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Abstract

Problems related to cable-in-conduit conductors (CICC) are intrinsically multi-physics involving coupled electro-magnetic/mechanical/thermal-hydraulic fields. Here we concentrate on the thermal-hydraulic issues because, although the CICC was first proposed for the low-$T_C$ superconducting coils of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER) many years ago, CICC thermal-hydraulics alone is less understood than could be expected. Some of the difficulties are due to the multi-channel nature of the ITER CICC, where strands containing the superconducting filaments are twisted in multi-stage sub-bundles (petals) delimited by wrappings and concentrated in an annular (porous-medium like) region, while a central channel, delimited by a spiral, provides lower hydraulic impedance and pressure relief to the flow of the supercritical helium coolant. Other difficulties are related to the multi-scale nature of this problem, with length scales relevant for thermal-hydraulics ranging from the strand diameter ($< 10^{-3}$ m), to the CICC length in a coil (up to several 10$^2$ m). On the other hand, taking advantage of this length-scale separation, the models presently used for CICC simulations are typically 1D (along the conductor) but they need constitutive relations (like friction and heat transfer coefficients) for the transverse mass, momentum and energy transport processes occurring between different conductor elements. The database for the transverse transport coefficients, unfortunately, does not appear complete, or free of internal contradictions, often because the smallness of the transverse scales makes even an experimental assessment of these processes difficult. Here we discuss these issues and possible strategies for overcoming some of the difficulties are proposed.
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1. Introduction

ITER magnets use cable-in-conduit conductors (CICC), typically cooled by forced flow supercritical helium (SHe) at temperature $T_{op} \sim 5$ K and pressure $p \sim 0.6$ MPa.

Essentially all ITER coils, with the exception of a subset of the correction coils [1] use a dual-channel CICC, which has a central channel (hole, H) with preferential low impedance and a cable region (bundle, B) with large wetted perimeter, see Fig. 1.

Magnets are wound with one or more CICC. While the CICC are connected electrically in series through joints, which conventionally identify the longitudinal CICC boundaries, they are hydraulically in parallel to avoid heat accumulation affecting the high-field region.

Thermal-hydraulics plays a central role in superconducting coil technology. As a first example the appropriate use of heaters and thermal-hydraulic modeling as indirect diagnostic tools allowed the assessment of conductor degradation in the ITER Model Coils [2,3]. As a second example, the pressure-drop tests, in e.g. the ITER Central Solenoid Insert Coil (CSIC), gave first evidence of Lorentz-induced cable deformation (the so-called “third channel”) in ITER CICC operation [4,5]. However, while the situation from the point of view of the ITER design criteria is possibly (albeit sometimes by chance) not unsatisfactory [6], we cannot be too happy with what we know.
today about ITER CICC thermal-hydraulics from a more fundamental point of view, which is our point of view in this paper.

The major length scales in a CICC are summarized in Table 1. One may note that \( \frac{L_{\text{longitudinal}}}{C29} \) \( \frac{L_{\text{transverse}}}{C29} \). This is used to justify the 1D (longitudinal) modeling approximation, which has been traditionally adopted since the early development of tools for the analysis of thermal-hydraulic transients in CICC (e.g., [7–9]), also because of its easier experimental validation. Constitutive relations for the transverse transport fluxes are then needed to close the set of fluid equations in the different cable elements.

Transverse inhomogeneities of the thermal-hydraulic parameters in the CICC lead to the transverse fluxes and they have been typically dealt with at the macro-element level, e.g., using multi-channel [10–12] and/or multi-conductor [13] models.

Transverse transport fluxes involve friction factors and heat transfer coefficients, for which correlations are needed (unfortunately, the short transverse length scales also imply much more difficulty in the experimental assessment of transverse processes).

Mass, momentum and energy transfer are typically (and also here) separated, but this separation is rather artificial, as the similar transport mechanism should be acting at the microscopic level, independently of the transported quantity. However, note that a particular but popular framework for the integrated treatment of friction and heat transfer (the so-called Colburn analogy, relating friction and heat transfer coefficients to their smooth-tube counterparts) was shown experimentally not to apply in the case of the central channel of a model ITER CICC [14].

Finally, it may be worthwhile to note that a few approaches at truly multi-dimensional modeling of the ITER CICC have been presented in the past. Martinez [16] presented a global 2D home-made model for the whole CICC, with porous medium treatment of the bundle, but applied it only in the case of laminar flow. Feng [17] self-consistently derived a so-called quasi-2D CICC model, which is however still not validated, to the best of our knowledge. Inaguchi and co-workers [18] applied a global 2D model of the whole CICC based on commercial software (CD code) to the CSIC quench study; however, they try to explain friction in the central channel while neglecting the spiral thickness (which they are apparently forced to do because of CPU limitation arising from the attempt to treat the whole CICC), but the spiral is, on the contrary, the main cause for significantly increased friction with respect to the smooth tube, see [19] and below; this approximation makes therefore their model unfortunately irrelevant for ITER.

Here we stick to the traditional 1D approach, but an introduction to a first application of a local 2D/3D model, as a support to global 1D modeling, will also be presented.

