

Integrated plasma state reconstruction, off-normal event handling and control with application to TCV and ASDEX Upgrade

<u>F. Felici¹</u>, T. Blanken², T. Bosman², F. Carpanese¹, R. Fischer³, C. Galperti¹, L. Giannone³, M. Kong¹, O. Kudlacek³, M. Maraschek³, A. Merle¹, J-M. Moret¹, S. van Mulders¹, A. Pau¹, E. Poli³, M. Reich³, N. Rispoli⁴, O. Sauter¹, B. Sieglin³, C. Sozzi⁴, W. Treutterer³, N.M.T. Vu¹, M. Weiland³ and the TCV^{1*}, ASDEX Upgrade^{3**} and EUROfusion MST1^{***} teams. E-mail: federico.felici@epfl.ch

> ¹ École Fédérale Polytechnique de Lausanne (EPFL), Swiss Plasma Center (SPC), Lausanne, Switzerland, ² Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, The Netherlands ³ Max Planck Institute for Plasma Physics, Garching, Germany ⁴ Istituto per la Scienza e Tecnologia dei Plasmi, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Milano, Italy *See author list of S. Coda et al., Nucl. Fusion 59 112023 (2019) **See author list of H. Meyer, et al., Nucl. Fusion 59 (2019) 112014 *** See author list of B. Labit et al., Nucl. Fusion 59 086020 (2019)

Main points:

• Future devices need more advanced integrated plasma control solutions including supervision, actuator management, event handling • Report on advances in tokamak control from collaborative work on TCV and ASDEX Upgrade within the EUROfusion MST1 work package • Advances in real-time plasma state estimation:

- Kinetic equilibrium reconstruction on TCV, real-time RABBIT and improved density reconstruction on ASDEX Upgrade.
- Generic control frameworks for supervisory control & off-normal event handling
 - Application to high density limit disruption avoidance on TCV and ASDEX Upgrade, use of virtual actuators on ASDEX Upgrade
- Iterative learning control tests for central T_e/T_i control on ASDEX Upgrade
- Outlook: new real-time TORBEAM version + real-time event detectors using deep learning

Diagnostics Actuators Tokamak Actuator Plasma and actuator interface state reconstruction Interface lay Pulse schedule Configuratio **Plasma state** parameters monitor and Actuator manager supervisory Controllers controller User interface Task layer Plasma control system (PC

plasma supervisory contro actuator Plasma state esourc controller scenario state monitor evaluate state o level of dange references allocate isma/actuator & define resource to ask activation & priority request per task

Use of virtual actuators on ASDEX Upgrade



- gyrotrons with another one
- Example time trace required for beta control:



Iterative 'learning' control - sho of actuator trajectories	t to shot optimization
 Iterative learning control: fast shot-to- shot scenario optimization, proof of principle at AUG 	Intitial feedforward trajectory
 Iterative improvement of feedforward trajectories based on error in previous trial High interest from ITER 	Execute tokamak plasma experiment feedforward correction
 Correction computation: 	Controlled
 New input to reduce error in next iteration while not making too large steps 	variable Compute correction to feedforward sign
 Linearized response of control variable to actuator action computed by RAPTOR 	Reference

- For error computation, IDA and IDI analysis is run between the shots
- 2 optimization experiments using NBI and central ECRH as actuators :

Motivation: future tokamak reactors will need to fulfil multiple control tasks with a limited set of actuators

New control challenges:

- Simultaneous execution of several (complex) control tasks with scarce actuators. Real-time prioritisation of these tasks based on evolving plasma state/events. Real-time automated assignment of scarce actuators to fulfil various tasks.
- This poster discusses new developments on TCV and ASDEX Upgrade to address key control challenges for future devices. Collaborative work carried out within EUROfusion MST1 work package

Improved density profile estimation during ICRH by improved RAPDENS ionization and transport model

- RAPDENS (like RAPTOR) combines
- Model-based predictions of the profile evolution
- Update to these predictions using interferometer & bremsstrahlung measurements
- Detection and rejection of faults.
- Improvements to RAPDENS on AUG
- Density profile agrees with off-line Thomson Sc.
- Yields routinely usable density profiles for various applications: ray tracing, temperature profile estimation, ...



