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• It is now time to focus the program in a more complete and fundamental way than we have done before.

• I would like FESAC to identify the major science and technology issues that need to be addressed, recommend how to organize campaigns to address those issues, and recommend the priority order for these campaigns.

• You will need to assemble a balanced domestic program that takes account of fusion programs abroad and that includes ITER as an integrated part of the whole. In each case, please recommend the relative priority of activities to pursue at any given time.

• It should be assumed that funding for ITER construction is provided in addition to (base program) funds.

• I would like FESAC to include Inertial Fusion and relevant aspects of High Energy Density Physics…

• Please look at the program through 2014, the year ITER operation is expected to begin.
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Lessons from Prioritization of Scientific Programs

• Examples from other areas of science have been examined.
  – “Connecting Quarks with the Cosmos:
    Eleven Science Questions for the New Century”
  – Astronomy’s and astrophysics’ decadal surveys
    • The Decade of Discovery in Astronomy and Astrophysics (1991)
    • Astronomy and Astrophysics in the New Millennium (2001)
  – NASA Astrobiology’s roadmaps

• In recent years, several areas of physical sciences have emphasized deep scientific questions as the basis for their planning and prioritizations.
  – Focus on questions leads to topical research programs.
  – Facilities are to be treated as means to address questions, rather than ends in themselves.

• FESAC has been charged by DOE/SC to prioritize all of our activities (i.e., not just the new scopes) for the next 10 years on the basis of questions and campaigns to address the questions.
  – There seem to be no models for this bottoms-up prioritization of entire programs.
  – OMB and OSTP strongly support DOE/SC’s charge.
Panel Work Plan

• Step 1 - Develop overarching themes, topical scientific and technical questions, and decision criteria.
  → Initial step completed—now seeking community feedback.

• Step 2 - Develop process working with the community to define research thrusts and campaigns.
  → Underway. Developing a strawman case and guidelines for community groups. Defining groups along lines of theme areas and possible chairs/participants.

  → Next meetings of the panel: April 13-14, June 17-19

Interim Report—July, 2004

• Step 3 - Develop priorities and interact with the community.
  → Panel discussing basic process.

Final Report—December, 2004
01. Understand the dynamics of matter and fields in the high-temperature plasma state.

02. Create and understand a controlled, self-heated, burning starfire on earth.

03. Make fusion power practical.
Theme: Macroscopic Plasma Behavior
T1. How does magnetic field structure affect plasma confinement?
T2. What limits the maximum pressure that can be achieved in laboratory plasmas?
T3. How much external control versus self-organization will a fusion plasma require?

Theme: Multi-scale Transport Behavior
T4. How does turbulence cause heat, particles, and momentum to escape from plasmas?
T5. How are large-scale electromagnetic fields and mass flows generated in plasmas?
T6. How do magnetic fields in plasmas rearrange and dissipate their energy?

Theme: High-energy Density Implosion Physics
T7. How can high energy density fusion plasmas be assembled and ignited in the laboratory?
T8. How do hydrodynamic plasma instabilities affect implosions to high energy density?
**Topical Questions (cont’d)**

**Theme: Plasma Boundary Interfaces**

T9. How can we interface a 100 million degree burning plasma to its room temperature surroundings?

**Theme: Waves and Energetic Particles**

T10. How can heavy ion beams be compressed to the high intensities required for creating high energy density matter?

T11. How do electromagnetic waves interact with plasma?

T12. How do high energy particles interact with plasma?

**Theme: Fusion Engineering Science**

T13. How does the challenging fusion environment affect plasma chamber systems?

T14. What are the ultimate limits for materials in the harsh fusion environment?

T15. How can systems be engineered to heat, fuel, pump and confine steady-state or repetitively pulsed burning plasmas?
T1. How does magnetic field structure impact fusion plasma confinement?

For fusion to be self-sustaining, plasma hot enough for fusion must be confined long enough to allow sufficient fusion reactions to take place…Both astrophysical and laboratory plasmas can be confined by magnetic field. The properties of the confined plasma depend sensitively on the structure of the magnetic field—curvature twist, spatial symmetries, strength, and topology. These characteristics of the field determine the existence of plasma equilibria, their stability (tendency to grow large scale structures from noise) and turbulent transport. Understanding their influence provides the basis to design configurations most favorable to fusion energy; for example, topological symmetries have been shown to beneficially improve many aspects of confinement. Many astrophysical phenomena such as plasma confined in solar magnetic arcades, in jets emanating from plasma surrounding black holes, and in extra-galactic plasma confined in radio lobes, are critically influenced by magnetic field structures. These share common physics principles that can be productively studied in magnetically confined fusion plasmas.
Decision Criteria for Prioritizing Activities Within the Fusion Program

Category A: Criteria to be applied to campaigns, or to activities within a campaign, across all topical questions.

Importance to Overarching Themes of the Fusion Program
What is the importance and benefit of the campaign or activity to addressing each of the three key overarching themes expressed in 01-03; i.e.

1. Understanding the physics and dynamics of the plasma state,
2. Creating, exploiting and understanding a controlled burning plasma, and
3. Making fusion power practical.

It is recognized that the relative contributions will vary for each campaign.

Portfolio Strength
Does the prioritized set of campaigns meet the strategic needs of the OFES fusion research program, including the required breadth of activities and development of the fusion workforce?
Category B: Criteria to be applied to individual campaigns or activities, to help determine priorities within each question or topical area.

Quality of Research
Is the research of high quality; does it have scientific and technical credibility?

Issue Resolution
Does the activity address a clearly defined science/technology issue? Does it provide reasonable expectation to develop the knowledge base required to resolve the issue?

Role in World Program
Is the research at the leading edge, or an important and timely contributor, in the context of the national and international fusion programs?

Present Capabilities and Results
Do present capabilities and results justify proceeding with this activity?

Education and Workforce
How strongly does the activity contribute to the training of junior fusion scientists?

Breadth of Impact
Are the results important for a range of fusion concepts? Is there cross-cutting application to other fields of science and technology?

Milestones
Are key milestones suitably identified for evaluation of progress? Are they achievable, and appropriate to campaign objectives?

Resources
Are necessary infrastructure resources at an adequate level of technological readiness?

Cost Effectiveness
Is the proposed activity a cost-effective way to address the defined issue?