2. Mass transfer

Mass transfer between cable bundle region and central channel allows the pressure relief in case of sudden heating of the strands and also contributes to access the central channel helium heat capacity by advective energy transfer [20]. The latter aspect is particularly important since separation/identification of the different mechanisms of energy transfer between the two regions is often unclear and source of some confusion as well.

---

1 Also in the bundle region, the geometry and flow conditions do not guarantee a priori the applicability of the Colburn analogy, which was derived analytically for laminar flow on a plane surface and shown to be applicable also to turbulent flow on a plane surface or in smooth pipes but not applicable, e.g., to laminar flow in a pipe [15].
Direct experimental evidence on this phenomenon is unfortunately very limited because, generally speaking, the diagnostics, if any, of what happens in the central channel, are typically limited to one thermocouple or so. To the best of our knowledge, only in the case of the QUELL conductor some more advanced measurement technique was applied, in order to diagnose density variations [21].

A rough (valve-like) model of radial transport in the CICC, relating the radial flow to the (square root) of the pressure gradient between bundle and hole regions is used in many codes (e.g., [10,11]), but it is not directly validated. The same is true for more complicated models [17].

3. Momentum transfer (friction factors \( f \))

Momentum transfer between helium and solids determines, for a given mass flow rate, the pressure drop along the CICC and the related cost of pumping.

For the analysis, even in the simplest approximation adopted here, separate friction factors \( f_B \) and for the hole \( f_H \), so that at least two sets of independent measurements are needed. Once \( f_B \) and \( f_H \) are known one can also compute the flow repartition in the CICC. \(^4\)

Two different strategies have been developed for performing independent measurements. In both cases the pressure drop for given mass flow rate is measured in the CICC with blocked central channel (giving \( f_B \)), but the strategies differ as to \( f_H \). In the first one, the pressure drop for given mass flow rate is measured in the standard CICC (giving \( f_H \) by subtraction), while in the second one, the pressure drop for given mass flow rate is measured in a spiral rib-roughened pipe (giving \( f_H \)).

It should be noted that both strategies rely on the assumption that the flow is the same with permeable or impermeable interface. Wraps, whenever present, and central spiral typically limit the possible interaction between the two flows, in particular from the point of view of momentum exchange (entrainment). In the second strategy outlined above, it is also assumed that the spiral geometry will be unchanged once it is in the real conductor. Also, as a possibly minor difference, the spiral gap is “attributed” to the bundle in the first case whereas it is attributed to the hole in the second.

Dimensional-to-dimensionless data conversion is obviously needed, going from pressure drop vs. mass flow rate to friction factor vs. Reynolds number. This conversion sometimes involves tricky choices, e.g., application or not of the traditional \([22]\) \( 5/6 \) reduction in the strand wetted perimeter, \(^5\) inner vs. outer diameter as hole hydraulic diameter, etc. While some of these choices may be arbitrary, other may give consistency problems, e.g., it is not obvious that any choice/definition of the central channel flow area \( A_H \) would allow reproducing the correct average flow speed \( V_H \), starting from the measured volumetric flow rate \( V_{HI}A_H \) (both \( V_{HI}A_H \) and \( V_H \) could be independently measured in a heat slug propagation test in the central channel, but unfortunately such tests were never performed so far).

3.1. (Sub-)cable region \( f \)

The cable bundle region has been recognized as a porous medium-like structure long ago. Correlations for the friction factor \( f_B \) in the form used for pebble beds were derived [23], which are also adopted, in a slightly modified version [24], in the present ITER design criteria. These correlations are in the form

\[
f_B = f_B(Re_B, \phi),
\]

where \( Re_B \) is the Reynolds number, defined in terms of a hydraulic diameter \( D_B^H = 4A_B^H/P_{wet} \) while \( \phi \) is the void fraction (porosity), defined as \( A_{fluid}^H/A_B^H \).

The correlation of Katheder [23]

\[
f_B = (1/\phi)^\alpha(\beta/Re_B + \delta),
\]

where \( \alpha = 0.72, \beta = 19.5, \gamma = 0.88, \delta = 0.051 \), was established for design/predictive purposes and the originally stated accuracy was between \( \pm 30\% \) and \( \pm 70\% \) against the database available at the time, which included only conductors without central channel and without wrappings. Consideration of the limited database available today from the tests of four different ITER samples with central channel blocked, \(^6\) see Fig. 2, clearly shows that conductors with essentially the same void fraction, such as the PFCI (\( \phi \sim 34\% \)) and the CSMC (\( \phi \sim 36\% \)), show \( f_B \) different by about a factor of 2, at the same \( Re_B \). \(^7\) This consideration leads to an important question: are we missing a parameter

---

\(^2\) In this paper we consistently use the so-called Moody (or Darcy) definition of the friction factor: \( \Delta p/L = 1/2\mu U^2/D_B \).

\(^3\) \( f_B \) and the respective Reynolds number \( Re_H \) are defined in this paper using the inner spiral diameter to compute both the hydraulic diameter and the flow area.

\(^4\) This two-channel model is a simplification of the reality, as several different flow channels are actually present in an ITER CICC: as already mentioned above, a “third” channel naturally appears during coil operation because of Lorentz forces and finite cable stiffness, and also “triangles” appear on the CICC cross section at the contact between two petals and the (inner jacket) cable wrap, etc., but the analysis of these issues is beyond the scope of the present work.

