



EUROfusion

EUROFUSION WPPMI-CP(16) 15725

T Franke et al.

Heating & Current Drive Efficiencies, TBR and RAMI considerations for DEMO

Preprint of Paper to be submitted for publication in
Proceedings of 29th Symposium on Fusion Technology (SOFT
2016)



This work has been carried out within the framework of the EUROfusion Consortium and has received funding from the Euratom research and training programme 2014-2018 under grant agreement No 633053. The views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of the European Commission.

This document is intended for publication in the open literature. It is made available on the clear understanding that it may not be further circulated and extracts or references may not be published prior to publication of the original when applicable, or without the consent of the Publications Officer, EUROfusion Programme Management Unit, Culham Science Centre, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 3DB, UK or e-mail Publications.Officer@euro-fusion.org

Enquiries about Copyright and reproduction should be addressed to the Publications Officer, EUROfusion Programme Management Unit, Culham Science Centre, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 3DB, UK or e-mail Publications.Officer@euro-fusion.org

The contents of this preprint and all other EUROfusion Preprints, Reports and Conference Papers are available to view online free at <http://www.euro-fusionscipub.org>. This site has full search facilities and e-mail alert options. In the JET specific papers the diagrams contained within the PDFs on this site are hyperlinked

Heating & Current Drive Efficiencies, TBR and RAMI considerations for DEMO

T. Franke^{1,2}, P. Agostinetti³, K. Avramidis⁴, A. Bader², Ch. Bachmann¹, W. Biel⁵, T. Bolzonella³, S. Ciattaglia¹, M. Coleman¹, F. Cismondi¹, G. Granucci⁶, G. Grossetti⁷, J. Jelonnek⁴, I. Jenkins⁸, M. Kalsey⁸, R. Kembleton⁸, N. Mantel⁸, J.-M. Noterdaeme^{2,11}, N. Rispoli⁶, A. Simonin⁹, P. Sonato³, M. Q. Tran¹⁰, P. Vincenzi³, R. Wenninger^{1,2}

¹*EUROfusion Consortium, Boltzmannstr. 2, D-85748 Garching, Germany*

²*Max-Planck-Institut für Plasmaphysik, Boltzmannstr. 2, D-85748 Garching, Germany*

³*Consorzio RFX (CNR, ENEA, INFN, Università di Padova, Acciaierie Venete SpA) Corso Stati Uniti 4 – Padova, Italy*

⁴*IHM, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT), Kaiserstr. 12, 76131 Karlsruhe, Germany*

⁵*Institute of Energy- and Climate Research, Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH, Germany*

⁶*Institute of Plasma Physics “P. Caldirola”, National Research Council of Italy, Milan, Italy*

⁷*IAM-AWP, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT), Kaiserstr. 12, 76131 Karlsruhe, Germany*

⁸*Culham Centre for Fusion Energy, Culham Science Centre, Abingdon, Oxfordshire, OX14 35127 3DB, United Kingdom*

⁹*CEA-IRFM, F-13108 Saint-Paul-Lez-Durance, France*

¹⁰*SPC Swiss Plasma Center (SPC), EPFL, CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland*

¹¹*Department of Applied Physics, University Ghent, Ghent, Belgium*

The Heating & Current Drive (H&CD) systems in a DEMOnstration fusion power plant are one of the major energy consumers. Due to its high demand in electrical energy the H&CD efficiency optimization is an important goal in the DEMO development.

The H&CD power for DEMO, based on physics scenarios for the different plasma phases, is needed for plasma initiation phases (incl. breakdown), current ramp-up, heating to H-mode, burn control, controlled current ramp-down, MHD control and other functions. Plasma control will need significant installed H&CD power, though not continuously used.

Previously, in the DEMO1 2015 baseline definitions, optimistic forecasted H&CD efficiencies had been assumed in the corresponding system code (i.e. PROCESS) module. Realizing that there is a high uncertainty in the assumptions the efficiencies have been modified and are discussed in this article. This article discusses the transition from previous to present assumptions and the impact on the DEMO power plant and basic tokamak configuration.

A comparison of the various H&CD systems NBI (Neutral Beam Injection), Electron Cyclotron (EC), Ion Cyclotron (IC) in terms of impact on Tritium Breeding Ratio (TBR) due to various openings for the H&CD front end components in the breeding blanket (BB) is presented.

For increasing the reliability as major features the power per system unit and the redundancy are identified leading to a new proposal for clusters for EC and modular ion-sources for NB.

