

UK Atomic Energy Authority

## UKAEA-CCFE-PR(20)78

Andrey Litnovsky, Janina Schmitza, Felix Klein, Karen De Lannoyea, Sophie Weckauf, Arkadi Kreter, Marcin Rasinski, Jan W. Coenen, Christian Linsmeier, Jesus Gonzalez-Julian, Martin Bram, Ivan Povstugar, Thomas Morgan, Duc Nguyen-Manh, Mark Gilbert, Damjan Sobieraj, Jan S. Wróbel Smart Tungsten-based Alloys for a First Wall of DEMO Enquiries about copyright and reproduction should in the first instance be addressed to the UKAEA Publications Officer, Culham Science Centre, Building K1/0/83 Abingdon, Oxfordshire, OX14 3DB, UK. The United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority is the copyright holder.

The contents of this document and all other UKAEA Preprints, Reports and Conference Papers are available to view online free at <u>scientific-publications.ukaea.uk/</u>

# Smart Tungsten-based Alloys for a First Wall of DEMO

Andrey Litnovsky, Janina Schmitza, Felix Klein, Karen De Lannoyea, Sophie Weckauf, Arkadi Kreter, Marcin Rasinski, Jan W. Coenen, Christian Linsmeier, Jesus Gonzalez-Julian, Martin Bram, Ivan Povstugar, Thomas Morgan, Duc Nguyen-Manh, Mark Gilbert, Damjan Sobieraj, Jan S. Wróbel

### Smart Tungsten-based Alloys for a First Wall of DEMO

Andrey Litnovsky<sup>a\*</sup>, Janina Schmitz<sup>a,b</sup>, Felix Klein<sup>a</sup>, Karen De Lannoye<sup>a,c</sup>, Sophie Weckauf<sup>a</sup>, Arkadi Kreter<sup>a</sup>, Marcin Rasinski<sup>a</sup>, Jan W. Coenen<sup>a</sup>, Christian Linsmeier<sup>a</sup>, Jesus Gonzalez-Julian<sup>a</sup>, Martin Bram<sup>a</sup>, Ivan Povstugar<sup>d</sup>, Thomas Morgan<sup>e</sup>, Duc Nguyen-Manh<sup>f</sup>, Mark Gilbert<sup>f</sup>, Damjan Sobieraj<sup>g</sup> and Jan S. Wróbel<sup>g</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH, Institut für Energie und Klimaforschung, 52425 Jülich, Germany <sup>b</sup>Department of Applied Physics, Ghent University, 9000 Ghent, Belgium <sup>c</sup>Vrije Universiteit Brussel, 1050 Elsene, Belgium

<sup>d</sup>Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH, Zentralinstitut für Engineering, Elektronik und Analytik (ZEA 3 Analytik, 52425 Jülich, Germany

<sup>e</sup>DIFFER Dutch Institute For Fundamental Energy Research, De Zaale 20, 5612 AJ Eindhoven, The Netherlands

<sup>f</sup>CCFE, United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority, Culham Science Centre, Abingdon, Oxfordshire OX14 3DB, United

Kingdom

<sup>g</sup>Faculty of Materials Science and Engineering, Warsaw University of Technology, Woloska 141, 02-507 Warsaw, Poland

During an accident with loss-of-coolant and air ingress in DEMO, the temperature of tungsten first wall cladding may exceed 1000°C and remain for months leading to tungsten oxidation. The radioactive tungsten oxide can be mobilized to the environment at rates of 10 - 150 kg per hour. Smart tungsten-based alloys are under development to address this issue. Alloys are aimed to function as pure tungsten during regular plasma operation of DEMO. During an accident, alloying elements will create a protective layer, suppressing release of W oxide.

Bulk smart alloys were developed by using mechanical alloying and field-assisted sintering technology. The mechanical alloying process was optimized leading to an increased powder production by 45%. Smart alloys and tungsten were tested under a variety of DEMO-relevant plasma conditions. Both materials demonstrated similar sputtering resistance to deuterium plasma. Under accident conditions, alloys feature a 40-fold reduction of W release compared to that of pure tungsten.

Keywords: DEMO, passive safety, tungsten alloys, suppressed oxidation, plasma-facing material, yttrium.

