# OVERVIEW OF THE FCC-ee COLLIDER DESIGN

M. Hofer Many thanks to K. Oide, T. Raubenheimer, D. Shatilov, R. Tomás, F. Zimmermann, and all colleagues from the FCC-ee collaboration



) FCC

FCCIS – The Future Circular Collider Innovation Study. This INFRADEV Research and Innovation Action project receives funding from the European Union's H2020 Framework Programme under grant agreement no. 951754

### Introduction

- Following the <u>2020 update of the European Strategy for Particle Physics</u>, CERN, together with international partners, launched the FCC Feasibility Study to address the feasibility of
  - A hadron collider with a center of mass energy of 100 TeV (FCC-hh)
  - with a highest-luminosity, energy frontier  $e^+e^-$  collider as first stage (FCC-ee)
- FCC-ee fills the need for a precision EW/Higgs factory
  - Design targets
    - 75 ab<sup>-1</sup>/IP at Z-pole (91 GeV)
    - 5 ab<sup>-1</sup>/IP at WW-threshold (161 GeV)
    - 2.5 ab<sup>-1</sup>/IP at ZH (240 GeV)
    - 0.8  $ab^{-1}/IP$  at  $t\bar{t}$  -threshold (365 GeV)
    - Other operation mode (direct H production)
      under study





### Overview and design choices

- Double ring  $e^+e^-$  collider with a circumference of 91 km
- Four experimental straights
  - Asymmetric layout around interaction points to limit SR towards detector
  - Horizontal crossing angle of 30 mrad and crab waist collision scheme
- Minimal changes of the layout between operation modes and layout compatible with hadron collider
- Synchrotron radiation power limited to 50 MW/beam at all energies
- Full energy booster in the same tunnel to enable top-up injection



### Parameters

○ FCC

Parameter [4 IPs, 91.1 km,T <sub>rev</sub> =0.3 ms]	Z	ww	H (ZH)	ttbar
beam energy [GeV]	45	80	120	182.5
beam current [mA]	1280	135	26.7	5.0
number bunches/beam	10000	880	248	40
bunch intensity [10 <sup>11</sup> ]	2.43	2.91	2.04	2.37
SR energy loss / turn [GeV]	0.0391	0.37	1.869	10.0
total RF voltage 400 / 800 MHz [GV]	0.120/0	1.0/0	2.08 / 0	2.5 / 8.8
long. damping time [turns]	1170	216	64.5	18.5
horizontal beta* [m]	0.1	0.2	0.3	1
vertical beta* [mm]	0.8	1	1	1.6
horizontal geometric emittance [nm]	0.71	2.17	0.64	1.49
vertical geom. emittance [pm]	1.42	4.34	1.29	2.98
horizontal rms IP spot size [µm]	8	21	14	39
vertical rms IP spot size [nm]	34	66	36	69
beam-beam parameter $\xi_x$ / $\xi_y$	0.004 / 0.159	0.011 / 0.111	0.0187 / 0.129	0.093 / 0.140
rms bunch length with SR / BS [mm]	4.38 / 14.5	3.55 / 8.01	3.34 / 6.0	1.95 / 2.75
luminosity per IP [10 <sup>34</sup> cm <sup>-2</sup> s <sup>-1</sup> ]	182	19.4	7.26	1.25
total integrated luminosity / year [ab-1/yr]	87	9.3	3.5	0.65
beam lifetime rad Bhabha + BS [min]	19	18	6	9

**Reference** 

### **Evolution of tunnel layout**

- Continued studies to optimize the placement of the ring in the Geneva basin have concluded on a new baseline tunnel layout
  - Many factors to consider: Geology, Infrastructure, Access tunnels, Periodicity, ..

- For feasibility study, new tunnel baseline with circumference of 91 km, 8 access shafts, and four-fold periodicity
- Detailed investigations of high-risk area foreseen



### Arc cell optics

) FCC

- · FODO cell is used in the arcs due to high packing factor
  - Large momentum compaction at Z and W required for mitigation of collective instabilities and low  $\epsilon_x$  for H and  $t\bar{t}$  operation
  - In current lattice, variable cell length implemented
    - For Z and W, cell length of ~100m
    - Reduce cell length for H and  $t\bar{t}$  to 50m by installing quadrupoles in the gaps between dipoles
  - Tapering of magnets along the ring to compensate for sawtooth effect
  - Tuning studies ongoing to define required correctors and tolerable field quality (see presentation by J. Keintzel)



K. Oide

### Arcs cell design

- For testing and optimizing fabrication, integration, and transport, a mock-up of an arc half-cell is in planning
  - Including booster hardware on top of the collider
  - See presentation by J. Bauche on Tuesday on Magnet design





