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Elements of the U.S. Compact Stellarator Program

FESAC 10 Year Goal:
- “Determine the attractiveness of a Compact Stellarator by assessing resistance to disruptions at high beta without instability feedback control or significant current drive, assessing confinement at high temperature, and investigating 3-D divertor operation.”

• CE Experiments, Existing and Under Construction
  - HSX - Quasi-helical symmetry
  - CTH - Kink and tearing stability

• Proposed New Projects: NCSX, QPS
  - NCSX – Low collisionality transport, high beta stability, quasi-axisymmetry, low R/a
  - QPS - Quasi-poloidal symmetry at very low R/a

• Theory
  - Confinement, Stability, Edge, Energetic Particles, Integrated Modeling

• International Collaboration
  - LHD, CHS, W7-AS ⇒ W7-X, Theory

• Reactor Studies
  - ARIES team + Stellarator experts
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Compact Stellarator Program will Address Key Issues of Fusion Energy Science

- Microturbulence and Transport:
  - Is quasi-symmetry effective in collisionless plasmas?
  - Challenge $E_r$ shear understanding via ripple control.

- Macroscopic Stability:
  - Disruptions - when, why, why not?

- Wave-particle Interactions:
  - Do we understand 3-D fast ion resonances, *AE modes in 3-D?

- Plasma-boundary interaction:
  - Effects of magnetic stochasticity?

Australia, Austria, Japan, Germany, Russia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine
NCSX & QPS Physics Validation Reviews

• **NCSX Design is Appropriate for the Central Element of the Compact Stellarator Program**
  - “The consensus of the Panel is that the physics requirements and capabilities of the pre-conceptual design of the NCSX experiment represent an appropriate approach to developing the design of a Proof of Principle scale experiment that is the central element in a program to establish the attractiveness of the Compact Stellarator (CS) Concept.”

• **QPS Combination of Low R/a with Quasi-poloidal Symmetry is an Attractive Stellarator Option**
  - “The Committee feels that the combination of low aspect ratio and quasi poloidal symmetry is an attractive stellarator option. The ORNL-led team has identified the scientific issues of equilibrium, ballooning stability, and transport that should be able to be addressed by the proposed experiment.
  - A clear majority of the Committee feels that these properties fully justify proceeding with the QPS project.”
“The NCSX program offers an exciting opportunity in fusion research for several reasons.

- **First**, a plausible case has been made (for example, at the NCSX Physics Validation Review) that a fusion power system based on a compact stellarator may resolve two significant issues for fusion power systems: **reduction or elimination of plasma disruptions, and provision for steady-state operation**. These gains earn for the compact stellarator an important place in the portfolio of confinement concepts being pursued by the US Fusion Energy Sciences program.

- **Second**, the NCSX would **complement research now underway on the advanced tokamak**, which addresses closely related issues by different methods. It also **complements stellarator research outside the US**, which has emphasized different geometries and plasma regimes.

- **Finally**, understanding the behavior of magnetized plasmas in **three-dimensional configurations is an important scientific frontier area**, which the NCSX program would advance and strengthen.”
New Stellarators Test Quasi-Symmetries and Disruption Immunity

- In $1/\nu$ regime, asymmetrical neoclassical transport scales as $\varepsilon_{\text{eff}}^{3/2}$
- Low flow-damping
  - manipulation of flows for flow-shear stabilization
  - zonal flows like tokamaks
- Initial (successful!) test in HSX, studies continuing.
- Stability with finite current also a key issue for PoP program:
  CTH focused on kink & tearing stability with external transform.
- NCSX will test quasi-axisymmetry and current at low $n^*$ and high $b$.
- QPS will test quasi-poloidal symmetry and current at very low $R/a$. 
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## NCSX and QPS PVR Construction Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>NCSX ($k FY01)</th>
<th>QPS ($k FY01)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fusion Core Systems</td>
<td>$19,131</td>
<td>$6,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Assembly</td>
<td>$2,961</td>
<td>$873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Systems</td>
<td>$2,361</td>
<td>$551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Systems</td>
<td>$5,123</td>
<td>$130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site &amp; Facilities</td>
<td>$3,994</td>
<td>$93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Systems</td>
<td>$2,684</td>
<td>$205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central I&amp;C &amp; Data Acquisition Systems</td>
<td>$3,550</td>
<td>$271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Oversight &amp; Support</td>
<td>$4,246</td>
<td>$616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparations for Operations</td>
<td>$470</td>
<td>$276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Without Contingency</td>
<td>$45,931</td>
<td>$9,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (~26.5%)</td>
<td>$12,419</td>
<td>$2,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$58,350</td>
<td>$12,152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why QPS vs. NCSX Cost Differential?