### **1. Introduction and motivation**

In a future fusion power plant, such as the DEMOnstration Power Plant (DEMO) safety of operation will be of highest importance [1, 2]. Presently, due to a number of advantages, such as a high melting point, low sputtering by plasma particles, relatively short-term activation, low tritium retention and high thermal conductivity, tungsten (W) is deemed as a preferred candidate material for a plasma-facing first wall. At the same time, assessment of accident conditions revealed severe issues with using pure tungsten [3]. In the case of a loss-of-coolant accident, accompanied by air ingress into the vacuum vessel, tungsten first wall would be in contact with surrounding atmosphere. In the absence of a coolant, the temperature of the tungsten cladding can climb to 1000°C and even higher due to the nuclear decay heat and remain at such a level for weeks [3]. At such temperatures, neutronactivated tungsten, among its radioactive isotopes, will form volatile oxides. According to calculations made for DEMO [4], the amount of radioactive oxides sublimated into atmosphere from the first wall will be in ther range of 50-150 kg/hour. Such a dramatic radioactive release must be suppressed to the highest possible extent.

Self-passivating tungsten based alloys were originally proposed and developed by Koch and Bolt [5-7]. These, so-called "Smart Alloys" (SA), change their properties depending on environment. During regular plasma operation, the lighter alloying elements such as chromium (Cr), zirconium (Zr) or yttrium (Y) will be more easily sputtered by plasma particles leaving almost a pure W surface facing the plasma and having all the aforementioned advantages of pure tungsten. During an accident, the remaining alloying elements in the bulk will diffuse to the surface and form their own oxides protecting tungsten from oxidation and subsequent sublimation into atmosphere.

Recent studies have shown the benefits of W-Cr-Y systems [4, 8, 9]. These SA have demonstrated greatly superior oxidation resistance. The research formerly based on laboratory-scale thin films, has been rapidly changed towards bulk samples. Usually, mechanical alloying (MA) [10] was used to obtain the SA. The samples were produced by using hot isostatic pressing [11]. Recently, field-assisted sintering technology (FAST) [12] was applied for the production of bulk samples, reducing the time necessary for the compacting and sintering of alloyed powders down to minutes [9, 13]. New SA systems produced using FAST featured superior oxidation properties [9, 13-15] and acceptable plasma performance [16-19]. The technology of production was treated as advanced enough to allow material performance tests on the timescale of their expected lifetime in DEMO.

In this paper, further optimization of the mechanical alloying route is explained followed by the results of the plasma tests of the SA under DEMO-relevant conditions. These investigations are accompanied by the assessment of bulk SA under accident conditions in DEMO. A summary of results and an outlook to future studies conclude the paper.

### 2. Optimized mechanical alloying

Mechanical alloving is a standard technique used for the production of bulk systems. The elemental powders, in our case, W, Cr and Y, are placed in a milling jar with tungsten carbide balls and then milled for several hours using a planetary mill. In the case of successful milling, the resulting powder represents the W-Cr alloy without residual W and Cr constituents. With the commissioning of a new powder metallurgical lab, the PowderLab at Forschungszentrum Juelich GmbH, the new planetary mill Retsch PM 400 became available. In contrast to previously used PM 400 in former studies, the new mill features higher rotational ratio 1: (-3). In this ratio, the first number is the normalized speed of base in a planetary system. The second number is a normalized speed of the milling jar with respect to the base. Higher rotational ratio allows the transfer or more energy to the powder i.e. it may potentially result in better and faster alloying. On the other hand, higher power exerted to the powder may lead to pressing the powder to the jar's walls and as a consequence, to incomplete milling. Other important parameters for milling are the ball-to-powder ratio (BPR) and the free remaining volume. The former mainly influences the intensity of the mechanical contact between the powder and the balls i.e. the efficiency of energy transfer to the powder. The latter parameter is important for ensuring that a sufficient amount of energy is transferred during a single contact of the powder with a milling ball.

Based on the aforementioned expectations, a parametric optimization was made. During such an optimization, usually one milling parameter was varied while all the remaining ones were fixed. The tungsten carbide milling jars with a total volume of 250 ml. were used for optimization. The rotation speed of the milling base was kept at 250 rpm. Unless otherwise stated, the reported results were obtained via milling for 60 hours using the 10 mm balls of tungsten carbide. The quality of the alloying was investigated using the Bruker Discover D8, X-Ray diffraction system at FZJ. The current results of the optimization are shown in Table 1.

As can be seen from the table, experiments 1 and 2, copying of the milling parameters from the former planetary mill did not result in complete mechanical alloying. Interestingly enough allowing smaller milling balls into the jar did not bring any advantages in milling, experiment 7. The most promising results were obtained by either reducing the free volume necessary for alloying (experiment 3) or by reducing the BPR i.e. by allowing more powder in the milling jar (experiment 5). With optimized parameters, it was possible to attain up to 40%

more of the fully alloyed powder per one milling session. The next optimization step would be to reduce the milling time from 60 to 40 hours, assuming the quality of alloying will not degrade. The corresponding optimization is underway and the results will be reported shortly.

