

# DEVELOPMENT OF A LOW-LATENCY, MICROMETRE-LEVEL PRECISION, INTRA-TRAIN BEAM FEEDBACK SYSTEM BASED ON CAVITY BEAM POSITION MONITORS

N. Blaskovic Kraljevic, R. M. Bodenstein, T. Bromwich, P. N. Burrows, G. B. Christian, M. R. Davis, C. Perry, R. Ramjiawan, John Adams Institute, Oxford, UK,  
D. R. Bett, CERN, Geneva, Switzerland

## Abstract

A low-latency, intra-train, beam feedback system utilising a cavity beam position monitor (BPM) has been developed and tested at the final focus of the Accelerator Test Facility (ATF2) at KEK. A low-Q cavity BPM was utilised with custom signal processing electronics, designed for low latency and optimal position resolution, to provide an input beam position signal to the feedback system. A custom stripline kicker and power amplifier, and a digital feedback board, were used to provide beam correction and feedback control, respectively. The system was deployed in single-pass, multi-bunch mode with the aim of demonstrating intra-train beam stabilisation on electron bunches of charge  $\sim 1$  nC separated in time by c. 220 ns. The system has been used to demonstrate beam stabilisation to below the 75 nm level. Results of the latest beam tests, aimed at even higher performance, will be presented.

## INTRODUCTION

A number of fast beam-based feedback systems are required at future single-pass beamlines such as the International Linear Collider (ILC) [1]. For example, at the interaction point (IP) a system operating on nanosecond timescales within each bunch train is required to compensate for residual vibration-induced jitter on the final-focus magnets by steering the electron and positron beams into collision. The deflection of the outgoing beam is measured by a beam position monitor (BPM) and a correcting kick applied to the incoming other beam. In addition, a pulse-to-pulse feedback system is envisaged for optimising the luminosity on timescales corresponding to 5 Hz.

The Feedback on Nanosecond Timescales (FONT) project has developed ILC prototype systems, incorporating digital feedback processors based on Field Programmable Gate Arrays (FPGAs), to provide feedback correction systems for sub-micron-level beam stabilisation at the KEK Accelerator Test Facility (ATF2) [2]. Demonstration of an upstream closed-loop feedback system that meets the ILC jitter correction and latency requirements is described in [3], together with results demonstrating the propagation of this correction along the ATF2 line. The ultimate aim is to attempt beam stabilisation at the nanometre-level at the ATF2 IP. We report here the results from the FONT project using a cavity BPM [4] to drive local feedback correction at the IP, and an outline of future plans.

## FONT5 SYSTEM DESIGN

An overview of the ATF2 extraction and final focus beamlines showing the positions of the FONT5 system components in the IP region, is given in Fig. 1. The IP region contains three C-band cavity BPMs (IPA, IPB and IPC) operated on an x, y mover system [6], with IPB being used in the single-loop IP feedback system described below. The IP feedback correction is applied using a stripline kicker (IPK). The final focus magnets (QF1FF, QD0FF) can be used to steer the beam by introducing a position offset or to move the x and y beam waists longitudinally along the beamline. The offset of the QF7FF magnet can be used to change the pitch of the beam trajectory through the IP region.

A schematic of the IP feedback system is given in Fig. 2. Determining the position of the beam at IPB requires both the dipole mode signal of IPB and the monopole mode signal of a reference cavity (Ref). The cavities were designed such that the y-port frequency of both signals is 6.426 GHz [4]. The signals are down-mixed to baseband using a two-stage down-mixer [7], as follows. The first stage down-mixer (M1) takes the 6.426 GHz reference and IPB signals and mixes each with an external, common 5.712 GHz local oscillator (LO) to produce down-mixed signals at 714 MHz. The second stage down-mixer (M2) mixes the IPB 714 MHz signal using the reference 714 MHz as LO, giving two baseband signals: I (IPB and reference mixed in phase) and Q (IPB and reference mixed in quadrature). The I and Q signals are subsequently digitised in the FONT5 digital board (Fig. 3) and normalised by the beam bunch charge; the charge is deduced from the amplitude of the reference cavity signal. The charge-normalised I and Q signals are calibrated against known beam position offsets (by




Figure 1: Layout [5] of the ATF2 extraction and final focus beamline with the FONT regions zoomed in.




Figure 2: Schematic of IP feedback system showing the cavity BPM (IPB), reference cavity (Ref), first and second down-mixer stages (M1 and M2), FONT5 digital board, amplifier and kicker (IPK).



Figure 3: FONT5 digital feedback board.

moving the BPM mover), allowing the IPB vertical beam position to be known in terms of a linear combination of charge-normalised I and Q.

### BEAM TEST RESULTS

We summarise here the results of beam tests of the FONT5 system. Further results are reported in [8].

The accelerator was set up to provide two bunches per pulse of beam extracted from the damping ring, with a bunch separation of 215.6 ns. This separation was found typically to provide a high degree of measured vertical spatial correlation between the two bunches. The feedback tests therefore involve measuring the vertical position of bunch one and correcting the vertical position of bunch two. The system was typically operated in an ‘interleaved’ mode, whereby the feedback correction was toggled on and off on alternate machine pulses; the feedback ‘off’ pulses thereby provide a continual ‘pedestal’ measure of the uncorrected beam position. For the purpose of recording data with BPM IPB the longitudinal location of the beam waist in the IP region was adjusted by varying the strengths of the two final focus magnets QF1FF and QD0FF. For the results

reported here the beam waist was typically set near the position of IPB.

