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“The LHC Injectors Upgrade should plan for delivering reliably to the LHC the beams required for reaching the goals of the HL-LHC. This includes LINAC4, the PS booster, the PS, the SPS, as well as the heavy ion chain…” (This is the mandate … Upgrade of Brightness)

+ determine possible improvements for high intensity beams.
**HL-LHC* beam parameters, today vs tomorrow**

*High Luminosity - LHC*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Param. @ LHC collision</th>
<th>Nominal(^1) 25 ns</th>
<th>Today * 50 ns</th>
<th>HL-LHC(^1) 25 ns</th>
<th>HL-LHC(^1) 50 ns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Int/bunch</td>
<td>1.15E11</td>
<td>~1.6E11</td>
<td>2.2E11</td>
<td>3.5E11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunches</td>
<td>2808</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>2808</td>
<td>1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam current [A]</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\varepsilon_n[\mu m])</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>~ 2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\beta^*[m])</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Lumi [cm(^{-2}) s(^{-1})]</td>
<td>1 10(^{34})</td>
<td>7.74 10(^{33})</td>
<td>9 10(^{34})</td>
<td>9 10(^{34})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Non official values
\(^1\)O. Bruning, HL-LHC/LIU day, 30/03/2012

**Goal of HL-LHC ~ 300- 250 fb\(^{-1}\) per year**

**Today we produce about 1 fb\(^{-1}\) per week**
25 ns is bunch spacing required by the LHC (today LHC uses 50 ns bunch spacing)

Production scheme:
a) Double batch injection from PSB (4 + 2 bunches, 6 bunches for PS at h=7)
b) 4 batches of 72 bunches each transferred to the SPS

Transverse emittance produced in the PSB, longitudinal in the PS

- Multiturn proton injection in PSB
- RF gymnastics in PS:
  - Triple splitting
  - Acceleration
  - 2 x Double splittings
  - Bunch rotation

- 3 RF systems in PSB
- 5 RF systems in PS
- 2 RF systems in SPS

→ Each bunch from the Booster divided by $12 \rightarrow 6 \times 3 \times 2 \times 2 = 72$
Challenges of this scheme

High intensity injected in PSB:
- every PSB bunch is split 12 times (to get finally 72 bunches at 25 ns spacing)
- Space-charge issue. See B. Mikulec & A. Molodozhentsev presentation
- Limited brilliance due to multiturn injection process

Long waiting time at PS injection:
- Space-charge issue. See A. Molodozhentsev presentation
- Headtail instability.

Long waiting time at SPS injection:
- Space-charge.
- TMCI instabilities. See H. Bartosik presentation

Many RF systems involved:
- Longitudinal instabilities and limitations to be overcome in all the machines
  See E. Shaposhnikova presentation

Beam quality is an issue:
- PS-SPS very sensitive to difference in relative bunch population
- LHC final luminosity very sensitive to degradation of transverse emittance
## HL-LHC beam parameters, today vs tomorrow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Param. @ LHC collision</th>
<th>Nominal(^1) 25 ns</th>
<th>Today * 50 ns</th>
<th>HL-LHC(^1) 25 ns</th>
<th>HL-LHC(^1) 50 ns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Int/bunch</td>
<td>1.15E11</td>
<td>~1.6E11</td>
<td>2.2E11</td>
<td>3.5E11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunches</td>
<td>2808</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>2808</td>
<td>1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam current [A]</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\varepsilon_n[\mu m])</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>~ 2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\beta^*[m])</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Lumi [cm(^{-2}) s(^{-1})]</td>
<td>1 10(^{34})</td>
<td>7.74 10(^{33})</td>
<td>9 10(^{34})</td>
<td>9 10(^{34})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Non official values
\(^1\)O. Bruning, HL-LHC/LIU day, 30/03/2012

**Goal of HL-LHC ~ 250 fb\(^{-1}\) per year**

**Today we produce about 1 fb\(^{-1}\) per week**
Basic Principles of the Injector upgrade

To increase performance (soon extended for heavy ions): **Increase Brightness**

Overcome main limitations of LHC injectors (brief intro summary):

