

Plans for Future Energy Frontier Accelerators to Drive Particle Physics Discoveries

MARK PALMER



NADIA PASTRONE



JINGYU TANG



MARLENE TURNER



Early-Career

ALEXANDER VALISHEV



Overview

- Introduction
 - Snowmass and **AF 4**
- Community Input Received
- **AF4** Concept Maturity Evaluation
- **AF4** Outcomes
- Summary & Conclusions

What is Snowmass?



Snowmass is a **Particle Physics Community Planning Exercise** and is a scientific study. It provides an opportunity for the entire particle physics community to come together to identify and document a scientific vision for the future of particle physics in the U.S.

Snowmass cycle: ~8 Years,
Snowmass 2021: 18
Months + 10 day Meeting in
Seattle.



Snowmass and AF4

Seattle
Meeting



Ten Frontiers:

- Energy Frontier
- Neutrino Physics Frontier
- Rare Processes and Precision Measurements Frontier
- Cosmic Frontier
- Theory Frontier
- **Accelerator Frontier**
- Instrumentation Frontier
- Computational Frontier
- Underground Facilities
- Community Engagement

Seven Working Groups within the AF:

- AF1: Beam Physics and Accelerator Education
- AF2: Accelerators for Neutrinos
- AF3: Accelerators for EW/Higgs
- **AF4: Multi-TeV Colliders**
- AF5: Accelerators for PBC and Rare Processes
- AF6: Advanced Accelerator Concepts
- AF7: Accelerator Technology R&D

Collect Community Input via LOIs and White Papers

Full list of LOI's:
<https://snowmass21.org/loi>

Coordination


Full list of white papers:
<https://snowmass21.org/loi>

Beam Mat. Int	CERN	M.Calviani	Future colliders	AF7-AF4	159	Marco.Calviani@cern.ch
Cooling R&D	JLAB	Y.Zhang	Hadron accel.	AF7-AF4	108	yzhang@jlab.org
Cosmic Ray	FNAL	D.Schiff	Cosmic Ray Observ	CF7-CR0-EF6-EF7-AF4-AF0	83	dschiff@udel.edu
Detector	MCC/INFN	C.Aime	MC	IF9-EF3-EF9-EF0-AF4-AF1	143	Collaboration
Diagnostics	LANL/SLAC	A.Scheinker	CLIC	AF1-AF4	29	ascheink@lanl.gov
Dynamics	CERN	E.Adli	Options	AF1-AF4	161	erik.adli@yale.edu
Energy Rec.	IBF	A.Marakh	IBEL	AF6-AF4	79	marakh@ibf.sciencem.com
Machine	CERN	O.Brueening	LHeC/FCC-eh	AF3-AF4-EF0	195	Oliver.Brueening@cern.ch
Machine	FNAL	PC.Bhat	Options	AF3-AF4-EF0	237	pushpa@fnal.gov
Machine	SLAC	E.A.Nanni	erlie-LC	AF3-AF4-EF1-EF2	245	nanni@slac.stanford.edu
Machine	ANL	C.Jing	AFLC (linear C.)	AF6-AF4	88	c.jing@evclitechlabs.com
Machine	BNL	C.B.Schroeder	Laser P. Linear C.	AF6-AF4	216	CSchroeder@lbl.gov
Machine	BNL	S.Jindariani	MC	EF0-TF7-TF0-AF4-AF3-IF0	234	sergo@fnal.gov
Machine Learning	SLAC	BD.O'Shea	Future colliders	AF6-AF4-CompP3/F2	165	boshe@slac.stanford.edu
Machine option	FNAL	PC.Bhat	Future colliders	EF0-AF4-AF3	239	pushpa@fnal.gov
Magnets	FNAL	E.Sarf	MC	AF7-AF4	199	barzi@fnal.gov
MDI	FNAL	G.Amaroso	Future colliders	AF7-AF4	54	amaroso@fnal.gov
MDI	C.Aime	MC	MC	TF7-TF0-EF4-EF0-AF4-AF0	46	author list
Neutrino	Imp.CL	K.Long	nuSTORM	NF6-NF2-EF0-AF2-AF4	82	long@imperial.ac.uk
Physics	FNAL	M.Szwarc	MC	EF1-EF4-AF3-AF4	177	mszwarc@fnal.gov
Physics	FNAL	H.Weber	MC	EF8-EF9-TF7-TF0-AF4-AF0	228	hweber@fnal.gov
Plasma Acc	SLAC	S.Gessner	Plasma LC	AF6-AF4	168	sgessn@slac.stanford.edu
Plasma Acc	C.Joshi	PWFA	AF6-AF6	251	joshi@uci.edu	
R&D for Innov.	MIT	W.Barletta	Acc Science	AF7-AF4	64	wbarletta@lbl.gov
Synergy	CUNY	L.Anchordoqui	Astro and Col. Physics	CF7-CR0-EF6-EF7-AF4-AF0	74	lu.anchordoqui@gmail.com
Target Mat.	INFN	R.L.Voti	MC-LEMMA	AF7-AF4	137	roberto.livio@unimol.it
Waterfield Acc.	ANL	J.Shao	SWA demo	AF6-AF4	42	jshao@anl.gov
Waterfield Acc.	ANL	C.Jing	SWA demo	AF6-AF4	90	c.jing@evclitechlabs.com