# **3.** Plasma performance under DEMO-relevant conditions: lifetime tests

Previous studies have already demonstrated good sputtering resistance of developed smart alloys at ion energies below sputtering threshold of W[17, 19]. As expected, the alloying elements on the plasma-facing surface were sputtered, whereas the pure tungsten layer remained. Such a tungsten layer provided a protecting action for the underlying smart alloy so that the resulting sputtering resistance of SA and pure tungsten becomes very similar. These experiments, previously performed in linear plasma device PSI-2 [20], were recently continued in the Magnum-PSI linear plasma facility [21], hosted by the Dutch Institute of the Fundamental Energy Research (DIFFER) in Eindhoven, The Netherlands.

Table 1. Results of MA optimization

No.BPRvolume, mlamount, mlResult1. $5:1$ 195110old mill, reference regime, complete alloying2. $5:1$ 195110new mill, repetition of a reference regime, incomplete alloying2. $5:1$ 195110of a reference regime, incomplete alloying3. $5:1$ 172156complete alloying4. $3:1$ 195168incomplete alloying risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jar5. $2:1$ 195232risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jar6. $2:1$ 160385Non-alloyed powder pressed on the jar7. $3:1$ 192179Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours8. $3:1$ 192156Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.			Free	Powder					
INO.BTRVolume, mlanothin, gResult1.5:1195110old mill, reference regime, complete alloying2.5:1195110of a reference regime, incomplete alloying2.5:1172156complete alloying3.5:1172156complete alloying4.3:1195168incomplete alloying5.2:1195232complete alloying risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jar6.2:1160385Non-alloyed powder pressed on the jar7.3:119516910 and 5 mm milling balls8.3:1192179Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours9.5:1172156Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.	No.	BPR	volume	amount	Pecult				
Imgold mill, reference regime, complete alloying1. $5:1$ 195110old mill, reference regime, complete alloying2. $5:1$ 195110of a reference regime, incomplete alloying2. $5:1$ 172156complete alloying3. $5:1$ 172156complete alloying3. $5:1$ 172156complete alloying4. $3:1$ 195168incomplete alloying5. $2:1$ 195232complete alloying risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jar6. $2:1$ 160385Non-alloyed powder pressed on the jar7. $3:1$ 19516910 and 5 mm milling balls8. $3:1$ 192179Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours9. $5:1$ 172156Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.			ml	amount,	Kesun				
1. $5:1$ $195$ $110$ $regime, complete alloying$ 2. $5:1$ $195$ $110$ $regime, complete alloying$ 2. $5:1$ $195$ $110$ $of a reference regime, incomplete alloying$ A. Reducing the free volume3. $5:1$ $172$ $156$ complete alloyingB. Changing BPR4. $3:1$ $195$ $168$ incomplete alloying risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jar5. $2:1$ $195$ $232$ $risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jar6.2:1160385Non-alloyed powder pressed on the jar7.3:119516910 and 5 mm milling balls8.3:1192179Complete alloying, milling time 70 hoursShorter milling with reduced free volume from A.9.5:1172156Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.$			1111	<u> </u>	ald mill reference				
1. $3:1$ $193$ $110$ regime, complete alloying2. $5:1$ $195$ $110$ regime, complete alloying2. $5:1$ $195$ $110$ of a reference regime, incomplete alloying3. $5:1$ $172$ $156$ complete alloying3. $5:1$ $172$ $156$ complete alloying4. $3:1$ $195$ $168$ incomplete alloying5. $2:1$ $195$ $232$ complete alloying risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jar6. $2:1$ $160$ $385$ Non-alloyed powder pressed on the jar7. $3:1$ $195$ $169$ $10$ and 5 mm milling balls8. $3:1$ $192$ $179$ Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours9. $5:1$ $172$ $156$ Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.	1	5.1	195	110					
2.5:1195110new mill, repetition of a reference regime, incomplete alloying3.5:1172156complete alloying3.5:1172156complete alloyingB. Changing BPR4.3:1195168incomplete alloying risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jar5.2:1195232risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jar6.2:1160385Non-alloyed powder pressed on the jar7.3:119516910 and 5 mm milling balls8.3:1192179Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours9.5:1172156Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.	1.	5:1			regime, complete				
2. $5:1$ $195$ $110$ new mill, repetition of a reference regime, incomplete alloying3. $5:1$ $172$ $156$ complete alloying3. $5:1$ $172$ $156$ complete alloyingB. Changing BPR4. $3:1$ $195$ $168$ incomplete alloying5. $2:1$ $195$ $232$ complete alloying risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jarC. Attempting to find an optimum combination6. $2:1$ $160$ $385$ Non-alloyed powder pressed on the jar7. $3:1$ $195$ $169$ $10$ and 5 mm milling balls8. $3:1$ $192$ $179$ Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours9. $5:1$ $172$ $156$ Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.									
2. $5:1$ $195$ $110$ of a reference regime, incomplete alloying3. $5:1$ $172$ $156$ complete alloying3. $5:1$ $172$ $156$ complete alloyingB. Changing BPR4. $3:1$ $195$ $168$ incomplete alloying risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jarC. Attempting to find an optimum combination6. $2:1$ $160$ $385$ Non-alloyed powder pressed on the jar7. $3:1$ $195$ $169$ $10$ and 5 mm milling balls8. $3:1$ $192$ $179$ Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours9. $5:1$ $172$ $156$ Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.		5:1	195	110	new mill, repetition				
A. Reducing the free volume3. $5:1$ $172$ $156$ complete alloyingB. Changing BPR4. $3:1$ $195$ $168$ incomplete alloying5. $2:1$ $195$ $232$ complete alloyingrisk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jarC. Attempting to find an optimum combination6. $2:1$ $160$ $385$ 7. $3:1$ $195$ $169$ Incomplete alloying, incomplete alloying risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jar7. $3:1$ $195$ $169$ Incomplete alloying, incomplete alloying, incomplete alloying, incomplete alloying, incomplete alloying, incomplete alloying, milling time 70 hours8. $3:1$ $192$ $179$ Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours9. $5:1$ $172$ $156$ Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.	2.				of a reference regime,				
