Parameters influencing the D/Be ratio in codeposited material

and

Implications for tritium retention in ITER

presented by R. Doerner

- Based on the modeling of:
 - A. Kukushkin, ITER Report [ITER_D_27TKC6]
 - K. Schmid, Report for EFDA Task TUNMOD
 - G. De Temmerman, manuscript submitted to Nucl. Fusion 2007
 - J. Roth, manuscript submitted to PPCF 2008.



Published database of D/Be levels in codeposits cover a wide range of values



- Almost an order of magnitude variation in measured D/Be levels exists in the published literature for similar conditions
- Be codeposition data by Mayer (from ion beam exp.) was contaminated with oxygen and carbon (~15%).
- Be codeposition data by Causey and Baldwin subsequently showed no systematic dependence with oxygen content, layers also had little carbon content.



Subsequent experiments in PISCES-B revealed even larger variations in D/Be



- Some trends in the experimental data could be identified
 - D/Be decreases with increasing temperature
 - D/Be decreases with increasing Be deposition rate
 - D/Be increases with increasing reflected deuterium atom energy



PISCES-B can systematically vary the relevant experimental parameters



Empirical equation was developed that describes the influence of the independent parameters on the retention



- Incident particle energy determines implantation depth \mathbf{F}_n \mathbf{r}_d
- Activation energy for desorption from plasma exposed Be ~1800K (R. Doerner FED 49-50 (2000)183), similar to temperature scaling
- Dependence on deposition rate is yet to be explained (pure deposition scales as r_d^{-1})
- Validity of the equation to entire literature D/Be database ??

Comparison with literature data



 Good agreement between literature data from various plasma based devices (not ion beam data as particle energy is >>60 eV) and parametric equation

 Apparent discrepancies between the different data can be explained by the different experimental conditions, to which the retention is sensitive



Applying D/Be model to ITER requires several input variables:

$\label{eq:rd} \begin{array}{l} r_d - \text{spatial distribution of Be deposition rate at all PFCs} \\ T - Surface temperature of PFCs \\ E_n - \text{spatial distribution of incident particle energy} \end{array}$



Particle flux and energy calculations come from Kukushkin report [ITER_D_27TKC6, Feb.9, 2008]

- B2-Eirene calculation grid does not extend to the ITER vessel wall
- Grid fluxes are mapped to the wall from the edge of the grid
- Power into the SOL is 100 MW
- Calculations shown are for a density case in the middle of the ITER operational window
- Calculations are done with carbon targets





Input from B2-Eirene Calculations



- Two different density cases are available (low & high), high density case (dotted lines) is used here
- D = dome
- T = target
- B = baffle
- IMP = inner mid-plane
- PFF = puff location
- OMP = outer mid-plane
- Design values of surface temperature are used
 [Note energy at OMP]

DIVIMP calculations are used (from K. Schmid) to obtain impurity deposition rates in divertor

- Beryllium first wall erosion is calculated based on B2-Eirene results (iter491 case)
- DIVIMP calculates impurity distribution in SOL and flux of Be to divertor tile locations
- Beryllium is re-eroded, transported and redeposited in the divertor (and allowed to escape from divertor back to main chamber) until an equilibrium situation is achieved
- Model results in 80% of Be eroded from the first wall is redeposited on the first wall





Equilibrium Be flux obtained in the ITER divertor



- Largest Be fraction found at inner baffle region (~ 5-10%)
- Redeposition has a large impact on Be deposition on dome
- Full W divertor is used
- Ar radiator included



T/Be level in codeposits is calculated from De Temmerman model assuming 50:50 D:T

- Codeposition database includes $15 < E_n (eV) < 62$ $0.01 < r_d (1e15 cm^{-2} s^{-1}) < 0.5$ 373 < T (K) < 600
- Limits are applied to some ITER values to ensure applicability of the model $2 < E_n (eV) < 100$ $3e-5 < r_d (1e15 \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}) < 10$ 500 < T (K) < 1323
- E_n at outer midplane is above 100 eV (so we are underestimating retention near outer midplane)





Several assumptions are made

- All models are strictly correct (even though they may not all be self-consistent)
- Uniform Be codeposition around first wall (assumption of constant fraction of Be in first wall flux has only a <15% effect, same number of Be atoms incident on wall)
- Toroidal symmetry
- No wall geometry effects included
- No transient phenomenon (i.e. no ELMs or disruptions)
- All steady-state operation (no start-up, ramp down, etc.)



