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## RCS as PS-Booster Upgrade

## Motivation:

- new machine instead of upgrading old one
- avoid triple splitting in PS


## Main Parameters:

| Energy | $160 \mathrm{MeV}-2 \mathrm{GeV}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Circumference | $1 / 7 \operatorname{Circ}(\mathrm{PS})=89.76 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{~h}=1, \mathrm{~h}=1+2$ or $\mathrm{h}=3)$ or <br> $4 / 21 \mathrm{Circ}(\mathrm{PS})=119.68 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{~h}=1+2$ or $\mathrm{h}=4)$ |
| Repetition Rate | 10 Hz |
| Maximum magnetic field | 1.3 T |
| Aperture estimates by downscaling <br> booster acceptance: | Dipoles (Scrapers): $29.5 \mathrm{~mm}(\mathrm{v}), 61 \mathrm{~mm} \mathrm{(h)}$ <br> Quadrupoles (vacuum chamber): $60.5 \mathrm{~mm}(\mathrm{v}), 67.5 \mathrm{~mm}(\mathrm{~h})$ |

## Not considered:

- nonlinearities, resonances etc.
- space charge
- Collimation


## Basic Options

## Racetrack - 2-fold symmetry:



Triangle - 3-fold symmetry:


Square - 4-fold symmetry:


Higher symmetries were not considered as the straight sections become too short to host Injection/Extraction

## Some Rule of Thumbs, limits and Conclusion

## Dispersion Suppression and Tune:

- n *2 Pi phase advance in the arcs (more or less determines the tune and phase advance)
- modified "missing bend" scheme

Twiss Parameters $\rightarrow$ Aperture:
Shorter (more) cells $\rightarrow$ smaller twiss functions $\rightarrow$ smaller aperture

## Injection Requirements:

FODO cell with QD in straight: 2*2.6 m straight section
Straight section without QD: 6.2 m straight section

## Gamma Transition:

not so clear, we considered gammat>3.6 $($ gamma $(2 \mathrm{GeV})=3.13)$
Number of quadrupole families:
until now 2 families, more families would provide more flexibility (e.g. working point adjustment) and smaller twiss functions

## 1/7 CIRC(PS) (NOT MANY CHOICES)

in general:

- high dipole filling factor required
$\rightarrow$ FODO lattice (best for lattices requiring a high dipole filling factor. E.g. doublet or triplet require higher quadrupole strength ( $\rightarrow$ longer quads, less space for dipoles) .
$\rightarrow$ Dispersion suppression with n*2 Pi phase advance in the arcs. Other dispersion suppressor schemes require missing bends or reduced bending strength
$\rightarrow$ in our case implies three-fold symmetry (Inj./Extr./RF), other symmetries are less space efficient.
$\rightarrow$ minimum number of cells (trade off between aperture and dipole filling factor)
$\rightarrow$ to reach a high enough gammat and low enough twiss functions a high phase advance is required


## 1/7 Circ(PS) - Triangle - FODO

15 cell FODO Lattice, Dispersion Suppression via 2Pi phase advance/arc
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## 1/7 Circ(PS) - Triangle - FODO+Doublet

15 cell FODO+Doublet Lattice, Dispersion Suppression via 2Pi phase advance/arc

$\star$ little space left for multipoles, diagnostics etc.
$\star$ high residual dispersion in straight section (maybe improvable with more ind. quads)
$\star$ "free" straight section for Inj./Extr.

| $\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{H}}$ | 4.2817 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 3.57 |
| Gamma Transition | 4.06 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{x}, \text { max }}$ (straight) | 0.88 m |
| phase advance per cell (x/y) | approx. $103^{\circ} /$ <br> $86^{\circ}$ |
| $\beta_{\mathrm{x}, \max } \beta_{\mathrm{y}, \max }$ | $11.35 / 12.23 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{x}, \text { max }}$ | 2.48 m |
| QF/QD FODO $(0.5 \mathrm{~m}$ length $)$ | $10.7 / 8.73 \mathrm{~T} / \mathrm{m}$ |
| QF/QD Doublet $(0.5 \mathrm{~m}$ length $)$ | $14.52 / 9.85 \mathrm{~T} / \mathrm{m}$ |
| Dipole field $(1.87 \mathrm{~m}$ length $)$ | 1.3 T |

## 4/21 CIRC(PS) (A BIT MORE FLEXIBLE)

in general:

