The Challenges of Plasma-Surface Interactions for ITER & Beyond

Dennis Whyte

Plasma Science & Fusion Center, MIT, Cambridge USA

FESAC, November 2008

Many thanks to all my PSI colleagues

Present tokamaks require that plasma-facing materials *simultaneously* meet several requirements

- Mechanical strength
  - Large JxB and eddy current forces during disruptions
- Forgiving of temperature transients.
  - Heat flux > GW / m^2
- Erosion/radiation characteristics favorable for a wide variety of exploratory fusion core plasma scenarios.
- To-date low-Z materials, in particular graphite/CFC, have met these challenges.





Present tokamaks require that plasma-facing materials *simultaneously* meet several requirements

- Mechanical strength
  - Large JxB and eddy current forces during disruptions
- Forgiving of temperature transients.
  - Heat flux > GW / m^2
- Erosion/radiation characteristics favorable for a wide variety of exploratory fusion core plasma scenarios.
- To-date low-Z materials, in particular graphite/CFC, have met these challenges.
- **Q~1 and fusion power > 10 MW achieved with Carbon walls + low-Z coatings, paving the way for our confidence in ITER.**



So what's the problem?

Lack basic understanding and diagnosis of PSI processes in fusion devices → Uncertain extrapolation

- Intermediate steps uncertain between sputtering and core plasma.
  - ➢ Intense power flux density
    - Materials placed near thermal limits.
  - ➢ Surface layers of plasma facing materials are rapidly and continually being reconstituted by plasma erosion and redeposition.
    - Peak ion flux ~ 100 kA /m^2
  - ➢ Plasma transport ensures large gradients in plasma conditions across magnetic flux surfaces.
  - ➢ Turbulent plasma transport
  - ➢ While plasma is axisymmetric, real armor geometry leads to 3-D effects.



?



Overview

- **Highlight five prominent PSI issues as one steps from present devices to ITER to Demo.**
  - Each issue is quantitatively and qualitatively "worse" in ITER, then Demo.
  - Every issue pushes our PSI knowledge up-to and past our limits.
  - Despite its severe challenges, ITER will not address most Demo PSI issues.

- **Way forward**: PSI diagnosis critical to advancing PSI science.

- **Limitations**
  - Cannot include all research topics
  - Discussion mostly restricted to "conventional" solid plasma-facing materials.
  - Personal opinion : PSI & fusion materials, particularly in ITER, remain contentious issues and the views stated are not consensus.

Controlling PSI becoming increasingly important and difficult as we move from present tokamaks → ITER → demonstration fusion power plants

Issue / Parameter	Present Tokamaks	ITER	DEMO	Consequences
Energy exhaust (production) *GJ / day*	~ 10	3,000	60,000	- active cooling - max. tile thickness ~ 10 mm

Heat exhaust is primary design point for edge materials, since this is directly related to fusion power density

$$q_{\text{target}} = \frac{\frac{1}{5} P_{fusion}}{A_{divertor}} \sim 10 - 20 \frac{MW}{m^2}$$



$$\approx 40 \frac{MW}{m^2}$$

Grazing Field lines





Melted Be tiles On JET

Field lines



Distorted surface "proud" to the field line receives $q_{//} \sim 500$ MW/m^2 and is immediately melted/ablated.

Even ITER falls short of Demo power density P/S ~ 1 MW/m^2 and energy throughput

	ITER	ARIES-AT	ARIES-RS	ARIES-ST
Duration (s)	400	$3x10^7$	$3x10^7$	$3x10^7$
Ambient T (C)	~ 200	1000	850	> 700
R (m)	6.2	5.2	5.52	3.2
A ≡ R/a	3.1	4.0	4.0	1.6
P_{exh} (MW)	150	390	515	624
P/S (MW/m^2)	0.21	0.85	1.1	0.99
P/A_{div} (MW/m^2)	2.4	10	12	20

