

Report of FESAC Panel

January 1998

The DOE Office of Energy Research chartered through the Fusion Energy Sciences Advisory Committee (FESAC) a panel to "address the topic of U. S. participation in an ITER construction phase, assuming the ITER Parties decide to proceed with construction." (Attachment 1: DOE Charge, September 1996). Given that there is expected to be a transition period of three to five years between the conclusion of the Engineering Design Activities (EDA) and the possible construction start, the DOE Office of Energy Research expanded the charge to "include the U.S. role in an interim period between the EDA and construction." (Attachment 2: DOE Expanded Charge, May 1997).

This panel has heard presentations and received input from a wide cross-section of parties with an interest in the fusion program. The panel concluded it could best fulfill its responsibility under this charge by considering the fusion energy science and technology portion of the U.S. program in its entirety. Accordingly, the panel is making some recommendations for optimum use of the transition period considering the goals of the fusion program and budget pressures.

INTRODUCTION

Fusion is the process that powers the stars. Harnessing that process to contribute to the global energy system is the vision of this panel and the fusion community. The pursuit of this vision also supports basic research and plasma science which are important in their own right.

The U.S. Fusion Energy Sciences Program focuses on the scientific foundations that underpin the fusion process. The three specific objectives of the program, as identified the 1996 FEAC Report are: (1) advance plasma science in pursuit of national science and technology goals, (2) develop fusion science, technology, and plasma confinement innovations, and (3) pursue fusion energy science & technology as an international partner. This "three-leg" strategy has been endorsed by the fusion community, Congress, and the Department of Energy. This panel also endorses it and observes that an implementation plan is needed.

The panel has addressed the near-term plan for the fusion energy science & technology objective of the program, the central near-term goal of which is the demonstration of a self-heated, energy-producing fusion plasma. The experimental study of self-heated plasmas has been recognized worldwide as the next frontier for fusion research. The panel supports this objective, both for the important science it involves, and as a requirement for fusion power-plant development. The major activity supporting this objective of the program is participation in the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER) Engineering Design Activities (EDA), consisting of physics analysis, engineering design, and supporting technology R&D activities.

By its nature, a facility capable of producing a self-heated, energy-producing fusion plasma will be technically challenging and expensive. By working collaboratively, the ITER Partners (European Union, Japan, Russia, and the United States) have benefited through cost-sharing. Additionally, the ITER collaboration has increased the integration

and effectiveness of the world fusion community during the development of the physics basis and the engineering design for a next-step experimental device capable of exploring controlled ignition and extended fusion burn of deuterium-tritium (D-T) plasmas. The imminent conclusion of the presently defined EDA makes this an appropriate time to assess our continued participation in ITER. Available options include the whole range from total withdrawal from the ITER process to full participation as the host country.

Independent technical reviews by FESAC and all the partners have concluded that the ITER engineering design is a sound basis for the project and for DOE to enter negotiations with the Parties regarding construction. The panel accepts the conclusion of these prior in-depth reviews. If a decision to construct ITER were being sought today, this panel would recommend U.S. participation at an appropriate level.

However, because construction phase financing is not presently available, a construction decision has been delayed, and a 3-year transition period proposed. In the panel's view, this 3-year period necessitates an assessment of the proper form and scale of the activities that support the third objective of the overall U.S. Fusion Energy Sciences Program.

CENTRAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The ITER mission includes the demonstration of controlled ignition, extended fusion burn, and integrated power-plant technologies. The panel supports this mission. However, if the financial resources continue to be unavailable, the U.S., in collaboration with its international partners, should develop a set of contingency plans and should be willing to consider a modification of the ITER mission. In the short term, it is important to keep the present ITER option open. In the longer term, it is critically important to get a D-T burning plasma machine internationally approved and built.

Therefore the panel's central recommendation is:

In concert with our international partners, a burning plasma facility should be built at the earliest possible time.

STRATEGIC PLAN

To implement the central recommendation, we propose the following elements for a U.S. strategic plan for the next three years to pursue the third objective of the Fusion Energy Science Program:

- 1. Pursue near-term opportunities for research supporting energy-producing fusion plasma science using existing unique large-scale facilities abroad.**

DISCUSSION:

Recent experimental and theoretical results point to new approaches to achieving high levels of energy production in tokamak plasmas, and the potential

for common benefits provides an impetus for the U.S. to pursue this challenging physics research with its international partners. Continuing development of these advanced tokamak scenarios may provide new paths for cost reduction in pursuing the central recommendation stated above.