A. Reducing the free volume3.5:1172156complete alloyingB. Changing BPR4.3:1195168incomplete alloying5.2:1195232complete alloying risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jarC. Attempting to find an optimum combination6.2:1160385Non-alloyed powder pressed on the jar7.3:119516910 and 5 mm milling balls8.3:1192179Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours9.5:1172156Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.					incomplete alloying				
3. $5:1$ $172$ $156$ complete alloyingB. Changing BPR4. $3:1$ $195$ $168$ incomplete alloying risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jar5. $2:1$ $195$ $232$ complete alloying risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jar6. $2:1$ $160$ $385$ Non-alloyed powder pressed on the jar7. $3:1$ $195$ $169$ $10$ and 5 mm milling balls8. $3:1$ $192$ $179$ Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours9. $5:1$ $172$ $156$ Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.	A. Reducing the free volume								
B. Changing BPR4.3:1195168incomplete alloying complete alloying risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jar5.2:1195232complete alloying risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jarC. Attempting to find an optimum combination6.2:1160385Non-alloyed powder pressed on the jar7.3:1195169Incomplete alloying, 10 and 5 mm milling balls8.3:1192179Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours9.5:1172156Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.	3.	5:1	172	156	complete alloying				
4. $3:1$ $195$ $168$ incomplete alloying complete alloying risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jar5. $2:1$ $195$ $232$ complete alloying risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jar6. $2:1$ $160$ $385$ Non-alloyed powder pressed on the jar7. $3:1$ $195$ $169$ Incomplete alloying, $10$ and 5 mm milling balls8. $3:1$ $192$ $179$ Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours9. $5:1$ $172$ $156$ Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.	B. Changing BPR								
5.2:1195232complete alloying risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jarC. Attempting to find an optimum combination6.2:1160385Non-alloyed powder pressed on the jar7.3:1195169Incomplete alloying, 10 and 5 mm milling balls8.3:1192179Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours9.5:1172156Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.	4.	3:1	195	168	incomplete alloying				
5.   2:1   195   232   risk of non-alloyed powder pressed to the jar     C. Attempting to find an optimum combination     6.   2:1   160   385   Non-alloyed powder pressed on the jar     7.   3:1   195   169   Incomplete alloying, 10 and 5 mm milling balls     8.   3:1   192   179   Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours     Shorter milling with reduced free volume from A.   9.   5:1   172   156   Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.	5.	2:1	195	232	complete alloying				
5. 2:1 195 232 powder pressed to the jar   C. Attempting to find an optimum combination   6. 2:1 160 385 Non-alloyed powder pressed on the jar   7. 3:1 195 169 10 and 5 mm milling balls   8. 3:1 192 179 Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours   Shorter milling with reduced free volume from A.   9. 5:1 172 156 Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.					risk of non-alloyed				
C. Attempting to find an optimum combination   6. 2:1 160 385 Non-alloyed powder pressed on the jar   7. 3:1 195 169 10 and 5 mm milling balls   8. 3:1 192 179 Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours   Shorter milling with reduced free volume from A.   9. 5:1 172 156 Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.					powder pressed to the				
C. Attempting to find an optimum combination6.2:1160385Non-alloyed powder pressed on the jar7.3:119516910 and 5 mm milling balls8.3:1192179Complete alloying, milling time 70 hoursShorter milling with reduced free volume from A.9.5:11729.5:1172156Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.					jar				
6. 2:1 160 385 Non-alloyed powder pressed on the jar   7. 3:1 195 169 Incomplete alloying, 10 and 5 mm milling balls   8. 3:1 192 179 Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours   Shorter milling with reduced free volume from A.   9. 5:1 172 156 Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.	C. Attempting to find an optimum combination								
6. 2:1 160 385 pressed on the jar   7. 3:1 195 169 10 and 5 mm milling balls   8. 3:1 192 179 Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours   Shorter milling with reduced free volume from A.   9. 5:1 172 156 Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.	6.	2:1	160	385	Non-alloved powder				
7. 3:1 195 169 Incomplete alloying, 10 and 5 mm milling balls   8. 3:1 192 179 Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours   Shorter milling with reduced free volume from A. 9. 5:1 172 156   Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.					pressed on the jar				
7. 3:1 195 169 10 and 5 mm milling balls   8. 3:1 192 179 Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours   Shorter milling with reduced free volume from A.   9. 5:1 172 156 Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.	7.	3:1	195	169	Incomplete alloving.				
8. 3:1 192 179 Complete alloying, milling time 70 hours   Shorter milling with reduced free volume from A.   9. 5:1 172 156   Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.					10 and 5 mm milling				
8.3:1192179Complete alloying, milling time 70 hoursShorter milling with reduced free volume from A.9.5:1172156Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.					balls				
8. 3:1 192 179 milling time 70 hours   Shorter milling with reduced free volume from A.   9. 5:1 172 156 Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.	8.	3:1	192	179	Complete alloving.				
Shorter milling with reduced free volume from A.9.5:1172156Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.					milling time 70 hours				
9. 5:1 172 156 Complete alloying, milling time 30 hours.	Shorter milling with reduced free volume from A.								
9. 5:1 $1/2$ 156 milling time 30 hours.	9.	5:1	172	156	Complete alloying.				
					milling time 30 hours.				