Machine Concept LOI's:

Machine	CERN	S.Stapnes	CLIC	AF4-AF3-EF0	177	steinar.stapnes@cern.ch
Machine	TAMU	P.McIntyre	Collider in Sea	AF4-AF0	239	mcintyre@physics.tamu.edu
Machine	JLAB	Y.Zhang	eh Collider	AF4-AF0	144	yzhang@jlab.org
Machine	CERN	M.Benedikt	FCC-hh	AF4-AF1-EF0	153	Michael.Benedikt@cern.ch
Machine		Krasny	gamma-gamma			mieczyslaw.witold.krasny@cern.ch
Machine	FNAL	A.Grassellino	ILC	AF4-AF0	75	annag@fnal.gov
Machine	CERN	D.Schulte	MC	AF4-AF0-EF0	103	daniel.schulte@cern.ch
Machine	MCC/CERN	S.Schulte	MC	AF4-AF7	102	daniel.schulte@cern.ch
Machine	MCC/RAL	T.Rogers	MC at CERN	AF4-AF7-EF0	65	chris.rogers@stfc.ac.uk
Machine	INFN	M.Biagini	MC-LEMMA	AF4-AF7	135	marica.biagini@lnf.infn.it
Machine	MCC	S.Machida	MC/Neutrino	AF4-AF2	36	shinji.machida@stfc.ac.uk
Machine	IHEP	J.Tang	SPPC	AF4-AF0	21	tangjy@ihep.ac.cn

Dynamics	MCC	T.Rogers	MC	AF4-AF6	66	chris.rogers@stfc.ac.uk
Dynamics	FNAL	Y.Alexahin	MC	AF4-AF7	34	makhov@fnal.gov
Dynamics	TAMU	P.McIntyre	Collider in Sea	AF4-AF0	24	mcintyre@physics.tamu.edu
Dynamics	JLAB	SA.Bogacz	MC	AF4-AF0	109	bogacz@jlab.org
Dynamics	FNAL	K.Yonehara	MC	AF4-AF0	33	yonehara@fnal.gov
General	FNAL	S.Nagarisev	Future accelerators	AF4-AF3-EF0-NF0-RF0	25	sergei@fnal.gov
Magnets	BNL	K.Amm	Future accel. and exp.	AF4-AF7	167	Collaboration
Magnets	BNL	S.Prestemon	Next G Colliders	AF4-AF7	187	soprestemon@lbl.gov
Magnets	IHEP	Q.Xu	SPPC	AF4-AF7	22	xuq@ihep.ac.cn
Magnets	MIT	D.Park	MC	AF4	169	dk_park@mit.edu
MDI	INFN	N.Bartosik	MC	AF4-AF7-IF9-IF0	104	nazar.bartosik@to.infn.it
Physics		Dallavalle	TeV Lepton/tau neutrino	AF4-AF0-EF3-EF0-NF6-NF10	81	marco.dallavalle@cern.ch
RF	BNL	T.Luo	MC/Muon cooling	AF4-AF7	93	lluo@lbl.gov
SRF	OxU	I.Konoplev	Linear and Circular	AF4-AF6	101	ivan.konoplev@physics.ox.ac.uk

Energy Frontier Desires > 10 TeV CoM Collider

Part of the Snowmass Goal: Enable communication between Frontiers.