Keywords: DEMO, Heating Current Drive, Efficiency, Tritium Breeding Ratio, RAMI

1. Introduction

EUROfusion is undertaking a fusion energy research project, which is called DEMO, a DEMONstration fusion power plant. DEMO shall deliver as first of its kind ~300-500MW of electrical energy to the grid. The design has started in 2014 and is in a pre-conceptual design state. During this phase the teams develop different systems to unravel possible design choices and to find the best solutions and combine them to a DEMO which is Tritium self-sufficient and highly reliable.

A future fusion power plant DEMO is considered as a sustainable and more environmental friendly solution compared to any existing conventional power plant technology (e.g. fission, coal) in the world and is independent of natural fluctuations (like wind, solar).

To heat the plasma, extend the pulse time and provide various control functions three H&CD systems are developed for integration in DEMO, namely: Electron Cyclotron (EC) System, Neutral Beam Injection (NBI) System and Ion Cyclotron Range of Frequency (ICRF) System. The Workprogramme does not include Lower Hybrid waves. The DEMO H&CD mix shall be defined at about end of 2024, in the middle of the conceptual design phase.

The present baseline under development is DEMO1, a pulsed machine. As possible alternative a steady-state machine DEMO2 is under study with higher and more demanding physics and engineering assumptions.

2. Heating and Current Drive (H&CD) Efficiencies

The efficiencies are discussed in detail in e.g. [1] and [2]. Both, the current drive & coupling (physics) and wall-plug (systems or transmission) efficiencies have impact to the DEMO design, especially for a steady-state device, in which the ohmic plasma current needs to be replaced completely by auxiliary CD power.

To move closer to a mature design it is proposed to use more realistic state-of-the-art systems efficiencies

(ITER-like values; EC 35% and for NB 25%), this will lead with an assumed mix of 20MW EC plus 30MW NBI power during flat top to an average systems efficiency of 29%. This is a reduction of about 10% to former assumptions. These numbers will be updated based on new and validated findings and a minimum Technical Readiness Level (TRL) of the systems, ideally having been tested in a relevant environment.

For a pulsed machine (pulse duration >2h) an efficiency reduction - as recently studied with PROCESS Code - of either the physics or transmission efficiency by 10% could in principle be compensated by increasing the fusion power/plasma volume and hence the major radius of the tokamak by ~0.1m but with negative consequences on the overall machine costs.

The Workpackage (WP) H&CD target is to carry out intensive R&D on systems efficiencies and doing studies

on how to improve physics based efficiencies in collaboration with the Power Plant Physics & Technology (PPPT) department of EUROfusion.

The total amount of installed H&CD power of DEMO is mainly driven by the power needed for the H-mode access (LH-threshold) and the control during burn phase [3]. This field of activity is under precise evaluation.

The DEMO H-mode access during the plasma ramp-up was simulated with 'METIS', a fast tokamak simulator, and leads in view of uncertainties to 100-150MW_{inj} power applying the ITPA-Martin scaling [4].

Additional MHD control power for Neoclassical Tearing Modes (NTMs) of <10-15MW_{inj} is needed [5].

As long as the required total injected H&CD power is under study each H&CD system (EC, NBI, and ICRF) is developed aiming for ~50MW_{inj} power, knowing that the amount of installed power will be decided at a later state of the DEMO conceptual design.




Fig. 1. Possible integration of the NBI in DEMO [6] (option with 34° injection angle)

Table 1. Main parameters of currently available (quasi off-the-shelf) ITER-like solutions versus new DEMO designs (one example of the most promising candidate solutions for the DEMO EC and NBI systems are shown below, some others are under development).

<i>EC ITER</i>	<i>EC DEMO (under study)</i>	<i>NBI ITER</i>	<i>NBI DEMO (under study)</i>
170 GHz gyrotrons	170 / 204 GHz gyrotrons	Single source (n=1)	Modular sources (n=20)
1 MW	2 MW	1000 keV, 17 MW	800 keV, 17 MW
Efficiency 35% (system), (Gyrotron ~50% + TL + MOU + Launcher + PS)	Efficiency ~50% (system), (Gyrotron ~60% + TL + MOU + Launcher + PS)	Efficiency 25% (system) (Neutralizer ~55%, stripping/halo 70%, etc.)	Efficiency ~50% (system) (Neutralizer ~70%, stripping/halo 90%, etc.)
Evacuated TL	Evacuated Quasi-optical TL	Gas-Neutralizer	Photo-Neutralizer
Front-steering antenna	Remote-steering antenna	Cryopumps	NEG pumps/Hg pump

3. Tritium Breeding Ratio (TBR) considerations for H&CD

As initial target the maximum reduction of the TBR due to the integration of auxiliary systems in the breeding blanket was defined as $\Delta TBR \leq 0.08$. This number is assumed to be equally shared by (i) all H&CD systems & (ii) all Diagnostic systems. The value might be modified in the future depending on the local tritium breeding performance of the breeding blanket. The integration of the different H&CD systems into DEMO is currently studied by H&CD in collaboration with the Breeding Blanket project [7].