- **Space charge current limitations**
  - **PSB injection**: Increase injection energy in the PSB from 50 to 160 MeV
    Linac4 (160 MeV H\(^-\)) to replace Linac2 (50 MeV H\(^+\))
    Prove operation with Laslett larger than \(|0.36|\) @ 160 MeV (today \(|0.7|\), required max. \(|0.5|\))
  - **PS injection**: Increase injection energy in the PS from 1.4 to 2 GeV
    Prove operation with Laslett larger than \(|0.3|\) @ 2 GeV (today \(|0.28|\), required max. \(|0.34|\))
  - **SPS injection** if confirm current operational limit
    Prove operation with Laslett larger than \(|0.15|\)

- **Transverse/Longitudinal stability limits**
  - TMCI @ SPS
  - Transient beam loading and CBI in the PS
  - RF limitations in SPS

- **Electron cloud related issues**
  - Wideband transverse damper in PS
  - SPS vacuum chamber coating+scraping+wideband damper

- Upgrade the PSB, PS and SPS to make them capable to accelerate and manipulate a higher brightness beam (feedbacks, cures against electron clouds, hardware modifications to reduce impedance, improve beam instrumentations…)

To increase reliability and lifetime (until ~2030!)
- PS is 53 years old
- PSB is 40 years old
- SPS is 36 years old
Upgrade Timeline

- Chamonix 2012
- Priority to LHC
  - LS1 for injectors
  - 2012
  - 2013
  - 2014
  - 2015
  - Priority to Injectors
  - LS2 for injectors
  - 2016
  - 2017
  - 2018
  - 2019

Analysis of different limitations and parameters definition

LIU Project Baseline definition

LS = Long Shutdown - No beam

- Linac 4 ready, PSB H+ injection could be available
- PSB-PS transfer 1.4 GeV → 2 GeV
- SPS aC coating, 200 MHz Injectors commissioned
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‘Conceivable’ improvements for stretch goals?

Goal: reduce losses (and SPS blowup) at the possible minimum

Will be real challenge to achieve with x2 beam intensities wrt today

Assumed optimistic budgets for losses and emittance blowup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stretch</th>
<th>PSB</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>SPS</th>
<th>LHC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>loss %</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blowup %</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Linac 4**: new 160 MeV $H^-$ linac injector for the CERN accelerator complex, to replace the 50 MeV $p^+$Linac2.

**Goals**: double brightness ($I/\varepsilon$) in the PS Booster from higher injection energy (factor 2 in $\beta\gamma^2$) for the LHC Luminosity Upgrade (>2020) + advantages of $H^-$ + more intensity for other users + modern and more reliable injector.

**Status**: building and infrastructure completed, accelerator installation starting.

---

**Ion species**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy [MeV]</th>
<th>Length [m]</th>
<th>RF Pow. [MW]</th>
<th>Focusing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFQ 0.045 - 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>RF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTL 3 - 50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>112 PMQs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCDTL 50 - 102</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14 PMQs, 7 EMQs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMS 102 - 160</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12 EMQs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Presentation of J.B. Lallement**
Linac4 - Status

- Installation of infrastructure (electricity, cooling, ventilation, racks, cabling, RF Network) to be completed in Autumn.

- Injector up to 3 MeV (Ion source, LEBT, RFQ, MEBT line) installed in a dedicated test stand and starting beam commissioning.

- Accelerating structures being assembled or delivered at CERN; after RF testing will be installed in the tunnel from end 2013.

- Commissioning in the tunnel from mid-2013 (3 MeV line), followed by DTL in 1st half 2014 (delayed because of long 2013/14 LHC shut-down), CCDTL in 2nd half 2014, PIMS at early 2015.

