

Steve Smith for the ANL / SLAC Cavity BPM Team May 2009





Linac Coherent Light Source at SLAC X-FEL based on last 1-km of existing linac

LCLS Injector at 2-km point

Existing 1/3 Linac (1 km)

New e⁻ Transfer Line (340 m)

Transport Line (200 m)

1.5-15 Å

Undulator (130 m) Near Experiment Ha

-Far Experiment Hall







- 2 Transverse RF cavities (135 MeV & 5 GeV)
- 179 BPMs
- 13 Toroids
- **7** YAG screens (at $E \le 135$ MeV)
- 12 OTR screens at $E \ge 135$ MeV
- 15 wire scanners (each with x & y wires)
- CSR/CER pyroelectric bunch length monitors at BC1 & BC2
- 4 beam phase monitors (2856 51 MHz)
- **3** Energy spectrometers: Gun, injector, dump

YAG screens
OTR screens
Wire scanners

Cavity BPM Requirements

Undulator orbit critical

- Must keep electrons and photons coincident
- to fraction of beam size
- over distance > gain length

Parameter	Requirement	Conditions
Resolution	< 1 micron	200 pC < Q < 1 nC
		Over \pm 1 mm range
	< ±1 micron	1 hour
Offset Stability		\pm 1 mm range, 20 C \pm 0.56 C
	< ±3 microns	24 hour
		\pm 1 mm range, 20 C \pm 0.56 C
Gain Stability	± 10 %	± 1 mm range
		$20~C\pm0.56~C$
Aperture	10 mm	

Cavity Beam Position Monitors

R. Lill, S. Hoobler, R. Johnson, W.E. Norum, L. Morrison, N. Sereno, S. Smith, T. Straumann, G. Waldsmith, D. Walters, A. Young, D. Anderson, V. Smith, R. Traller,

+ many others



The second

Argonne National Laboratory

- Cavities
- Receiver/downconverter
- Waveguides
- Stands
- Undulator

SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory

- Digitizer
- Readout
- Processor
- Power / slow control
- Firmware / software





Concepts

- Avoid the monopole mode
- Cavity-waveguide coupler rejects monopole mode by symmetry
 - Zenghai Li (PAC 2003)
 - T. Shintake, "Comm-free BPM"
 - V. Balakin (PAC 1999)
- Predecessor at KEK's ATF
 - 16 nm resolution in test beam Walston, (NIM 2007)

Choices

- Single, degenerate X&Y cavity
- Reference cavity per BPM





Prototype cavity





Cold Test Set-Up for Pre-Braze test

- All BPMs are tuned and cold tested before brazing
- Tuning accomplished by micro-machining end-caps
- Good correlation between cold test data before and after braze





- Position and reference cavities machined in common block
- Closed with endcaps



 (\sim)

Clock

Trigge

Clock

Clock

Clock Fanout

Receiver Power Supply Chassis

Trigger X

Trico

Ô

Ô

119 MMz PLL



BPM & Receiver







Receiver

•Downconverts X-band to ~40 MHz IF Mounted on Undulator stand



Steve Smith



Receiver Chassis

- Three channel receiver
 X, Y, Reference
- Downconvert 11.4 GHz
 RF to 40 MHz IF
- Waveguide in
- Coax out
- Located underneath undulator





Data Acquisition

Undulator Readout Racks (1 of 2)



4 Channel VME ADC (1 of 36)







SLAC 4-Channel VME Digitizer

- 4 channels
- 16 bits
- LTC2208 ADC chip
- Up to 130 M samples/sec
 - Optional: use internal 120 MHz clock
 - Typically use external 119 MHz clock locked to linac RF
- Optional quadrature digital IF downconversion in FPGA
 - (not used at present)





Algorithms

- Reduce each waveform to amplitude & phase (I,Q)
- Normalize position signal to reference (amplitude and phase)
 - X' = X/Ref (complex normalized amplitude)
 - Y' = Y/Ref
- Calibrate:
 - move BPM
 - observe normalized amplitude vs. BPM position
 - Can use other BPMs (uncalibrated) to remove beam jitter
 - Extract phase & scale of position signal in normalized amplitude
- Measurement
 - Rotate normalized amplitude by phase angle from calibration
 - Project real component
 - Scale and remove position offset



