# **XFEL Impedance Effects and Mitigation**

M. Dohlus IPAC 2018 May 01

The European XFEL About FELs and Wakes A Measurement

# **The European XFEL**

main linac,  $L_{tot} = 1179 \text{ m}$  $L_{act} = 640 \times 1.038 \text{ m} = 664 \text{ m}$ 





SASE1 L<sub>tot</sub> = 225 m

L<sub>act</sub> = 35 × 5 m = 175 m



**Compression Scenario**  $\rightarrow$  **BCO**  $\rightarrow$ 





### ightarrow BC1 ightarrow





#### ightarrow BC2 ightarrow





 $\textbf{BC1} \rightarrow \textbf{SASE1} \rightarrow \textbf{SASE3} \rightarrow \textbf{dump}$ 





## **Impedance Budged before Undulator**

accelerator wakes for Q = 1nC



total energy spread  $\approx 35.3$  MeV

## In the Undulator

SASE1:  $L_{tot} = 225 \text{ m}$  $L_{act} = 35 \times 5 \text{ m} = 175 \text{ m}$ 

SASE3: 21 segments





#### Intersection



### **Impedance Budged for one Undulator Section**

numbers for Q = 1nC,  $I_{peak} = 5 \text{ kA}$ 

#### energy spread

SASE1 has 35 sections SASE3 with 21 sections

total energy spread (per section)  $\approx$  412 keVelliptical pipe $\rightarrow$  274 keV (pure surface effects)surface effects $\rightarrow$  331 keVgeometric effects $\rightarrow$  81 keV





- shape: large cross-section (mirror currents & pumping) + small gap (undulator)
   → elliptical pipe
- material: frequency dependent conductivity + anomalous skin effect
  - $\rightarrow$  aluminum profile
- more surface effects: roughness + oxide layer
  - $\rightarrow$  very tight tolerances 300 nm + 5 nm in undulators

1000 nm + 5 nm in BC chambers





## **Geometric Effects**







#### bellows (pipe with gaps)





beam position monitor



#### optimize geometric effects



## **About FELs and Wakes**

beam properties

energy, energy deviationemittance, opticsbunch charge, peak current



resonance condition

$$\lambda_{l} = \frac{\lambda_{u}}{2(\gamma_{0} + \delta\gamma)^{2}} \left(1 + \frac{K^{2}}{2}\right) + \frac{\lambda_{u}}{2}(\chi'^{2} + \chi'^{2})$$

power gain length (assuming optimal beta function)

$$L_{g} = 1.18 \sqrt{\frac{I_{A}}{I_{\text{peak}}}} \frac{\left(\varepsilon_{n}\lambda_{w}\right)^{5/6}}{\lambda_{l}^{2/3}} \frac{\left(1 + \frac{K^{2}}{2}\right)^{1/3}}{KA_{JJ}} \left(1 + \delta(\sigma_{\gamma}, \cdots)\right)$$

overlap electron – photon beam

$$\sigma_r \approx \sigma_{r,l}$$
  $L_g \approx L_r$ 

$$\sigma_{r,l} \approx \sqrt{L_r \lambda_l / \pi}$$
  $\sigma_r$   $\Box$  diffraction  $2\sigma_r$ 

### **Some Dimensions** ≈ European XFEL

	typical beam properties	energy $\approx$ 14 GeV bunch charge $\approx$ 250 p peak current $\approx$ 3 kA	( 17.5 GeV) C ( 1 nC)
	photon wavelength	$\lambda_{l} \mu 10^{-10} \mathrm{m} \ \mu \lambda_{u} / \gamma^{2}$	
	cooperation length	$L_l \ \mu \ 10^{-8} \mathrm{m}$	
	transverse oscillation	$\hat{x} \mu 10^{-6} \mathrm{m}$	(undulator trajectory)
	bunch length	$L_b \ \mu \ 10^{-5} \ m$	
	bunch width	$\sigma_w \mu \sqrt{\lambda_l L_g} \mu 10^{-5} \mathrm{m}$	(overlap electron-beam EM wave)
	undulator (SASE1)	$\lambda_u \approx 4 \times 10^{-2} \mathrm{m}$	
pc Ra	power gain length	$L_g \approx 5 \text{ m}$	(overlap electron-beam EM wave)
	Rayleigh length	$L_R \approx L_g$	
	linear operation	$z < 8L_g$	
	saturation length	$L_s \approx 10 L_g \dots 20 L_g$	