$A_{div} / S \sim$ 5-10%







Thermal efficiency dictates high ambient T →
Fundamentally different Physical Chemistry regime for wall that is completely unexplored in fusion devices

- Rate equations follow Arrhenius relationship reaction rate ∝ exp(-E_o/kT)
  - Activation energies E_o ~ 0.5 -1 eV.
- Precludes water cooling technology in reactor



Helium gas (or molten metal) cooling/heating required for hot walls (T > 700 C)

- **Actively controlled temperature of all plasma-facing components.**
- **US Engineering demo peak heat removal ~ 10 MW/m^2**
  - **He and PFC joining sets the limit for peak heat removal in divertor.**
- **The heat removal challenge: P_{exh} / A_{div} ~ 10 MW / m^2 right at the technology limit!!**
  - Radiation / geometry effects must be invoked to find solutions.

Table 2
Test results

Flow rate (kg s^{-1})	Heat flux (MW m^{-2})	Peak surface temperature (°C)	Pumping power (W (% of power removed))
0.022	10	380	157 (0.8)
0.011	6	422	21 (0.2)
0.0064	3	424	3.4 (0.06)



Fig. 1. GA divertor module.

C.B. Baxi / Fusion Engineering and Design 25 (1994) 263–271

Energy sustainment chasm to Component Test Facility (CTF) & DEMO

- **CTF** (Q < 3) cares about energy fluence, period.
  - Power density x Δt: BOTH MATTER!
  - Must also have a closed Tritium fuel cycle!

- **DEMO**: Burn Q > 25 + Power/m^2 x Δt.
  - **P_{exh}/S** ~ 1/4 P_n/S ~ **1 MW/m^2 x 3x10^7 s** ~ 1 full-power year
  - Ambient temperature > 700 C for thermal efficiency
    - Therefore CTF must also have high T walls to test components.

- Present track of devices, including ITER, do *not* address energy sustainment issues required for CTF or DEMO
  - P/S and pulse duration too small.
  - Water-cooled, low-T walls.
  - Open fuel cycle.

Controlling PSI becoming increasingly important and difficult as we move from present tokamaks → ITER → demonstration fusion power plants

Issue / Parameter	Present Tokamaks	ITER	DEMO	Consequences
Quiescent energy exhaust *GJ / day*	~ 10	3,000	60,000	- active cooling - max. tile thickness ~ 10 mm
Transient energy exhaust from plasma instabilities $\Delta T \sim MJ / A_{wall}(m^2) / (1\ ms)^{1/2}$	~ 2	15	60	- require high $T_{melt/ablate}$ - limit? ~ 40 for C and W - surface distortion

Rapid dissipation of plasma thermal energy poses major challenges in any Demo

$$T_{surface,\max} = T_{ambient} + C\frac{W_{th}}{A_{wall}\,\tau^{1/2}}$$

Material	T_{max} (K)	Limit MJ m^{-2} $s^{-1/2}$
Be	1550	8
C	**4000**	**42**
Mo	2900	28
W	**3680**	**45**

Transient thermal limits ($T_{ambient}$ ~ 1200 K)

Thermal energy dissipation timescale $\tau \sim$ ms. Set by both atomic physics & MHD

Global energy balance model of ITER disruption mitigation By neon injection



Thermal energy dissipation timescale ~ ms. Can be easily triggered by PSI "failure"



C-Mod Molybdenum (T_{melt}=2900 K) limiter melted during disruptions



- Dilute MFE plasma (n~10^{20} m^{-3}) extinguished by small particulate
  - 2 mm "drop" of W == $N_{e,ITER}$

Plasma thermal energy intimately linked to fusion power efficiency. Near "perfect" dissipation will still be major challenge in any Demo

$$\frac{W_{th}}{A_{wall}\,\tau^{1/2}} \sim \frac{pV}{A(R/c_s)^{1/2}} \sim P_{fusion}^{1/2}\,\varepsilon R^{1/2}$$

- Only flexibility is in τ.
  - Will large-scale tokamaks & stellarators have τ > ms?
  - Can we trick the plasma into having τ > ms, opacity?
  - Liquid walls?



