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Motivation

- Fermilab’s ECloud R&D is focused towards proton upgrades of Main Injector
  - NOvA (700kW)
  - Project X (2+ MW)
- Program consists of experimentation and simulation to build Project X
- Additionally, look for general advancement of the question for future machines (e.g. ILC)
Overview of Activities

- Simulation Input from LBL
- Initial ECloud experimental installation
- Development of instrumentation
  ▪ RFA and microwave
- New ECloud experimental installation
  ▪ Some Preliminary Measurements
- Simulations
LBL Simulation

*M. Furman*

- POSINST simulation suggested that the Main Injector might be near a threshold for electron cloud formation
  - 4-5 orders or magnitude increase of cloud density with a doubling of bunch intensity
- Further simulations have been performed to match measurements
  - Success of comparison has been mixed
  - Progress made in different beam configurations
  - Consistent basic behavior for bunched proton beams:
    - Strong threshold when secondary emission runs away
Initial Installation & Measurements

- Argonne RFA (Borrowed)
  - Installed in drift region of MI
- Allowed direct observation of Cloud
  - Time- (energy-) dependent signal
  - Qualitatively
Threshold

- Large number of cycles sampled at maximum current
- Clear turn-on at higher intensities
  - Threshold at \( \sim 26e12 \) protons
  - Threshold later moved higher
- Allowed fitting of Furman’s simulation to data, giving an SEY
Beam Pipe Surface Conditioning

- Threshold evolved with time, moving higher as MI established higher-intensity operation
- When 11 batch became operational, threshold increased quickly (Jan, 2008)
- As beam intensity increased to 40e12, the threshold eventually increased beyond range (March, 2008)
- Conclude that SS conditions well to 40e12 protons, will it to 150e12?
Microwave Measurements

N. Eddy, J. Crisp, M. Wendt

- Sideband and direct phase measurements
  - Very good time-resolution
- Allows measurement in dipole sections
- Will have direct comparison with RFAs
- Need better theoretical understanding of phase shift, particularly in magnets
- See data in Manfred’s talk
Project X Plan

- Expect to have to mitigate ECloud
  - < 10% of the machine is open drift space
    - Solenoids don’t provide much help
  - Beam Pipes are captured in magnets
    - Grooves and electrodes not practical
  - Will try to optimize beam properties (frequency/distribution)
- Coating is the most straightforward option
  - TiN is well known, also investigate others

- Project X R&D:
  - Test TiN or other coating in MI
  - Develop process to coat entire MI (and maybe RR)
  - Advance simulations and provide enough experimental cross-checking that we can extrapolate TiN’s properties to Project X beam currents
Electron Cloud Experimental Upgrade - 2009

Major upgrade just finished installation, this summer

- 2 New experimental Chambers
  - Identical 1 m SS sections, except that one is coated with TiN
- 4 RFAs (3 Fermilab & 1 Argonne)
- 3 microwave antennas and 2 absorbers
  - Measure ECloud density by phase delay of microwaves

Primary Goal: validate TiN as a potential solution for Project X

Secondary Goals:

- Remeasure threshold and conditioning
- Further investigate energy-dependence
- Measure energy spectrum of electrons
- Test new instrumentation
- Directly compare RFA and Microwave
- Measure spatial extinction of ECloud
New Detectors

- New RFAs evolved from Argonne style
- Maximize signal with enlarged area and by removing ground grid
  - Ground is provided by the beam pipe
- Shaping of electrodes optimizes energy filter performance
  - Also, more hermetic
- Amplifier/filter in tunnel
  - Better-quality cables to surface
Detector Simulation
CY Tan, L McCuller

- Electrode layout optimized with SimIon simulation
- Track electrons through a detailed grid
- Summer student added secondary emission functionality
  - Still being validated, but looks promising
Test Stand

- Test new detectors with electron gun
- Demonstrated that the detectors work as expected
- Will allow further exploration of detector effects
  - Secondary emission
  - Magnetic Field
  - Detailed calibration
TiN Coating

