

# Robustness of improved error field suppression in long-pulse discharges

College W&M **Colorado Sch Mines** Columbia U Comp-X FILI **General Atomics** INI Johns Hopkins U LANL IINI Lodestar MIT Nova Photonics New York U Old Dominion U ORNL PPPL PSI Princeton U SNL Think Tank, Inc. UC Davis UC Irvine UCLA UCSD **U** Colorado **U** Marvland **U** Rochester **U** Washington **U** Wisconsin

## Jon Menard, PPPL

#### Advanced Scenarios and Control TSG Final Review Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory March 21, 2008

Culham Sci Ctr U St. Andrews York U Chubu U Fukui U Hiroshima U Hvoao U Kyoto U Kvushu U Kyushu Tokai U **NIFS** Niigata U **U** Tokvo JAEA Hebrew U loffe Inst **RRC Kurchatov Inst** TRINITI **KBSI** KAIST POSTECH ENEA. Frascati CEA, Cadarache **IPP. Jülich IPP**, Garching **IPP AS CR** U Quebec In 2007, using optimized  $B_P$  sensors in control system allowed feedback to provide most/all n=1 error field correction at high  $\beta$ 

- Previous n=1 EF correction required a priori estimate of intrinsic EF
- Additional sensors  $\rightarrow$  detect modes with RWM helicity  $\rightarrow$  increased signal to noise
- Improved detection → higher gain → EF correction using <u>only feedback on RFA</u>

#### EFC algorithm developed in FY07:

- Use time <u>with minimal intrinsic EF</u> and RWM stabilized by rotation
- Intrinsic Ω<sub>φ</sub> collapse absent in 2007
   → purposely apply n=1 EF to reduce rotation, destabilize RWM
- Find corrective feedback phase that reduces applied EF currents
- Increase gain until applied EF currents are nearly completely nulled and plasma stability restored
- Then turn off applied error field (!)



Normalized beta

→ Use same gain/phase settings to suppress RFA from intrinsic EF **and** any unstable RWMs

# High gain, phase difference $\delta$ =270° between measured U/L avg B<sub>P</sub> & applied B<sub>R</sub> optimal $\rightarrow$ can we optimize control further?



- Higher gain beneficial for improved RFA suppression  $G_P >> 1$  possible?
  - Goal Factor of 2 gain increase w/o loss of controller stability
- Significant increase in AC control power evident at higher gain
- More optimal controller? LPF at SPA request to reduce noise...?

Outboard  $\Omega_{\phi}$  changes by 30-40% with n=3 polarity flip

- Optimal n=3 current magnitude = 300-400A
- Coil shape data indicates VF coil (PF5) produces some n=3 EF
  - Need to assess if PF5 EF is consistent with empirical correction below





### Goal: Extend optimal EFC to wider range of scenarios and I<sub>P</sub> Methodology/shot plan:



• Add n=1 feedback – 2 shots for each  $I_P$  – use optimal 2007 gain & phase (6 shots)

#### **Optimize n=1 RFA suppression controller**

•	Reproduce 2007 900kA reference shots which used externally applied ne field to trigger rotation collapse and disruption	=1 error (3 shots)
•	Scan RWM control proportional gain until feedback system is unstable	(4 shots)
	<ul> <li>Add LPF to control coil currents as necessary to avoid very large SPA current</li> </ul>	ts
•	With gain at highest stable value, increase $\tau_{LPF}$ from 0 to:	
	– 1ms, 3ms, 10ms, 30ms, 100ms (2 shots for each $\tau_{LPF}$ )	(10 shots)
•	PF where AC RMS control power is reduced by factor 2-4, increase gain	
	again and determine highest stable value	(4 shots)
•	Test controller for two new plasma currents: 700kA and 1.2MA	(4 shots)

Day 2