

# Status of the EP-WF, development towards CG and kick models with applications to AUG, SA and JET

# Ph. Lauber, V.-A. Popa, T. Hayward-Schneider

TSVV#10 progress meeting 3.5 2022





1























1. ASDEX Upgrade

Status EP MHD 22.2.2022







### AUG-IMAS modelling: EP driven modes change bursting characteristics during slow L-H transition in hydrogen: discharge stays in L mode despite 5MW heating

#### July 2021









# IPP

#### model transition using time-dependent EP workflow using trview-IMAS interface









160 time slices based on IDA largely automated analysis (except visualisation)

presently working on NBI EP

ready for:

coupling to transport codes systematic UQ, 'error bars' scenario optimisation

problem: deal with incomplete data (e.g. beam blips missing for Ti) IDS merger tool (V.-A. Popa)









### AUG observation: switching on core ECCD at 3.5s, n=2 TAE disappears



**ITER** helena IMAS version

LIGKA mode 6







## LIGKA-CASTOR comparison: differences of WFs due to different q's in reconstructed eq - to be resolved



LIGKA

TSVV#10 progress meeting 3.5 2022

### CASTOR

#### n=2 TAE eigenfunctions - similar, but different equilibria lead to observed differences







## LIGKA-CASTOR comparison: differences of WFs due to different q's in reconstructed eq - to be resolved

t=3.21



can be resolved by re-reading helena-written IDS by different eq-codes (now experience with chease->helena)

![](_page_9_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Figure_9.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_0.jpeg)

# 2. JT-60SA

TSVV#10 progress meeting 3.5 2022

![](_page_10_Picture_5.jpeg)

11

![](_page_11_Figure_2.jpeg)

TSVV#10 progress meeting 3.5 2022

#### JT-60SA: successful coupling of EP WF to JINTRAC output (scenario 2, 70000,419) [L Garzotti]

![](_page_11_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_6.jpeg)

### JT-60ASA: successful coupling to JINTRAC output (scenario 2, 70000,419) [L Garzotti]

![](_page_12_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_0.jpeg)

**3. JET** 

TSVV#10 progress meeting 3.5 2022

![](_page_13_Picture_4.jpeg)

14

pp

![](_page_14_Figure_1.jpeg)

### JET: repeated damping study of AEs for predicted DT scenario after 2010 ITPA effort - similar results.

![](_page_14_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Figure_2.jpeg)

analyse ion and electron contributions, structure of mode structures and  $E_{I/2}$ 

TSVV#10 progress meeting 3.5 2022

What is the role of KAWs for the damping of low-n TAEs?

![](_page_15_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_0.jpeg)

adding step by step electron resonances: no electron LD damping:

 $\gamma/\omega = -0.16\%$  (ion LD)

# adding circulating k=0 resonance:

 $\gamma/\omega = -0.67\%$  (ion LD+circ el )

# adding circulating k=±1 sidebands:

 $\gamma/\omega = -0.77\%$  (ion LD+circ el+sb)

# adding trapped electrons:

 $\gamma/\omega = -0.87\%$  (ion LD+all el)

# JET: analysis of damping mechanisms [Lauber, AAPPS-DPP 2021]

![](_page_16_Figure_12.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_14.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_0.jpeg)

adding step by step electron resonances: no kinetic electron damping:

 $\gamma/\omega = -0.16\%$  (ion LD)

# adding circulating k=0 resonance:

 $\gamma/\omega = -0.67\%$  (ion LD+circ el )

# adding circulating k=±1 sidebands:

 $\gamma/\omega = -0.77\%$  (ion LD+circ el+sb)

# adding trapped electrons:

 $\gamma/\omega = -0.87\%$  (ion LD+all el)

to k//=0

![](_page_17_Figure_13.jpeg)

# missing trapped electrons lead to weakly damped region close

![](_page_17_Picture_16.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_17.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_18.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_0.jpeg)

# adding step by step electron resonances: no electron LD damping:

 $\gamma/\omega = -0.16\%$  (ion LD)

# adding circulating k=0 resonance:

 $\gamma/\omega = -0.67\%$  (ion LD+circ el )

# adding circulating k=±1 sidebands:

 $\gamma/\omega = -0.77\%$  (ion LD+circ el+sb)

# adding trapped electrons:

 $\gamma/\omega = -0.87\%$  (ion LD+all el)

smooth structure - KAW coupling visible in E// mode structure differs from MHD result - **non-perturbative** 

# JET: analysis of damping mechanisms

![](_page_18_Figure_13.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_15.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_16.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_17.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_18.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_0.jpeg)

TSVV#10 progress meeting 3.5 2022

towards EP transport models

![](_page_19_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_0.jpeg)

# towards EP transport: HAGIS2 as library is crucial element for various transport models

![](_page_20_Figure_2.jpeg)

distributions IDS holds all orbit-averaged information about marker space - fast, repetitive calls are possible [A. Bierwage, CPC 2022, LIGKA orbit integrals, CPC 2007] 'finder' routine to set up marker space, determine trapped-passing bnd, sort, classify and select particles,... now full implemented in IMAS, also with extended IDS structures etc, MDS+ limitations (2GB) identified TSVV#10 progress meeting 3.5 2022

![](_page_20_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_5.jpeg)

21

![](_page_21_Figure_0.jpeg)

# towards EP transport: HAGIS2 as library is crucial element for various transport models

![](_page_21_Figure_2.jpeg)

distributions IDS holds all orbit-averaged information about marker space - fast, repetitive calls are possible [A. Bierwage, CPC 2022, LIGKA orbit integrals, CPC 2007] 'finder' routine to set up marker space, determine trapped-passing bnd, sort, classify and select particles,... now full implemented in IMAS, also with extended IDS structures etc, MDS+ limitations (2GB) identified TSVV#10 progress meeting 3.5 2022

![](_page_21_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_2.jpeg)

 apply to F<sub>EP</sub>(Pz,E,mu) using various (diffusive, convective,...) 'Ansätze' • extend to 4D i.e. including amplitude - opens path to intensity closure models • pass either F<sub>EP</sub> or moments back to transport codes

# implementation of PSZS transport models - here: kick-model limit (ITER case)

[M.V. Falessi, 2017-2022, ENR ATEP project]

calculate <dPz/dt> , <dE/dt> for given fixed mode structures at fixed amplitude:

dPz/dt (Pz,E), Lambda=845 [\*100]

![](_page_22_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_13.jpeg)

- first application to JT-60SA, scenarios will be available soon
- ITER scenario studies ongoing [V.A. Popa, IAEA TCM Data Analysis, Dec 2021]
- JET-TAE studied in [Ph. Lauber AAPPS-DPP, 2021], no WF application so far
- DEMO: start to test EP-WF on a few generic scenarios to be determined soon
- further needs:
- interfaces between experiments and IMAS databases (JET, JT-60SA)
- consistently filled IDSs (core\_profiles, equilibrium, distributions)
- error analysis and UQ is now possible
- reproducibility; IMAS based orbit data-base routines available [Bierwage et al 2021]

# outlook

• EP -WF also successfully applied to TCV [M. Vallar] - some EAE problems of WF to be resolved

depending on smoothness, interpretative transport runs necessary - IDA analysis is sufficient

set of standardised smoothing/fitting tools for exp. data, in particular EP distribution functions -

![](_page_23_Picture_18.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_19.jpeg)