Some initial results and their TBR impact are discussed below.

3.1 EC launcher

The currently studied EC port plug design options are: (i) Blanket Integrated Design (plugged into the blanket) and (ii) Separated Blanket Module (SBM) (cf. Fig. 2). For the SBM two different arrangements of the launchers are under assessment, stacked 1x8 or 2x4 (rows x columns). The design depends also on the launcher technology with the focus on the Remote Steering Antennae (RSA) or alternatively on step-tunable gyrotrons (requiring Brewster windows), or a combination of both.

Neutronic calculations [8] result in ΔTBR of $\sim 0.0175 - \sim 0.035$ for $50MW_{inj}$ with power launched through 5 equatorial ports.




Fig. 2. EC conceptual launcher design example

3.2 ICRF antenna

The ΔTBR of the ICRF travelling wave antenna (TWA) for DEMO (cf. Fig. 3) quantified in [9] has values of less than ~ 0.006 , depending on the blanket

concept. The calculations were however done for the antenna only, neglecting the RF feeders.

Different feeding schemes (number and size of RF feeders) and related integration issues are under assessment. The feeding could be done (i) through the Central Outboard Segment (COBS) of the Breeding Blanket (BB), alternatively (ii) through both the Right and Left Outboard Segments (ROBS and LOBS) of the BB. For both alternatives a 1 line feeding or a 2 line feeding is actually considered.

The total number of feeders may vary between 36 (COB with 1 line feeding) up to 144 (ROBS and LOBS with 2 line feeding). The final ΔTBR of the TWA with RF feeders is not yet available and depends on which feeding configuration is chosen.




Fig. 3. ICRF 360° TWA antenna (1 of 18 sectors), RF feeding scheme still to be defined

3.3 NBI duct

Depending on the integration strategy the ΔTBR is expected to be in the range of ~ 0.002 to ~ 0.006 for one NB injector. For the present assumption of 3 injectors (power launched from 3 inclined equatorial NB ports) and a partially voided port design (cf. Fig. 4), the NBI ΔTBR can be expected to be in the range of about 0.006 to 0.018 for $50MW_{inj}$.




Fig. 4. NB blanket integration proposal

4. RAMI approach for H&CD

In a nuclear power plant environment maintenance periods are optimised. To ensure DEMO availability target are met, H&CD is applying from the concept stage RAMI methodology. The following tasks are proposed.

Firstly, define the interfaces of the H&CD. An example is shown in Table 2 based on the DEMO Plant Breakdown Structure (PBS).

Table 2. Example of interfaces matrix

Demo PBS (partially)	EC	NB	IC
Magnet System	x	x	x
Vacuum Vessel	x	x	x
Divertor			
Thermal Shields			
Tritium Fuelling Vacuum (TFV)	x	x	x

Secondly, define the Functional Break Down Structure (FBS) of the H&CD with primary functions (cf. Table 3) and constraint functions (cf. Table 4). For each interface identified a minimum of one constraint function should be attributed.

Table 3. Example of H&CD primary functions

Function N°	Functions
1	To control the fuel mix
1.1	To heat the fuel mix
1.1.1	To heat fuel mix to break down
1.1.2	To heat plasma to H mode
1.1.3	To heat plasma to burn
1.2	To drive the plasma current
...
2	To condition the wall

Table 4. Example of constraint functions

Function N°	Interaction with PBS	Constraints function
n	Magnet System	To fit through magnetic coil system
n+1	Vacuum Vessel	To maintain & control vacuum at the interface with plasma chamber

Thirdly, attribute the primary functions to the H&CD system.

Fourthly, define at which machine state the system is performing the function.

The following steps will involve a further decomposition of the functions at the subsystem level followed by a Failure Mode Effect Analysis (FMEA). Having a clear understanding of the failure mode at an early concept stage is paramount to integrate, at minimum cost, the reliability, maintenance, monitoring and inspection requirements in the design.

4.1 Examples of reliability study for H&CD

New proposals for DEMO to improve the reliability of the auxiliary heating systems are shown below (cf. Table 5) to give with a few examples an indentation about the type and direction of the strategy.