The basic principles of plasma exposures applied during experiments on PSI-2 [17, 19] remained. The SA and pure W samples were exposed to the steady-state deuterium plasma under as similar as possible conditions. In all experiments, the sample temperature was kept in the range 620°C-700°C i.e. at the

temperature expected for the first wall in DEMO. In all experiments, the ion energy was about 120 eV, which was attained by active biasing of the samples. Plasma parameters were monitored using the moveable Langmuir probe in PSI-2, whereas in Magnum-PSI the Thomson scattering was employed for such a purpose [22]. The temperature of the samples was monitored in PSI-2 using the multi-zone infrared camera (FLIR) calibrated using the thermocouple mounted beneath one of the samples. In experiments on Magnum-PSI the temperature of samples was monitored using a spectroscopic pyrometer. A key difference in the exposures on both machines was the way the samples were exposed. In PSI-2, all SA and W probes were exposed simultaneously (Fig. 1a) taking an advantage of a hollow plasma profile and rather large diameter of a plasma column, whereas in Magnum-PSI, only one sample can be exposed at once, see Fig.1b. Therefore, exposures of all samples were made consecutively and repeated for SA and W samples respectively.



Fig. 1. Photographs of plasma exposures in linear devices: a) simultaneous exposure of smart alloy and pure tungsten samples in linear device PSI-2 and b) consecutive one-by-one exposure in MAGNUM Psi.

Here, we introduce the following nomenclature of experiments, which will be followed in our subsequent papers. The first capital letter designates the main plasma ion species; the following number represents the ion energy in eV, the capital letter afterwards, e.g. "P" or "M" stays for the facility: "P" for PSI-2 and "M" for Magnum-PSI. The last letter is the number of the particular experiment. As an example, "D120P2" would mean the second experiment performed on PSI-2 with deuterium plasma, having ion energies around 120 eV.

The main parameters and the results of exposures are summarized on Table 2. In Magnum-PSI it was possible to obtain the highest plasma fluence of  $2.0x10^{27}$  ion/m<sup>2</sup>.This is a factor ~ 12 higher than the highest one attained in PSI-2. Taking into account the estimates for expected fluxes on the first wall in DEMO [23], the highest attained fluence corresponded to that in about 20 days of continuous DEMO operation. The experiments in Magnum-PSI have confirmed a desired similarity of sputtering resistance of W-Cr-Y smart alloys and pure tungsten.

