

ISSUES IN THE STABILITY ANALYSIS FOR THE ARIES COMPACT STELLARATOR DESIGN

A.D. Turnbull and L.L. Lao
General Atomics

**(with contributions from W.A. Cooper, R.G. Storer,
G.Y. Fu, and M.C. Zarnstorff)**

**Presentation for the ARIES Compact Stellarator
Project Meeting
UC San Diego
January 8 - January 10 2003**

SEVERAL IMPORTANT ISSUES ARISE IN EVALUATION OF EQUILIBRIUM TOOLS FOR COMPACT STELLARATOR DESIGN STUDIES

- **Fixed versus free boundary equilibrium:**
 - Is the plasma boundary shape imposed or determined by coils?
- **Full 3D versus 2D approximations:**
 - Is the 'stellarator expansion' (large aspect ratio ordering) utilized?
 - Is helical symmetry assumed?
 - ⇒ infinite aspect ratio and infinite number of field periods
 - Is the geometry averaged over field periods? ⇒ axisymmetry
 - Is 'stellarator symmetry' assumed?
 - ⇒ At least one toroidal plane exists with up-down symmetry)
- **Direct or inverse equilibrium:**
 - Is $\psi(r,z,\phi)$ determined directly or $r(\psi,\chi,\phi)$ and $z(\psi,\chi,\phi)$ computed for a set of prescribed flux values ψ , poloidal angles χ and toroidal angles ϕ ?
 - Are nested flux surfaces imposed or not?
 - ⇒ If nested flux surfaces are assumed, are they *simply nested*?
 - ⇒ If nested flux surfaces are not assumed:
 - do well defined magnetic islands exist?
 - do approximate surfaces exist? ('flux surface quality')

SEVERAL RELATED ISSUES ARISE IN THE EVALUATION OF COMPUTATIONAL STABILITY TOOLS FOR COMPACT STELLARATOR STUDIES

- **Fixed versus free boundary stability:**
 - Is the plasma bounded by a wall or by a vacuum region?
 - ⇒ Can both internal and external modes be evaluated?
- **Nested versus non-nested flux surfaces:**
 - Are nested flux surfaces assumed for the equilibrium?
 - Are non-nested islands or ergodic regions allowed in the equilibrium?
- **Full 3D versus 2D approximations:**
 - Is an equilibrium expansion (e.g. 'stellarator expansion') used?
 - Is axisymmetry or helical symmetry assumed in the equilibrium?
 - Is 'stellarator symmetry' assumed in the underlying equilibrium?
 - Is 'field period' symmetry invoked in the selection of fourier modes? (Fourier modes are coupled within mutually decoupled families that depend on the number of field periods)

SEVERAL ADDITIONAL ISSUES ARISE IN THE EVALUATION OF COMPUTATIONAL STABILITY TOOLS FOR COMPACT STELLARATOR STUDIES

- **Ideal versus resistive MHD stability:**
 - Are plasma and field components incompressible or compressible?
 - Is the plasma resistivity finite?
 - Are other non-ideal 'Extended MHD' effects (kinetic effects, fast particles, two-fluid or multi-fluid effects) included?
- **Primitive or derived MHD equations:**
 - Solution of initial value, dynamic equations, or variational method
 - Primitive physical variables (δp , δx , δB) or derived quantities
- **Linear versus nonlinear stability:**
 - Is the underlying equilibrium topology fixed?
- **Local stability or global stability:**
 - Is the instability assumed to be localized to a flux surface or extended over a finite region?
 - ⇒ If localized, is Mercier or ballooning stability assumed?
 - ⇒ If global, is it assumed confined to a region (edge or core)?

A SUITE OF DIRECT AND INVERSE FREE BOUNDARY AND FIXED BOUNDARY EQUILIBRIUM CODES EXISTS

- **VMEC (S. Hirshman, ORNL):**
 - **Fixed boundary, fully 3D, inverse equilibrium code with simply nested flux surfaces imposed**
- **HINST (K. Harafuji, NIFT):**
 - **Free boundary, fully 3D, direct equilibrium code**
- **PIES (A. Rieman, PPPL):**
 - **Free boundary, fully 3D direct equilibrium code**
- **NEAR (T. Hender, Culham):**
 - **3D MHD equilibrium code with simply nested flux surfaces imposed**
- **BETA (O. Betancourt, Courant Institute):**
 - **3D MHD finite difference equilibrium code**
- **RSTEQ (B. Carreras, ORNL):**
 - **2D equilibrium from averaging 3D equilibrium over field periods**

