

#### Modelling of Runaway Electron Dynamics in Tokamak Disruptions

Nardon E., Artola F.J., Bandaru V., Bergström H., Decker J., Ekmark I., Fülöp T., Halldestam P., Hoelzl M., Hoppe M., et al.

#### ► To cite this version:

Nardon E., Artola F.J., Bandaru V., Bergström H., Decker J., et al.. Modelling of Runaway Electron Dynamics in Tokamak Disruptions. 29th IAEA Fusion Energy Conference (FEC 2023), Oct 2023, Londres, United Kingdom. cea-04566157

#### HAL Id: cea-04566157 https://cea.hal.science/cea-04566157

Submitted on 2 May 2024  $\,$ 

**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.



# Modelling of Runaway Electron Dynamics in Tokamak Disruptions

IAEA FEC 2023, 20/10/23

E. Nardon, F.J. Artola, V. Bandaru, H. Bergström, J. Decker, I. Ekmark, T. Fülöp, P. Halldestam, M. Hoelzl, M. Hoppe, D. Hu, A. Järvinen, M. Lehnen, S. Olasz, G. Papp, Y. Peysson, G.I. Pokol, I. Pusztai, C. Reux, K. Särkimäki, R. Saura, C. Sommariva, O. Vallhagen, C. Wang, the JOREK team, JET contributors *Framework = EUROfusion TSVV 9 project + ITER DMS Task Force* 



This work has been carried out within the framework of the EUROfusion Consortium, funded by the European Union via the Euratom Research and Training Programme (Grant Agreement No 101052200 — EUROfusion). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Commission. Neither the European Union nor the European Commission can be held responsible for them.

The views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of the ITER Organization. This work was partly funded by the ITER Organization.



- Introduction: disruptions, Runaway Electrons (REs)
- Simulation tools
- Validation
- Simulations for ITER
  - RE generation (avoidance)
  - RE beam termination (mitigation)
- Conclusion



- Introduction: disruptions, Runaway Electrons (REs)
- Simulation tools
- Validation
- Simulations for ITER
  - RE generation (avoidance)
  - RE beam termination (mitigation)
- Conclusion

# **Disruptions**

- 1) Thermal Quench (TQ):
  - MHD instability, **B** stochastization
  - Radiative collapse



[Nardon PPCF 2021]

- 2) Current Quench (CQ):
  - Very high resistivity  $\eta \to I_p$  decay
  - Large  $\mathbf{E} = \eta \mathbf{j}$ , typically >>  $\mathbf{E}_{c}$
  - $\rightarrow$  Sometimes, **RE beam**



# **RE beam impact: fireworks...**





#### WEST #58003

# **Primary (seed) RE generation**



- Dreicer: collisional diffusion into RE domain [Connor NF 1975]
  - Typically negligible in ITER
- Hot-tail: related to fast cooling during the TQ [Smith PoP 2007]
  - Deviation from a Maxwellian distribution
  - Hard to predict because very sensitive to:
    - TQ timescale
    - e<sup>-</sup> transport associated to stochastic B
  - Potentially by far largest seed in ITER disruptions
- Nuclear [Martín-Solís NF 2017]
  - Small but active during CQ  $\rightarrow$  Expect no strong stochastic losses
  - Tritium β decay
  - Compton scattering by wall-emitted γ rays



# Secondary RE generation: the avalanche



- Close ('knock-on') collisions can generate 2 REs from 1
- $\rightarrow$  **Exponential growth** in RE population



Initial theory by Rosenbluth and Putvinsky [Rosenbluth NF 1997]

 $\rightarrow$  When E >> E<sub>c</sub>, avalanche gain **G**<sub>av</sub> scales exponentially with  $\Delta I_p$ !

