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## Future Circular Collider Study

Consists of three sub-studies:

- FCC-hh: 100 TeV proton collider
- FCC-ee: 91-350 GeV lepton collider
- FCC-he: electron-proton option

Each study has its own requirements, but technology for FCC-hh is most challenging!

## Constraints on FCC-hh

- Magnet technology $\left(\mathrm{Nb}_{3} \mathrm{Sn}\right)$
- Shape (racetrack vs. circle)
- Geology
- Overlap with LHC (if used as injector)
- Injection, beam dump, experiments

Not covered today:

- Constraints from housing FCC-hh and FCC-ee in the tunnel at the same time
- Constraints from FCC-he


## 1) Bending radius

Proton beam energy: 50 TeV
Beam rigidity: $\quad B \rho=p / e \approx 1.67 \times 10^{5} \mathrm{Tm}$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{B}=20 \mathrm{~T}: & \rightarrow \rho=8.5 \mathrm{~km} \\
\mathrm{~B}=16 \mathrm{~T}: & \rightarrow \rho=10.7 \mathrm{~km}
\end{array}
$$

$B=16 \mathrm{~T}$ achievable with $\mathrm{Nb}_{3}$ Sn technology!
(FCC-ee: $B=55 \mathrm{mT}$ )

## 2) Circumference

- Approx. 67\% of circumference C are bends:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
B=20 \mathrm{~T}, \rho=8.5 \mathrm{~km} & \rightarrow \mathrm{C}=80 \mathrm{~km} \\
\mathrm{~B}=16 \mathrm{~T}, \rho=10.7 \mathrm{~km} & \rightarrow \mathrm{C}=100 \mathrm{~km}
\end{array}
$$

- RF frequency should be a multiple of RF frequency of LHC (bunch to bucket transfer)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \rightarrow C=3 \times 26.7 \mathrm{~km}=80.1 \mathrm{~km} \\
& \rightarrow \mathrm{C}=4 \times 26.7 \mathrm{~km}=106.8 \mathrm{~km}
\end{aligned}
$$

## 3) Layout objectives

Hadron machine

- Max. momentum limited by

$$
\oint B(s) d s
$$

$\rightarrow$ High fill factor
$\rightarrow$ As few straight sections as possible

Lepton machine

- Limited by synchrotron radiation power

$$
P_{\gamma}=\frac{2}{3} \alpha \hbar c^{2} \frac{\gamma^{4}}{\rho^{2}}
$$

$\rightarrow$ High fill factor
$\rightarrow$ High bending radius
$\rightarrow$ Many straight sections for RF to limit sawtooth effect

## FCC-ee: Sawtooth effect



12 RF sections

Energy loss per turn


4 RF sections

$$
x(s)=x_{\beta}+D \frac{\delta p}{p}
$$

(175 GeV beam energy): $\quad \mathrm{U}_{0}=7.7 \mathrm{GeV}(4.3 \%)$
4) Shape

Circular shape (like LHC)

- Preferred for lepton collider


Racetrack (like SSC)

- Most of the infrastructure can be concentrated at two main sites
- Chromaticity correction easier


Courtesy: John Osborne et al.

## 5) Geology



## Boundary Limits:

- East: Pre-Alps
- South: Rhone, Vuache Mountain
- West: Jura
- North: Lake Geneva

Courtesy: John Osborne


## Lake Geneva



- The lake gets deeper to the North
- The Molasse rockhead as well


## $\rightarrow$ The tunnel level must be deeper in the earth

## 80 km circle



Courtesy: John Osborne, Yung Loo

## 100 km circle



Courtesy: John Osborne, Yung Loo
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## Tilting the tunnel

- LEP/LHC: 1.42 \%
$\rightarrow$ Maximize tunnel extend in Molasse, minimize tunnel extend in Limestone and Moraines
$\rightarrow$ Minimize the depth of the access shafts


Courtesy: John Osborne

## 100 km circle with tilt



Courtesy: John Osborne, Yung Loo

# 6) Location relative to LHC 



FCC and LHC should overlap, if LHC is used as injector
Required distance L for transfer lines depends on:

- Difference in depth d
- Magnet technology
- Beam energy
- Max. slope of tunnel 5\%


## Distance for transfer lines



- Required length: $L=500-1500$ m


## 7) Length of Long Straight Sections

Space for septum, kicker magnet and absorbers for machine protection

Injection: Energy: 3.5 TeV

- 600 m

Beam dump: Energy: 50 TeV

- 800 m-1000 m (?)