*Linda Valerio*

- Coating of test chambers performed at BNL
- Will need to adapt this procedure for *in situ* coating of 3000 m of Main Injector
Status of New Installation

- Main Injector beam started 2 weeks ago
  - Intensity has been gradually rising (near maximum now)

- All apparatus have been exercised
  - Starting to understand data

- Initials RFA signals very strong and thresholds low
  - Rapid scrubbing ensued
  - Electron energy scans difficult due to ramping nature

- Microwave data taken, but requires understanding
  - Very short paths (1 m)
  - Cavity behavior? - absorbers were too mitigate
  - May show qualitative agreement with RFAs
Preliminary Data - 9/16/09: 12e12 on 6-batch

- Uncoated (FNAL): 280 nA
- Uncoated (ANL): 110 nA
- Coated (5”): 25 nA
- Coated (mid): 15 nA

- FNAL/ANL ≈ 2.5
- Uncoated/Coated ≈ 18
- Longitudinal Penetration Distance ≈ 4 cm (e-folding)
- Temporal structures are mostly similar, and similar to what was seen before
Preliminary Data - 9/16/09: 13e12 on 11-batch

- Biased at 120 V
- Red line shows bunch length
Preliminary Data - 9/18/09: 26e12 on 11-batch

- Time duration is much larger
  - Extends to end of cycle
- Max current: 3.6 uA
- Uncoated/coated is ~ 2 in peak
  - Greater in tails
  - Both in deep saturation at max
  - Differential scrubbing
- BPM shows skew
### Preliminary Data - Early Conditioning Summary

Rough Thresholds – more precise numbers when data fully analyzed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Uncoated</th>
<th>Coated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>&gt;33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>&gt;33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>&gt;34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>&gt;34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>&gt;34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>&gt;35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Energy spectra created by collecting many individual pulses and differentiating
- For now, sample size is small
- At the mercy of pulse-to-pulse variation
  - Intensity variation
  - Bunch length variation
- Initial data appears consistent with POSINST simulation
  - Bulk of electrons around 40 eV for 6e10 per bunch
Synergia Simulation

Paul Lebrun

• Have a working electron code simulation
  • Concentrating on simulating microwave measurements
• Linear approximations (Sonnad and others) verified in low-intensity regime
• Larger (more realistic) intensities and microwave amplitudes have more complicated effects
  • Paul feels strongly that AM may be contaminating PM signals (ruins normalization)
  • Looking for resonance effects (ECR and lower frequencies)
ORBIT Simulations

Leonid Vorobiev

• Adopting ORBIT simulations to MI case
  ▪ Multibunch is crucial feature in MI beam – not working well with ORBIT model
  ▪ Electron cloud module already rewritten for shorter bunches, but need more for multiple bunches and beam feedback

• Considering integrating other codes
Future Plans

• Chief experiment is comparing the conditioning histories for TiN and SS pipes
  - Pushing maximal intensity is also crucial

• Extrapolation to PrX intensity requires a number of hooks
  - Plan to install ECloud1 (SLAC) when Cornell is finished with it
  - Perhaps ECloud3 as well

• Simulation goal is a full ECloud simulation that can also simulate multiple-bunch instabilities
Summary

- Proton upgrades at Fermilab are our chief focus
- Major upgrade of the ECloud experimental area in the Main Injector is complete
  - Instrumentation works – collecting a lot of data
  - Initial data looks qualitatively similar to previous measurements
- TiN shows a clear suppressive effect
  - But, it needs conditioning too, and conditions more slowly
- New data will allow further cross-checks to simulation
- Planning further upgrades to installation
  - Considering the ECloud1 & ECloud3 stands from SLAC
- Need to combine simulation with experiment to be confident in solutions for Project X
Electron Cloud R&D at Fermilab

Bob Zwaska
Linear Collider Workshop of the Americas
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