VMEC IS THE INDUSTRY STANDARD INVERSE FIXED BOUNDARY EQUILIBRIUM CODE

- **Fixed boundary, full 3D, inverse equilibrium code:**
 - 3D plasma boundary surface shape is imposed
 - Simply nested flux surfaces:
 - ⇒ Calculates $r(\psi, \chi, \phi)$ and $z(\psi, \chi, \phi)$ for a set of flux surfaces ψ and angles χ and ϕ
 - No assumptions of symmetry except 'stellarator symmetry'
- **Widely utilized stellarator equilibrium code:**
 - Used extensively since 1984
 - Computes equilibrium input for the major global stability codes
- **Variational moment method to find stationary equilibrium states:**
 - High accuracy suitable for stability studies
 - Computationally efficient

A CHOICE OF DIRECT FREE BOUNDARY EQUILIBRIUM CODES IS AVAILABLE

- Free boundary, fully 3D, direct equilibrium codes:
 - Two codes are available and used extensively: HINST and PIES
 - Plasma boundary surface shape is defined by coils
 - ⇒ Plasma surface is the outermost surface with confined field lines
 - Calculate $\psi(r, z, \phi)$ irrespective of whether ψ forms nested surfaces
 - ⇒ Islands and ergodic regions can be treated
 - No assumptions of symmetry except 'stellarator symmetry'
- HINST (K. Harafuji NIFS):
 - Iterates to an equilibrium by relaxation of dissipative MHD equations to steady state
 - ⇒ Enhanced dissipation used to accelerate relaxation to equilibrium
 - Code is extremely time consuming
 - Not widely utilized outside of Japan
- PIES (A. Rieman, PPPL):
 - Integrates magnetic differential equation $\text{div}(\mathbf{j}) = 0$ with \mathbf{j}_\perp from $\text{grad}(\psi) = \mathbf{j}_\perp \times \mathbf{B}$
 - Use Amperes Law $\text{curl}(\mathbf{B}) = \mu_0 \mathbf{j}$ to determine field line structure
 - Time consuming but routinely used for NCSX

A SUITE OF LINEAR GLOBAL MHD STABILITY TOOLS IS AVAILABLE FOR STELLARATORS

- **HERA (R. Gruber, EPFL):**
 - **Helically symmetric 2D linear MHD stability code**
- **TWIST (S. Medvedev, Keldysh Inst.):**
 - **Linear ideal MHD stability code with 3D equilibrium averaged over field periods**
- **RST (B. Carreras, ORNL):**
 - **Linear ideal MHD stability code with 3D equilibrium from RSTEQ averaged over field periods**
- **TERPSICHORE (W.A. Cooper, CRPP/EPF-Lausanne):**
 - **Free boundary, fully 3D, global, linear *ideal* MHD stability code with simply nested flux surfaces assumed**
- **CAS-3D (C. Nuhrenberg, Max Planck Institute):**
 - **Free boundary, fully 3D, global, linear *ideal* MHD stability code with simply nested flux surfaces assumed**
- **SPECTOR-3D (R.G. Storer, Flinders University):**
 - **Free boundary, fully 3D, global, linear *resistive* MHD stability code with simply nested flux surfaces assumed**

TERPSICHORE AND CAS-3D ARE STATE OF THE ART FREE BOUNDARY FULLY 3D LINEAR IDEAL MHD STABILITY CODES

- **Comprehensive free boundary, fully 3D, linear ideal MHD stability:**
 - Equilibrium plasma boundary surface shape is bounded by a vacuum region and can be perturbed
 - ⇒ external modes can be treated
 - No expansions or assumptions of symmetry in underlying equilibrium except 'stellarator symmetry'
 - Advantage taken of 'field period' symmetry
 - Variational energy principle formulation
 - Compressible and incompressible ideal MHD plasma versions exist
- **Restricted to simply nested inverse equilibria:**
 - Input equilibrium from VMEC
- **Extensively benchmarked:**
 - Against each other for 3D LHD cases
 - Against 2D linear MHD stability codes for tokamak cases