Models indicate codeposition on the first wall cannot be ignored for tritium accumulation in ITER



- Low surface temperature and high particle energy of first wall region push retention up
- Large area first wall
- Imposed energy limit of 100 eV may underestimate first wall retention
- Where are T containing codeposits likely to grow?



Level of retention in first wall codeposits exceeds the level in divertor codeposits

- First wall global average : $(D+T)/Be \sim 0.42$
 - High particle energies, low surface temperatures
- Divertor cassette global average : $(D+T)/Be \sim 0.008$
 - Low particle energies, higher surface temperatures
- However, Be codeposits on both first wall or in the divertor may be subsequently eroded and not contribute to retention
- On the other hand, Be codeposited in protected regions of the first wall, such as castellations, may not be re-eroded (the actual first wall geometry would need to be included)



Details of Be prompt redeposition to the first wall will determine where codeposits grow or erode

- Wherever amount of incident Be exceeds the sputtering yield (of D on Be, no He, T, Ar, etc), codeposited layers will grow
- Codeposits may also form in details of surface geometry (castellations, behind poloidal rib limiters, etc.)
- Detailed tracking of eroded Be atoms is necessary





Example assuming a constant Be flux fraction distribution of eroded Be flux back to the first wall



Tritium retention in first wall codeposits can dominate accumulation in ITER

T in first wall ~ 2e22 T/shot, T in inner div ~ 2e20 T/shot, T in outer div ~ 0 T/shot, T in dome ~ 1e18 T/shot

330 g T limit would be reached in ~3000 shots



Codeposits grow and tritium is retained only in deposition dominated regions

Example assuming a uniform distribution of eroded Be flux back to the first wall



Tritium retention in first wall codeposits can dominate accumulation in ITER

T in first wall ~ 6e22 T/shot, T in inner div ~ 2e20 T/shot, T in outer div ~ 0 T/shot, T in dome ~ 1e18 T/shot

330 g T limit would be reached in ~1000 shots



Example assuming a uniform distribution of Be flux back to the first wall and no re-erosion



Codeposits grow and tritium is retained throughout first wall region (no re-erosion)

Worst Case Assumption

Tritium retention in hidden first wall codeposits - 80% of eroded Be back to first wall, all redeposited Be in hidden areas

T in first wall ~ 1.4e23 T/shot, T in inner div ~ 2e20 T/shot, T in outer div ~ 2e20 T/shot, T in dome ~ 1e18 T/shot

330 g T limit would be reached in ~ 500 shots

Some uncertainty in predictions still exist



Retention on the main chamber first wall must be considered during tritium accounting predictions

- T retention in divertor Be codeposits should be less than presently estimated
 - Roth et al., PPCF 2008 : (D+T)/Be ~ 0.1 in divertor
 - De Temmerman scaling (this study) : $(D+T)/Be \sim 0.008$ in divertor
- T retention in first wall Be codeposits will definitely be more than presently predicted (greater than zero)
- A better understanding of both erosion and prompt redepostion rates at the first wall are needed
- Surface temperature estimates throughout ITER are important
- Re-erosion of Be deposited on the first wall needs better understanding (tile geometry, castellations)
- Transient events need to be considered in any predictions
- First wall retention is not necessarily bad for ITER
 - Can tritium retained in first wall codeposits be easily removed by intentional pulsed heating of large, exposed areas of the first wall?