Material	T_{max} (K)	Limit MJ m^{-2} $s^{-1/2}$
Be	1550	8
C	**4000**	**42**
Mo	2900	28
W	**3680**	**45**

Transient thermal limits

Similar arguments apply to even "minor" transient heating in reactor-class devices. E..g. Material heating limits lead to very restrictive ELM size in ITER

Before exposure



After 5 "large" ELMs (~2 MJ / m^2)





Klimov PSI08

Similar arguments apply to even "minor" transient heating in reactor-class devices. E..g. Material heating limits lead to very restrictive ELM size in ITER

Before exposure

After 5 pulses





Klimov PSI08

The consequences of large particulate removal on both plasma survival & safety are unknown









Controlling PSI becoming increasingly important and difficult as we move from present tokamaks → ITER → demonstration fusion power plants

Issue / Parameter	Present Tokamaks	ITER	DEMO	Consequences
Quiescent energy exhaust *GJ / day*	~ 10	3,000	60,000	- active cooling - max. tile thickness ~ 10 mm
Transient energy exhaust from plasma instabilities $\Delta T \sim MJ / A_{wall}(m^2) / (1\ ms)^{1/2}$	~ 2	15	60	- require high $T_{melt/ablate}$ - limit? ~ 60 for C and W - surface distortion
Yearly neutron damage in plasma-facing materials *displacements per atom*	~ 0	~ 0.5	20	- evolving material properties: thermal conductivity, swelling, traps for tritium

14 MeV neutron-induced damage set lifetime limits for graphitic fusion materials



An emerging area of study: Neutron damage producing Tritium trap sites in refractory metals like tungsten

- Neutron-induced displacements produce damage "trap" sites for D/T fuel in bulk of material
  - Lab studies ~ 0.1 - 0.3 trap / dpa that saturate 1% traps / atom.



Controlling PSI becoming increasingly important and difficult as we move from present tokamaks → ITER → demonstration fusion power plants

Issue / Parameter	Present Tokamaks	ITER	DEMO	Consequences
Quiescent energy exhaust *GJ / day*	~ 10	3,000	60,000	- active cooling - max. tile thickness ~ 10 mm
Transient energy exhaust from plasma instabilities $\Delta T \sim MJ / A_{wall}(m^2) / (1\ ms)^{1/2}$	~ 2	15	60	- require high $T_{melt/ablate}$ - limit? ~ 60 for C and W - surface distortion
Yearly neutron damage in plasma-facing materials *displacements per atom*	~ 0	~ 0.5	20	- evolving material properties: thermal conductivity & swelling
Max. gross material removal rate with 1% erosion yield *(mm / operational-year)*	< 1	300	3000	- must redeposit locally - limits lifetime - produces films

Tokamak edge plasmas feature extreme spatial gradients and fluctuations levels, making erosion prediction and control very difficult

- Extreme range (100 eV → 1 eV) is possible for plasma temperatures
  - Highly ionizing → recombining.
  - Physical sputtering → chemical removal.
- Develops large-scale sonic flows to surfaces.
  - Particle flux density ~ 10^5 A / m^2
- **Key result: PFC species have ionization distances << linear size of divertor targets**
  - **Every atom removed from surface has already been removed and replaced by plasma many times over.**
  - **Plasma and surfaces are strongly coupled to each other**



*Whyte et al. Nucl. Fusion **41** (2001) 1243*

"Archeological" deposition measurements:
Tokamak plasmas effectively net "transfer" carbon from one location of the wall to another





McLean et al APS 04

- Controlling mechanisms of erosion sources, long-range transport and deposition balance are not understood.

A new generation of innovative in-situ PSI diagnostics are being developed on C-Mod

Example: RFQ accelerator

- High-current cw RFQ accelerator attached to the tokamak

- Innovation: Exploit intrinsic magnetic fields to steer beam to any poloidal (toroidal) location.

