

# Update on Chromaticity Measurements

# Ralph J. Steinhagen, BE-BI

- Stability Overview during 2011 vs. 2010
- Q'(t) during the Ramp
  - Same as beginning of last year: not too many ramps with Q'
  - Three periods/categories:
    - "Naked Ramp"  $\rightarrow$  raw time scales, magnitude
    - Reproducibility ↔ as done during ion run
    - Final feed-forward and last measurement
  - (Presume that Decay is covered by Nichola's analysis/presentation)



### **Context of Intensity Increase I/III**

Updated since Evian, so far: 10 months in  $2010 \rightarrow 1$  month in 2011





# **Context of Intensity Increase II/III**

Tune stability as one but maybe not the only contributing factor...



FiDeL: Update on Q' Measurements in 2011, Ralph.Steinhagen@CERN.ch, 2011-04-12



# **Context of Intensity Increase III/III**

- Much less diagnostics/explorative ramps with Q'(t) in 2011
  - Most ramps with Tune-FB  $\rightarrow$  indications of impact of running without:





# **Residual overall Chromaticity Stability**

• Q'(t) dominated by decay/snapback at ramp start and end  $\rightarrow$  Ezio's talk



5



#### Q'(t) overview

- Three waves on Q'(t)...
  - I Initial "naked ramp  $\rightarrow$
  - II status-quo  $\leftrightarrow$  ion reference period
  - III b<sub>3</sub> re-iteration, tune feed-forward



FiDeL: Update on Q' Measurements in 2011, Ralph.Steinhagen@CERN.ch, 2011-04-12



#### Q'(t) Reference Period I Naked Ramp I/II

- Initial analysis limited by "-10<Q'<+25" (rejecting outlier), 10 s average (noise)</p>
  - Re-fined de-modulation over 1.6 seconds:



FiDeL: Update on Q' Measurements in 2011, Ralph.Steinhagen@CERN.ch, 2011-04-12



#### Q'(t) Reference Period I Naked Ramp II/II

- Effective snap-back over in less than 16 seconds  $\rightarrow$  further shorten the ramp?
  - Assymmetric: ΔQ'<sub>H</sub>≈-64 (-50) & ΔQ'<sub>ν</sub>≈+36 (+36) for B1 (B2)





# **Q'(t)** Reference Period II

- Constant feed-forward via lattice sextupoles and gradual-out at ... seconds
- Reproducibility of  $\Delta Q' \approx \pm 2$  (most of the times)





- Last beam-based feed-forward iterations
  - Remaining variations during snap-back



...need control measurement of last iteration.



#### Impact on Machine Performance: How well do we need to Control Q/Q'?



- 2011: still not enough statistic yet for strong confirmation  $\rightarrow$  MDs
  - Biggest error: emittance growth estimates, too few ramps with Q'(t)



#### Summary

- 10 month in 2010  $\rightarrow$  one month in 2011
  - Still, not everything improved by a factor of ten
- Impressive Machine reproducibility enforcing magnetic pre-cycle pays off
  - Q(t) reproducible to 0.01
  - Q' stable to ± 2 units
  - Most of the remaining (recurrent) perturbations during snap-back
  - Can we get a control on the decay amplitude/time-constant?
- Gretchen Frage: how well do we need to control Q/Q'?
  - Got some indications for Q(t) but less for Q'(t)
    - Beam survives without Tune-FB but with percent level losses
    - Chromaticity appears to impact rather beam sizes than life-times
  - Impact on emittance and life-time needs more systematic investigation
    - $\rightarrow$  two MDs proposed to answer/tackle this issue
      - You are most welcome to join and help!
      - Please help to push the priority of this task