E.g.  $G_{av} = 1.9 \times 10^{16}$  in ITER (15 MA) vs. 1.8 × 10<sup>3</sup> in JET (3 MA) [Hender NF 2007]

• Theory extended to account for **bound electrons** around partly ionized impurities  $\rightarrow$  Too many impurities can strongly **boost**  $G_{av}$  [Hesslow NF 2019]

# **RE-handling strategies**

#### ITER: Shattered Pellet Injection (SPI) [Lehnen JNM 2015]

- One or several Ne+H pellets
- Aim: RE avoidance and/or mitigation





#### **SPARC: RE mitigation coil**

- Passive system
- Induced current from
  - $dI_p/dt \rightarrow B$  stochasticity  $\rightarrow RE$  avoidance

[Izzo, this conf., Oral, Fri. am]



[Tinguely PPCF 2023]

E. Nardon | IAEA FEC | 20 Oct. 2023 | Page 8

### EU-DEMO: sacrificial limiters

[Maviglia FED 2022]





- Introduction: disruptions, Runaway Electrons (REs)
- Simulation tools
- Validation
- Simulations for ITER
  - RE generation (avoidance)
  - RE beam termination (mitigation)
- Conclusion

# Simulation tools: 2 main workhorses

- **DREAM** kinetic code
  - Solves 1D flux-surface-averaged transport equations
  - Self-consistently evolves e<sup>-</sup> distribution function

- JOREK 3D MHD code with different models for REs
  - RE fluid [Bandaru PRE 2019]
  - Test e<sup>-</sup> [Sommariva NF 2018] [Särkimäki NF 2022]
  - PiC model (kinetic e<sup>-</sup> + MHD) in development [Bergström TSDW 2023]





[Hoelzl NF 2021]

ΞK

[Hoelzl, this conf., Ov. P., Mon.]





- Introduction: disruptions, Runaway Electrons (REs)
- Simulation tools
- Validation
- Simulations for ITER
  - RE generation (avoidance)
  - RE beam termination (mitigation)
- Conclusion

### Work is ongoing to validate each aspect of our models

- <u>Avalanche</u>: RE generation by Ar MGI in JET #95135 simulated with DREAM and JOREK (2D)
  - Input parameters ↔ Knobs for fitting data
    → Validation or fancy fit? → Test by falsifying the avalanche gain Γ<sub>av</sub> → Correct Γ<sub>av</sub> gives best match
    → Looks like (preliminary) validation ☺
  - Bayesian optimization framework can be used for objectivity [Järvinen JPP 2022] [Järvinen, this conf., P/2, Tue]
- <u>TQ and stochastic losses</u>: JOREK 3D simulation of JET Ar MGI reproduces I<sub>p</sub> spike and supports its link with stochasticity [Nardon NF 2023]





 <u>RE beam termination:</u> JOREK 3D RE fluid simulation of benign termination in JET #95135, building on [<u>Bandaru PPCF 2021</u>]
 Now involving synthetic synchrotron diagnostic

[Sommariva EPS 2023]





- Introduction: disruptions, Runaway Electrons (REs)
- Simulation tools
- Validation
- Simulations for ITER
  - RE generation (avoidance)
  - RE beam termination (mitigation)
- Conclusion

### Predicting RE generation (avoidance) in ITER with DREAM (1/2)

[Vallhagen, this conf., P/3, Wed.]

- Wide range of scenarios, with or w/o nuclear seeds
- 2 types of **SPI schemes**:
  - Single Ne+H
  - **Staggered**: pure H then Ne+H
    - 2 step cooling: 1) dilution, 2) radiative collapse
    - Benefit: hot-tail suppression
- Ne quantity adjusted so that 50 ms <  $T_{CQ}$  < 150 ms
- Basic model for pellet ablation plasmoid drifts in some simulations
- Ad hoc TQ model informed by 3D MHD simulations → [Hu, this conf., P/9, Sat.]
  - Particle mixing
  - Rechester-Rosenbluth e<sup>-</sup> transport