- dipole filling factor:
$\rightarrow$ FODO and doublet lattice as basic choices
$\rightarrow$ Dispersion suppression with $n * 2$ Pi phase advance in the arcs or missing bend scheme
$\rightarrow 2,3$ or 4 -fold symmetry
$\rightarrow$ Could consider going to a higher number of cells
- aperture:
$\rightarrow$ at least equivalent number of cells as for 1/7 PS circumference
15 cells $* 4 / 3=20$


## 4/21 Circ(PS) - Racetrack/Square - FODO

|  | Square | Racetrack |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| \# cells | 20 |  |
| \# cells/straight sec. | 1 | 2 |
| straight section | $2 * 2.49 \mathrm{~m}$ | $4 * 2.49 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| d(Quad-Dip) | 0.89 m | 0.89 m |
| phase adv./cell (h/v) | $95 / 98$ | $95 / 98$ |
| $\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{H}} / \mathrm{Qv}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | $5.28 / 5.46$ | $5.28 / 5.46$ |
| $\gamma_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 4.96 | 4.99 |
| $\beta_{\mathrm{x}, \text { max }} / \beta_{\mathrm{y}, \text { max }}$ | $10.09 / 11.20 \mathrm{~m}$ | $10.13 / 10.29 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{X}, \text { max }}$ | 2.55 m | 2.84 m |
| Vert. Accept. Dip. | 33.5 mm | 31.9 mm |
| Hor. Accept. Quad. | 68.0 mm | 70.2 mm |


$\star$ similar optics for racetrack and square
$\star$ enough space for multipoles etc.
$\star$ small residual dispersion with adjusted tunes
$\star$ high gammat
$\star$ tight for Inj./Extr.

## 4/21 Circ(PS) - Triangle




Based on: Design of low energy ring(s), Internal Task Note, Antoine Lachaize, André Tkatchenko

* higher gammat and slightly smaller aperture with doublet
$\star$ tune chosen to have no dispersion in straights
$\star$ no real advantage by going to 24 cells (same aperture, but smaller phase advance per cell)
$\star$ dispersion suppression does reduce considerably the aperture requirements, but reduces the space in the DS free straight sections


## 4/21 Circ(PS) - Triangle

|  | FODO (QD in Straight) |  |  | Doublet |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| \# cells | 21 |  | 24 | 21 (DS suppr.) | 21 | 24 |
| \# cells/straight sec. | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| straight section | $4 * 2.55 \mathrm{~m}$ | $2 * 2.55 \mathrm{~m}$ | $4 * 2.09 \mathrm{~m}$ | $2 * 2.20 \mathrm{~m}$ | $2 * 4.30 \mathrm{~m}$ | $2 * 3.59 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| d(Quad-Dip) | 0.75 m | 0.75 m | 0.65 m | 0.5 m | 0.90 m | 0.69 m |
| phase adv./cell (hor.) | 72 | 60 | 61 | 91 | 72 | 61 |
| phase adv./cell (vert.) | 68 | 63 | 59 | 69 | 70 | 61 |
| $Q_{H}$ | 4.205 | 3.5 | 4.05 | 5.29 | 4.206 | 4.05 |
| $Q_{v}$ | 3.95 | 3.7 | 3.95 | 4.05 | 4.05 | 4.05 |
| $\gamma_{T}$ | 3.64 | 3.32 | 3.60 | 4.8 | 3.77 | 3.66 |
| $\beta_{\mathrm{x}, \text { max }}$ | 8.97 m | 9.64 m | 8.23 m | 9.95 m | 8.08 m | 7.55 m |
| $\beta_{\mathrm{y}, \text { max }}$ | 10.84 m | 10.03 m | 9.10 m | 11.34 m | 9.03 m | 8.47 m |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{x}, \text { max }}$ | 3.75 m | 4.73 m | 3.99 m | 1.83 m | 3.77 m | 3.84 m |
| Vert. Accept. Dip. | 33.6 mm | 32.8 mm | 31.6 mm | 33.7 m | 32.2 mm | 31.4 |
| Hor. Accept. Quad. | 74.6 mm | 83.4 mm | 74.6 mm | 62.3 mm | 72.1 mm | 72.0 mm |

## CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

## Different lattices give a rough guess about the feasibility of a RCS, but more detailed studies

 are needed.
## e.g. next step:

- play with more quadrupole families to reduce twiss functions, especially dispersion, and adjust the working point
- include multipoles, skew quads etc.
- space charge