\(^5\) This was originally justified by assuming the core region of a triplet as inaccessible to the flow and as such not wetted, but it should also be observed that sometimes, in conductor cross sections, triplets are not that easily recognized/maintained as structures. It is still important, however, to guarantee consistency: if, for instance, a certain correlation was developed using the \( 5/6 \) factor in the dimensional-to-dimensionless conversion, that must be kept in mind once trying to compare one’s own data with that correlation.

\(^6\) CSMC short straight sample [25], Toroidal Field Model Coil (TFMC) short straight sample [24], Poloidal Field Conductor Insert (PFCI) short straight sample, with and without wraps [26].

\(^7\) Note also from Fig. 2 that wrappings do not contribute significantly to the friction factor of the PFCI conductor [26], as opposed to what seen on EAST conductor tests [27], see also below.
in the $f_B$ correlation? Indeed, a correlation only depending on the porosity cannot be very accurate: according to such a correlation, a single-stage CICC, with the strands assembled all parallel in a spaghetti-like fashion, should have the same friction factor than a CICC with the same strands randomly twisted, but this cannot be true because the tortuosity of the coolant path will certainly affect the pressure drop.

In order to properly address the issue of friction in the cable bundle region, an extended database will be used here, including also conductor test results from non-ITER CICC characterized by the absence of the central channel, e.g., those used in the EAST [28] and KSTAR [29] tokamaks, as well as in the W7-X [30] stellarator. The inclusion of non-ITER conductors in this database is aimed at exploring a broader range of parameters (cabling patterns, etc.) than present in the ITER database strictly speaking, thus hopefully helping in identifying the most critical ones to be included in the correlation for $f_B$. Also (a subset of) the original Katheder database will be considered, which, for obvious historical reasons, does not include any ITER conductor strictly speaking.

The main features of the extended database are summarized in Table 2. It is seen that most of the tests were performed at room temperature (RT), using different fluids. Therefore, hydrodynamic similarity must be assumed to extrapolate to the relevant (cryogenic) ITER conditions. The whole database is shown in Fig. 3, wherein the conventional representation $f_B$ vs. $Re_B$ is used and $Re_B$ is related to $D_B^p$. A rather significant dispersion of the data may be noted, even emphasizing the differences between the ITER conductors, which was shown in Fig. 2.

In a porous medium a generally accepted model for the pressure gradient is given by [31]

$$\nabla p = -\frac{\mu}{K} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \frac{J}{\sqrt{K}} \rho |\partial|, \tag{2}$$

where $\mu$ is the fluid viscosity, $K$ is the permeability of the porous medium, $x$ is the so-called seepage velocity

---

8 The stronger disagreement in the case of W7X may be related to the peculiarities of the cabling pattern used for this CICC [30].

9 At least in an ideal cable bundle, $K$ should depend mainly on the so-called tortuosity of the medium, which in a CICC should reasonably depend in turn on the cabling pattern and on the pitches of the different cabling stages, as well as on spiral and cable diameters.
J is the inertial constant and \( q \) is the fluid density. The linear term in (2) is the well-known Darcy contribution (friction drag), whereas the quadratic term is the so-called Forchheimer contribution (form drag). We may rewrite (2) in the 1D case we are interested in (coordinate \( x \) along the CICC), introducing the fluid flow velocity \( u \) (averaged over a volume including only the fluid phase) in \( x \) direction, which is related to the seepage velocity by the Dupuit–Forchheimer relation \( u = \phi a \). We have then

(i.e., the velocity averaged over a representative elementary volume, including both the fluid and the solid phase), \( J \) is the inertial constant and \( \rho \) is the fluid density. The linear term in (2) is the well-known Darcy contribution (friction drag), whereas the quadratic term is the so-called Forchheimer contribution (form drag). We may rewrite