### Predicting RE generation (avoidance) in ITER with DREAM (2/2)





# Effect of vertical movement assessed with JOREK



- DREAM simulations use a fixed plasma geometry
- Effect of vertical movement on avalanche gain  $G_{av}$ ?  $\rightarrow$  Use JOREK 2D simulations
- On each toroidal flux ( $\Phi$ ) surface,  $\log(G_{av}) \sim \Delta \psi$ , where  $\psi \equiv \text{poloidal flux [Boozer PoP 2015]}$ 
  - Δ between t=0 and when surface becomes LCFS
- JOREK finds that  $\psi_{LCFS} \approx constant$  in time
  - Related to ~ ideal behaviour of the wall
- In contrast, in DREAM,  $\psi_{LCFS} \downarrow$  in time  $\rightarrow$  Larger  $\Delta \psi$
- $\rightarrow$  G<sub>av</sub> in DREAM too large by several orders of magnitude
- Impact unclear (G<sub>av</sub> remains very large), under investigation with both DREAM and JOREK





- Introduction: disruptions, Runaway Electrons (REs)
- Simulation tools
- Validation
- Simulations for ITER
  - RE generation (avoidance)
  - RE beam termination (mitigation)
- Conclusion

## **RE** beam termination (mitigation) studied with JOREK (1/2)



- In present machines, a **benign RE beam termination** can be obtained via H or D injection into the beam [Paz-Soldan NF 2021]
  - Associated to fast and large MHD instability
- Could this work in ITER?

#### JOREK ITER simulations [Bandaru in prep.]

- Intentional generation of a large (9 MA) beam
- No model for H injection but studied effect of background plasma resistivity η
  - H injection is expected to increase η
- $\rightarrow$  MHD grows faster and larger at higher  $\eta$ 
  - Qualitatively consistent with observations
  - May be due to slower relative growth of secondary modes at larger η [Nardon PoP 2023]



E. Nardon | IAEA FEC | 20 Oct. 2023 | Page 18

# **RE** beam termination (mitigation) studied with JOREK (2/2)

Heat loads calculated with test particles and realistic 3D wall model

•



TRe



 $\rightarrow$  Losses follow a **helical pattern** which is **more extended at larger**  $\eta$ 

 $\rightarrow$  More distributed heat loads at larger  $\eta$ ... but peak value similar



- Introduction: disruptions, Runaway Electrons (REs)
- Simulation tools
- Validation
- Simulations for ITER
  - RE generation (avoidance)
  - RE beam termination (mitigation)
- Conclusion

# Conclusion



- Validation of DREAM and JOREK underway using Bayesian optimisation and synthetic diagnostics
- Regarding **predictions**, ITER is our main focus, but we also work on EU-DEMO, SPARC, STEP, ...
  - REs are an important concern for high I<sub>p</sub> nuclear machines
  - **RE mitigation coil** seems promising based on modelling with DREAM+

#### ITER outlook:

- DREAM predictions for **RE generation at 15 MA**:
  - With nuclear seeds, multi-MA beam whatever the SPI settings
  - W/o nuclear seeds, negligible beam with appropriate SPI settings (e.g. staggered SPI)
  - Future work:
    - Take vertical motion and 3D MHD into account ( $\rightarrow$  smaller  $G_{av}$ )
    - Refine hot-tail predictions (JOREK 3D simulations), ablation plasmoid drifts and nuclear seed estimates
- JOREK simulations of **RE beam termination** at  $I_{RE}$  = 9 MA show benefit of increasing  $\eta$ 
  - Future work:
    - Include explicit model of H SPI into the beam
    - Model cases with smaller I<sub>RE</sub>
- Overall, full RE avoidance unlikely but combined minimization of I<sub>RE</sub> + mitigation with H SPI might work...
  To be assessed!