The IP feedback system latency was measured and found to be 212 ns [9]. The performance of the feedback system was measured using IPB; Fig. 4 shows the vertical position of both bunches with feedback off and on. The IP feedback reduced the vertical beam jitter from an r.m.s. deviation of 420 nm to 74 nm (Table 1). Fig. 5 shows the bunch 2 position versus bunch 1 position for this data set. The feedback removes the correlated component between the bunches, reducing the bunch-to-bunch position correlation from 98.2 % to approximately zero (Table 1).

Table 1: Position jitter of bunch 1 ( $\sigma_{y_1}$ ) and 2 ( $\sigma_{y_2}$ ) and bunch-to-bunch position correlation ( $\rho_{y_1y_2}$ ) with and without application of the IP feedback correction

Feedback	$\sigma_{y_1}$ (nm)	$\sigma_{y_2}$ (nm)	$\rho_{y_1y_2}$ (%)
Off	$412 \pm 29$	$420 \pm 30$	$+98.2^{+0.3}_{-0.4}$
On	$389 \pm 28$	$74 \pm 5$	$-13 \pm 10$




Figure 4: Distribution of the vertical position of (a) bunch 1 and (b) bunch 2 in IPB with (red) and without (blue) application of the IP feedback correction.




Figure 5: Vertical position for bunch 2 versus bunch 1 in IPB with (red) and without (blue) application of the IP feedback correction.




Figure 6: Vertical bunch position  $y$ , obtained for each trigger by linearly interpolating the measured beam positions at IPB and IPC, versus longitudinal distance  $z$  from the IP.

The jitter that can be attained with feedback on ( $\sigma_{y_2}$ ) can be calculated from the feedback off values for the jitter of the two bunches ( $\sigma_{y_1}$ ,  $\sigma_{y_2}$ ) and their correlation ( $\rho_{y_1 y_2}$ ):

$$\sigma_{y_2}^2 = \sigma_{y_1}^2 + \sigma_{y_2}^2 - 2\sigma_{y_1}\sigma_{y_2}\rho_{y_1 y_2} \quad (1)$$

where  $\sigma_r$  is the BPM resolution [10]. The above equation yields  $\sigma_{y_2} = 79.4$  nm, suggesting  $\sigma_r \sim 50$  nm.

## OUTLOOK

Future plans consist in using two IP BPMs in order to stabilise the beam at a location between them. Preliminary measurements have been taken simultaneously at BPMs IPB and IPC, located equidistantly either side of the IP. Given the absence of magnetic fields in the IP region, the beam trajectories can be calculated by linearly interpolating the positions measured at the two BPMs as shown in Fig. 6. The results show that, under typical operating conditions, the position jitter is  $\sim 3$   $\mu\text{m}$  at IPB and IPC. The beam waist can be clearly reconstructed at a location 0.3 mm downstream of the nominal IP with an interpolated position jitter of 82 nm.

In addition to the benefit of stabilising the beam at a location other than the BPM itself, the use of two BPMs to perform the measurement has the potential of

improving the position resolution available to the feedback system. In the configuration where IPB and IPC are used to stabilise the beam at the IP, the vertical position at the IP would be taken as the average of the vertical positions measured at IPB and IPC. Thus, the error on this mean position would be  $\sigma_r/\sqrt{2}$  where  $\sigma_r$  is the resolution of either BPM [10]. The challenge in this mode of operation results from the requirement of a large BPM dynamic range of over 10  $\mu\text{m}$  whilst preserving the BPM resolution.

## CONCLUSIONS

Beam stabilisation using a cavity BPM at the IP has been demonstrated successfully at ATF2. Vertical beam position stabilisation to below the 75 nm level has been achieved using a local IP feedback system. The system has a demonstrated latency of 212 ns. Work is ongoing to improve the resolution of the cavity BPMs and to work towards operating a feedback system using the inputs from two IP BPMs.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the KEK ATF staff for their outstanding logistical support and beam time and our ATF2 collaborators, especially from KU and LAL, for their help and support. Financial support was provided by the UK Science and Technology Facilities Council and CERN contract KE1869/DG/CLIC.

## REFERENCES

- [1] C. Adolphsen et al., The ILC technical design report, volume 3: Accelerator, JAI-2013-001, 2013.
- [2] B. I. Grishanov et al., ATF2 proposal, vol. 2, KEK Report 2005-9, 2005.
- [3] N. Blaskovic Kraljevic et al., THPOR034, these proceedings.
- [4] S. Jang et al., THOAA02, these proceedings.
- [5] G. R. White et al., Phys. Rev. Lett., vol. 112, p. 034802, 2014.
- [6] O. R. Blanco et al., IPAC2015 proceedings, MOPHA003.
- [7] Y. Inoue et al., Phys. Rev. ST Accel. Beams, vol. 11, p. 062801, 2008.
- [8] N. Blaskovic Kraljevic et al., IPAC2015 proceedings, MOPTY083.
- [9] M. R. Davis, DPhil thesis, Oxford University, 2014.
- [10] N. Blaskovic Kraljevic, DPhil thesis, Oxford University, 2015.