Fermilab **ENERGY** Office of Science



Towards Linac RF Optimization with Machine Learning

Ralitsa Sharankova, Kiyomi Seiya, Matilda Mwaniki, Michael Wesley 3rd ICFA workshop 3 November 2022

Contents

- Fermilab Linac Introduction
- RF Tuning goals and methods
- Linac Diagnostics
- Machine Learning methods for RF Optimization
- Summary and Outlook



The Fermilab Linac



- Pre-accelerator
 - Magnetron H- source + LEBT + RFQ + MEBT
- Linac: Drift tube (DTL) and side-coupled (SCL) parts
 - DTL: 5 tanks, 201 MHz RF
 - SCL: 7 modules, 805 MHz RF
 - Transition section: buncher and vernier

StatusLinac output:~20mAPulse length:35 μsecEfficiency:95%

辈 Fermilab

Linac RF Systems

DTL RF system elements & schematic



- DTL RF system main components
 - LLRF pulse generator
 - Driver: pre-amplification of RF pulse
 - Modulator: provides high-power
 - Power Amplifier
 - Transmission line to cavity



- SCL RF system components
 - LLRF pulse generator
 - PFN: modulator equivalent
 - Klystron
 - Waveguide to cavity



RF Parameter Optimization: Goals

- We strive to deliver stable beam energy and maximal beam current
- Beam emittance and energy can drift (both short and long timescale)
 - Ambient temperature affects cavity resonant phases
 - Source conditions affect emittance & energy
- Tuning RF cavity parameters can help minimize emittance (reduce losses, increase beam current) and stabilize energy
 - Phase: field timing w.r.t. beam
 - Gradient: magnitude of acceleration

Preacc + Linac + debuncher = 17 cavities x2 = 34 parameters



RF Parameter Tuning in Operations

- Hand scan params for min beam losses and max beam current
 - Done ~1/day by operators or experts
- Typically, only tune:
 - Phase set points of RFQ, MEBT buncher, and DTL Tank 5
 - SCL Module 7 phase to improve energy flatness along 35us pulse



Linac TOR and BLM display



RF Parameter Optimization: Going Forward

- Challenges:
 - Losses and currents not always best diagnostic; limited diagnostics in DTL
 - Can only tune 1 param at a time: may be local minima
 - Limited by operator/expert availability
- Ultimate goal: automate Linac RF tuning for all cavities (w/ ML techniques)
- Our approach:

Crucial for successful ML training!

- Step 0: revisit old & develop new diagnostics to ensure robustness of data
- Step 1: demonstrate ML algorithms can accurately model RF parameters given diagnostics data
- Step 2: demonstrate offline momentum control (single/multi cavity)
- Step 3: develop near-line momentum control (using FPGA or other fast hardware)





Beam Loss Monitors (BLMs)

- Measure particle loss: can hint at large longitudinal/transverse emittance
 - Useful for relative comparison rather than in absolute (losses change w/ beam current)
 - Caveat: do not carry information about cause of loss
- BLM distance to beampipe was non-uniform fixed during shutdowns 2021&2022





Beam Loss Monitors (BLMs)

Installed 7+1 PMT BLMs along T1 and T2 \geq



10000

20000

30000

11/3/22

Paddle Signal Delta (V)

Beam Position Monitors (BPMs)

- Measure beam transverse (x&y) position and longitudinal phase
 - Enable energy measurement via ToF
- Fixed mis-labeled cable connections
- Performed cable length calibration for BPMs after last RF cavity
 - Some discrepancy on BPM positions being investigated



SCL Module 7 phase set point (deg)

Beam energy from BPM phase as a function of Module 7 phase set point

No acceleration past last Linac module: BPM phase differences correspond to ToF*



Bunch Length Detector (BLD)

- Measures average longitudinal profile of beam
 - Can help identify longitudinal mismatch (filamentation)
- ➢ Re-commissioned BLD in 2021



Bunch longitudinal profiles



Modeling RF Parameters from Diagnostic Data (1)

- First attempt: use BLM and TOR data to predict RF phase set points
 - Inputs: 30 BLM + 4 TOR (all calibrated TORs and all SCL BLMs)





Modeling RF Parameters from Diagnostic Data (1)

- First attempt: use BLM and TOR data to predict RF phase set points for RFQ, MEBT Buncher, DTL T5
 - Model would not reach desired precision nor train consistently on data 6mo apart: not enough information in DTL; loss patterns **very** different 6mo apart



Modeling RF Parameters from Diagnostic Data (2)

- Second attempt: use BPM data (x, y, long. phase) to predict RF phase set points
 - Inputs: 18 BPM in DTL + 12 BPM in SCL (all DTL BPMs and 1 module in SCL)





Modeling RF Parameters from Diagnostic Data (2)

- Second attempt: use BPM data (x,y,phase) to predict RF phase set points
 - Model trains equally well on data 3 weeks apart
 - Model predicts w/in desired precision for data close in time to training data.



Truth vs. prediction

Modeling RF Parameters from Diagnostic Data (3)

- Second attempt: use BPM data (x,y,phase) to predict RF phase set points
 - Model trains equally well on data 3 weeks apart
 - Model predicts w/in desired precision for data close in time to training data.
 - However prediction much worse on data 3 weeks apart



🚰 Fermilab

Phase prediction error (degrees)

Daily Evolution of Beam Motion

- Started recording and comparing BPM and BLM data hourly several weeks before summer shutdown
 - Observed that beam phase and transverse positions drift even when no Linac RF parameters are changed by hand
 - Changes appear upstream of 1st available Linac diagnostic



Exploring New Parameters for Training

- Have since identified a handful of parameters which seem to correlate with cavity/beam phase readback
 - RFQ phase regulation loop: responds to temperature changes, source output changes, etc. Reference is not cavity phase set point we tune on
 - DTL Marx modulator 'special cell' voltage: variable load capacitor cell used to account for beam loading effects
- In the process of training a new model including these parameters as input



Single Cavity Momentum Control (1)

- US-JP Collaboration Project (Fermilab/PNNL/J-PARC)
- Measure beam energy at end of Linac using ToF (BPM or FCT)
- Model relationship between last RF cavity phase and energy change
- Offline control scheme:
 - Sample beam energy (single pulse or average several pulses)
 - Model inference predicts desired change (if any) to Mod 7 phase setting
 - Automated script enacts change via current control scheme (ACNET)



Single Cavity Momentum Control (2)

- Nearline control scheme:
 - Sample beam energy in slices of 35us pulse
 - Model inference predicts desired change (if any) to Mod 7 phase setting per slice
 - Automated script enacts change via fast hardware (e.g. FPGA)
- Requires a lot of software and hardware dev to implement





Summary and Outlook

- Fermilab Linac delivers 400 MeV H- beam to downstream machines
 - Stable emittance and beam energy are crucial
- RF cavity parameter tuning can help controll emittance growth and energy changes
 - Currently hand-tuning ~1/day
- Our goal: automate RF tuning in stepped approach
 - Revisiting old & developing new beam diagnostics
 - ML modeling of RF phases from observed diagn. data
 - Aim for proof of concept of offline single-cavity momentum control in next couple of months



Supplementary Slides



Bunch length detector: working principle

- Originally designed by A. Freschenko at INR
- Beam hitting wire produces e-
- Wire potential repulses e-towards slit
- Lens focuses e-
- RF deflector: pass zero- -10 kV phase e-, deflect the rest: slice the bunch longitudinally
- RF cavity phase manipulation allows to scan full bunch
- e- collected by EMT