- Connection to the PS Booster only at the next long LHC shut-down (2017/18), preceded by a series of beam tests and improvements to reliability.
PSB intensity limitations

- Space charge (losses, emittance blow up)
- Instabilities along the cycle (efficiency of the transverse feedback system)
- LHC beams presently not limited by these effects
- Limit today due to injection transverse painting
L4-PSB H⁻ injection layout (design ongoing)
L4-PSB H⁻ injection layout (design ongoing)

- Stripping foil
- Septum dipole
- Merging dipole
- Dipole
- Dipole

H⁻ → H⁺ → H⁰ → p⁺
L4-PSB H⁻ injection layout (design ongoing)

Stripping foil

Septum dipole

Merging dipole

Dipole

Dipole
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Space charge: PTC-Orbit studies

Measurements to be improved

See A. Molodozhentsev presentation for progress in Space charge studies

Effect of [1,0,4] resonance

Study progressing to:

a) Improve understanding of transverse emittance blowup due to space charge
b) Eventually improve resonance compensation used in normal operation and propose one for 160 MeV operation
c) Beta-beating compensation during injection process
d) Understand if lattice symmetry-breaking due to space requirements of the new H⁻ injection might reduce machine performances

Machine model to be improved

Acceptable agreement between experimental data and simulation results (LHC25 beam)

Maximum random error of the PSB quadrupole magnets $\sim 1.0 \times 10^{-3} (1\sigma)$
PS intensity limitations

Acceleration/Bunch splittings
Longitudinal CBI
Transient beam loading
Transition crossing

Injection flat bottom:
Space charge
Headtail instability

Flat top:
Longitudinal CBI
Electron cloud
Transverse instabilities

Av. intensity = $1.33 \times 10^{11}$ ppb
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Impact of Magnetic Field on Intensity

1st Injection
2nd Injection
h=7
h=21
h=42
h=84

Time [ms]

Magnetic Field [T]

Intensity

26 GeV/c
1.4 GeV

Reminder
Acceleration/Bunch splittings
Longitudinal CBI
Transient beam loading
Transition crossing

Longitudinal CBI
Electron cloud
Transverse instabilities

Space charge
Headtail instability

Time [ms]

e-cloud signal [a.u.]

Av. intensity = $1.33 \times 10^{11}$ ppb
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Study to determine largest acceptable tune spread.

**Today max acceptable:** $\Delta Q_y \sim |0.3| \quad @ \ 1.4 \ GeV

**HL-LHC max needed:** $\Delta Q_y \sim |0.34| \quad @ \ 2 \ GeV

**Goal:** demonstrate that possible to inject a beam with $\Delta Q>|0.3|$ with limited emittance blowup (max 5%)

How the problem is approached:

- **Experimental studies:**
  - Learn from operational beams experience. Current Laslett at about -0.28 with $Q_y=0.23$
  - Tune scan to identify via beam losses dangerous resonances
  - Driving terms measurements
    - Understand the effect of the integer resonance and scan it.
    - Compensate resonances (as done already in 1975 with injection at 50 MeV)

- **Simulation studies:**
  - PTC–Orbit simulations
  - Lack of good magnetic error model
    - No error tables from magnetic measurements (à la LHC) available from 195
    - Opera©-based magnetic error simulations starting from construction tolerances fed in PTC-Orbit
**PS intensity limitations**

**Injection flat bottom:**
- Space charge
- Headtail instability

Cured by introducing linear coupling
Encouraging tests two weeks ago of T-damper
Eventually possible to use octupoles

**Acceleration/Bunch splittings**
- Longitudinal CBI
- Transient beam loading
- Transition crossing

Longitudinal Feedback (kicker)
Implemented after LS1
Not an issue

**Flat top:**
- Longitudinal CBI
- Electron cloud
- Transverse instabilities

Encouraging tests last week of T-damper
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Damper commissioning

Damper/TFB tests proved:
- Can damp headtail instab. at injection
- Can damp injection oscillations
- Can damp high energy instabilities

Results presented today @CERN
Batch compression and bunch merging

More evolved RF manipulations schemes from $h = 9$ to 21 to increase LHC brightness after LS1