Waveform / Spectrum

- Cavity IF waveform sampled at 119 MHz
- 16 bit digitizer
- Extract amplitude, phase of
 - X, Y, Reference





Calibration

Measure complex amplitudes

Move BPM

X, Y, Ref

Normalized amplitude = Position/Reference (Complex) Remove beam jitter using adjacent upstream BPMs Fit complex normalized amplitude to mover position Repeat for off-axis component





SLAC

Steve Smith

May 2009



- Measure resolution via correlation between BPMs
 - Coherent acquisition over
 - Many pulses e.g. 120 pulses
 - Many BPMs, e.g all 36 cavity BPMs
- Least-squares fit of each BPM (X,Y)
 - to linear combination of neighboring BPMs
- Model-independent
- Slightly biased estimate
 - underestimates resolution very slightly due to fit
 - Insignificant bias for Npulses >> Nbpms
 - Overestimates resolution slightly, assumes other BPMs are noise-free
 - Real resolution should be better by roughly 10%
 - Correction would depend on beta functions



Resolution Measurement

Example:

Fit the 26th BPM (the BPM on the 23rd undulator girder) to a linear combination of Y measurements in previous 2 BPM and next 2 BPM 120 beam pulses.

BPMs 25:27 Y vs Pulse 30 Measured Y - Mean(Y) (microns) 20 10 20 -30 -40 80 20 40 60 100 120 ٦N Pulse Number

Plot fit & residual.



Position Resolution

• Typical (median) resolutions:

- $-\sigma_x \sim 440$ nm with a few > 1 micron
- $-\sigma_v \sim 230$ nm, none > 1 micron
- Why the difference? Jitter? Energy variation?
- Distribution of measured resolution:



Steve Smith

May 2009



Stability of Calibration

- Calibrate every shift for 3 ¹/₂ days
- Compare parameter drifts from day-to-day
- Compare new calibration to calibration taken weeks earlier
- Phase of position cavity with respect to reference cavity
 stable short and long term to fraction of degree.
- Gain (coefficient of ratio of position to reference amplitude) possibly varies at ½% level, must check



Calibration Cycle

May 2009

Measuring Stability in Presence of Beam Jitter

- Accumulate data parasitic to beam operations
- Take data periodically 120 shots every 20 min over 3¹/₂ days
 - Total >15,000 beam pulses
- Ignore first 10 girders
 - undulator feedback moves these to maintain launch into undulator
- Ignore downstream girders
 - periodic mover calibration running
- Beam jitter ~10 microns at this time
- Beam steering sometimes > 100 microns
- Must remove real beam motions:
- Take one run (120 pulses) from middle of weekend to learn correlation between each BPM and its neighbors
 - Fit linear coefficients to predict:
 - X_n from X_{n-1} and X_{n+1}
 - Y_n from Y_{n-1} and Y_{n+1}
 - Use these coefficients to predict Xn, Yn
 - Compare measurement to prediction BPMs pulse-by-pulse







Longer-Term Stability Issue

- Above stability tests done in February
- March shutdown to install undulator
- Begin undulator operation in April
- Find substantial gain changes in BPM X-band receivers
- Up to 10 dB worst case
- Unlikely pssibilities:
 - Radiation
 - Overvoltage
- Investigating:
 - Samples sent back to ANL and to Miteq last week



Offsets

- Currently don't know much about BPM offsets
 - Early studies showed BPM offsets ~50 microns in Y
 - Up to 400 microns in X
 - Should be symmetric
 - Alternating pattern of X-offsets matches what is expected to compensate earth's field, but scale is 3X expected.
- So far FEL commissioning has priority over understanding BPM offsets



Potential Improvements

- Understand receiver gain loss
- Lower noise figure possible
 - Noise figure dominated by input pad
 - Can absorb out of band power without attenuating in-band signal
 - Potential to improve resolution by up to 14 dB
- In-line calibration
 - Can introduce calibration signal from opposite ports
 - Presently terminated
- Subliminal calibration
 - Can calibrate with beam motion << beam jitter
 - Could perform continuous calibration while lasing
 - using with few-micron amplitude motion





Steve Smith