## Collimation?



## 8) Experiments



## FCC-hh Interaction Region

Interaction region (IR) design for

- Huge Detectors
$\rightarrow L^{*}=46 \mathrm{~m}!!!$
- Length of single IR: $\rightarrow \approx 1100 \mathrm{~m}$
- Small crossing angle: $\rightarrow 11 \mu \mathrm{rad}$
- $\rightarrow \beta^{*}=1.1 \mathrm{~m}$


Court. R. Alemany, B. Holzer

## FCC-ee Interaction Region

Local chromaticity correction scheme


- $\beta_{y}{ }^{*}=1 \mathrm{~mm}, L^{*}=2 \mathrm{~m}!!!$
- Large crossing angle
$\rightarrow 30 \mathrm{mrad}, 11 \mathrm{mrad}$
More about IR design:
Roman Martin's presentation
- IR even longer


## Current FCC-ee design



Circular shape, 100 km circumference

- 12 straight sections
$\rightarrow$ Length: 1.5 km
- 4 experiments
- Length of arcs: 6.8 km

$$
\rightarrow \rho \approx 10.6 \mathrm{~km}
$$

Details of the FCC-ee lattice were presented yesterday in my other talk

## Resume

- Magnet technology sets constraints on bending radius and circumference
- Injection, beam dump, collimation and experiments define length of the straight sections
- Compromise for the layout must be found
- Geology and transfer lines define location of FCC
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## Thank you for your attention!

Court. J. Wenninger

## Unequally distributed RF



## Experiments FCC-ee

Completely different IR design:

- Large crossing angle
- $\beta_{y}=1 \mathrm{~mm}, L^{*}=2 \mathrm{~m}$ !!!
- Local chromaticity correction scheme
- IR length: even larger

More about IR design: Roman Martin's presentation


Court. R. Martin

## FCC-he design parameters

| collider parameters | FCC ERL | FCC-ee ring |  | protons |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| species | $e^{-}\left(e^{+}\right.$? $)$ | $\boldsymbol{e}^{ \pm}$ | $e^{ \pm}$ | $p$ |
| beam energy [GeV] | 60 | 60 | 120 | 50000 |
| bunches / beam | - | 10600 | 1360 | 10600 |
| bunch intensity [ $10^{11}$ ] | 0.05 | 0.94 | 0.46 | 1.0 |
| beam current [mA] | 25.6 | 480 | 30 | 500 |
| rms bunch length [cm] | 0.02 | 0.15 | 0.12 | 8 |
| rms emittance [ nm ] | 0.17 | 1.9 (x) | 0.94 (x) | 0.04 [0.02 y] |
| $\beta_{x, y}{ }^{*}[\mathrm{~mm}]$ | 94 | 8, 4 | 17, 8.5 | 400 [200 y] |
| $\sigma_{x, y}{ }^{*}[\mu \mathrm{~m}]$ | 4.0 |  |  | equal |
| beam-b. parameter $\xi$ | ( $D=2$ ) | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.022 (0.0002) |
| hourglass reduction | $\begin{gathered} 0.92 \\ \left(H_{D}=1.35\right) \end{gathered}$ | ~0.21 | ~0.39 | F.Zimmermann ICHEP14, June |
| CM energy [ TeV ] | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.9 |  |
| luminosity [ $\left.10^{34} \mathrm{~cm}^{-2} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}\right]$ | 1.0 | 6.2 | 0.7 | Preliminary |

## LHeC: IR layout

Interaction Regions for ep with Synchronous pp Operation


Still work in progress: may not need half quad if $L^{*}(e)<L^{*}(p)$


Courtesy Max Klein

- A similar interaction scheme needs to be designed for FCC-he