**SASE** 



## **Amplifier Model** (linear operation)

EMwave

 $\mathbf{X} = \left| \begin{array}{c} \text{beam, density modulation} \\ \text{beam, energy modulation} \end{array} \right|$ 

white noise 
$$\begin{pmatrix} 0\\1\\0 \end{pmatrix}$$
  $\rightarrow$   $U$   $\rightarrow$   $X_1$   $\rightarrow$   $U$   $\rightarrow$   $X_2$   $\cdots$   $\rightarrow$   $U$   $\rightarrow$   $X_n$   
 $X_2(\omega) = U(\omega)X_1(\omega)$   
 $\alpha(\omega)X_e(\omega) = U(\omega)X_e(\omega)$   
only one eigenvector is amplified  $\rightarrow X_n(\omega) \sim (\alpha(\omega))^n X_e(\omega)$ 



#### **Amplifier Model** (linear operation)

energy loss per stage  $\gamma_n = \gamma_0 - n\delta\gamma$ shifted resonance condition  $\lambda_l(n) = \frac{\lambda_u}{2\gamma_n^2} \left(1 + \frac{K^2}{2}\right)$  $\alpha_n(\omega) \approx \alpha_0(\omega - n\delta\omega)$ 



### **Amplifier Model** (linear operation)

our parameters:  $\frac{\sigma_{\omega}}{\omega_0} \approx 0.0005$  after 9 power gain length  $\frac{\omega'}{\omega_0} 9L_g \approx 0.00045$  for Gaussian bunch with 250 pC, 5 kA wake:  $\approx -18 \text{ MeV}/(100 \text{ m})$ ISR:  $\approx -5.7 \text{ MeV}/(100 \text{ m})$ with undulator intersections CSR: exponentially increasing but smaller

than wake + ISR



### **SASE in Non-Linear Regime**



#### for our parameters (SASE1, 0.1nm, 250pC, 5kA):

linear regime:wakes + ISR > CSR (SASE)mild shift of resonance condition

beyond linear regime: CSR > wakes + ISR energy loss → further shift of resonance complicated interaction of kinetic- and field-energy and micro-bunching

## **Tapered Undulator (Mitigation)**

systematic energy loss  $\gamma(S)$  can be compensated by tapering K(S)keep resonance condition:  $\lambda_l = \frac{\lambda_u}{2(\gamma(S))^2} \left(1 + \frac{K(S)^2}{2}\right)$ 

optimal tapering is more than compensation of resonance condition, it also considers the dynamics of the bunching process

the optimal taper is non-linear in the range of saturation, it is usually adjusted empirically



### **Energy Profile before Undulator**

the taper compensates wake effects in the undulator, but different parts of the bunch (~ cooperation length  $\approx$  10 nm) radiate on wavelengths defined by the **energy before the undulator** (+ some frequency shift)



the initial energy width causes an additional broadening of the SASE3 spectrum

$$\frac{\Delta \gamma}{\gamma} \approx 0.0026$$

$$\downarrow$$

$$\frac{\Delta \omega}{\omega} \approx 0.0053$$

Gaussian bunch with 250pC, 5kA

# **A Measurement**



operation: 14 GeV, 250 pC, no SASE

change the compression (in BC2) by varying phase and amplitude of L2  $\rightarrow$  variation of wakes due to different bunch length measure energy loss (B2, CL, T4 and T4D) and keep BCM signal

repeat measurement for few phase settings and measure rms bunch length with transverse deflecting structure





#### comparison with simulated compression (vs rms bunch length)



# Summary/Conclusion

#### European XFEL

impedance data base with about 2000 components
before SASE1: major sources of wakes are cavities, collimators, warm pipes
(L3 to undulator) and fast kickers
SASE1 and 3: optimized geometry (cross section, flanges, pumps, diagnostics, ...)
consider surface effects (material, roughness, oxide layers)

#### **FELs and Wakes**

SASE1 wake causes energy variation before SASE3

#### Measurement

measurements of energy losses (due to variation of bunch length) are in reasonable agreement with simulation based on impedance data base