TERPSICHORE AND CAS-3D ARE ESSENTIALLY EQUIVALENT CODES

- **TERPSICHORE (W.A. Cooper, CRPP):**
 - **Robust and widely utilized 3D stability code**
 - ⇒ extensively used in design studies for LHD and NCSX, and in exploratory stability studies
 - **The vacuum formulation (so-called 'pseudo-vacuum) has numerical problems except in LHD and quasi-symmetric cases**
 - **Code runs on NEC-SX5 and recently ported to SGI Octane (GA)**
 - ⇒ porting to Pentium-4 Linux system looks promising
- **CAS-3D (C. Nuhrenberg, MPI):**
 - **Used extensively in the design of W7AS and W7X**
 - **Code consists of a double family of codes:**
 - ⇒ **Compressible and incompressible ideal MHD plasma and compressible and incompressible toroidal field options**
 - ⇒ **Explicit extraction of high toroidal and poloidal mode numbers**
 - **Vacuum formulation is not fully benchmarked and tested**
 - **Runs on several platforms in Europe and at PPPL**

SPECTOR-3D IS THE ONLY EXISTING LINEAR GLOBAL RESISTIVE MHD STABILITY CODE

- **Free boundary, fully 3D, global, resistive MHD stability code:**
 - **Equilibrium plasma boundary surface shape is imposed and is assumed bounded by a perfectly conducting wall**
 - **No expansions or assumptions of symmetry in underlying equilibrium except 'stellarator symmetry'**
 - **Advantage taken of 'field period' symmetry**
- **Restricted to simply nested inverse equilibria:**
 - **Input equilibrium from VMEC**
 - **Initial value code formulation in terms of magnetic and velocity potentials**
 - **An option with a vacuum does not appear to be available (i.e. ⇒ internal global modes only)**
- **Not yet widely utilized code:**
 - **Code has difficulties with accuracy of VMEC equilibria near the axis**
 - **Code is presently incompressible but plans are underway for a compressible option**

IT IS NOT CLEAR THAT LOCALIZED MHD STABILITY IS RELEVANT FOR STELLARATORS

- Stellarator experiments have substantially exceeded the stability limits predicted from local Mercier and ballooning code calculations:
 - LHD and W7AS have exceeded the predicted β limits by a factor two
- Localized instabilities predicted by these calculations well below the limit predicted by global MHD codes should be strongly stabilized by finite orbit effects:
 - In tokamaks, finite toroidal mode number n corrections to ballooning and Mercier stability are generally small
 - ⇒ the infinite n calculation accurately reflects the real limit
 - In stellarators, the global stability codes in principle incorporate the high n localized modes with low and intermediate n
 - ⇒ In practice the high n modes are numerically excluded
- Global calculations are much closer to experimental stability limits:
 - By excluding the high n modes that in practice are stabilized by finite orbit effects the global codes are more closely reflecting the physics
 - ⇒ More realistic to ignore localized Mercier and ballooning limits and just use low and intermediate n global calculations
 - ⇒ In the global calculations the range of n needs to be terminated at the limit where finite orbit effects become important

3D GLOBAL EXTENDED MHD STABILITY CODE TOOLS ARE AVAILABLE

- **M3D (W. Park, PPPL):**
 - Full 3D nonlinear extended MHD code has recently been applied to compact stellarator equilibria
 - Presumably assumes nested (but not necessarily simply nested) flux surfaces, at least to a high approximation:
 - ⇒ Otherwise numerical problems arise in accurately resolving perturbations parallel and perpendicular to the equilibrium field
- **NIMROD (National Nimrod Team):**
 - Full 3D nonlinear extended MHD code can also be applied in principle to compact stellarator equilibria
 - Presumably assumes nested (but not necessarily simply nested) flux surfaces, at least to a high approximation:
 - ⇒ Otherwise numerical problems arise in accurately resolving perturbations parallel and perpendicular to the equilibrium field