Most ‘simple’ scheme:  $h = 9 \rightarrow 10 \rightarrow 11 \rightarrow 12 \rightarrow 13 \rightarrow 14 \rightarrow 7 \rightarrow 21$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pure $h = 21$</th>
<th>25 ns</th>
<th>50 ns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Splitting ratio PS ejection/injection</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch length from PS</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pure $h = 9$

24 b, 50 ns at PS ej.
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SPS intensity limitations

Injection flat bottom:
- Capture losses
- Longitudinal instability
- Space charge
- TMCI

Along the whole cycle:
- Longitudinal instability
- Electron cloud

See Helga’s presentation for PS-SPS transfer
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Electron cloud in SPS

- SPS: has been a major performance limit (beamloss, vacuum, ecloud instability and incoherent emittance growth)
  - Presently **not a limitation for 50 ns** bunch spacing (**well scrubbed**)
  - **Serious for 25 ns** beam: scrubbing difficult (**StSt chambers**)
  - **Robust solution developed with aC coating** of vacuum chambers inside the magnets (**LIU baseline**)
  - High bandwidth feedback could cure eC-instab. – would help scrubbing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beampipe profile</th>
<th>SEY threshold @ 1.1 $10^{11}$ p/bunch</th>
<th>SEY threshold @ 2.5 $10^{11}$ p/bunch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 156 (LSS)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 130 (LSS)</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA (Dipole)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBB (Dipole)</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Low gamma-transition SPS optics

- Present intensity limitations for LHC p+ beams:
  - TMCI at injection $\Rightarrow N_{th} \sim 1.6 \times 10^{11} \text{p/b (small Q')}: N_{th} \sim \eta \varepsilon_l/\beta_y$
  - Longitudinal instability ($N_{th} \sim 3 \times 10^{10} \text{p/b for 50 ns}): N_{th} \sim \eta \varepsilon_l^2$

- Instability thresholds scale with slip factor $\eta = 1/\gamma_t - 1/\gamma$

\[ \gamma_t \text{ reduced from 23 to 18 by changing integer } Q_x \text{ from 26 to 20 ("Q20" optics).} \]

See presentation of Hannes

About 3 times higher $\eta$ at injection

Big increase in TMCI and longitudinal instability thresholds

Presently being deployed operationally in SPS for regular LHC filling
Longitudinal instabilities and RF upgrade

- Longitudinal stability: 25 ns beam unstable at $2-3 \times 10^9$ p+/b
  - Presently mitigated with long. emittance blowup (0.6 eVs) and 800 MHz
- Need $\geq 0.9$ eVs for 25 ns stability with $x2$ nominal $I_b$ (Q26)
  - Q20: instability thresholds higher, but need smaller $\varepsilon_I$ to get same bunch length for given $V_{RF}$
- SPS 200 MHz upgrade: $\times 2$ power, 4→6 (shorter) cavities
  - Will allow 10 MV at extraction for 3 A RF current (now 1.5 A)
  - 20% less impedance
- Will give $\times 2$ intensity range
  - $2.3 \times 10^{11}$ p+/b for 25 ns
  - $>3.4 \times 10^{11}$ p+/b for 50 ns
  - Unknown is beam stability with high intensity (combination of single- and coupled-bunch effects)

See E. Shaposhnikova presentation
Planned SPS upgrades (as example to describe the large impact of the upgrade on the injectors)

- Double power of 200 MHz RF system
- Power and low-level control upgrade of 800 MHz RF system
- Ecloud mitigation – in-situ aC coating of all dipole and quadrupole vacuum chambers;
- Deployment of low gamma-transition “Q20” optics
- Major Improvement of beam size, orbit and loss monitoring, plus other new or upgraded BI systems;
- New High Bandwidth transverse feedback system;
- Upgraded pickups for present high power damper system;
- Upgraded passive protection devices in extractions and transfer lines TI 2 and TI 8 (relocation plus new devices);
- Improved vacuum sectorisation – arcs and near critical equipment;
- Complete impedance reduction of MKE and dump kickers.