The ratio of the mass of removed material both from the W and SA samples was estimated taking into account the same surface recession caused by sputtering of both SA and W samples and using the theoretical density of SA of 15.9 g/cm<sup>3</sup> [24]. The theoretical ratio  $\Delta m_W/\Delta m_{SA}$  is 0.82. As can be seen from the table 2, the actual ratios

measured in the course of all exposures match the theoretical value very well. The only exclusion detected for an experiment D120M1 was due to a very short exposure time and hence, a larger uncertainty of results. Generally, an excellent agreement between the modeled and experimental ratios of mass loss for SA and pure W evidences an absence of additional loss of alloying elements during the described plasma exposures. Thus, clear evidences of the feasibility of plasma operation with smart alloys as plasma-facing material were obtained.

At the same time, the exposures performed at energies above the sputtering threshold of tungsten and exposures made with seeded plasmas have shown unfortunately, a vulnerability of both W and SA [17, 18]. Certainly, these questions need to be addressed in greater details in future. The preparation of the overview of plasma performance of smart alloys is presently underway.

### 4. Smart alloys under accident conditions

Ensuring good performance under the expected severe accident conditions is another fundamental condition in ensuring the viability of smart alloys. For this purpose, several studies were performed on controlled oxidation of smart alloys in the air-containing atmosphere in a dry and later on, in a humid environment [13-15, 25-27]. The aim of these studies is to evaluate the oxidation resistance of smart alloys under conditions as close as possible to those expected during opening of a fusion power plant to the atmosphere in the case of a severe accident as described in the introduction. All studies were performed in the thermogravimetric (TGA) facility Setaram TAG 16/18 equipped with the steam generator Setaram WetSys located in the ThermoLab [28] in Forschungszentrum Jülich.

Table 2. Main parameters and results of plasma exposures in PSI-2 and Magnum-PSI linear devices.

Experiment	Fluence, ion/m <sup>2</sup>	Sample temperature, °C	$\Delta m_W / \Delta m_{SA}$	Results
D120P1	1.0x10 <sup>26</sup>	620-700	0.81	Similar sputtering of W and SA. Protecting W layer on the surface of SA. Insignificant
D120P2	1.7x10 <sup>26</sup>	620-700	n.a	
D120M1	1.0x10 <sup>26</sup>	630-670 0.62	0.62	
D120M2	5.0x10 <sup>26</sup>	630-670	0.89	change of morphology.
D120M3	1.0x10 <sup>27</sup>	630-670	0.83	retention of order of 1x10 <sup>14</sup> D/cm <sup>2</sup> in PSI-2 [24]
D120M4	2.0x10 <sup>27</sup>	630-670	0.82	

Usually, in the course of controlled oxidation the mass increase of a sample caused by oxidation is

recorded. The radioactive hazard in the fusion power plant will not however, be directly caused by oxidation. It is sublimation of oxidized tungsten and transmutation elements, which is responsible for a radioactive hazard. Recently, the TGA facility in Jülich was upgraded in such a way, that direct measurements of sublimation became possible [15], to our knowledge for the first time. The time evolution of the mass decrease due to sublimation from smart alloy is presented in Fig. 2. The smart alloy sample was exposed in an atmosphere containing 20 vol.% of synthetic humid air and 80 vol. % of argon. The sample was kept at 1000°C during the exposure. The synthetic humid air having 70 relative % of humidity was fed at a temperature of 40°C to the SA sample. The resulting mass loss due to sublimation is presented via curve A on figure 2 Curve B represents the tungsten oxide sublimation as measured in fully oxidized tungsten thin film. Curve C shows the sublimation mass loss for the tungsten oxide released from the bulk pure tungsten sample. Curves B and C therefore, create an area where we could expect the WO3 sublimation from the pure tungsten sample.

As mentioned in [15] with the present setup of the TGA it was impossible to detect any Cr sublimation. Only W sublimation could be detected. The sublimation curve A from the smart alloy therefore, represents only the W sublimation out of the surface of the smart alloy. In order to evaluate the possible maximum contribution of chromium sublimation, a reference model chromium thin film was fully oxidized and then the sublimation of chromium oxide was measured. The conditions of exposure were identical to those described above. The resulting evolution of mass loss due to Cr sublimation is presented via curve D in figure 2. The comparative analysis of the W sublimation from the smart alloys and from the pure W samples yields more than 40-fold suppression of W release on the time scale of 10 days, outlining the remarkable performance of bulk smart alloys produced by FAST under accident conditions.