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conductor (cabling pattern)</th>
<th>Nominal void fraction (%)</th>
<th>Fluid</th>
<th>( p ) (bar)</th>
<th>( T ) (K)</th>
<th>Re range</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS1.2B (3 x 4 x 4 x 6)</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>H(_2)O</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>10-1000</td>
<td>Short straight sample</td>
<td>[P. Bruzzone]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFMC (3 x 3 x 5 x 4)</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>N(_2)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>600-7000</td>
<td>Short straight sample</td>
<td>[S. Nicollet]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFCI (3 x 4 x 4 x 5 x 6)</td>
<td>33.5-34.3</td>
<td>H(_2)O</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>299-300</td>
<td>10-1000</td>
<td>Short straight sample</td>
<td>[C. Marinucci]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wraps/nowraps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABB-L</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>He</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>20-500</td>
<td></td>
<td>[H. Katheder]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitachi</td>
<td>39.9-46.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA-DPC</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRCO 5.7 (3 x 3 x 3 x 7)</td>
<td>47, 35</td>
<td>He</td>
<td>( \leq 17.2 (p_{\text{in}}) )</td>
<td>RT ( \rightarrow 77 )</td>
<td>100-4000</td>
<td>( f(Re) ) only, 6 m sample</td>
<td>[H. Bai, P. Weng]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-DPC</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSTGH</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSTAR TF00 (3 x 3 x 3 x 3 x 6)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>He</td>
<td>5.3 (( p_{\text{in}} ))</td>
<td>( \sim 4000 )</td>
<td>No central channel, Limited subset</td>
<td>[K. Kim]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSTAR CSMC (3 x 4 x 5 x 6)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 (( p_{\text{in}} ))</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>( \sim 4000 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST ((2+2) x 3 x 4 x 5+1)</td>
<td>36.7-38.4</td>
<td>N(_2)</td>
<td>1.1 (( p_{\text{out}} ))</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>300-3000</td>
<td>N(_2) ( \rightarrow 4 ) short samples, 2 wraps/2 nowraps, He ( \rightarrow ) TF5, nowraps, No central channel, Limited subset</td>
<td>[H. Bai, P. Weng]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>He</td>
<td>5 (( p_{\text{in}} ))</td>
<td>5.1-5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTX (3 x 3 x 3 x 3)</td>
<td>37 \pm 2</td>
<td>He</td>
<td>1 (( p_{\text{out}} ))</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>10-150</td>
<td>Double layer on spool, No central channel, Limited subset</td>
<td>[K. Risse]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Fig. 3. Bundle friction factor as a function of the bundle Reynolds number derived from the experiments on the samples listed in Table 2.](image)
This relation can be integrated along the CICC length $L$ under two different simplifying assumptions: either incompressible flow is assumed, which will be applicable to, e.g., the H$_2$O test results, or Fanno flow (compressible, 1D, isothermal flow of a perfect gas) is assumed, which will be applicable to, e.g., the He and N$_2$ RT test results. The result of the integration can be summarized in dimensionless terms by the deceptively simple relation:

$$f_K = \frac{1}{Re_K} + J,$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where the friction factor and Reynolds number are defined (using the square root of permeability as length scale instead of the hydraulic diameter), respectively, as

$$f_K = \frac{\Delta p}{\rho u^2} \frac{\sqrt{K}}{L} \frac{1}{\phi^2},$$  \hspace{1cm} (5a)$$

$$Re_K = \frac{(dm/dt)\phi}{\mu \rho_{\text{fluid}}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (5b)

$\beta = 1$ for incompressible flow (whereas $\beta = \rho_{\text{in}}/\rho_{\text{out}} = (p_{\text{in}} + p_{\text{out}})/2p_{\text{out}}$ for Fanno flow), $\rho_{\text{out}}$ is the fluid density at the outlet of the test section, $dm/dt$ is the mass flow rate.

It is seen that (4) predicts, for any (!) CICC bundle (independently of the details of its internal structure), a linear dependence of the suitably defined $f_K$ on $1/Re_K$. It is known [31] that the permeability $K$ depends on the medium porosity and geometry but, unfortunately, there is no obvious way to compute the permeability $K$ from the medium geometry except in very simple cases, which are hardly relevant for the case at hand. Concerning the inertial constant
it is known that this is actually not a constant but may depend also on the medium geometry, as well as on pore-scale turbulence [31], but this term is otherwise even less known than \( K \). Indeed, the only potentially practical way to compute \( K \) (and \( J \)) in an ideal bundle geometry is through CFD calculation, correlating a posteriori the mass flow rate computed for a given pressure gradient with the pressure gradient itself, see below.

In view of the above, we use the pressure drop data to find, for the subset of CICC in the database for which all needed input is available to us, the values of \( K \) and \( J \) best fitting the measurements. These values are collected in Table 3 while the result of correlation (4) is shown in Fig. 5.

It is seen in Table 3 that the deduced \( K \)'s vary by a factor of \(~4\) notwithstanding a range of porosities different by at most \(~15\%)! An even larger variation of \( J \), by about a factor of 10, may be noted. These variations obviously reflect the above-mentioned significant differences in the hydraulic characteristic of the different CICC. Both \( K \) and \( J \) turn out to be in the same order of magnitude assessed in the past on somewhat different cables [14].

Quite obviously, the direct comparison (in terms of accuracy) between (4) and Katheder's correlation, see Fig. 4, is partly unfair, because the former is mainly interpretive in nature, while the latter confirms its predictive purpose, although error bars are rather large. Predictive use of (4) would require an a priori determination of \( K \) and \( J \), which is presently beyond our capabilities.