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS: EQUILIBRIUM

- **Equilibrium stability and transport are not separable in stellarators:**
 - Existence of nested flux surface equilibrium can be considered as either an equilibrium or a stability problem
 - Transport is strongly dependent on underlying equilibrium magnetic topology and in turn determines the possible equilibrium profiles
- **Equilibrium codes can therefore be considered stability codes:**
 - An equilibrium computed under certain constraints must be stable unless those constraints can be avoided by a physically valid motion:
 - VMEC imposes fixed boundary and simply nested flux surfaces:
 - ⇒ **Stable to all fixed boundary topology preserving instabilities**
 - PIES and HINST have essentially no constraints on the equilibrium:
 - ⇒ **Stable to all MHD instabilities preserving 'stellarator symmetry'**
- **VMEC is interfaced to TERPSICHORE CAS-3D and SPECTOR-3D:**
 - PIES or HINST are necessary to determine to what extent a nested flux surface configuration actually exists with a specific finite coil set
- **The NCSX Group has developed a procedure for optimizing stellarator design using reverse engineering (S. Hudson, PPPL):**
 - Design the configuration for specific physics properties using VMEC
 - Find a coil set to give a nearby similar free boundary equilibrium
 - Heal remaining bad surfaces by shifts in coil positions or trim coils

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS: STABILITY

- **CAS-3D and TERPSICHORE are almost equivalent**
 - **TERPSICHORE is apparently easier to use and does have a working vacuum boundary condition for some cases at least**
 - **CAS-3D has a number of versions within the code family, some of which greatly reduce the computation time**
- **SPECTOR-3D is still under development but is used for the H-1 Helic at ANU in Canberra**
 - **There is no other comparable code and like most resistive MHD codes it tends to be restricted to lower magnetic Reynolds numbers than are typical of experiments**
- **Local stability criteria are routinely computed by the major global linear stability codes TERPSICHORE and CAS-3D**
 - **Local stability criteria can be ignored when significantly different from global stability limits calculated with sufficiently high mode number**

SUMMARY OF EQUILIBRIUM AND STABILITY ISSUES

- **Equilibrium codes:**
 - Situation is adequate with VMEC for accurate and fast equilibrium calculations suitable for stability analysis and
 - HINST and PIES for evaluating the 'realizability' of the equilibria
 - ⇒ **Major deficiency: Lack of a 3D Stellarator equilibrium fitting code analogous to EFIT for 2D equilibria**
- **Global linear stability codes:**
 - Situation is almost adequate for linear ideal stability:
 - ⇒ A completely robust free boundary and vacuum formulation does not yet exist
 - ⇒ **Major deficiency: There is no linear stability code capable of handling islands or ergodic regions (except in the sense in which PIES and HINST can guarantee some stability)**
 - Situation is still inadequate for linear resistive stability:
 - ⇒ SPECTOR-3D presently suffers from numerical problems when mapping from VMEC near the axis
 - ⇒ **Major deficiency: No linear code exists based on the asymptotic matching method suitable for high S**

SUMMARY OF EQUILIBRIUM AND STABILITY ISSUES

- **Localized linear stability codes:**
 - **Situation is probably adequate for localized ideal stability:**
 - ⇒ **There is a consensus developing that predictions from the infinite n limit are irrelevant and misleading**
 - ⇒ **Global linear codes are better suited to optimizing the stability limits if a sufficiently high range in n is covered**
 - ⇒ **Major deficiency: No formulation of finite n corrections in the high n stability limit**
- **Global nonlinear stability codes:**
 - **Situation is almost adequate for nonlinear extended MHD stability**
 - **The M3D code can be used in limited studies and NIMROD can also handle stellarator geometry in principle**
 - ⇒ **Major deficiency: Nonlinear simulations are extremely time consuming**

STABILITY ANALYSIS PLANS FOR 2003

- **Port TERPSICHORE to local GA Linux workstation:**
 - Assistance from W.A. Cooper with non source code libraries
 - Assistance from G.Y. Fu (PPPL) with interpretations
- **Obtain equilibrium from VMEC (M.C. Zarnstorff PPPL):**
 - Stability analysis using TERPSICHORE for significant range of toroidal mode number n
 - Monitor high n stability but ignore for optimization
 - Increase β or estimate modifications to plasma parameters required to stabilize
- **Modify VMEC equilibrium accordingly (M.C. Zarnstorff):**
 - Iterate with stability analysis using TERPSICHORE
 - Converge on final equilibrium when β limit is reached and simple adjustments to other parameters are ineffective
- **Reconstruct free boundary equilibrium using PIES (M.C. Zarnstorff):**
 - Modification to coils and plasma parameters to reproduce a reasonable set of free boundary nested surfaces
- **Iterate with VMEC and TERPSICHORE calculations:**
 - Linear resistive and nonlinear MHD calculation of final equilibria