Measurement of Cavity BPM Performance

- 1. Goal
- 2. Measurement with Network Analyzer
- 3. Measurement with Beam
- 4. Summary and Outlook

D. Lipka, J. Lund-Nielsen, D. Nölle, M. Siemens, S. Vilcins, Th. Traber; MDI, DESY Hamburg

D. Treyer, M. Stadler; PSI

With special thanks to R. Kammering, J. Kruse, D. Liebertz, J. Liebing, J. Thomas, H.-C. Weddig

Sorry for forgetting somebody!



Goal

Measurement of

- Resonance frequency
- Bandwidth
- Loaded quality factor
- Orthogonal coupling
- Slope Voltage/Offset and Voltage/Charge
- Compare with expectation to improve next generation



Reference and Dipole resonator



Drawing of Cavity BPM







Photos





Produced 3 Cavity BPM: BPM I BPM II BPM III



Measurement setup with Network Analyzer



2 channel network analyzer (NWA), measurement of scattering matrix (Sparameter: S11, S22 [reflection] and S12, S21 [transmission])

Other ports terminated with 50 Ohm





NWA: Rohde & Schwarz

Up to 8 GHz N-Cal-Kit from PSI





Transmission Data: Analysis

Time domain

Frequency domain

$$U(t) = U_{out}e^{-\frac{t}{\tau}}\cos(\omega_{R}t)\Theta(t)$$
Fourier transformation
$$F(\omega) = \frac{U_{out}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{\frac{1}{\tau}+i\omega}{\left(\frac{1}{\tau}+i\omega\right)^{2}+\omega_{R}^{2}}$$

$$f_{R} = resonance \ frequency$$

$$\tau = \frac{Q_{L}}{\pi f_{s}}, \ decay \ time$$
Adapting $|F(\omega)|$ to transmission data gives resonance frequency and loaded

$$Q_L =$$
, loaded quality factor
 $BW = \frac{f_S}{r}$, bandwidth

 Q_L $U_{out} \propto beam offset$ quality factor





Dipole resonator: Results

Parameter	Expected	BPM I	BPM II	BPM III
f _R / MHz	4400±17	4408.7 ± 0.6	4419.0 ± 0.5	4414.5 ± 0.6
BW / MHz	74	70.1 ± 2.2	66.7 ± 0.7	72.9 ± 1.5
Q _L	60	63.0 ± 2.0	66.3 ± 0.7	60.6 ± 1.3

For resonance frequency the reflection data of dipole resonator used too,

Systematic shift of frequency to higher values because of roundings

× ×	



Orthogonal Coupling





HELMHOLTZ | GEMEINSCHAFT

Reference Resonator: Analysis

Only Reflection S11 because one port on this resonator



Adjust *L* until $Re(Z_r)$ constant, point of intersection between *Re* and |Im| gives bandwidth for Q_L with $Z_r + 50$ Ohm



Reference Resonator: Results

Parameter	Expected	BPM I	BPM II	BPM III
f _R / MHz	4400 ± 16	4410.6 ± 0.2	4412.0 ± 0.1	4411.5 ± 0.1
BW/ MHz	70	67.75 ± 0.95	69.59 ± 0.92	70.63 ± 0.36
Q _L	62	65.11 ± 0.91	63.41 ± 0.85	62.46 ± 0.32

Systematic shift of frequency to higher values

because rounding causes this shift



Transmission Data broad frequency range



Adapting $|F(\omega)|$ to broad frequency range transmission data gives resonance frequency and loaded quality factor for higher order modes

Global fit does not describe background perfectly, therefore range per mode restricted



Transmission Data broad frequency range: Results

Mode	Parameter	Expected	BPM I	BPM II	shown
	<i>f_R</i> / MHz	4400 ± 17	4409.0 ± 0.7	4419.2 ± 0.4	
1 IVI ₁₁	Q_{L}	60	62.8 ±1.9	65.4 ± 0.4	Result: Agreement with short range TM ₁₁ , therefore broad range can be used too
TM ₂₁	<i>f_R</i> / MHz	5192	5183.1 ± 0.4	5191.5 ± 0.4	
	Q _L	30	29.2 ± 0.2	29.9 ± 0.2	
TM ₁₂	<i>f_R</i> / MHz	7612	7623.6 ± 3.2	7618.2 ± 1.0	
	Q _L	54	61.6 ± 0.3	60.3 ± 1.8	

Measured values wn

Reflection Data:

Too few data points to get result of quality factor



Summary Network Analyzer Measurement

- Measured frequency, loaded quality factor of dipole and reference resonator
- Measured orthogonal coupling of dipole resonator
- Frequency shifted to higher values due to rounding
- Orthogonal coupling of BPM III higher because of mechanical tolerances



BPM III in Beamline

Beam Measurement with Oscilloscope (6 GHz, 20GS/s), 123 m cable between BPM and Oscilloscope

Available: stepper motor in both transverse directions (x, y)

Test of movement range, boundaries determined by beam loss monitor: Horizontal: between -1.57 and 2.05 mm Vertical: between -2.82 and 0.97 mm

SASE not affected!