Fig. 2. Mass reduction due to sublimation as a function of exposure time for W-Cr-Y smart alloy (curve A), fully oxidized tungsten thin film (curve B), oxidized bulk W sample (curve C) and for oxidized pure Cr film (curve D) in humid air at 1000°C.

Recent studies of the surface morphology were undertaken using the Carl Zeiss CrossBeam XB 540 combined scanning electron microscope (SEM) – focused ion beam device equipped among others, with the Energy-Dispersive X-Ray spectroscopy (EDX) system for an elemental analysis. The SEM photograph of the surface of SA after 10 days of exposure in humid air is presented in figure 3. The evaluation of the EDX mapping yielded to less than 1% surface coverage by the mixed W-Y oxides in a remarkable contrast to the full WO3 surface coverage of the pure tungsten.

#### 5. Summary and outlook

Significant progress has been attained in the research and development of self-passivating tungsten-based smart alloys for a future fusion power plant. The bulk W-Cr-Y systems, produced by mechanical alloying and compacted via field-assisted sintering technology, show remarkable performance both under regular plasma and under accident conditions. Developed smart alloy solutions now allow for the testing under conditions comparable with lifetime conditions in DEMO power plant. Plasma performance of smart alloys have been tested under plasma particle fluence expected after up to 20 days of the continuous DEMO operation.



Fig. 3. Surface of W-Cr-Y smart alloy after oxidation in humid atmosphere at 1000°C for 10 days.

Due to the initial selective sputtering of the alloying elements, a layer of pure tungsten has been formed effectively protecting the remaining smart alloy from sputtering by the plasma. As a result, both smart alloys and pure tungsten samples demonstrated to have very similar sputtering resistance given the energies of plasma particles is below the sputtering threshold for W. The detected mass loss of smart alloys and of tungsten was identical to the estimated values, confirming the absence of additional loss of alloying elements in the course of plasma exposure.

Performance of smart alloys was also extensively tested under accident conditions. Studies were made with heated SA samples exposed to the humid air atmosphere as expected in the course of a severe accident in DEMO. Direct measurements of sublimation have been pioneered in the course of this study. Smart alloys demonstrate at least a 40-fold suppression of sublimation as compared to that of pure tungsten. The surface of exposed smart alloy contains less than 1 area % of W-Y mixed oxides. The formation of volatile WO<sub>3</sub> was not detected. The aforementioned experimental findings coupled with a pronounced shape preservation even under accident conditions [9] outline the remarkable progress in R&D on smart alloys.

Certainly, there are still open questions both in physics understanding and in technological development of the smart alloy systems. The role of yttrium in the stabilizing of the W-Cr solid solution is yet to be understood in sufficient details. Our preliminary abinitio based thermodynamic modelling of phase diagram in ternary W-Cr-Y system showed that in presence of Y, the predicted solute solution temperature in W-Cr subsystem is reduced in a comparison with those found in the corresponding binary alloy. The adverse effects caused by high energy particle sputtering and by seeded plasmas need further investigations. Among the crucial challenges are the thermo-mechanical properties of developed systems. Very important are also technological aspects, such as joining technology for casting smart alloys onto corresponding structural materials and scaling up the manufacturing technology to the industrial level. Last but not least, a complete evaluation of neutron effects, such as transmutation and the assessment of impurity effects on the smart alloy performance, are of highest importance. A dedicated program has been started research at the Forschungszentrum Jülich and the first results are reported in [28].

### Acknowledgments

A part of these studies has been carried out within the framework of the EUROfusion Consortium and has received funding from the Euratom research and training programme 2014-2018 and 2019-2020 under grant agreement No. 633053. The views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of the European Commission. The research benefitted from a grant of the European Commission through the Erasmus Mundus International Doctoral College in Fusion Science and Engineering (FUSION-DC).

### References

- N. Teylor and P. Cortes Lessons learnt from ITER safety & licensing for DEMO and future nuclear fusion facilities, Fusion Engineering and Design 89 (2014) 1995;
- [2] N. Teylor, S. Ciattaglia, H. Boner et al., Hydrogen isotope retention in beryllium for tokamak plasma-facing applications, Fusion Engineering and Design 124 (2017) 1177;
- [3] D. Maisonner et al, A Conceptual Study of Commercial Fusion Power Plants, Final Report, 2005, EFDA-RP-RE-5.0;
- [4] T. Wegener, A. Litnovsky, F. Klein et al., Nucl. Materials and Energy, 9 (2016) 394–398;
- [5] F. Koch and H. Bolt Phys. Scr. T128 (2007)100;