- **Message from the Energy Frontier:** interest to explore particle collisions where the constituent center-of-mass energy is $E(\text{cm}) > 10$ TeV.
 - challenge for HEP community: collider concepts that can achieve >10 TeV energy scale have a broad spread in maturity
 - focus of AF4 has been a review of the machine options for hadron and lepton collider technologies that **may provide a path to this threshold**,
 - evaluate their maturity.

Energy Frontier Desires > 10 TeV CoM Collider

- **Message from the Energy Frontier:** interest to explore particle collisions where the constituent center-of-mass energy is $E(\text{cm}) > 10$ TeV.
 - focus of AF4 has been a review of the machine options for hadron and lepton collider technologies that may provide a path to this threshold,
 - evaluate their maturity.
- Earliest timescale for making a **construction decision** for such a discovery machine will be sometime in the next decade.

AF4 Maturity Evaluation

Design Maturity	Maturity Criteria #1 (Design Maturity)	Maturity Criteria #2 (R&D Maturity)
0	No end-to-end design concept prepared	Concept proposed, but no systematic design requirements and/or parameters available.
1	No end-to-end design concept prepared	Concept proposed, proof-of-principle R&D underway
2	End-to-end preliminary design concept under development	Ongoing R&D to address fundamental physics/technical issues .
3	End-to-end preliminary design concept available	Sub-system operating parameters established based on preliminary design concepts for novel/critical sub-systems
4	End-to-end integrated design concept under development	Preliminary design concepts with operating parameters established for all sub-systems . Sub-system design R&D underway.
5	End-to-end integrated design concept available. Enables end-to-end performance evaluation .	Sub-system preliminary designs exist. Sub-system design R&D continues.
6	End-to-end performance evaluation complete. Reference (pre-CDR level) Design Report under development.	Sub-system performance risk assessment complete.
7	Reference Design available. Sub-system parameters and high potential alternatives documented.	Sub-system detailed design and performance R&D for highest risk sub-systems underway.
8	Conceptual Design Report in preparation.	Sub-system specifications with validated operating parameters established. High risk sub-system R&D underway.
9	Conceptual Design Report and detailed cost estimate available.	High risk sub-system R&D ongoing. Risk mitigation strategy for sub-system performance established.
10	Ready for Construction Proposal . Detailed Engineering Design being developed.	Performance Optimization R&D underway.

- Evaluations focused in two key criteria of the facility concept:
 - Design Maturity: What is the status of the full machine design?
 - R&D Maturity: What is the status of the R&D for each of the accelerator sub-systems required to fully specify the machine design?

Disclaimer: non-linear color scale, 0-10, with 10 the most mature.

Evaluation of Concept Maturity

Collider Concepts			
Technical Maturity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low maturity conceptual development. • Proof-of-principle R&D required. • Concepts not ready for facility consideration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emerging accelerator concepts requiring significant basic R&D and design effort to bring to maturity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designs have achieved a level of maturity to have reliable performance evaluations based on prior R&D and design efforts. • Critical project risks have been identified and sub-system focused R&D is underway where necessary.
Funding Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding for basic R&D required. • Availability of "generic" accelerator test facility access often necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efforts would benefit from directed R&D funding to mature collider concepts. • Availability of test facilities to demonstrate a broad range of technology concepts required. • Some large-ticket demonstrators are generally necessary before a detailed "reference" design can be completed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding approach typically transitions to "project-style" efforts with significant dedicated investment required.