Baseline

- New transverse beam tail scraper system
- Improvement/replacement of beam dump system
- New low-impedance extraction kickers
- New faster injection kickers (for ions)
- Upgraded transfer line collimation system
- Upgrade extraction protection beam diluters
- Improved electrostatic septa
- New high energy orbit correction system

Ongoing studies/Options
Present and future SPS performance (in terms of beam power for Neutrino beams)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>SPS record</th>
<th>After LIU (2020)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LHC</td>
<td>CNGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS beam energy [GeV]</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bunch spacing [ns]</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bunch intensity/10^{11}</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of bunches</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>4200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS beam intensity/10^{13}</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS beam intensity/10^{13}</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS cycle length [s]</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS cycle length [s]</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS momentum [GeV/c]</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average current [μA]</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power [kW]</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Feasibility including operational viability (especially in the PS) remains to be demonstrated.
Main present limitations for high intensity CNGS-type beam (Neutrino production beams)

- **In all machines:**
  - Beam losses leading to radiation issues; already now at the limit in PS → present (2012) operation with lower total intensity of $4 \times 10^{13}$

- **In the SPS:**
  - Longitudinal beam stability (leading to uncontrolled longitudinal emittance blow-up)
  - Maximum available power at 200 MHz (750 kW for full ring) and therefore voltage (7.5 MV) due to beam loading
  - Equipment (extraction kicker, ...) heating
  - Large transverse (vertical) emittance at injection
  - Injection below transition
  - No bunch-to-bucket transfer, debunched beam component
LIU plans and specific studies required for high intensity CNGS-type beam

LHC Injectors Upgrade (LIU), also beneficial for the CNGS-type beam:

- **Linac4**
- Increase of injection energy, new beam controls and upgrade of transverse dampers in PSB and PS, replacement of RF system in the PSB, upgrade of LLRF in the PS, improved beam instrumentation in all accelerators and TLs

- **SPS:**
  - Upgrade of the 800 MHz (2015): 1→ 2 cavities, new FB and FF systems
  - Upgrade of the 200 MHz RF system (2020) : 4 → 6 cavities.
  - Impedance reduction (by 20% for 200 MHz RF - 2020, serigraphy of extraction kickers - 2015)

**Studies**

- **PS:**
  - Loss reduction and related activation,
  - Transition crossing
  - Debolding-rebunching and Multi-turn Ejection at 4x10^{13} p/p
  - Operational compatibility with different users, spares policy...

- **SPS:**
  - Use of the 800 MHz RF system (Landau cavity) for beam stability
  - Optimum transition crossing
  - Need for collimation system for loss localisation
  - New optics with lower transition energy (under implementation for the LHC beam)
Conclusions

Upgrade of LHC beams in injectors requires:
  a) improve understanding of current limits due to space charge → improve machine modeling, understand resonances…
  b) overcome current limitations of RF systems, in particular in PS and SPS
  c) Major improvement of many subsystems, including beam instrumentation, vacuum, etc…

Goal: Main interventions during 2018 to start commissioning for HL-LHC in 2019 of basically 4 new machines (L4+PSB@2GeV + PS +SPS) to fully profit from performances of L4.

