Boris Keil, Pedro Baeta, Robin Ditter, Fabio Marcellini, Goran Marinkovic, Markus Roggli, Jonas Purtschert (PSI, Villigen, Switzerland)

Overview of SLS 2.0 Beam Based Feedbacks and BPM System

For the ongoing upgrade of the Swiss Light Source (SLS) storage ring, the previous ageing beam-based feedbacks and beam position monitor (BPM) systems are replaced by newly developed versions, where beam commissioning is planned to start in January 2025. Feedbacks include the fast orbit feedback (FOFB), transverse and longitudinal multi-bunch feedback (MBFB), and filling pattern feedback (FPFB). In this contribution, we give an overview of the architectures and development/production status of these feedbacks and of the **BPM system, including latest pre-beam test results.**

Abstract

Summary & Outlook

- The installation of the SLS 2.0 storage ring is in progress, most part of beam pipe & magnets are already installed, with external pre-assembly of most parts. • BPM electronics series production is in progress, expecting the last production batch 1 October 2024. The pilot tone effectively suppresses beam position drift that occurs upstream of the 2x2 crossbar switch in the RFFE, including external 4x splitter for lab tests.
- After pre-beam installation and test of BPM, FOFB, MBFB and FPFB, beam commissioning is expected to start January 2025.
- The electronics of BPMs (designed by PSI), FOFB, MBFB and FPFB is all based on Xilinx/AMD Zynq UltraScale+ MPSoCs, where MBFB and FPFB have additional Multi-GSample/s ADCs and DACs on the chip ("RFSoC"). This maximizes synergies between the systems and simplifies their interfacing.
- 3rd generation synchrotron light source
- User operation since 2001

- **1st beam 1/2025**
- New storage ring: >40x higher hard X-ray brilliance

- Replace ageing SLS 1.0 hardware
- Keep building & linac & booster & storage ring tunnel

SLS 1.0:

SLS 2.0:

SLS 2.0 copper beam pipe • BPM blocks from stainless steel

BPM Requirements and Pickups

- Longitudinal ~kHz beam oscillations: FOFB sees dispersion orbit & removes it from BPM readings before correction.
- FOFB corrects RF frequency periodically \rightarrow longitudinal phase changes
- FOFB stabilizes orbit at MBFB BPM, reducing common mode ADC offset.

Fast Orbit Feedback (FOFB)

Corrector Magnets Tree Topology

• Fiber optic tree network, central FOFB engine • PSI-specific real-time data transfer protocol

Multi-bunch & Filling Pattern Feedback

- Algorithm first in C++ on Zyng UltraScale+ CPU, beam test $@$ SLS 1.0 (~4k corrections/s)
- Final version now implemented in programmable logic (PL) of Zynq U+ (~100k corrections/s)

Low-Latency FOFB Algorithm Implementation in FPGA

- 2 mm stainless steel beam pipe ω correctors (steel elsewhere)
- 4 k corrections/s
- FOFB algorithm distributed on 12 DSP boards

15 days 40nm Beam signal simulated with external RF M3-BPM2:BPM1-POS-STG2-DIFF0-X:Time (Ms **generator. Pilot 40nm signal (SMA output of RFFE) externally with** MRIDI-DRPM3-RPM2:RPM1-POS-STG2-DIFF0-Y: Time (Ms **beam signal,** 16 -0.64 **then sum of** -0.66 **both split 4x to RFFE inputs to centered beam. 40nm** -0.8 -0.6 -0.4 -0.2 MRIDI-DBPM3-BPM2:BPM2-POS-STG2-DIFF0-Y:Time (Ms **Plots show beam 40nm signal -> drift compensation 40nm RFFE has active temperature regulation using 0.1 multiple sensors & heating zones ° per RFFE. C Stability <0.1°C.**

Feedback Loop Latency & Correction Bandwidth (1995)

Lot-Tone Drift Compensation With Pilot-Tone Drift Compensation

- **MBFB** & **FPFB** both based on **RF System-on-Chip (RFSoC)** = Zynq UltraScale+ (used by BPMs/FOFB) + **8x4GSPS ADCs** & **8x6GSPS DACs**
- Replacing analog down/upconverters with **direct ADC sampling** & **direct DAC drive** solution (see poster WEP42)

Dependencies

MBFB ↔ FOFB/BPMs

- 0.35 mm lamination thickness
- 0.5 mm stainless steel beam pipe

SLS 1.0:

SLS 2.0:

- 0.5mm stainless steel pipe @ correctors (copper elsewhere)
- Up to 100 k corrections/s
- FOFB algorithm on single central Zynq UltraScale+ MPSoC

SLS 1.0 & 2.0

• Only one type of orbit corrector magnet, used for static correction and $FOFB \rightarrow$ compromise between strength, bandwidth, and noise

FPFB ↔ FOFB/BPMs

• Stable filling pattern reduces systematic dependency of BPM electronics on filling pattern & beam current

FPFB ↔ MBFB

- Maximum charge in "camshaft bunch" limits MBFB resolution
- Beam stability depends on filling pattern (HOMs, ions, …)

* Temporarily for SLS 2.0 1st beam with optional extra coil windings(disconnected later).