### 3.2. Central channel \( f \)

Early attempts to correlate the pressure drop with the mass flow rate in the QUELL CICC central channel assumed \( f_H = \zeta_f \times f_{\text{smooth}}(Re_H) \) [32]. However, tests of different TFMC pancakes at Ansaldo showed that details in spiral design (in particular the gap size \( g \)) could significantly affect the pressure drop [33]. This was eventually confirmed both in the CSMC operation (MIT circular wire vs. flat spiral) [34] and in the TFMC operation [35]. In this sense, a fundamental understanding of the friction in the central channel could in principle allow the optimization of the spiral (for instance, minimizing the pressure drop while keeping sufficient heat exchange and pressure relief capabilities), subject to mass, momentum, energy transfer and mechanical constraints, as well as to the presence of the wraps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conductor</th>
<th>Void fraction ( \phi )</th>
<th>( K (m^2) )</th>
<th>( J )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PFCI (w)</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>2.80E-09</td>
<td>7.57E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFCI (nw)</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>3.80E-09</td>
<td>7.34E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSMC</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>3.10E-09</td>
<td>1.14E-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFMC</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>1.10E-09</td>
<td>1.56E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST PF1 (w)</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>1.60E-09</td>
<td>3.34E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST PF2 (w)</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>1.60E-09</td>
<td>2.84E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST PF3 (nw)</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>2.30E-09</td>
<td>1.56E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST TF (nw)</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>2.30E-09</td>
<td>2.87E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W7X</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>3.70E-09</td>
<td>1.25E-01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5. Friction factor, as defined in (5a), as a function (4) of the Reynolds number, as defined in (5b), deduced from test results of a sub-set of the samples listed in Table 2.
CEA started testing of spiral rib-roughened pipes in the OTHELLO facility using pressurized N\textsubscript{2} at RT during 1999, providing least square fits for each spiral in the database [33].

From the same database (3 spirals with different gap but same diameter $D_{in} \sim 10$ mm) a general correlation for all spirals in the database was developed, including $g/h$ as additional dimensionless parameter [19] in the form

$$f_{H} = f_{H}(Re_{H}, (h/D \text{ fixed}), g/h),$$

and validated [36] on CSMC straight sample data.

Unfortunately, the limited database available at present on $f_{H}$ is not free of contradictions. For instance, derived data for $f_{H}$ from the TFMC straight sample differ by a factor of $\sim 2$ from TFMC spiral data, see Fig. 6. In Fig. 6 we may also note that the results of the PFCI sample are in the same ball park as the CSMC sample and the TFMC spiral data over a certain range of $Re_{H}$, notwithstanding a smaller value of the gap ($\sim 1.7$ mm for the PFCI [39] vs. 2.4–3.0 for CSMC-TFMC). Also, at decreasing Reynolds $f_{H}$ tends to increase in the PFCI case whereas it decreases in the case of the CSMC sample, suggesting that either data are not reliable for $Re_{H} < 10^{4}$. Finally, the spread between PFCI data with and without wraps may only be attributed to measurement inaccuracy, as the central channel is the same in these two cases (more mixing between the two channels in the case without wraps should not happen anyway, because at steady state the local radial pressure gradient driving the flow between the two should vanish, both with and without wraps).

In view of the proposed use in ITER of CICC with a smaller central channel ($D_{in} \sim 7$ mm for the CS and TF coils [1]) CEA recently started performing tests of new spirals based on which we aimed at assessing if there is any explicit dependence of the friction factor on the relative roughness $h/D$

$$f_{H} = f_{H}(Re_{H}, h/D, g/h).$$

These tests were performed both in the OTHELLO facility (which uses pressurized N\textsubscript{2}) and in the HECOL facility (using pressurized H\textsubscript{2}O). Unfortunately, several problems have been encountered during the evaluation of the data concerning, e.g., smooth-tube validation, hydrodynamic similarity, dependence on flow direction. It may therefore be concluded that, concerning friction in the central channel, the experimental database available today appears insufficient to draw any conclusions in the form of generally applicable correlations of the type given in (7), so that such a predictive correlation for $f_{H}$ is not available at present [40].

---

10 Some uncertainty exists as to the actual gap width in one very popular spiral (the so-called Showa) used for some of the TFMC pancakes as well as for some of the CSMC layers. While the original measurement for the spiral alone gave 2.4 mm [33], on which all correlations for $f_{H}$ are based, measurements performed during the conductor QA resulted in $\sim 3.0$ mm [37] and very recent examination of $\sim 10$ pitch lengths in the CS1.2B conductor gave a range 2.7–3.0 mm [38]. Therefore, at least a $\pm 10\%$ uncertainty around an average of 2.7 mm should be considered, based on the whole set of dimensional checks above.
We shall see below that advanced computational fluid dynamics (CFD) methods are being proposed to address the problem of friction in the central channel (as well as others in ITER CICC thermal-hydraulics, see above) and can be applied, of course within their own limitations, to help overcome at least some of the above difficulties.

3.3. Global $f$

The above results should be used in the end for at least two “practical” purposes, which are obviously not independent: (a) to determine the pressure drop on the conductor for a given total (bundle + hole) mass flow rate, (b) to assess the flow repartition between the two channels. Details of this approach and implications for the ITER design criteria are discussed in [6].

If we rely on the correlation of Katheder for $f_B$ and we assume we have a perfect correlation for $f_H$, the error bars in $f_B$, see Fig. 2, result in an uncertainty of pressure drop and flow repartition as shown in Fig. 7. It may be noted that for the range of multipliers relevant for ITER conductors (see Fig. 2) a decrease of $f_B$ obviously leads to an increase of the flow fraction in the bundle as well as, because of the simultaneous reduction of the flow fraction in the hole at constant total mass flow rate and $f_H$, to a decrease of the pressure gradient. It should also be noted that the range of uncertainties (Katheder multipliers) shown for ITER conductors in Fig. 2 corresponds to a rather significant uncertainty of up to 40–50% in the pressure drop and up to ±5% (absolute) in the flow fraction in the bundle.

