

Tungsten sources and core contamination in WEST plasmas: from experiments to simulations

N Fedorczak, S Di Genova, C Guillemaut, R Guirlet, L Cappelli, A Gallo, L Colas, J Romazanov, S Brezinsek, Y Marandet, et al.

▶ **To cite this version:**

N Fedorczak, S Di Genova, C Guillemaut, R Guirlet, L Cappelli, et al.. Tungsten sources and core contamination in WEST plasmas: from experiments to simulations. OSI25 - 25th International Conference on Plasma Surface Interaction in Controlled Fusion Devices, Jun 2022, E-Conference, South Korea. cea-03784806

HAL Id: cea-03784806
https://cea.hal.science/cea-03784806

Submitted on 23 Sep 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

FI22

Tungsten Sources and Core Contamination in WEST Plasmas: From Experiments to Simulations

N Fedorczak[1], S. Di Genova[2], C. Guillemaut[1], R. Guirlet[1], L. Cappelli[2], A. Gallo[1],L. Colas[1], J. Romazanov[3], S. Brezinsek[3], Y. Marandet[4], H. Bufferand[1], H. Yang[1], G. Ciraolo[1], E. Serre[2], E.A. Unterberg[5], C.C. Klepper[5], C.A. Johnson[5], D.C. Donovan[6], S. Kosslow[6], J. Maker[6], A. Grosjean[6], E. Tsitrone[1], J. Bucalossi[1], and the WEST team[6]




DE LA RECHERCHE À L'INDUSTRIE

1 IRFM, CEA-Cadarache, 13108 Saint-Paul-lez-Durance, France
2 M2P2, Aix-Marseille Univ, CNRS, Centrale Marseille, 13013 Marseille, France
3 Forschungszentrum Jülich, 52425 Jülich, Germany
4 PIIM, Aix-Marseille Univ, CNRS, 13013 Marseille, France
5 Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830, USA
6 Department of Nuclear Engineering, University of Tennessee-Knoxville, Knoxville, Tennessee 37916, USA
6 http://west.cea.fr/WESTteam

PSI 2022

Outline




Overview of the *Phase 1* divertor operation

Experimental assessment of tungsten sources & core contamination


Numerical modelling of tungsten sources and transport with transport codes: status & developments

Divertor phase 1: Lower single null operation with *uncooled* divertor



W-coated graphite tiles + actively cooled ITER-like monoblocks

→ Exposed to ~3.5 hours of plasma & 20 GJ of injected energy



Lower hybrid current drive +

Ion cyclotron resonance heating

Up to 8.8MW coupled

Up to 40s steady-state operation in LSN

Divertor heat loads $q_{dep} \leq 6\text{MW.m}^{-2}$ [1]


L-mode operation (limited by radiation)

Regular boronisations, moderate gain

(radiation recovery after 5-10 pulses)

[1] J. Gaspar et al 2021 Nucl. Fusion 61

Divertor phase 1: significant surface bombardment




W-coated graphite tiles + actively cooled ITER-like monoblocks

→ Exposed to ~3.5 hours of plasma & 20 GJ of injected energy

→ Deuterium fluency E26~27 m^{-2} (wetted area ~ 1 m^2)

→ Gross tungsten erosion ~ few μm + co-deposition




Deposition/erosion: impact on infra-red surface emissivity

J. Gaspar P003

M. Diez TI07 (Tuesday)


Radiated fraction (~60%) weakly impacted by plasma scenario



Standard scenario: LSN, $B_T = 3.7T, q_{95} = 4.5$, w/o boronisation

- line averaged density from 2 to 6 10^{19}m^{-3}
- total input power from 0.5 to 8 MW


→ **"Stiff" radiated fraction: no dependence with plasma density**
weak with input power



$c_W \approx 10^{-4}$


$c_{lowZ} \approx 10^{-2}$

Core tungsten concentration ~10^{-4}, generally stable in time



Central tungsten density estimated with:

- **Absolutely calibrated VUV spectrometer Γ_{ph}^{WX+} $(T_e \geq 3keV)$ [1]**
- **Bolometry tomography + ADAS cooling rate ([2])**
  (soft X-rays treatment ongoing)




15% of scenarios impacted by tungsten accumulation or radiative collapses [3]

Core tungsten density profiles weakly peaked

[1] R. Guirlet submitted 2022
[2] T. Pütterich Nucl. Fusion 2010
[3] V. Ostuni, submitted 2022

Outer strike point sputtering in the range of multi-machine observations



Langmuir probes : $\Gamma_{sat}, n_e, T_e,$ [1]

Visible spectroscopy : $\Gamma_{ph}^{WI\ 400.9nm}$ [2]

$$\Gamma_W \equiv \frac{S}{XB}(n_e, T_e) \times \Gamma_{ph}^{WI\ 400.9nm} \quad [3]$$

→ **uncertainties from atomic models (meta-stables + sheath profiles)**


Large variability from experiment, but effective sputtering yield coherent with ~ 0.1 - 1% light impurity concentration (B,C,O,N)