# Backup slides

### **Other activities**



- WP-TE:
  - Interaction with experimental teams on JET, ASDEX Upgrade, TCV, WEST
  - DREAM modelling of **RE generation in TCV** [Hoppe EPS 2023]
  - DREAM modelling of effect of ripple on REs in TCV [Wijkamp REM 2023]
  - DREAM modelling of benign termination in TCV [Hoppe in prep.]
  - DREAM modelling of **SPI/MGI in ASDEX Upgrade** [Halldestam REM 2023] [Edes REM 2023]
- WP-SA: DREAM+SOFT study on EDICAM camera for SR measurement in JT60-SA [Olasz FED 2023]
- Related to **ITER** 
  - DREAM+ study of effect of alpha-particle-driven modes on RE generation in ITER [Lier NF 2023]
  - JOREK modelling of **SPI hot tail interaction** in ITER [Hu NF 2022]
  - Study on start-up REs with STREAM [Hoppe JPP 2022]
- Related to other future machines
  - DREAM and JOREK modelling of RE gen. and term. in **EU-DEMO** [Lengyel REM 2023] [Vannini REM 2023]
  - DREAM modelling of spherical tokamak reactor [Berger JPP 2022]
  - DREAM modelling of the RE Mitigation Coil in SPARC [Tinguely PPCF 2023]
  - JOREK modelling of SPI and RE generation in DTT
  - SOFT modelling of **REIS diagnostic for DTT** [Hoppe ENEA report 2023]



### Runaway electrons [Breizman NF 2019] [Boozer PoP 2015]



#### Force on an electron from collisional friction and radiation reaction forces



 $\rightarrow$  Electrons may run away whenever E > E<sub>c</sub> (**'critical electric field'**)

 $\rightarrow$  RE energy is limited (typically to ~10-20 MeV) by radiation reaction forces

### Predicting RE generation in ITER with DREAM



#### Example of single Ne+H SPI in 15 MA L-mode w/o nuclear seeds

 $\tau_{TQ}$  = 3 ms;  $\tau_{CQ}$  = 100 ms; TQ onset criterion: T<sub>e</sub> < 10 eV anywhere inside q=2



- Fast radiative collapse in the core  $\rightarrow$  Hot-tail generation
- Small remaining hot-tail seed after transport event (~10<sup>-10</sup> A) but very large  $G_{av} \rightarrow \sim 6$  MA beam

# Predicting RE generation in ITER with DREAM



#### Now with staggered (pure H then Ne+H) SPI (otherwise same parameters) 20 20 16 f) e) d) 14 I [MA] 12 10 8 n<sub>Hyd</sub> $T_e[eV]$ 15 [1e20 m<sup>-3</sup>] 15 6 5000 2000 t[ms] t[ms] 2 1000 10 74.4 65.1 55.8 46.5 37.2 27.9 18.6 9.3 500 200 100 0.01 $10^{-4}$ $10^{-6}$ 5 50 20 10 5 $10^{-8}$ $10^{-10}$ $10^{-12}$ 0 1.0 1.5 100 150 200 0.5 0.5 50 1.0 1.5 0 r[m]t[ms] r[m]

- Larger rise in  $n_e$  + more gradual cooling  $\rightarrow$  Negligible hot-tail generation  $\rightarrow$  No RE beam

 $\rightarrow$  Staggered scheme promising (w/o nuclear seeds!) but note **possible issue**: pure H ablation plasmoids may experience a strong **drift** towards LFS

- Model developed [Vallhagen JPP 2023], to be used in DREAM

### **Electron losses due to 3D MHD studied with JOREK**

- Hot-tail seed losses during or shortly after TQ? RE losses during CQ?
- JOREK test electron pusher applied to assess transport in ITER 3D CQ simulation
  [Särkimäki NF 2022]
  - (Long stochastic phase but unclear if this is realistic)



• ITER SPI sims. underway [Hu NF 2023] and hot-tail predictions planned



### **RE** beam termination studied with JOREK (2/3)



- Clear effect of η on Poincaré cross-sections
  - Smaller role of secondary modes at larger η [Nardon PoP 2023]
  - May explain larger MHD growth





E. Nardon | IAEA FEC | 20 Oct. 2023 | Page 29