Non-LHC beams for neutrino production are challenging in some different ways, but will profit from the from the LIU planned activities
Spares
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>nominal</th>
<th>25ns</th>
<th>50ns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.15E+11</td>
<td>2.2E+11</td>
<td>3.5E+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_b$</td>
<td>2808</td>
<td>2808</td>
<td>1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beam current [A]</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td><strong>1.12</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.89</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x-ing angle [μrad]</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beam separation [σ]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$β^*$ [m]</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td><strong>0.15</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ε_n$ [μm]</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ε_L$ [eVs]</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energy spread</td>
<td>1.20E-04</td>
<td>1.20E-04</td>
<td>1.20E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bunch length [m]</td>
<td>7.50E-02</td>
<td>7.50E-02</td>
<td>7.50E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBS horizontal [h]</td>
<td>80 -&gt; 106</td>
<td><strong>20.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBS longitudinal [h]</td>
<td>61 -&gt; 60</td>
<td><strong>15.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilsinski parameter</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td><strong>2.54</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.66</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geom. reduction</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beam-beam / IP</td>
<td>3.10E-03</td>
<td><strong>3.9E-03</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.0E-03</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Luminosity</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^{34}$</td>
<td>$9.0 \times 10^{34}$</td>
<td>$9.0 \times 10^{34}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events / crossing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>340</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Translated for the injectors …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25 ns</th>
<th>PSB inj</th>
<th>PSB extr/PS inj</th>
<th>PS extr/SPS inj</th>
<th>Ps extr/SPS inj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy GeV</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Ib} \ [\text{e11 p+}] )</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Ib in LHC} \ [\text{e11 p+}] )</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Exyn} \ [\text{mm.mrad}] )</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50 ns</th>
<th>PSB inj</th>
<th>PSB extr/PS inj</th>
<th>PS extr/SPS inj</th>
<th>SPS extr/LHC inj</th>
<th>LHC top</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy GeV</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Ib} \ [\text{e11 p+}] )</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Ib in LHC} \ [\text{e11 p+}] )</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Exyn} \ [\text{mm.mrad}] )</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Space charge in the PSB \((\Delta Q>0.36)\) ?
- Space charge in the PS \((\Delta Q>0.28)\) ?
- Longitudinal instabilities in the PS?
- Space charge in the SPS \((\Delta Q>0.15)\) ?

Assumptions for beam losses and emittance conservation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PSB</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>SPS</th>
<th>LHC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>loss %</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blowup %</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Space charge in the PSB, PS, SPS (acceptable ΔQ)
  → Do we fully understand the effects and do we have simulation tools (benchmark with our machines) for predictions?

• Longitudinal instabilities in the PS

• Longitudinal instability and TMCI in the SPS
  → Is Q20 optics enough to raise these thresholds above the requested values?

• Electron cloud effects with larger intensity (PS & SPS)
  → Can we rely on scrubbing or do we need coating?
  → High bandwidth transverse feedback system?
Limits: space charge/brightness

- **PSB at 160 MeV**
  - **Very confident** to run with $\Delta Q_y \approx -0.3$
  - (and reasonable hope for $\Delta Q_y \approx -0.36$, or 1.4 um/2.4e12 p+)

- **PS at 2 GeV**
  - **Very confident** to run with $\Delta Q_y > -0.26$ (and reasonable hope to increase to $\Delta Q_y \approx -0.30$, with 180 ns long bunches, giving 1.6 um/2.4e12 p+)
  - Then looks reasonably well matched to what PSB can provide

- **SPS**: $\varepsilon_{xy} [\text{um}] \approx -1.22 N_b [\text{e12}] / \Delta Q_y$, with Q20 optics at 26 GeV
  - Present **assumption** is to run with $\Delta Q_y \approx -0.15$
  - Gives 1.2e11 p+/um or 1.6 um for 2.0e11 p+
  - Need to increase to $\Delta Q_y \approx -0.18 – 0.20$ for 50 ns beam, or 1.2 um for 2e11 p+

Fundamental question: why different space-charge limits for different machines?
Examples of Operational Beams (1.4GeV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beam</th>
<th>LHC-50</th>
<th>TOF</th>
<th>AD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensity [ xE10  ppb]</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>650-850</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε horizontal, normalized, 1σ [π.mm.mrad]</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε vertical, normalized, 1σ [π.mm.mrad]</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunch Length (4σ) [ns]</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δp/p (1σ) [xE-3]</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working point</td>
<td>(6.235 ; 6.245)</td>
<td>(6.14 ; 6.26)</td>
<td>(6.21 ; 6.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Laslett Tune-spread</td>
<td>(0.19 ; 0.28)</td>
<td>(0.18 ; 0.29)</td>
<td>(0.18 ; 0.27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Currently no significant emittance blow-up nor losses are observed for operational beams that cannot be cured by increasing the vertical tune and adapting the horizontal to remain near the diagonal (recent change Qx: 6.21->6.235 , Qv: 6.23-> 6.245)