A. Grosjean P184

Note: Core radiation not correlated with divertor sources

[1] R. Dejarnac et al Fus.Eng.Des (2020)
[2] O. Meyer et al Rev. Sci. Instrum (2018)
[3] S. Brezinsek et al Phys. Scr. (2017)
C. Johnson et al Nuc. Mater. Energy 2019
J. Guterl et al Contrib. Plasma Phys. 2020

Sources from RF antennae limiters *might* dominate core contamination



LHCD & ICRH antennae equipped with tungsten limiters

(total limiters surface ~1m^2)


WEST ICRH antenna


Main trends concerning gross tungsten fluxes:

- Increase with input power (or P_{SEP}) [1]
  → correlates with core radiated power
- Strong increase from active ICRH antennae
  → enhanced sputtering from rectified sheath potential [2,3]

But:

- **Similar radiated power with ICRH or LHCD**
- **Sources decrease with plasma/antennae gap, not the radiated power**

[1] C.C. Klepper et al PPCF submitted
[2] L. Colas et al Nucl. Fusion 62 (2022)
[3] G. Urbancyk et al Nucl. Fusion 2021



Overview of the *Phase 1* divertor operation


Experimental assessment of tungsten sources & core contamination

- Sputtering yields coherent with 0.1-1% low-Z conc.
- Core radiation (tungsten) ~ 50% P_{IN} in any scenario
- Core radiation weakly correlated to gross sources

  → sheath redeposition & transport are critical

Numerical modelling of tungsten sources and contamination with transport codes: status & ongoing developments


Modelling objectives & workflow



Curtesy S. Digenova Nucl. Fus. 2021

Validate modelling tools against L-mode WEST experiments:

- **source strength & wall distribution (full W device)**
- **resulting core contamination (screening mechanisms)**



Tungsten sputtering & transport: kinetic Monte-Carlo
+ Synthetic diagnostics for experimental comparison


<u>Note</u>: no feedback (yet) of W radiation on background simulations

[1] H. Bufferand Nucl. Fus. 2015
[2] J. Romazanov et al Phys. Scr. 2017
[3] J.D. Elder et al Nuc. Mat. Energy 2017


SOLEDGE-EIRENE background coherent with experimental conditions


S. Di Genova et al. Nucl. Fus 2021

- WEST scenario $P_{SEP} \approx 2.5$ MW, $n_{sep} \approx 2$ E19m^{-3}
- SOLEDGE transport tuned to "match" experimental profiles
- No drifts
- **Outer gap with antenna limiters LARGER than in experiment**



- both strike points in high recycling regime (T_e>20eV)






ERO2.0 generates W sources from deuterium + oxygen (low-Z proxy)

S. Di Genova et al. Nucl. Fus 2021

Experiment:

$< n_W >_{core} \approx 50 \times 10^{14} m^{-3}$


ERO2.0 result:




- Modelled divertor sources match experiment with 0.1% oxygen
- Core contamination:
  - Defined as averaged tungsten density inside separatrix
  - sources from all plasma facing components

→ **Simulated core contamination much lower than in experiment**


lower divertor sources ERO2 / experiment






ERO2.0 simulations indicate the dominant role of secondary PFCs

S. DiGenova et al. Nucl. Fus 2021



- Lower divertor dominates the source, but low penetration
- **Upper divertor dominates core contamination, in LSN**
- Baffle sources potentially important (far SOL) **J. Maker P181**



Contamination highly sensitive to *SOL regime* & PFC/plasma gaps

Accurate plasma & wall geometry necessary (3D antennae, etc)

S. Di Genova P129


ERO2.0 highlights the importance of energetic Tungsten atoms

S. DiGenova

ER02.0 simulations (all PFCs) with same oxygen level but *different charge states*


Case 1

75% O^{+1} / 15% O^{+2} / 10% O^{+3}



Case 2

O^{+1} → O^{+8} from SOLEDGE [1]



- **Gross source larger in Case 2:**
  Impact $E_{inc} = 2T_i + 3\boldsymbol{Z}T_e$
  on sputtering yield

- **At equivalent source, core contamination 5X larger in the case 2**

→ **Lower redeposited fraction**

→ **Refined kinetic modelling needed**

[1] A. Gallo et al Nucl. Fus. 2020

Wrap-up & future plans

- **Phase 1 divertor operation limited by tungsten core radiation**
  - Prevented routine H-mode access (P_{SEP} marginal → ITER?)
  - DOMINANTE SOURCES NOT ELUCIDATED YET → highly sensitive to transport
  - Significant L-mode database (IMAS format) for code validation
- **Simulation tools under validation, not yet quantitative:**
  - ERO2.0 improved with better description of sheath profiles & thermal forces
  - Redeposition physics (in grazing angles) highly sensitive to kinetic details

  → UV spectroscopic data needed from SOL region (W7+ etc)
  - 3D sources & transport from localized limiters *on going*
  - Modelling of rectified RF sheath & impact on W erosion & transport