Architecture of task-based PCS: separation between specific interface layer and generic task layer

For more details:

T. Blanken Nucl. Fus 2019 [T. Vu Fus. Eng. Des 2019] [T. Vu IEEE TNS, accepted]



Real-time kinetic equilibrium reconstruction demonstrated on TCV for the first time



[F. Carpanese NF 2020] **RAPTOR** computes profiles from model + measurements. LIUQE equilibrium reconstruction uses RAPTOR profiles as basis functions.



Real-time feedback of NBI power deposited to ions on ASDEX Upgrade using RABBIT code

RABBIT code: [Weiland et al, NF 2018] Fast calculation of NBI 2.5·10⁶ LH transition ion RAB deposition using RABBIT code Pion target $2.0.10^{6}$ b) • Implemented in ASDEX Ptot target a a 1.5.10 Upgrade real-time control \mathbb{N} 1.0.10⁶ Used for feedback control 5.0·10⁵ • Ramp total power deposited to ions Keep total deposited power constant 10 2 6 8 0 4



Example of application for TCV High Density Limit disruption avoidance experiments

 Define Off Normal Events (ONE) and program danger levels per events based on thresholds

 TABLE 1.
 Table of danger levels conditions programmed for TCV HDL avoidance experiments

Danger level	no	low	mid	high
ONE				
Disruption limit (D)	d≥0.15	d<0.15	d<0	d<0 for Δt >0.5s
Actuator limit (A)	<50% energy used	>50% energy used	-	>95% energy used

Define mapping between ONE danger level and reaction level (0-4)

Mapping between danger levels for each off-normal event (ONE) and desired reaction level. TABLE 2. Levels 2 (backup scenario) and 4 (DMS triggering) are also available but not used in this example.

Danger level ONE	no	low	mid	high
Disruption limit (D)	0	0	1	1
Actuator limit (A)	0	0	0	3

Map all combinations of reaction levels to desired control scenario

TABLE 3. Lookup table (OS mapping) that maps all possible combinations of reactions for each ONE to control scenarios. Note that reaction levels 2 and 4 were not used in this experiment.

D reaction level	A reaction level	Control Scenario
0	0 or 1	normal

Central Ti optimization at constant T_e central Te/Ti optimization at constant W_{MHD}

done

More ILC applications for fusion: [F. Felici, CDC conference Osaka, Japan 2015]

Application to T_i, T_e control on ASDEX Upgrade



 Goal: increase central T_i at constant Te with respect to the starting point Good convergence after 3 iterations · Increase in NBI heating, decrease in **ECRH**

Outlook: Real-time plasma confinement state detector using Deep Learning for TCV and more

- Combines convolutional layers (CNN) + LSTM
- Based on [Matos, NF 2020]
- Reduced number of parameters for real-time implementation.
- Tests in TCV control system ongoing



[G. Marceca, ICDDPS 2021]







ASDEX Upgrade #35693

Time [s]

Demonstration of high-density limit disruption avoidance using heating & gas on ASDEX Upgrade [See B. Sieglin et al., Fus. Eng. Des 2020]

• Feedback control of gas fueling and central ECRH, based on distance from Disruptive Area, used to avoid high-density limit disruption.

1.0

• Starting point for TCV implementation of similar control scheme to prove generality and portability

1.1

H_{98y2}

0.6

0.5 + 0.8

system DCS



1	0 or 1	recovery
0 or 1	3	soft-stop

• Define control tasks for each control scenario

TABLE 4. Control tasks defined for each Control Scenario Additional Heating control task Control scenario Gas control task conditions *d*>=0.15 Feedforward Feedforward Normal Increase proportionally to -d*d*<0.15 Freeze Maximum Recovery Decrease



2D plane as identified in ASDEX Upgrade [Maraschek NF 2018]

Outlook: Inclusion of RT TORBEAM including jcd calculations in TCV & AUG control systems

 Benchmark of new **TORBEAM** version (RT capable) vs TORAY for TCV carried out.

• New RT-TORBEAM to be interfaced with TCV & AUG control system to provide better RT jECCD estimate for real-time q profile modeling



28th IAEA Fusion Energy Conference (FEC 2020), Virtual Conference, 10-15 May 2021 - EX-P4/4

This work has been supported in part by the Swiss National Science Foundation











This work has been carried out within the framework of the EUROfusion Consortium and has received funding from the Euratom research and training programme 2014-2018 and 2019-2020 under grant agreement No 633053. The views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of the European Commission.