- [6] F. Koch, S. Köppl and H. Bolt, J. Nucl. Mater. 386–388 (2009) 572-574
- [7] F. Koch, J. Brinkmann, S. Lindig, T.P. Mishra and Ch. Linsmeier, Phys. Scr. T145 (2011) 014019;
- [8] A. Calvo, C. Garcia-Rosales, N. Ordas et al., Selfpassivating W-Cr-Y alloys: Characterization and testing, Fusion Engineering and Design 124 (2017) 1118;
- [9] A Litnovsky, T Wegener, F Klein, Ch Linsmeier, M Rasinski, A Kreter, X Tan, J Schmitz, J W Coenen, Y Mao, J Gonzalez-Julian and M Bram "New oxidationresistant tungsten alloys for use in the nuclear fusion reactors", Phys. Scr. T170 (2017) 014012;
- [10] J.S. Benjamin, Metallurgical Transactions, vol. 1 (1970) 2947;
- [11] P. Lopez-Ruiz, N. Ordas, N, S. Lindig et al Phys. Scr. T145 (2011) 014018;
- [12] O. Guillon, J. Gonzalez-Julian, J., Dargat et al., Advanced Engineering Materials, issue 16, vol. 7 (2014) 830;
- [13] F. Klein, T. Wegener, A. Litnovsky et al., "Oxidation resistance of bulk plasma-facing tungsten alloys", Nuclear Materials and Energy 15 (2018) 226;
- [14] F. Klein, T. Wegener, A. Litnovsky et al., "On Oxidation Resistance Mechanisms at 1273 K of Tungsten-Based Alloys Containing Chromium and Yttria", Metals 8 (2018) 488;
- [15] F. Klein, A. Litnovsky, T. Wegener et al., "Sublimation of Advanced Tungsten Alloys Under DEMO Relevant Accidental Conditions", Fusion Engineering and Design 146 (2019) 1198;
- [16] J. Schmitz, A. Litnovsky, F. Klein et al., "WCrY smart alloys as advanced plasma-facing materials – exposure to steady-state pure deuterium plasmas in PSI-2", Nuclear Materials and Energy 15 (2018) 220;
- [17] J. Schmitz, A. Litnovsky, F. Klein et sl., "Argon-seeded plasma exposure and oxidation performance of tungstenchromium-yttrium smart alloys", Tungsten (2019);
- [18] J. Schmitz, A. Litnovsky, F. Klein et al., "On the plasma suitability of WCrY Smart Alloys - the effect of mixed D+Ar/He plasmas", Phys. Scripta (2019), in press.
- [19] A. Litnovsky, F. Klein, J. Schmitz et al., "Smart first wall materials for intrinsic safety of a fusion power plant", Fusion Engineering and Design 136 (2018) 878;
- [20] A. Kreter, C. Brandt, A. Huber et al., Fusion Sci. Technol. 68 (2015) 8;
- [21] H.J.N. van Eck, G.R.A. Akkermans, S. Alonso van der Westen et al., "High-fluence and high-flux performance characteristics of the superconducting Magnum-PSI linear plasma facility", Fusion Engineering and Design 142 (2019) 26;
- [22] H.J. van der Meiden, A. R. Lof, M. A. van den Berg et all, "Advanced Thomson scattering system for high-flux linear plasma generator", Review of Scientific Instruments 83 (2013) 123505;
- [23] Yu. Igitkhanov, B. Bazylev, I. Landman and R. Fetzer, KIT Scientific report 7637 (2013) 20;
- [24] J. Schmitz. Development of tungsten alloy plasma-facing materials for the fusion power plant. PhD thesis, Ruhr-

Universität-Bochum, Fakultät für Physik und Astronomie; Ghent University, Department of Applied Physics, 2019;

- [25] A Litnovsky, T Wegener, F Klein et al., "Advanced smart tungsten alloys for a future fusion power plant", Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion 59 (2017) 064003;
- [26] A. Litnovsky, T. Wegener, F. Klein et al, "Smart tungsten alloys as a material for the first wall of a future fusion power plant", Nucl. Fusion 57 (2017) 066020;
- [27] T. Wegener, F. Klein, A.Litnovsky et al.,"Development and analyses of self-passivating tungsten alloys for DEMO accidental conditions", Fusion Eng. Des. 124 (2017) 183;
- [28] ThermoLab: <u>https://tec.ipp.kfa-juelich.de/thermolab</u> (access details: <u>thermolab@fz-juelich.de</u>);
- [29] F. Klein, M. Gilbert, A. Litnovsky et al., Improved Safety for DEMO by Advanced Tungsten Alloys as First Wall Armor, presented at the International Symposium on Fusion Nuclear Technology (ISFNT 2019), Budapest, Hungary, EU, September 22-28, 2019.