

EU-DEMO Fuel Cycle Operation Modelling and Design

Jonas C. Schwenzer IAEA Technical Meeting on Plasma Physics and Technology Aspects of the Tritium Fuel Cycle for Fusion Energy 11 – 13 Oct. 2022



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.



Part I: Integral Fuel Cycle Modeling & Dependencies

Jonas C. Schwenzer IAEA Technical Meeting on Plasma Physics and Technology Aspects of the Tritium Fuel Cycle for Fusion Energy 11 – 13 Oct. 2022



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.

Fuel Cycle – Functional View



Systems in the fuel cycle serve different tritium processing functions:

- Machine Gas Throughput
- Fuel Rebalancing
- Tritium Extraction
- Tritium Recovery

The incurred load on the fuel cycle scales with plant parameters via "fuel cycle performance metrics"



Performance Metrics – Troughput I



Machine Gas Throughput:

- Fuelling and exhaust capabilities provided by systems for:
 - Matter Injection (Pellets & Gas)
 - Composition Control
 - Fuel Separation
 - Vacuum Pumping
 - Exhaust Processing
- System size (and complexity) scales with total throughput
 - Upper limit given by #ports for vacuum pumping



$$M_{MG} = \frac{F_{burn}}{\sum F_{fuel}} = \eta_f f_b$$

Performance Metrics – Troughput II



Machine Gas Throughput:

- Fuelling and exhaust capabilities provided by systems for:
 - Matter Injection (Pellets & Gas)
 - Composition Control
 - Fuel Separation
 - Vacuum Pumping
 - Exhaust Processing
- System size (and complexity) scales with total throughput
 - Upper limit given by #ports for vacuum pumping

Fuelling to Torus (Up to): 380 Pa m³/s DT via Pellets 50 Pa m³/s DT via Gas Puffing **Burn-up (2GW):** 2.68 Pa m³/s DT



$$M_{MG} = \frac{F_{burn}}{\sum F_{fuel}} = \eta_f f_b$$
$$t_{MG} = 0.25 h$$

Performance Metrics – Rebalancing I

Fuel Rebalancing:

- Disproportionate sinks/sources of hydrogen have to be compensated to keep isotopic purity of fuel
 - Protium outgassing is always present in metal systems
 - Large surface areas at elevated temperature in torus





Performance Metrics - Rebalancing II

Fuel Rebalancing:

- Disproportionate sinks/sources of hydrogen have to be compensated to keep isotopic purity of fuel:
 - Protium outgassing is always present in metal systems
 - Large surface areas at elevated temperature in torus
- Excess H (or D/T) is removed in IRPR by processing a fraction of the fuel stream
 - Amount given by balances for each isotopic species
 - Total removal of all H uneconomical
 (→ Requires isotopic separation of all fuel (ITER-like)
- Implanted D/T may also outgas at disproportionate rates
 - Effect expected to change over lifetime



$$\begin{split} M_{FR,i} &= 1 - \frac{F_{fuel} z_i}{F_{fuel} z_i + \Delta F_i} \\ t_{FR} &= 14 \ h \end{split}$$

Performance Metrics - Rebalancing III

Fuel Rebalancing:

- Disproportionate sinks/sources of hydrogen have to be compensated to keep isotopic purity of fuel
 - Protium outgassing is always present in metal systems
 - Large surface areas at elevated temperature in torus
- Excess H (or D/T) is removed in IRPR by processing a fraction of the fuel stream
 - Amount given by balances for each isotopic species
 - Total removal of all H uneconomical
 (→ Requires isotopic separation of all fuel (ITER-like)
- Implanted D/T may also outgas at disproportionate rates
 - Effect expected to change over lifetime







J. Schwenzer | IAEA TM | 13.10.22 | Page 9

Performance Metrics - Extraction

Tritium Extraction:

- Extracted tritium requires further processing in fuel cycle
 - Separation from carrier gases
 - Isotopic separation from doping agents (H,D)
- TBR is fairly fixed [1.0 1.1]

 \rightarrow Variations have only minor impact on tritium flowrate

- →Fuel cycle impact is mostly dependent on Tritium Extraction technology selection
- No isotope separation required if T>D and H< ϵ

Not using hydrogen doping agents has the potential to significantly simplify the outer fuel cycle



$$M_{TE} = \frac{F_{ext}}{F_{burn}} (= TBR^*)$$
$$t_{TE} = \sim 40 h$$

*at steady state



Performance Metrics - Recovery



Tritium Recovery:

- Tritium may be lost from the fuel cycle due to permeation
- Laborious recovery required to limit discharges
 - All tritium is eventually converted to HTO
 - Conversion to hydrogen and isotope separation required
- Largest fuel cycle systems in terms of size and energy consumption

Minimizing Tritium permeation can yield significant gains in fuel cycle system size and energy demand