Setup



Reference resonator signal always on channel 4 Free port terminated with 50 Ohm load



Attenuation and Phase shift of cables and filters

Signal (pickup port nr.)	Patch cable tunnel side [dB] ∠ [°]	120 m 7/8" Coaxial cable from [2]	Patch cable "Kryo-Anbau" side	Low pass filter	Total
1 D _Y	$1.50 \angle 0$	10.5 ∠ 0	$1.70 \angle 0$	0.49 ∠ 0.0	14.2 ∠ 0.0
2 D _X	1.35 ∠ 3	10.5 ∠ -2.5	1.45 ∠ -5	0.47 ∠ -0.9	13.8 ∠ -5.4
3 D _Y	1.60 ∠ −5	10.5 ∠ 17	1.50 ∠ 8	0.45 ∠ 0.8	14.1 ∠ 20.8
4 D _X	1.55 ∠ 6.5	10.0 ∠ -14	1.50 ∠ 4	0.44 ∠ 3.5	13.5 ∠ 0.0
5 Ref	1.52 ∠ 2.5	9.8 ∠ -7	1.65 ∠ 10	0.54 ∠ -0.9	13.5 ∠ 4.6

Table: Summary of signal losses and phase differences in [dB] and [°].

In addition 10 dB attenuator for Dipole signals and 20 dB for Reference signal



Fit function

To increase oscilloscope resolution for amplitude a fit is applied to the time signal, in addition resonance frequency and loaded quality factor is observed:



For time between $t_{trigger}$ and t_s (transient oscillation):



 $U(t) = U_{out} e^{(t-t_s)f_g} \cos(\omega_R t + \phi)$

 f_{g} gradient frequency

Fit maximum range



- t = 14 ns shows an additional oscillation: reflection between patch cable in tunnel (1.5 m long connected on BPM) and 7/8" coaxial cable
- therefore time of fit limited to $t_{max} = 13$ ns



Fit at small offsets



For small offsets the fit does not describe to the data perfectly, frequency and loaded quality factor at boundary

D. Lipka, MDI, DESY Hamburg



Frequency Domain



Because other frequencies contribute to the signal

But amplitudes from fit are useful at small offsets too; resonance frequency and loaded quality factor are taken outside of the beam offset minimum

Vertical Scan

Charge about 0.65 nC, Voltage corrected to attenuation



Dipole resonator: $f_R = 4417.7 \pm 0.8$ MHz $Q_I = 56.7 \pm 1.8$

Left slope: -6.63 V/mm Right slope: 6.71 V/mm



Reference resonator: $f_R = 4407.4 \pm 0.9$ MHz $Q_L = 68.8 \pm 1.1$

$$U_{mean} = 99.1 \pm 1.3 \text{ V}$$

Errors are standard deviation



Scan Results in horizontal and vertical direction: Slope

	Charge Toroid /	Slope /	Slope /	U _{ref} /	U _{ref} /
	nC	V/mm	V/(mm nC)	V	V/nC
X scan	0.653 ± 0.010	6.62 ± 0.19	10.13 ± 0.33	100.2 ± 1.2	153.4 ± 3.0
Y scan	0.662 ± 0.009	6.67 ± 0.06	10.08 ± 0.15	99.1 ± 1.3	149.8 ± 2.8
Average 20 Pulses X scan	0.656 ± 0.009	6.12 ± 0.16	9.33 ± 0.28	91.2 ± 1.3	138.9 ± 2.8
Average 20 Pulses Y scan	0.649 ± 0.010	5.78 ± 0.29	8.91 ± 0.47	84.7 ± 1.2	130.5 ± 2.8
	Sim	ulation:	9.8 V/(mm nC	() •	92.6 V/nC
Toroid charge almost constant but reference and dipole data decreasing Measurement has to be repeated					



Scan Results in horizontal and vertical direction: f, Q

Dipole resonator:	NWA Measurement:	Expected:
$f_R = 4416.8 \pm 0.6 \text{ MHz}$	4414.5 ± 0.6 MHz	4400 ± 17
$Q_L = 57.0 \pm 0.9$	60.6 ± 1.3	60
Reference resonator: $f_R = 4407.8 \pm 0.1 \text{ MHz}$ $Q_L = 67.1 \pm 0.4$	4411.5 ± 0.1 62.46 ± 0.32	4400 ± 16 62

Frequency domain measurement with higher resolution; here only statistical uncertainty



Crosstalk



Slope of orthogonal Ports shows increase of signal (crosstalk)

Result: -29 dB for all measured orthogonal Ports

Analysis of time data to frequency domain gives slope, results in a crosstalk of -23 dB

NWA Measurement: -20 and -27.5 dB



Crosstalk in time and frequency domain

Question: crosstalk in time domain smaller compared to frequency domain?



Reason: larger loaded quality factor on orthogonal port gives larger signal in frequency domain

Result: Crosstalk depend on analysis/electronics!



Summary Beam Measurement and Outlook

- Measured time signals from cavity BPM: dipole and reference resonator
- Slope of Reference Cavity higher as expected
- Measurements has to be repeated with monitoring charge synchronously
- Crosstalk
- Next prototypes: 3.3 GHz (cooperation decision)
- Number: 3 for resolution measurement installed at FLASH each with stepper motor in both transverse directions
- Status: Design
- Date of installation: Christmas 2008, measurement until April 2009