- Shielded neutron + gamma detection from MeV D beam nuclear reactions with PFCs

- Shot-to-shot "maps" of erosion, redeposition and tritium retention, depth resolved to penetration distance of beam (~10 microns).



Controlling PSI becoming increasingly important and difficult as we move from present tokamaks → ITER → demonstration fusion power plants

Issue / Parameter	Present Tokamaks	ITER	DEMO	Consequences
Quiescent energy exhaust *GJ / day*	~ 10	3,000	60,000	- active cooling - max. tile thickness ~ 10 mm
Transient energy exhaust from plasma instabilities $\Delta T \sim MJ / A_{wall}(m^2) / (1\ ms)^{1/2}$	~ 2	15	60	- require high $T_{melt/ablate}$ - limit? ~ 60 for C and W - surface distortion
Yearly neutron damage in plasma-facing materials *displacements per atom*	~ 0	~ 0.5	20	- evolving material properties: thermal conductivity & swelling
Max. gross material removal rate with 1% erosion yield *(mm / operational-year)*	< 1	300	3000	- must redeposit locally - limits lifetime - produces films
Tritium consumption *(g / day)*	< 0.02	20	1000	- Tritium retention in materials and recovery

Tritium retention in Demo must satisfy fuel cycle and regulatory limits: Orders of magnitude improvement required.



An emerging area of concern:
Neutron damage producing Tritium trap sites in refractory metals

- Neutron-induced displacements produce damage "trap" sites for D/T fuel in bulk of material
  - Lab studies ~ 0.1 - 0.3 trap / dpa that saturate 1% traps / atom.

- High temperature MUST heal these traps since in a D-T reactor ~ 20 kg Tritium can be stored in (Traps / atom) ~ 10^{-2}
  - Surpassed in a few hours in Demo due to high permeability of the D/T in tungsten at high ambient temperature.
  - Entire world supply of tritium.





It is hard to overstate the importance of ambient temperature for fuel control & T retention



Wampler et al. J. Nucl. Mater. ***176 & 177*** *(1990) 987*

Carbon

High-Z metal





30+ years of experience in confinement devices tells us we should be worried/excited about all this, and in particular the effects of having "hot walls"

- Every major (and minor) modification to the wall surfaces had profound effects on core performance.
  - E.g. lithium layers (TFTR, NSTX), He discharge cleaning (TFTR, DIII-D, etc), boronizations (DIII-D, C-Mod, etc.), ad infinitum

- **Can we be so naïve that ~10 orders of magnitude modifications to boundary condition of wall will not have profound effects on the core?**

- Must assess effects experimentally but can make educated guesses
  - **Fuelling balance: surface strongly desorbed of H_2 --> no retention?**
  - **Recycling: depleted walls?**
  - **Safety: flakes/dust fully T depleted, reactivity?**
  - **Impurity control: ~ ZERO vacuum impurities (H_20, C_2O)**
  - **High-Z materials: fuel permeated through wall, no sputtering?**
  - **Erosion control: Hydrogen activity with materials fundamentally modified.**

Conclusion: The PSI chasms to ITER, then Demo, are so large we must start to address them now

- Every PSI issue pushes us to our science and technology limits
  - Power density (P/S ~ 1 MW/m^2) x duration (30,000,000 s)
  - Transient energy dissipation: all materials at / past thermal limits.
  - Erosion and fuel control
  - Evolving quasi-equilibrium due to neutron damage.

- Where do we start?
  - We must assess materials in the proper physical chemistry range (T_{wall})
  - Establishing quasi-equilibrium between PFC materials and plasma will be a key scientific advancement.
  - A new generation of innovative in-situ PSI diagnostics are essential.

- The fusion community must realize this is not "just" a technology issue, but rather a grand "fusion science" challenge since it deals with nearly every aspect of plasma and material science.