Arc perspective view, F. Valchkova-Georgieva

- In the current design, all arc magnets are normal conducting
  - To reduce power consumption, option with nested SC quadrupoles and sextupoles under consideration



### **Experimental IR**

○ FCC

- Common IR layout for all working points
  - L\* of 2.2 m and horizontal crossing angle of 30 mrad
  - Weak bending of dipoles upstream of IP to keep SR *E<sub>crit</sub>* < 100 keV</li>
  - Detector solenoid with 2 T locally compensated by anti-solenoids
  - Local chromaticity correction in vertical plane, combined with crab sextupoles





Operation mode	β <sub>x</sub> [mm]	β <sub>y</sub> [mm]
Z	100	0.8
W	200	1
Н	300	1
tī	1000	1.6

<sup>400</sup> See K. Oide, PRAB **19**, 111005, Nov. 2016

### **Machine Detector Interface**

- Complex integration of different elements (SC quadrupoles, LumiCal, shielding, diagnostics, ..)
  - Mechanical integration, thermal analysis, and discussion on alignment strategy ongoing



FCC



#### From arXiv:2105.09698

- SR background from last dipoles and quadrupoles upstream of IP and location for SR collimators under study
- Beamstrahlung radiation to require a photon dump downstream of IP
- Studies on vibration tolerances ongoing
  (see presentation by E. Montbarbon on Thursday)

	Total Power [kW]	Mean Energy [MeV]
z	370	1.7
ww	236	7.2
ZH	147	22.9
Тор	77	62.3

A. Ciarma, et al.

### **RF** insertions

FCC

- After preliminary survey of surface sites, recommendation is to place RF in points H and L
  - To reduce the uncertainty on center-of-mass energy, RF located in a single place for Z and W operation
  - In  $t\bar{t}$  operation, RF cavities distributed between points H and L
- At Z and W, separate RF for each beam
  - Beam crossing in the middle of the insertion
- Common RF for H and  $t\bar{t}$  operation modes







11



### Collimation

FCC

- Stored beam energy in FCC-ee reaches 20.7 MJ, similar to heavy ion operation in LHC
  - A halo collimation system is being developed to protect equipment (e.g. SC final focus quadrupoles) from unavoidable loss
  - One straight section to host both betatron and momentum collimation





IPA (Exp.)  $= 9.6 \ km$ IPL IPB (RF) (Inj./Extr.) IPJ IPD Lsss = 1.4 km (Exp.) (Exp. IPH IPF (RF) (Coll.)  $1.55 = 2.1 \ km$ IPG (Exp.

## **Top-up** injection

FCC

- Top-up injection essential ingredient to maximize integrated luminosity
- Four feasible injection schemes have been identified
  - Multipole kicker injection using a special kicker with zero on-axis field
  - Orbit bump injection using a one turn bump
  - Both schemes also work off-momentum



Tracking studies under way to determine impact on stored beam and evaluate injection efficiency of each mode

in the presence of errors





M. Aiba, P. Hunchak



### Sextupoles and DA optimization

• For on-momentum top-up injection, a dynamic aperture of more than  $15\sigma$  is required

- For off-momentum injection, DA >  $5\sigma$  for chosen setting of  $\Delta p/p$
- Target for momentum acceptance based on beam lifetime in the presence of large energy spread due to beamstrahlung
  - For  $t\bar{t}$ , requirement is  $\delta_{acceptance} > 2.8\%$ , while for Z, threshold  $\delta_{acceptance} > 1.3\%$
- Chromaticity correction by families of non-interleaved sextupole pairs, with –I transform between sextupoles
  - All 75(Z) / 146 (tt̄) sextupole pair used in dynamic aperture optimization





### Sextupoles and DA optimization

 Sufficient dynamic aperture and momentum acceptance is found

- Tracking for 2 times long. damping time 45 turns (tt) / 2500 turns (Z), including tapering & SR
- Achievable performance  $t\bar{t}$ in presence of misalignments together with different sextupole powering schemes to be studied



### Conclusions

- The European Strategy Update 2020 recommends feasibility study of a 100 TeV centre-of-mass hadron collider with an electron-positron collider as first stage
  - Profiting from many accelerator developments in the past decades, the FCC-ee aims at  $e^+e^-$  collision with unprecedented energies and record luminosity
  - Sheer size and ambitious parameter set provide interesting challenges

- Next steps are to provide a consistent baseline design for the mid-term review in mid 2023
  - Iteration in time for the completion of the Feasibility Study Report in 2025
  - Investigate alternative options with significant impact on cost or performance to define required R&D and timeline

## Thanks for your attention!