

# Review of electron cloud at CESRTA and future machines for bright beams

Stephen Poprocki,

J.A. Crittenden, S.N. Hearth, J.D. Perrin, D.L. Rubin, S.T. Wang

Beam Dynamics meets Vacuum, Collimations, and Surfaces

March 10, 2017 Karlsruhe, Germany









- Electron cloud (EC) can cause instabilities and emittance growth, and can be a limiting factor in accelerator performance
- EC has been studied at CESRTA (the Cornell Electron-Positron Storage Ring Test Accelerator) since 2008
  - Local and ring-wide EC measurements
  - EC mitigation techniques
- Emittance growth from EC not well understood until now
- ⇒ We have developed an incoherent model which predicts emittance growth from EC
- This talk will compare simulations to measurements for tune shifts and equilibrium beam size





- Buildup of electrons hitting the vacuum chamber wall and generating secondary electrons
- Main source: photoelectrons from synchrotron radiation
  - Also beam-gas ionization or stray protons hitting the wall
- Bunches accelerate the electrons as they pass
- Positron bunches pull the cloud towards it ("pinch effect")
- EC builds up along a train of bunches





- CESR (Cornell Electron-Positron Storage Ring)
  - 768 m in circumference
- Starting in 2008, CESR was reconfigured into a low emittance damping ring as a Test Accelerator (CESRTA) for the ILC Damping Ring specifically, and future high intensity, ultra low emittance storage rings in general
- The goal was to:
  - Characterize the build-up of EC in each of the key magnetic field regions
  - Study the most effective methods of suppressing EC in each region
- Electron and positron beams
- 1.8 6 GeV
- Flexible bunch patterns
- 12 Superconducting wigglers at low energy (2 GeV)
  - Generate 90% of the synchrotron radiation







CesrTA

- The vacuum system was modified to include various EC diagnostics
  - EC Experimental Regions & special vacuum chambers
  - RFAs (Retarding Field Analyzers)
  - SPUs (Shielded Pickups)
  - Microwave resonance EC detectors (TE Wave)
  - In-situ SEY station
- The beam instrumentation was also upgraded
  - Bunch-by-bunch, turn-by-turn beam position monitors
  - Bunch-by-bunch, turn-by-turn X-ray beam size monitor



Figure 2.13: Q15 EC Test Chamber, equipped with a RFA (1) and 4 SPUs (2)

BDmVCS 2017: Review of electron cloud at CesrTA – Stephen Poprocki



#### Local EC measurements

- Local EC measurements from RFAs and SPUs provide
  - A way of measuring the effect of various EC suppression techniques:
    - ★ Low emission coatings
      - TiN, amorphous carbon, diamond-like carbon
    - ★ Grooves in chambers
    - ★ Solenoid windings
    - ★ Clearing electrodes
  - A way of calibrating simulation parameters
    - ★ Primary and secondary emission parameters



DETAIL A -- Flange End with Mask





Figure 2.59: Photo of electrode connection button on the bottom of the SCW beam pip



- EC model calibrated and validated on a wide range of local and ring-wide measurements
- Has been used to help design future accelerators
  - ILC
  - CHESS-U
  - SuperKEKB



Figure 2: Modeled and measured (black points) tune shifts for a 20-bunch train of 5.3 GeV positrons with population  $3.2 \times 10^{10} \text{ e}^+$  (2 mA/b)



Time resolved RFA measurements in grooved and smooth AI chambers compared to simulations varying the peak SEY



#### An incoherent model for emittance growth from EC



- Beam:
  - 2.1 GeV positrons or electrons
    - ★ Horizontal emittance: 3.2 nm, fractional energy spread: 8x10<sup>-4</sup>, bunch length: 9 mm
  - 30 bunch train, 0.4 mA/b and 0.7 mA/b, 14 ns spacing
    - **★** ( $0.64 \times 10^{10}$  and  $1.12 \times 10^{10}$  bunch populations)
  - 1 witness bunch, 0.25 to 1.0 mA, bunch positions 31 to 60
    - ★ Witness bunch position probes cloud as it decays
    - ★ Witness bunch current controls strength of **pinch effect** (cloud pulled in to e+ bunch)
- Measure:
  - Betatron tunes: using digital tune tracker
    - ★ Bunch-by-bunch
  - Vertical bunch size: from X-ray beam size monitor
    - ★ Bunch-by-bunch, turn-by-turn
  - Horizontal bunch size: from visible light gated camera
    - ★ Bunch-by-bunch, single-shot
- Bunch-by-bunch feedback on to minimize centroid motion
  - Disabled for a single bunch when measuring its tunes



 Vertical emittance growth along a train of positron bunches above a threshold current of 0.5 mA/b





#### Beam size

- Trains of e- bunches do not blow-up
  - Emittance growth is due to EC



BDmVCS 2017: Review of electron cloud at CesrTA – Stephen Poprocki



• Horizontal beam size also blows-up in 0.7 mA/b e+ train





- One witness bunch to a 30 bunch 0.7 mA/b e+ train
  - Start with witness at bunch #60, vary current, eject bunch, move to #55...
  - For a given witness bunch #, the cloud it sees is the same
    - ★ Strong dependence of emittance growth on current (pinch effect)



