Plasma shape control with XSC during the ramp-up and ramp-down phases
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The XSC allows the SLs to directly specify the target shape, without specifying the PF current waveforms.

The PF current waveforms are automatically computed by the model-based control algorithm.

The PF currents may saturate during the experiment.

The Current Limit Avoidance System (CLA) has been recently designed and implemented to avoid current saturations in the PF coils when the XSC is used to control the plasma shape.
Aims of Px-2.1.7

The main aims of Px-2.1.7 are:

- to apply the CLA to realistic plasma scenarios in condition of low disruption probability and low forces at disruption
- to show that the **CLA can enlarge the operational space of the XSC**
  1. when the nominal currents in the PF coils are close to their limits and XSC has no margin for plasma boundary control
  2. when large variations of $\beta_p$ and $l_i$ push the currents requested by the XSC close to their limits **(variations of $I_p$, $l_i$ and $\beta_p$ are seen as disturbances by the plasma shape control)**
The early session on **Friday 18th May** was aimed to study the behavior of XSC+CLA during plasma current **ramp-up** and **ramp-down**.

This session was aimed to perform a preliminary assessment of the CLA performance during a variation of $I_i$.

As important “by-product”, the first pulse ever in full XSC control has been run [Jotter pulse 83014](#).

More details (pulse list, comments, etc.) can be found on the [wiki page](#).
Comparison between SC and XSC

The following pulses are considered in order to compare the behavior of the two plasma shape controllers during the $I_p$ ramp-up:

- #83011 – with SC
- #83014 – with XSC

while the comparison during the $I_p$ ramp-down is done considering the pulses:

- #72203 – with SC
- #83014 – with XSC
Shape control during $I_p$ ramp-up

Pulses #83011 and #83014 - $I_p$ ramp-up

@41s shape control takes over

@43s the transition to the desired plasma shape should be completed
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- Bad shape control in the inner side.
- This is mainly due to the fact that P4 is used to control ROG, while RIG is not controlled.
Shape control during $I_p$ ramp-up

#83014 - Shape tracking during the ramp-up with XSC

@43s  
@44s  
@44.5s
The biggest error in shape control is in the top outer region (remember the XSC minimizes the shape error in least mean square sense!)

This error could be reduced by increasing the error in a different region (i.e. in the divertor region)

Good shape tracking in both RIG and ROG regions, and good tracking of strike points and x-point position

By using the XSC the transition time can be further reduced, i.e. the desired plasma shape can be achieved about 1s earlier during the ramp-up (at 42s)
Plasma surface and $q_{95}$

JET Data Display

- 83011 MAGN/IPLA
  - Seq=2 (0)

- 83014 MAGN/IPLA
  - Seq=2 (0)

- 83011 EFIT/Q95
  - Seq=23 (0)

- 83014 EFIT/Q95
  - Seq=24 (0)

- 83011 EFIT/AREA
  - Seq=23 (0)

- 83014 EFIT/AREA
  - Seq=24 (0)
Shape control during \( I_p \) ramp-down

Pulse #72203 - \( I_p \) ramp-down with SC

JET Data Display

- \( 72203 \) MAGN/IPLA
  - Seq=5 (0)

\[\text{shape snapshot}\]

\[\text{reference shape}\]
Shape control during $I_p$ ramp-down

#72203 - Shape tracking during the ramp-down with SC
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Pulse #83014 - $I_p$ ramp-down with XSC

JET Data Display

- Shape control during $I_p$ ramp-down

- 83014 MAGN/IPLA
  Seq=2 (0)

- Shape snapshot
- Reference shape
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Shape control during $I_p$ ramp-down

#83014 - Shape tracking during the ramp-down with SSC

SURF Lx201.2

@55s  

SURF Lx201.2

@56s  

SURF Lx201.2

@58s  
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Also during $I_p$ ramp-down, XSC has demonstrated to better control the shape.

As for the use of the CLA during the ramp-down (when PF currents approach 0), the following preliminary considerations need to be further investigated:

- The use of CLA with 0 low limits seems to delay the soft stop, hence to enlarge the XSC operational space.
- This improvement seems increase when the derivative of $I_p$ is increased.
Conclusions

- By using XSC a better control of plasma shape can be achieved during both $I_p$ ramp-up and ramp-down.
- Thanks to the CLA safe operations are guaranteed.
- Although only ohmic ramp-up/ramp-down have been run with XSC, simulations have been performed also for high confinement scenarios with $\beta_p$ variations.
- The use of XSC+CLA is recommended during $I_p$ ramp-up and ramp-down, where large variations of $I_p$, $I_i$ and $\beta_p$ are expected.
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