- **Green-shaded:** designs sufficiently mature to enable an informed decision about the proposed approach for physics performance, cost, and risk.
- **Yellow-shaded:** concepts require significant technology R&D and more detailed design studies to fully evaluate their realistic physics potential and to understand both the risks and costs of the approach.
- **Red-shaded:** concepts are very preliminary concepts that cannot be qualitatively compared with other designs.

Evaluation of Concept Maturity

Collider Concepts	<p>Collider-in-Sea</p> <p>MuIC</p> <p>Multi-TeV ILC</p> <p>WFA</p> <p>ReLIC (≤ 3 TeV)</p> <p>MuC</p> <p>CCC (TeV)</p> <p>SppC</p> <p>FCC-eh</p> <p>TeV ILC (Nb)</p> <p>FCC-hh</p> <p>CLIC</p>
Technical Maturity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low maturity conceptual development. • Proof-of-principle R&D required. • Concepts not ready for facility consideration.
Funding Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding for basic R&D required. • Availability of "generic" accelerator test facility access often necessary.

- **Blue:** Concepts offer a path to constituent center-of-mass collision energies > 10 TeV.
- **Orange:** electron-hadron machines.
- More details in AF4 report.

Evaluation of Concept Maturity

Collider Concepts	WFA		MuC	SppC	FCC-hh
	Collider-in-Sea	MuIC	ReLIC (≤3 TeV)	FCC-eh	CLIC
		Multi-TeV ILC	CCC (TeV)		TeV ILC (Nb)
Technical Maturity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low maturity conceptual development. • Proof-of-principle R&D required. • Concepts not ready for facility consideration. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emerging accelerator concepts requiring significant basic R&D and design effort to bring to maturity. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designs have achieved a level of maturity to have reliable performance evaluations based on prior R&D and design efforts. • Critical project risks have been identified and sub-system focused R&D is underway where necessary.
Funding Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding for basic R&D required. • Availability of "generic" accelerator test facility access often necessary. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efforts would benefit from directed R&D funding to mature collider concepts. • Availability of test facilities to demonstrate a broad range of technology concepts required. • Some large-ticket demonstrators are generally necessary before a detailed "reference" design can be completed. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding approach typically transitions to "project-style" efforts with significant dedicated investment required.

- Concepts shown in **yellow**-shaded region have the potential to achieve sufficient maturity within the next decade for evaluation by the HEP community.
- It is important to note that the necessary technical maturity for these concepts, and hence the ability to evaluate both the overall physics performance as well as cost scale, cannot be delivered without dedicated Collider R&D research investment over the next several years.

AF4 Outcomes

- To provide reliable inputs to the HEP community, concepts in the red/yellow regions need to mature.
 - Need for a focused collider R&D program in the US.
 - Initiative has been part of the AF 4 discussion and Snowmass discussions in general.
 - White paper submission:

July 14, 2022

U.S. National Accelerator R&D Program on Future Colliders

P.C. BHAT^{1,†}, S. BELOMESTNYKH^{1,5}, A. BROSS¹, S. DASU⁶, D. DENISOV⁴, S. GOURLAY⁷,
S. JINDARIANI¹, A.J. LANKFORD^{8,†}, S. NAGAITSEV^{1,2,†}, E.A. NANNI³, M.A. PALMER⁴,
T. RAUBENHEIMER³, V. SHILTSEV¹, A. VALISHEV¹, C. VERNIERI³, F. ZIMMERMANN⁹

<https://arxiv.org/pdf/2207.06213.pdf>

Synergies

- Wakefield accelerators connect and couple to:
 - Light source, nuclear security, rare process physics applications
 - Compact Medical applications and unique treatment options
- Muon colliders couple to:
 - Material science applications
 - Rare processes with the most intense muon source ever developed
 - Neutrino physics program
- High field magnet R&D:
 - Benefits hadron and muon colliders
 - Industrial applications
- Lepton colliders:
 - multi-TeV research with EW/Higgs research

Summary

- AF4 collected and structured community input on multi-TeV colliders
- EF emphasized interest in colliders with > 10 TeV CoM energies
- AF4 evaluated concept maturity and found that a focused US collider R&D program would allow to provide informed decisions for the HEP community