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## Day 1: Monday

- Spend a few hours in the morning figuring out tuner issue in cavity $D$;
- Mechanical issue found and resolved after an access;
- Tested the station state machine;
- Injected beam, tuned feedback loons;
- One beam loss event at 200 mA due to the user error;
- Reduced integral gain and easily reached 500 mA ;
- Dumped the beam and reinjected from scratch in the "hands-off" mode.
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## Day 2: Tuesday

- Started at 8 AM from capturing some data with SRF1 at 500 mA ;
- Moved to LLRF9;
- Injected to 500 mA in 100 mA steps, captured characterization data at each step;
- Upon completing all the measurements we transitioned to the 7 nm lattice; - Captured data at 100 and 500 mA;
- Two runs in top-up mode, 1.5 and 2 hours.


## Day 2：Tuesday

－Started at 8 AM from capturing some data with SRF1 at 500 mA ；
－Moved to LLRF9；
－Injected to 500 mA in 100 mA steps，captured characterization data at each
－Upon completing all the measurements we transitioned to the 7 nm lattice： －Captured data at 100 and 500 mA；
－Two runs in top－up mode， 1.5 and 2 hours．

## Day 2: Tuesday

- Started at 8 AM from capturing some data with SRF1 at 500 mA ;
- Moved to LLRF9;
- Injected to 500 mA in 100 mA steps, captured characterization data at each step;
- Upon completing all the measurements we transitioned to the 7 nm lattice; - Captured data at 100 and 500 mA ;
- Two runs in top-up mode, 1.5 and 2 hours.


## Day 2: Tuesday

- Started at 8 AM from capturing some data with SRF1 at 500 mA ;
- Moved to LLRF9;
- Injected to 500 mA in 100 mA steps, captured characterization data at each step;
- Upon completing all the measurements we transitioned to the 7 nm lattice;
- Captured data at 100 and 500 mA;
- Two runs in top-up mode, 1.5 and 2 hours.


## Day 2：Tuesday

－Started at 8 AM from capturing some data with SRF1 at 500 mA ；
－Moved to LLRF9；
－Injected to 500 mA in 100 mA steps，captured characterization data at each step；
－Upon completing all the measurements we transitioned to the 7 nm lattice；
－Captured data at 100 and 500 mA ；
－Two runs in top－up mode， 1.5 and 2 hours．

## Day 2：Tuesday

－Started at 8 AM from capturing some data with SRF1 at 500 mA ；
－Moved to LLRF9；
－Injected to 500 mA in 100 mA steps，captured characterization data at each step；
－Upon completing all the measurements we transitioned to the 7 nm lattice；
－Captured data at 100 and 500 mA ；
－Two runs in top－up mode， 1.5 and 2 hours．

## Overall Picture




- Stripcharts sampling at 2 SPS:
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## Bunch-by-

- Klystron forward power and phase.
- Full day 2 AP;
- The first top-up run;
- The second top-up run
- Station voltage is $2820 \pm 1.2 \mathrm{kV}$.
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Cavity voltages



## Glitches Observed During the AP



- Cavity 1 amplitude and phase jump, 0.7\% and $0.3^{\circ}$.
- Cavity 2 responds in a mirror fashion to keep the vector sum fixed;
- Cavities 3 and 4 follow 2;
- Suggests cavity 1 probe signal insertion loss change;
- A few more glitches, now cavity 3;
- Not in the vector sum, no reaction from cavities 1 and 2;
- Unfortunately, AP stripcharts were captured at 2 SPS, not 10. Archiver is only capturing at 1 SPS.
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## Glitch on March 16th






- Fired up stripcharts at 10 SPS and within an hour had a glitch;
- Cavity 1 jumps 2.8\% and $1.5^{\circ}$;
- Cavities 2, 3, and 4 respond to keep the vector sum fixed;
- Cavity 1 tuner responds 1.5 s later, consistent with the 0.5 SPS tuner loop update rate;
- Zoom in close, transition in 100 ms;
- Still consistent with cavity 1 probe signal insertion loss change;
- Forward power increase due to mismatch in cavities 2-4?
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## Bunch-by-bunch Signals and Spectra





- At 500 mA ;
- Station phase is slightly different for LLRF9;
- May affect front-end sensitivity;
- See dramatic reduction in the RMS.
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## Cumulative Spectra


－Clear difference between the cumulative spectra；
－Some difference at 360 Hz ；
－A big difference around 2.7 kHz ；
－Smaller increase around the synchrotron frequency as well．

## Cumulative Spectra


－Clear difference between the cumulative spectra；
－Some difference at 360 Hz ；
－A big difference around 2.7 kHz ；
－Smaller increase around the synchrotron frequency as well．

## AP Summary

## Cumulative Spectra

Cumulative spectra（bunch－by－bunch data，system L）

－Clear difference between the cumulative spectra；
－Some difference at 360 Hz ；
－A big difference around 2.7 kHz ；
－Smaller increase around the synchrotron frequency as well．

## Cumulative Spectra

Cumulative spectra (bunch-by-bunch data, system L)


- Clear difference between the cumulative spectra;
- Some difference at 360 Hz ;
- A big difference around 2.7 kHz ;
- Smaller increase around the synchrotron frequency as well.


## Detailed Spectra



- Broadband noise floor is lower;
- The line at 360 Hz is halved;
- 2.7 kHz is completely absent;
- Synchrotron frequency is less shifted and attenuated.
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## Summary

- Very smooth commissioning for the full beam currents;
- Good stability margins, short-term operation experience suggests this is a fairly robust configuration;
- Field stability is comparable to the old station at offsets above 10 Hz , more stable below;
- Feedback configuration can be further optimized;
- EPICS vector sum control is designed and ready for integration.
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