It was already noted in the past that the comparison of different data (including 3-turn samples) of the TFMC conductor seems to indicate an effect of conductor curvature, leading to an ~50% larger $f$ for both the TFMC and the 3-turn samples, if compared with the straight sample [36]. In view of their singularity, we also checked the TFMC straight sample data (where N$_2$ was used), but they appear to be confirmed by data collected, again at CEA, on another straight TFMC sample using H$_2$O, see Fig. 8. Note that correlations for curved pipes, e.g., Ito’s [41], predict an increase of the pressure drop scaling with the parameter $[Re(r_{cond}/r_{curv})^2]$, where $r_{cond}$ is the channel radius and $r_{curv}$ is the curvature radius of the coil (i.e., irrelevant for the bundle flow if compared with the central channel, in view of the much smaller hydraulic diameter); these correlations, however, give at most a 10% correction or so, i.e., not enough to explain the above-mentioned differences in the case of the TFMC.

However, the curvature effect seems not confirmed by CSMC data (although from the point of view of curvature it should be at least as affected as the TFMC, which has locally smaller curvature radii but also long straight legs), see Fig. 9, where CSMC 1A data (obtained using He in cryogenic conditions) [34] appear to fall on a reasonable extrapolation of CSMC straight sample data (obtained using H$_2$O at RT) [25].

The forthcoming test of the PFCI should hopefully help in clarifying the curvature issue by comparing results of pressure drop tests with those obtained on a PFCI short sample (without blocking the central channel) [39]. Also tests from other conductors (e.g., W7X) or perhaps

![Fig. 7. Sensitivity of the pressure gradient and of the flow repartition between bundle and hole on the uncertainty on $f_B$ (quantified by the chosen multiplier of the Katheder correlation) at given total mass flow rate (10 g/s He @ 5 K, 5 MPa). TFMC conductor data and $f_H$ correlation as in [19] were assumed.](image-url)
dedicated tests of curved conductors with blocked central channel could be used to track which, if any, of $f_B$ and/or $f_{HI}$ may be affected by curvature.

4. Energy transfer (heat transfer coefficients $h$)

The major heat transfer processes in a CICC are summarized in Fig. 10, emphasizing the different conductor components involved: bundle region helium, hole region helium, strands, jacket. Heat transfer significantly affects, together with friction, the most relevant time scales of thermal-hydraulic transients in CICC [42]. The single heat transfer processes are considered below.

4.1. Strand–helium $h$ (transient and steady state)

The heat transfer coefficient between strands and helium ($h_{St-He}$) enters the stability (Stekly) condition [43].

$h_{St-He}$ is modeled in the codes as series of $\min(1/h_t, 1/h_{Nu})$ and Kapitza resistance, where $h_t$ and $h_{Nu}$ identify the transient and steady state components, respectively, of the heat transfer coefficient.
Transient heat transfer \( (h_t) \) can be modeled at different levels of sophistication [44]. In the simplest approach we may consider the thermal boundary layer of thickness \( \delta(t) \) forming at the strand surface because of sudden (step) heating of the strand and then propagating inside the fluid at a rate related to the fluid thermal diffusivity \( \kappa_f \) until thermal and flow layers become comparable (steady state heat transfer condition). As a thermal boundary layer has not been established yet during the transient phase, the heat transfer coefficient may be deduced assuming pure conduction with conductivity \( k_f \) through the forming boundary layer, while \( \delta(t) \) can be assessed as the length scale in the fundamental solution of the transient heat conduction problem. Therefore, we have

\[
h_t \sim \frac{1}{k_f} \sim \frac{1}{k_f} \frac{1}{\kappa_f} = \frac{\kappa_f \rho_f' \varepsilon_{f,t}}{t}
\]

Steady-state heat transfer \( (h_{Nu}) \) is derived from correlations for the Nusselt number \( Nu \) (Re, Pr) and the Dittus–Boelter correlation is typically used, giving \( h_{Nu} = h_{DB} \sim several 10^5 \text{W/m}^2\text{K} \). However, it should be noted that, strictly speaking, application to our case (essentially heat transfer between solid and fluid phase of a porous medium) of the Dittus–Boelter correlation, which was derived for pipes, is somewhat unjustified. Furthermore, it was already noted in the past, see, e.g., [45,46], that \( h_{Nu} \sim several 10^3 \text{W/m}^2\text{K} \) appears needed in several applications. Even in this case, as for the friction coefficient in the bundle region discussed above, correlations for porous media not in thermal equilibrium between the phases, see, e.g., [47], may indeed result in more appropriate values, up to 1 order of magnitude larger than \( h_{DB} \).

Kapitza heat transfer, which is related to the “interfacial thermal boundary between any two dissimilar materials where electronic transport does not contribute” [48], is modeled as \( h_K = 200(T_{St} + T_{He})(T_{St}^2 + T_{He}^2) \). Simple verification shows that the Kapitza thermal resistance is typically negligible at ITER operating conditions \( (T > \sim 5 \text{K}) \) since \( h_K > \sim 10^3 \text{W/m}^2\text{K} \).