• Three Reasons:
  1) CE vs. PoP scientific scope (factor of ~1/3)
  2) Assumed site infrastructure configured to QPS specs
  3) Assumed limited initial diagnostics and controls

• 1) Core, Assembly, Auxiliary Systems: QPS is 1/3 of NCSX
  – Smaller, lower field (1T, 0.9m vs. 1.7T, 1.4m)
  – Initial heating ~ 300 kW ECH vs. 3 MW NBI
  – No internal vacuum vessel, cryogenic coils, PFCs or magnetic trim coils
  – Cheaper (assumed university-based) labor for coil construction
  – Re-using some existing PF coils and most of vacuum tank

• 2) Power, Site and Facilities: QPS is 1/40 of NCSX
  – Assume power systems moved, operational and configured to QPS specs
  – Assume new building, test cell, control room configured to QPS specs

• 3) Diagnostics and I&C: QPS is 1/14 of NCSX
  – Initial diagnostic set only
  – Small allocation for control system
Stellarator Community Theory Planning

Future Directions in Theory of 3D Magnetic Confinement Systems
ORN, December 3 – 5, 2001

• Have a scientific exchange on issues and opportunities for theory of 3D confinement systems and to identify crucial issues not presently being addressed.
• Provide a forum for the stellarator experimental projects to communicate needs and priorities to the theory community.
• Draw in researchers not traditionally associated with stellarators, but with interests and expertise that could contribute to, and benefit from, such a discussion, for example, the presence of 3D magnetic structures in tokamaks.
• Produce a summary document/white paper which would aid researchers in the preparation of proposals for stellarator theory and which would aid OFES in funding such proposals.

“Lead, but don’t control.”
# Current Stellarator Theory Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorists Supported by Non-Project Funds</th>
<th>FTE's</th>
<th>$225k/FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Laboratories</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>$2,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLNL*</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORNL</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPPL</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorists Supported by NCSX &amp; QOS Projects</th>
<th>FTE's</th>
<th>$608</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPPL &amp; ORNL</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Collaborators</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* excludes 1.25 FTE from internal LDRD funds
What is the Appropriate Level of Stellarator Theory?

• First Principles Calculation:
  • Non-project fusion Theory and Computation is $27.5M in FY2001
    
    How much of this is concept specific?
    Maybe 2/3 ⇒ $18.3M ??
  
  • Total OFES experimental program is $152M in FY2001
  
  • Perhaps non-project stellarator theory should be:
    
    $18.3M / $152M = 0.12 x experiment ??

• Common Sense Check:
  
  • As stellarator experiment grows, growth in theory will be needed.
# Incremental Cost of CS Program is Moderate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Activities</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSX</td>
<td>$1.6M</td>
<td>$1.8M</td>
<td>$2.0M</td>
<td>Return to FY00 level, add RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTH</td>
<td>$0.5M</td>
<td>$0.7M</td>
<td>$0.7M</td>
<td>Comparable to Pegasus, HBT-EP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Project Stellarator Theory</td>
<td>$2.2M</td>
<td>$2.2M</td>
<td>$2.2M</td>
<td>Levelized by definition (excludes LLNL support).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Collaboration</td>
<td>$0.6M</td>
<td>$0.6M</td>
<td>$0.6M</td>
<td>Levelized by definition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Projects</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCSX</td>
<td>$4.2M</td>
<td>$15M</td>
<td>$22M</td>
<td>Increment in 2008 non-PPPL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Theory</td>
<td>$0.45M</td>
<td>$0.15M</td>
<td>$1.1M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPS</td>
<td>$0.5M</td>
<td>$4.2M</td>
<td>$4.2M</td>
<td>Site move funded separately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Theory</td>
<td>$0.15M</td>
<td>$0.1M</td>
<td>$0.2M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Incremental Cost</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Incremental cost over FY01, includes HSX &amp; CTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$14.9M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$22.1M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redirected Activities</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Non-Project Theory</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>$0.4M</td>
<td>$1.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional International Collab</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>$0.3M</td>
<td>$0.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIES Stellarator Study</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>$1.0M</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stellarator Community Common Perspectives:**

"Existing Activities" have precedence over "New Projects."
NCSX is the central element of the Compact Stellarator Proof of Principle program.
QPS's combination of very low R/a with quasi-poloidal symmetry is an attractive complementary stellarator option.
"Redirected Activities" depend on moving forward with "New Projects."

**Notes**

$ FY01
Credit to NCSX for joint operation with NSTX.
CS Program Integrates well with a Tokamak Burning Plasma Experiment

- **Compact Stellarator completes a broad portfolio base for moving forward with a tokamak burning plasma experiment**
  - Portfolio contains PoP programs from “self-organized” to “externally controlled” (operating or under construction).
  - Demonstrates a clear national commitment to optimization of toroidal fusion systems.

- **Compact Stellarators can benefit particularly well from BP physics in a tokamak**
  - Very similar symmetry, aspect ratio, continuous with tokamak (NCSX).
  - Very similar alpha to Alfvén velocity ratio.
  - Very similar thermal transport issues (NCSX).
  - Very similar technology issues.
  - Closely related macro-stability and edge issues.

- **BP Experiment has reduced burden of proof for approval**
  - Three approaches (AT, CS and ST) can benefit from BP physics & technology
  - Reduced need to validate full AT physics before moving forward
Conclusions

• The incremental cost of the Compact Stellarator Program is moderate.
  – The potential science and energy impacts are large.
  – CS program addresses FESAC 10 year goal.

• The U.S. Compact Stellarator program integrates well scientifically with
  – the world stellarator program.
  – the world tokamak ⇒ burning plasma program.

• Thoughtful, positively reviewed plans are in place, including plans for a strong stellarator theory program.

• Let’s proceed!