Summary Part 1



Part 1 Takeaway:

- Fuel Cycle is designed to support one optimal fuel composition of D/T/H
 - Shifts in isotopic ratio can be achieved but requires *hours days* to perform necessary isotope separations
- Full understanding of all mass transport effects in Torus is essential for fuel cycle design
 - Use of hydrogens in other isotopic composition than that of the fuel is highly undesirable from a fuel cycle perspective
- Design & sizing of inner fuel cycle driven mainly by
 - Total machine gas throughput
 - Isotopic purity of exhaust



Part II Dynamic Simulation of Fuel Cycle Operation

Jonas C. Schwenzer IAEA Technical Meeting on Plasma Physics and Technology Aspects of the Tritium Fuel Cycle for Fusion Energy 11 – 13 Oct. 2022



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.

Introduction

- Dynamic process simulations of the fuel cycle are being developed for the evaluation and design of the fuel cycle
- The dynamics of the inner fuel cycle are governed by the Torus Fuelling and Exhaust streams
- \rightarrow Dictated by the fuel demand of the plasma

But....

...I am not a plasma physicist...

.... And I have questions.

What does the fuel demand of a DEMO reactor look like?







Fig. 5. T2 flat-top fuelling delivery experiment with 20 sec peak for the inductive plasma operation.



DEMO Fuelling – Current Understanding I



Gas Injection

DT gas injected at the mid-plane area

Gas Puffing

DT + Ar gas injected at the divertor

Pellet Fuelling

 Frozen DT + Xe pellets injected at high speed into the plasma core

Fuelling time traces?



DEMO Fuelling - Current Understanding II



<u>Flat Top (t_{FT}=7200 s):</u>

- Pellet Fuelling 380 Pa m³/s
 - Core fuelling [10 50 Pa m³/s]
 - Fuelling & SOL losses [150 330 Pa m³/s]
- Gas Puffing 50 Pa m³/s
 - Detachment control

<u>Dwell Phase (t_{Dwell} = 600 s):</u>

- No fuelling
 - But: Outgassing of DT, H, Impurities

<u>Ramp-Up (t_{RU} = 200s):</u>

- DT is injected into the machine
- Gas puffing is ramped up
- Pellet fuelling is engaged once gas injection becomes insufficient

<u>Ramp-Down: (t_{RD}= 150 s):</u>

All active fuelling contributions are slowly disengaged

Flowrates into the Torus **Pellet Injection** 100 400 of FT Flowrate 80 Flowrate (Pa.m³/s) 60 Dwell Burn 40 100 20 % Gas Puffing 15.0 RU RD 60 12.5 e12.5 10.0 of FT Flowrate 50 Flowrate (Pa.m³/s) - 5.0 2.5 % 10 0 0.0 Gas Injection 120 500 of FT Flowrate 400 Flowrate (Pa.m³/s) 20 % 100 6000 6500 7000 7200 7350 7500 7950 8150 8500

Time (s)

∑t = 8150 s ∑F_{FT}= 430 Pa m³/s

Results: Dwell Phase Pressure

- The pressure at the sub-divertor governs the exhaust flowrate
- 1 Metal Foil Pump only operates above a given pressure limit

(2) Residual pressure converges to a steady state pressure determined by outgassing rates

Assumptions:

- 0.23 Pa m³/s Outgassing (99% DT 1% H2)
- Constant pumping speed of backing pumps
- Negligible ⁴He production during RU/RD
- No plasma interactions considered



Results: Dwell Phase Residual Gas Composition (2)



Assumptions:

- 0.23 Pa m³/s Outgassing (99% DT 1% H2)
- Constant pumping speed of backing pumps
- Negligible ⁴He production during RU/RD
- No plasma interactions considered



Results: Buffer Vessel Pressure

- The inner fuel cycle (DIRL + INTL) operates fully continuous (w/o hydride storage)
- → Pressure oscillations need to be buffered to allow stable operation of fuel composition control system

 $\begin{array}{l} \Delta p V_{buffer} \geq \Delta p V_{PC} \\ \Delta p V_{PC} \approx 3 P a \cdot 6400 \ m^3 \end{array}$



(1) The vessel pressure slowly drops due to burn-up. Once the lower threshold is reached DT is replenished from storage. (2) During burn/dwell cycling the buffer vessel pressure first increases and then drops again due to the changing fuel demand. (3) The buffer vessel needs to be sized large enough to not hit the upper pressure threshold even if recently filled up.

$$\rightarrow V_{buffer} \ge 1 m^3$$

Conclusions & Outlook

- Inner fuel cycle transient behaviour governed by the plasma fuelling scheme
- Ramp-up and ramp-down fuel demand determine the fuel cycle dynamics
- Fully continuous operation possible

Detailed design and engineering of systems requires sound understanding of

- Fuelling transients
- Required control capabilities of fuelling systems

Thank You! Questions?