITION CROSSING WITH A NEW PICK-UP IN SS76 IN THE CERN PS Sandra Aumon - Heiko Damerau - Simone Gilardoni

BE/ABP - LIS Meeting 15 August 2009

CONTENTS

- Motivations: MRP through transition in 2007.
- The radial loop control system (RLC).
- Trajectory through transition with the new CODD
- Disadvantages of the current RLC configuration.
- Motivations for the choice of the new RLC config.
- MD What did we do Results
- Conclusions Outlooks

MEAN RADIAL POSITION @ TRANSITION (2007)

Mean Radial Position (MRP) computed with the 40 PUs of the orbit measurement system (CODD) with an AD beam



• MRP-jump due to the doublets inversion of the Gammajump.

• 1-2 mm of the jump is explained by the fact that the orbit doesn't pass by the center of the GJ quadrupoles

• However, 2mm are left.

MRP WITH A RADIAL STEERING

SFTPRO 10/10/07, Transition time: 486 ms



With the radial steering:

- Less losses.
- No MRP jump at transition

MRP WITH A RADIAL STEERING

• BLM SFTPRO 2 Juillet 2007 – sans correction

SFTPRO: 1392 e10 part

du



MRP WITH A RADIAL STEERING



6

RADIAL LOOP SYSTEM

• The radial loop system controls the MRP with initially 3 PUs in section 22-51-96. The PU 36 was included in 2008.

• It is working jointly with the phase loop.



TRAJECTORY THROUGH TRANSITION



Data taken with the new orbit measurements system (10000 trajectories through transition)

From J. Bellemann

DISPERSIONS THROUGH TRANSITION

Dispersion at 4 PUs

Mean Dispersion in the PS



- The PU51 might be less sensitive to changes in trajectory due to dispersion.
- Dispersion computed with MADX





9

PROBLEMS WITH THE CURRENT SYSTEM

- PU51 is less sensitive to changes in trajectory due to its low dispersion during the Gammajump.
- Not optimal phase advance between the PU51 and 96 and PU36.
- Proposal to include the PU76 in the radial loop system With dispersion average @ the



MRP MEASUREMENTS WITH THE PU76

- The PU76 was connected to the radial loop control system.
- MRP measurements on the AD, SFTPRO and ToF beams with several PUs combinations (PU22, 36, 76, 96 and the current configuration)
- Trajectories turn by turn thanks to the new orbit measurements system.

Results MD - AD beam



MRP @ transition and along the cycle.

- \bullet Beam well centered for 22-36-76-96
- Almost no MRP jump
- \bullet Mean center of the GJ quadrupoles around -1mm

12

Results MD – SFTPRO BEAM



MRP @ transition and along the cycle.



Results MD - TOF beam



MRP @ transition and along the cycle.

 \bullet Mean center of the beam of the GJ quads ~-1mm.

• The direction of the jump is inversed.

CONCLUSIONS-OUTLOOKS

- In 2007, the center of the GJ quads seemed to be around +3.5mm. This year, the center seems to be around -1mm.
- Measurements with radial steering to check the transition crossing of the MRP.
- Launch orbit simulations with the new alignment of the GJ quads.
- The steering of the beam had been improved by using the new PU76: the radial loop system is more sensitive to energy error and the Pus have a better advance.
- MRP-jump due to:
 - steering of the beam at the GJ quads (inversion of the doublet @ transition)
 - The radial loop system can not correct quick deviation (doublets inversion ~500µs.), the system is inactive for several ms. This is what we observed