4.2. Strand–jacket \( h \)

Provided there is sufficient contact between strands and jacket (which is typically the case except on the high-field side of a conductor because of Lorentz forces inducing sometimes significant deformation of the cable and its detachment from the jacket), the heat transfer coefficient between strands and jacket \( (h_{St-Jk}) \) contributes:

- The second, after \( h_{St-He} \), parallel channel for direct strand cooling (but the strand contact perimeter \( \sim f_{contact}P_{Jk} \) is \( \sim \) two orders of magnitude lower than the strand wetted perimeter).
- A channel for accessing the jacket heat capacity in the later quench phase. Above 30 K, indeed, the jacket heat capacity in the CICC is about an order of magnitude larger than the helium heat capacity. Therefore, the time scale \( \sim 1000/(h_{St-Jk} \rho_He \varepsilon_{He}) \) s could be relevant (see below) for quench propagation and hot spot temperature.
- The only direct channel for strand heating, if the jacket is heated first by, e.g., a heater as, for instance, in the case of the Insert Coil stability tests [46] (here a possible selective heating in case of cable deformation should also be taken into account).

Direct experimental knowledge of \( h_{St-Jk} \) is unfortunately very limited. Values up to 2500 W/m²K were recently measured [49] but @ relatively low mechanical load (100 kN/m) with respect to the operating (1 x B) peak load of ITER conductors. Values assumed so far in the simulations are therefore most likely arbitrary.

Finally, let us note that, at least to the extent that they are both related to contact resistance issues, \( h_{St-Jk} \) is also relevant for the heat transfer coefficient between strand and strand \( h_{St-St} \) needed in the case of multi-solid models, which are not discussed here in detail.

4.3. Jacket–helium \( h \)

The heat transfer coefficient between helium and jacket \( (h_{Jk-He}) \) is relevant for several issues and namely:

- Analysis of stability tests and resistive heater tests.
- Interpretation of the jacket temperature sensor signals.
- Access to the jacket heat capacity in the later quench phase (but the corresponding time scale may be longer than that estimated above for \( h_{St-Jk} \) because of stagnating He in the hot spot region).

From the porous medium point of view, \( h_{Jk-He} \) should be in principle different from \( h_{St-He} \) because the different (lower) porosity close to the jacket [31] leads to a different flow pattern and therefore to different heat transfer [47].
4.4. Helium–helium $h$

The most important heat transfer mechanism between helium and helium affects the heat transfer coefficient between bundle and hole region $h_{BH}$, which contributes to determine the time scale on which the central channel helium heat capacity becomes accessible for cooling the strands. This is not relevant (it is too slow) for stability, but it is important for, e.g., re-cooling of the coil after transient events (AC losses), and/or quench propagation.

A long time interest for this topic exists, related to heat slug propagation in a dual-channel CICC [50–51]. Very recently, the problem has been reconsidered, following different approaches and making use of new experimental data available from the test of short samples. We refer to that literature for details [52–54].

The helium–helium heat transfer problem appears more critical, in perspective, for multi-channel modeling, where, e.g., the issue of heat transfer between sub-channels, for instance between petals, see below, must be considered, or even worse, between artificial channels (without real physical boundaries like the sub-cable wraps). The latter situation is relevant to the case when the description/discretization of the CICC cross section should go below the last but one stage and possibly down to the single strand level [12].

5. Comments on the present design criteria

We present here just a brief summary of the above-mentioned issues, as seen from the point of view of the ITER design criteria.

**Transverse (bundle/hole) mass flux** is presently not included in the design criteria.

For the case of the pressure drop (friction) a detailed discussion is already given in [6].

Instead of attempting a first principle approach, in the design criteria the Stekly criterion is assumed valid and values of $h_{St-He}$ have been deduced from experimental data of stability margin. One disappointing implication of this approach is that different $h_{St-He}$ are presently foreseen for different SC material, which is obviously unjustified from a purely thermal-hydraulic point of view.

None of the other above-mentioned heat transfer coefficients – between strands and jacket ($h_{St-Jk}$), between helium and jacket ($h_{Jk-He}$), or between bundle and hole region ($h_{BH}$) – enters the present design criteria.

6. Special problem areas

Under this heading we collect a couple of selected thermal-hydraulic problems, which in a sense combine the previous items into a (more) complex picture.

6.1. Buoyancy effects

In the case of a vertical tract of a CICC (like it may occur in the TF coils, but also presently in the Sultan short samples), localized heating of a portion of the CICC (typically the He in the bundle region cooling the strands heated by neutrons and/or by AC losses) may result, in the case of originally down-flowing coolant, in stagnation/backflow of the coolant in the annular region combined with increased down-flow in the central channel. In this situation, although the total (forced) mass flow rate would be maintained, heat transfer in the cable region could be compromised, seriously affecting the CICC performance. Indirect evidence of these phenomena was indeed provided by temperature measurements in Sultan short samples at sufficiently high input power [55]. Simulation results, however, were only in qualitative agreement with the measurements, in view of the very complex interplay of local heat and mass transfer phenomena both along and across the CICC, over very short length scales ($10^{-2}–10^{-1}$ m, in the case of AC-loss-induced buoyancy in a Sultan sample) [56]. More recently, the similar phenomena were investigated in another Sultan sample [57].