0.7 mA/bunch train

#### Witness bunch to a 0.4 mA/b train (below threshold)

e-

e+



BDmVCS 2017: Review of electron cloud at CesrTA – Stephen Poprocki



- Simulations involve three codes which feed into each other
  - Synchrotron radiation
    - → Photo-electron production rate along the wall
  - Electron cloud buildup
    - → Electric field maps
  - Tracking of beam through the lattice with EC elements
    - → Betatron tunes
    - → Beam size



- Benchmark EC simulations at CesrTA have used a 2D analytic calculation for the photon absorption rate along the walls in a lattice
  - Current results use this method
- We are currently incorporating a 3D Monte Carlo simulation including \_ reflections (specular & diffuse)







## EC buildup simulation

- Start with EC buildup simulations with ECLOUD in both dipole and field-free regions
- Use element-type ring-averaged beam sizes
  - Dipole: 730 x 20 um
  - Drift: 830 x 20 um
    - ★ The large horizontal size is dominated by dispersion
- Obtain electric field maps from the EC for 11 time slices during a single bunch passage, in ±5σ of the transverse beam size

- ∆t = 20 ps

- Only ~0.1% of electrons are within this beam region
  - Necessary to average over many ECLOUD simulations

Transverse EC charge distributions in an 800 G dipole for bunch 30 of a 0.7 mA/b positron train





- EC density calculated during buildup simulation in dipoles and drifts for a train of bunches
- Beampipe-averaged density larger for drifts
- Bunch-charge-weighted density larger for dipoles later in the train
  - EC pinned to the vertical magnetic field lines in the dipoles





- Tune shifts are proportional to the electric field gradients
- Gradient just before a bunch passage → coherent tune shift
- Gradient during pinch  $\rightarrow$  incoherent tune spread, emittance growth



BDmVCS 2017: Review of electron cloud at CesrTA – Stephen Poprocki



- Use the time-sliced electric fields in EC elements at the dipole and drifts
- Track particles in bunch through the full lattice (using Bmad) for multiple damping times, with radiation excitation and damping
- "weak-strong" model: does not take into account effects on the cloud due to changes in the beam
  - Weak: beam; Strong: EC
  - In the EC buildup simulations: Weak: EC; Strong: beam
  - Justification: EC buildup simulations are rather insensitive to vertical beam size
- Strong-strong simulations are too computationally intensive to track for enough turns
  - Damping times at CesrTA are ~20,000 turns



BDmVCS 2017: Review of electron cloud at CesrTA – Stephen Poprocki



#### Tune shifts - train

- Measurements (points):
  - Feedback is disabled for a single bunch
  - Use digital tune tracker to measure tunes of the bunch
    - ★ Frequency sweep & phase lock
- Simulations (lines):
  - Calculated from 1-turn transfer matrix or FFTs (good agreement)
  - Dipoles (62% of ring) dominate the horizontal tune shift compared to drifts (23%)
  - Drifts do contribute to vertical tune shift



(Revolution frequency: 390 kHz)



### Tune shifts - witness bunch

- Simulations shown as lines
- Measurements show no dependence of witness bunch current on tune shift
  - Pinch effect doesn't contribute to coherent tune shift
- Measured vertical tunes at different currents include a machine impedance tune shift
  - 1 kHz/mA from single bunch measurement
  - Subtract out for comparison to simulations





BDmVCS 2017: Review of electron cloud at CesrTA – Stephen Poprocki





- Bunch size from simulation is the average over last 10k turns (of 60k)
- See vertical emittance growth in 0.7 mA/b simulations
- Do not see horizontal emittance growth at 0.7 mA/b
  - Do see growth for higher currents
  - ECLOUD simulation used large ring-wide horizontal beam size
    - Pinch effect is stronger with smaller beam sizes
    - ★ May need to use different EC elements based on local horizontal beta



### Bunch size growth - witness bunch



0.7 mA/bunch train

- More emittance growth with:
  - shorter distances from train (more cloud)
  - higher witness bunch current (more pinch)
- Simulations show similar behavior



- Cornell has made extensive measurements of EC effects since 2008
  - Constrain parameters in EC buildup simulations
- Simulations in good agreement with local (RFA, SPU) and ring-wide (tune shift) measurements
- A witness bunch at a range of currents gives a direct measurement of the pinch effect
  - Vertical emittance growth scales with pinch
  - Coherent tune shift does not
- We have developed a weak-strong incoherent model which is consistent with this data
- The simulations can uncover the largest contributions to tune shifts and emittance growth
  - EC mitigation methods can be targeted to these regions and tested in simulation
- Future work:
  - Reconcile data/simulation discrepancies (horizontal emittance growth)
  - Revisit emittance growth predictions in ILC damping ring
  - Use model to understand underlying factors driving emittance growth
    - ★ Develop new approaches to mitigating emittance growth from EC



Thank you for your attention