Table 5. Examples for aiming higher H&CD reliability

EC System	NBI System	ICRF System
Clustered solution (cf. Fig. 6) to minimise the number of EC components	Increase number of sources (stacked 2 x 10 modular sources) instead of single source.	TWA as integrated part of the breeding blanket with the same reliability as the blanket.
Maximize the systems reliability, ~100% achieved after initial burn in	Decrease beam energy from 1 MeV (ITER) to 800 keV (DEMO)	Avoid antenna arcing due to lower power density (360° TWA)

The clustered solution for the EC system (ECS) will be discussed in some more detail below. Fig. 5 shows first the principle of a simple Electron Cyclotron Line (ECL) which is commonly used in present day experiments.




Fig. 5. Simple (ECL) Configuration

A clustered ECL is shown in Fig. 6. and is composed of 1 to n components and B1 to Bm backup components.




Fig. 6. Cluster EC Line (ECL) Configuration

For the case $n = 1$ (and without backup components $m = 0$) the ECL is - except the Power Switch (PS) - the same as in Fig. 5 with only 1 PSU (Power Supply Unit), 1 Gyrotron (G), 1 Transmission Line (TL) and 1 Launcher (L). For a higher number of EC lines ($n > 1$, $m \geq 1$) the reliability R_{ECS} of the ECS increases whereas the number of items can be reduced as shown in Table 6.

The input values for the study are similar to ITER-assumptions (component R&D targets), and supposed to have a reliability centred maintenance (RCM) approach for DEMO: G 98.0%, TL 99.9%, L 99.9%, PSU 100.0%.

Assuming a single redundancy ($m = 1$) (cf. Table 6) shows which reliability R_{ECS} and MTBF (Mean Time Between Failures) could be achieved. The best configuration can be found for 4+1 ECLs, in which the number of Gyrotrons is 40 (also for L and PS).

Table 6: Cluster ECL configuration with back-up items

n+m	Number of ECLs	R_{ECS}^* (in %)	MTBF (in pulses)	Number of Gyrotrons
1+1	28+1	99,9601	2507	58
2+1	14+1	99,9896	9606	45
3+1	10+1	99,9945	18291	44
4+1	7+1	99,9972	35852	40
5+1	6+1	99,9979	47777	42
6+1	5+1	99,9985	66830	42
7+1	4+1	99,9987	79870	40
8+1	4+1	99,999	100198	45
9+1	4+1	99,999	100200	50

*Assuming lifetime after initial burn in and before end of lifetime cycle

Former integration studies showed that one EC port plug is capable to collect max. 8 EC launchers (cf. chapter 3.1). Assuming the reliability targets are met the ECS will need 5 equatorial DEMO ports.

5. Summary

New H&CD concepts with high wall-plug efficiencies are under investigation. The present estimates regarding the impact on the TBR of the H&CD systems are promising. Detailed studies are ongoing hand-in-hand with the blanket integration. RAMI is

considered from the beginning and proposals were made how to increase present reliability limitations.

Acknowledgments

This work has been carried out within the framework of the EUROfusion Consortium and has received funding from the Euratom research and training programme 2014-2018 under grant agreement No 633053. The views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of the European Commission.

References

- [1] Zohm, H. et al., 'Assessment of H&CD System Capabilities for DEMO', 40th EPS Conference on Controlled Fusion and Plasma Physics, 2013
- [2] Franke, T. et al., 'RF H&CD systems for DEMO - Challenges and opportunities', AIP Conference Proceedings 1580, 207 (2014)
- [3] Biel, W. et al., 'Controlling a DEMO reactor with a sparse set of diagnostics', ICPP conference, Kaohsiung, Taiwan, 27th June 2016
- [4] Vincenzi, P. et al., 'EU DEMO transient phases: main constraints and heating mix studies for ramp-up and ramp-down', 2016, 29th SOFT, P4.19
- [5] Wenninger, R. et al., 'Advances in the physics basis for the European DEMO design', Nuclear Fusion 55 063003, 2015
- [6] Sonato, P. et al., 'Conceptual design of the DEMO NBIs: main developments and R&D achievements', submitted to the 26th IAEA FEC, Oct. 17-22, 2016, Kyoto, Japan
- [7] Cismondi, F. et al., 'Progress in EU-DEMO In-Vessel Components integration', 2016, 29th SOFT, P3.128
- [8] Grossetti, G. et al., 'DEMO Port Plug design and integration studies', submitted to the 26th IAEA FEC, October 17-22, 2016, Kyoto, Japan
- [9] Garcia, A. et al., 'Effect on the tritium breeding ratio for a distributed ICRF antenna in a DEMO reactor', AIP Conf. Proc., Vol.1689, Issue 1, 2015