The potential relevance of buoyancy for ITER TF operation (where it might be induced by nuclear heating of the inner leg) turned out to be doubtful according to simple modeling [58] but is now under more detailed evaluation [57,59].

6.2. Transverse temperature gradients

Most of present-day codes are one-dimensional, as seen above, so that temperature gradients are assumed to exist only in the axial direction (along the CICC). Because of their different proximity to the strands, a possible temperature difference between helium in the cable region and helium in the central channel (both assumed separately uniform) was hypothesized, but temperature measurement in the central channel is not easy/customary except in dedicated experiments, so that experimental evidence in this field is somewhat scattered.

Indeed, a $\Delta T$ between central channel and jacket was measured, e.g., in the USP joint and also simulated [60], while a $\Delta T$ between central channel and annulus was measured in HECL tests at CEA [61]. $\Delta T$ between petals was measured in the GJ conductor [62] and simulated semi-quantitatively [63] with the M&M code.

Clearly, transverse $\Delta T$ between different cable components, even at the sub-petal level, may be particularly relevant in the case of coupled electro-magnetic thermal-hydraulic transients (e.g., a local normal transition in NbTi CICC in the form of “sudden quench”), as discussed above for the single heat transfer coefficients [67].

7. CFD modeling of thermal-hydraulic phenomena in ITER CICC

It was seen above that several uncertainties affect transverse transport (be it mass, momentum or energy) in CICC while, on the other hand, 1D models are already sufficiently computationally intensive to make a multi-dimensional
treatment of the whole CICC unpractical. Therefore, we propose here a novel approach:

- **Assess the radial/transverse transport with local 2D/3D (Reynolds-Averaged) Navier–Stokes models.**
- **Determine by post-processing the resulting constitutive relations.**
- **Apply these relations in 1D axial but global models.**

Here only an introduction to a first step in this direction is given, devoted to the issue of friction in the central channel (details and validation of this step are reported in [64]). This approach, in view of its potentially modular nature, shall then be extended elsewhere to transverse heat and mass transfer, friction in the annular region, etc.

We use the FLUENT commercial code for detailed 2D/3D flow modeling in the central channel: for any given pressure drop $\Delta p$ the mass flow rate is computed by the code integrating the axial flow field across the CICC and compared with experimental results. This corresponds in a sense to performing a computational experiment. From the results of several runs (i.e., several different $\Delta p$) a computational hydraulic characteristic of the central channel can be determined from which the friction factor vs. $Re$ and geometry can be computed. In other words, $f$ is in such 2D/3D computation an output parameter as opposed to the 1D computation where it is needed in input.

Just to give an idea of the approach, we consider a 2D model of the spiral (simulated in this case by repeated/periodic annular ribs), see Fig. 11 which shows the computed streamlines inside the gap for two different turbulence models. The results confirm the critical sensitivity of the prediction to the turbulence model chosen, which is well known in the literature on separation and reattachment problems, see, e.g., [66]. As discussed in [19], the shorter the predicted reattachment length is, the higher the friction.

8. Conclusions and perspective

Although ITER CICC’s work, thermal-hydraulics in ITER CICC is perhaps less understood, from a fundamental point of view, than it could be expected after many years of research.

Thermal-hydraulic issues in ITER CICC are summarized by friction factors and heat transfer coefficients, which enter the lumped-parameter description of transverse fluxes used in the present codes. These codes are routinely used to analyze thermal-hydraulic transients that are intrinsic to the operation of such systems, but of course, they depend heavily on the availability of accurate coefficients for the set of equations they solve, as the simulation results will never be more accurate than the input.

The main issues identified in this paper can be roughly summarized as follows:

- **Transverse (bundlehole) mass flux:** not well known. Further work (both experimental and theoretical/modeling) is needed to understand this possibly important coupling mechanism between the two main regions of an ITER CICC.
- **Friction factor in the cable region $f_B$:** available predictive correlations, depending on void-fraction only, lead to errors $> 60\%$ in some cases. Based on the porous medium approach we have proposed an improved...
correlation, Eqs. (4) and (5), in terms of permeability and inertial constant. The latter have however to be determined either experimentally by case or they could be assessed computationally in idealized geometry for predictive purposes. An improved predictive correlation is therefore still missing.

- Friction factor in the central channel $f_{hC}$: available correlations fit well only a sub-set of the data. The database is partially internally inconsistent. Extended data (at different spiral diameters) and modeling effort are needed to take advantage of the potential for optimization of spiral design, as well as for understanding the physics of friction in this region.

- Heat transfer coefficients: experimental work directly addressing the measurement of $h_{St-Hc}$ in ITER CICC is presently missing, so that correlations typically used for this basic heat transfer mechanism come from available literature in other fields of application; for $h_{St-Hc}$ the situation is similar, while limited available work on $h_{St-Jk}$ should be extended to peak load conditions in ITER; much new work has become recently available on $h_{HT}$, although a correlation is still missing.

The use of local multi-dimensional CFD modeling of thermal-hydraulic transport processes in a CICC is advocated as an alternative means to obtain constitutive relations and assess the respective transport coefficients. Hints at a first application of this novel approach to the problem of friction in the central channel were given.
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