In experimental research, we recommend increased participation in the large foreign experiments, JET and JT-60U. The objective is to establish advanced tokamak physics in large tokamaks as a design basis for burning plasma experiments. This effort would be supportive of ITER. With the recent shutdown of TFTR, there is now only one operating physics experiment in the world capable of conducting meaningful D-T burning experiments, namely the JET device in the EU. We suggest that the U.S. explore with our European colleagues the possibility for increased collaboration in JET. Enhanced U.S. participation in JT-60U should be discussed with our Japanese colleagues. As part of these collaborations, the partners should consider developing and testing techniques for remote experimentation on foreign fusion devices.

In addition, we recommend an expanded effort on broad-based theoretical and computational activities to understand high-temperature confined plasmas in the energy-producing regime, in support of the international effort in this area.

2. Restructure the fusion energy technology development effort to more broadly support the fusion energy objective of the program.

DISCUSSION:

Much of the U.S. fusion technology effort has been devoted to ITER over the past five years because of the strong overlap between work carried out specifically for ITER and work that would be carried out under our normal fusion energy technology R&D activities. It is important to continue U.S. industry involvement in fusion technology R&D, which at the present time is largely carried out through the ITER EDA.

The U.S. should continue to participate in those aspects of ITER technology R&D which are dual-purpose, in the sense that they are both critical for a variety of approaches to fusion energy and they also help complete the R&D required for the ITER design. In regard to the ITER design, prior technical reviews have concluded that the designs of most major components are now detailed and well integrated. Validation of the designs, however, depends on completion of the ITER R&D program. To derive full benefits of the EDA investments and reduce risks on open technical issues, these technology efforts should be completed or otherwise brought to an appropriate conclusion.

In addition, the U.S. should continue to make use of international collaboration in fusion technology development to realize the full potential of fusion as an environmentally and economically attractive energy source. Here, non-ITER-specific fusion energy technology R&D should be conducted, including, for example, development of low activation materials. We recommend a community review to determine the role and scope of these technology development activities and their relation to existing technology activities in the rest of the program.

3. Continue to participate in and support the ongoing ITER joint design work at a lower level.

DISCUSSION:

To date the ITER design concept has been developed as an international collaboration. Two of the design partners, the EU and Japan, now have much larger fusion programs than the U.S. Continued involvement gives us the opportunity to participate in the construction and operation of ITER, should the parties decide to go forward with it. In the strategic context of the U.S. science-focused fusion program, our involvement in the construction and operation of ITER would clearly be beneficial.

ITER joint design work includes both JCT and U.S. Home Team activities. We support efforts to explore opportunities for cost reduction and for enhanced scientific flexibility within the ITER scope. Some of these efforts could be carried out in conjunction with the physics research and technology R&D recommended above.

4. Undertake design efforts on lower cost fusion-energy-producing plasma concepts.

DISCUSSION:

Given the present situation where construction commitments have not been secured for the full-mission ITER device, we believe that it is prudent for the international community to examine options that involve reconsideration of the fundamental trade-offs between cost, risk and mission. This effort should be directed at examining lower-cost, reduced scope options in the interest of achieving a fusion-energy-producing plasma experiment on the fastest possible schedule. These options provide a contingency plan that will be necessary in the event that the financial commitments cannot be secured for the full-mission ITER machine.

Design studies carried out in the past by the U.S. and by our international partners have explored a range of mission options from short-pulse ignition to ITER-like sustained burn, covering a cost range from \$2B to the present ITER cost. These studies, with modifications reflecting the new experimental findings from present large-scale tokamaks, could form the basis for an international activity to develop contingency plans for building a facility.

In preparation for this international activity, it is essential that the United States initiate a domestic study with broad fusion community involvement to explore the many options.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS

For the fusion energy science and technology objective of the program, we recommend the following annual funding allocations (FY99\$) for the 3-year plan outlined above:

REC. 1: Research on Existing Large-Scale Facilities Abroad (supporting energy-producing-fusion plasma science)	\$10-20M
REC. 2: Fusion Energy Technology Development (including dual purpose technologies critical for ITER and other fusion approaches)	\$20-25M
REC. 3: Continued ITER Joint Design Work	\$15M
REC. 4: Design Efforts on Lower Cost Concepts (in collaboration with our international partners)	\$5-10M

We recommend these levels in the recognition that the entire fusion program is funding-limited and all three of its components require additional resources. Our recommendations are made within the context of the 1997 PCAST funding profile for fusion energy science research. We endorse this PCAST executive summary report and the FEAC 1996 program restructuring report, both of which called for a \$200M minimum support level for the plasma science and confinement innovations program objectives. These objectives comprise an important element of the country's basic science portfolio and include: nurturing basic research in plasma science; supporting both alternative concepts and advanced tokamak physics research; and developing enabling technologies in support of these concept innovation efforts. Achievement of these objectives is essential to provide the knowledge needed for development of fusion energy in the long run.