

# ACTIONS FOR THE RLIUP WORKSHOP AND HL-LHC WP2

Elias Métral

- ◆ **RLIUP => Comments to be given on several scenarios considered:**  
[http://emetral.web.cern.ch/emetral/ICEsection/2013/2013-10-02/RLIUP\\_LHC\\_scenarios.pptx](http://emetral.web.cern.ch/emetral/ICEsection/2013/2013-10-02/RLIUP_LHC_scenarios.pptx)
- ◆ **HL-LHC WP2 (16<sup>th</sup> meeting, 13/09/2013) =>** <https://indico.cern.ch/getFile.py/access?resId=minutes&materialId=minutes&confId=270585>

# RLIUP (1/3)

	$N_{b \text{ inj}}$ [ $10^{11}$ ]	$\epsilon^*_{\text{inj}}$ [ $\mu\text{m}$ ]	$N_{b \text{ coll}}$ [ $10^{11}$ ]	$\epsilon^*_{\text{coll}}$ [ $\mu\text{m}$ ]	B-B Sep [ $\sigma$ ]	Min $\beta^*$ (xing/sep) [cm]	Xing angle [ $\mu\text{rad}$ ]	$L_{\text{peak}}$ [ $10^{34}$ $\text{cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$ ]	$L_{\text{lev}}$ [ $10^{34}$ $\text{cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$ ]	$\tau_{\text{lumi}}$ [h]	Lev. time [h]	Machine eff. 6 h fills [%]	Machine eff. opt. fill length [%]	Opt. Fill length [h]	Avg. Peak- pile-up density [ev./mm]	Target int. Lumi [ $\text{fb}^{-1}/\text{year}$ ]
PIC	1.3	1.28	1.24	1.54 <sup>1)</sup>	12	40/20	285	3.6	-	5.8	-	33.9	33.6	5.1	1.24	70
PIC	1.3	1.65	1.24	1.98 <sup>2)</sup>	12	40/20	323	3.1		8.1		35.0	35.0	6.1	0.97	70
US1	1.45	1.37	1.38	1.8 <sup>2)</sup>	10 <sup>4)</sup>	40/10	256	6.2	5.1	5.6	1.1	49.6	49.3	5.1	1.53	170
US1	2.0	2.18	1.9	2.62 <sup>1)</sup>	10 <sup>4)</sup>	40/10	320	7.4	4.6	8	3.7	41.8	41.4	7.2	1.45	170
US1	2.0	2.18	1.9	2.62 <sup>1)</sup>	10 <sup>4)</sup>	40/20	310	5.4	4.6	8	1.2	49.4	49.4	6.2	1.45	170
US2	2.32	2.08	2.2	2.5 <sup>2)</sup>	12	15/15	590 <sup>3)</sup>	20	5.1	8.2	11.2	57.3	47.3	13.0	1.16	270
US2	2.32	2.08	2.2	2.5 <sup>1)</sup>	10 <sup>4)</sup>	30/7.5	420	19	5.1	8.2	10.7	57.3	48.0	12.6	<1.24 <sup>5)</sup>	270

- ◆ **PIC** => Experiments compatible with 140 PU-events crossing
- ◆ **US1** => PIC + BBLR in 1 and 5 + needs for 40 / 10 optics
- ◆ **US2** => US1 + Crab cavities + 800 MHz? + e- lens?

## RLIUP (2/3)

### ◆ **Transverse beam stability and heating**

- Are the above schemes compatible with transverse stability taking into account the collimator settings (assuming present jaw materials) presented by Roderik at the WP2 meeting on 13/9?
- At which stage do we need to have Molybdenum-Graphite jaws with Molybdenum coating for impedance reduction?
- Is the octupole strength sufficient for all cases up to 7 TeV?
- When heating is becoming an issue for the present hardware?

### ◆ **Beam-beam**

- Is there any scheme among those proposed for BCMS (see next slide) that could pose problems for beam-beam effects?
- What is the required beam-beam separation for flat optics and no BBLR? What is the dependence on intensity?
- BBLR position vs emittance, flat beam crossing angle with BBLR. Is it compatible with collimation?

# RLIUP (3/3)

- Filling patterns with BCMS and max of 5 PS train per SPS extraction => Any proposal or other suggestion?

	$K_{B1/B2}$	$k_{IP1/IP5}$	$k_{IP2}$	$k_{IP8}$
Filling 1	2508	2508	2108	2204
Filling 2	2508	2472	2087	2240
Filling 3	2508	2428	2061	2284
Filling 4	2508	2384	2035	2328
Filling 5	2652	2652	1839	1859

- Abort Gap Keeper at 276 bunches
- Max. 5 PS train/SPS extraction (=240 bunches)
- No isolated bunches to ATLAS and CMS
- 12 bunches intermediate injection
- Over injection over pilot

## ◆ E-cloud effects

- What are the heat loads that we can expect after scrubbing for the considered scenarios? And during scrubbing?
- What is the required SEY to achieve in the triplets to avoid electron cloud build-up?
- What are the electron cloud effects that we can expect after scrubbing during the various phases?
- Countermeasures?

## HL-LHC WP2 (1/2)

- ◆ **BS to contact ElenaS and StephaneF to get estimates of the parameters that they are considering for the scaling of the beam-induced RF heating for HL-LHC**
- ◆ **GR should try and include, in his presentation on the heat load on the triplets beam screens due to electron cloud, the effect of the simultaneous presence of the 2 beams**
- ◆ **EM to discuss with the equipment teams about the possibility of testing with measurements and simulations the cooling effectiveness**
- ◆ **EM to provide estimates including the trapped mode analysis for the new TDI (being refurbished during LS1 and new design should be foreseen for after LS2)**
- ◆ **EM to ask for more accurate analysis of heat management (cooling effectiveness)**
- ◆ **Impedance team to analyze the MKI temperature data collected in 2012**

## HL-LHC WP2 (2/2)

- ◆ **EM to transmit the information concerning the heat load on the striplines for the HL-LHC triplet**
- ◆ **Impedance team to check the new design of the BSRT (which should reduce the RF heating) for the HL-LHC parameters**
- ◆ **Impedance team to create a table with the expected heat loads for all the LHC components for which the impedance is known assuming the HL-LHC nominal beam parameters**
- ◆ **Impedance team to estimate the RF heating for the various upgrade scenarios (RLIUP), highlighting the need of possible interventions on some of the hardware components**