

Fusion technologies data needs: the missing links

Jean-Christophe Sublet

United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority, Culham Campus, Abingdon, OX14 3DB, UK

Exploring the fusion fuel landscape –

Nuclear data for materials science, component engineering

Transport theory and applications

The nuclear landscapes are diverse, and applications driven Nuclear **power** technologies, data requirements are also application driven Nuclear Fusion requirement **significantly differs** from nuclear Fission

Fission power technologies relates to a **careful interpretation of the neutron** balance/map (criticality Keff) in regular (2D) "cylindrical" lattice geometry with neutron slowing down from 2 MeV in moderator/coolant channels from many regularly spaced source terms (fuel rod)

K Atomic

Authority

Upper Guide Structure Assembly

Fusion technologies relates to the moderation, shielding in donut (3D) "spherical in the making" geometry with neutron slowing down from 14 MeV from a single large source term (plasma)



Which nuclear data types are important? e.g. **mubar and gamma production/heating**

What is "mubar"

- UK Atomic Energy Authority
- In terms of cosine (-1 < mubar < 1), it is the average lab frame scattering angle for the neutron in elastic scattering mf=4 mt=2
- In terms of evaluated data μ_L , it is part of the continuous-slowing-down parameters as an auxiliary MT number MT=251
- It is processed by NJOY2016 card 3 251 'mubar', given by incoming group and exists in derived file only, not in the original evaluation
- The mubar is given as mean, or average per group
- It includes up-scatter (if present), self-scatter and down scatter
- NJOY2016 only calculates the P1 contribution for mubar
- mubar interact with the P1 fluxes
 Ieakage rates



What is "mubar"







- When mubar is positive, the scattering event move forward, the mean free path mfp is maximum, longer, the neutron escape, the overall leakage is directed, increased in the cosine direction
- When mubar is negative, the scattering event move backward, the mean free path mfp is reduced, shorter, the overall leakage is decreased, the neutron population stay stable, is spatially maintained
- Uncertainty for mubar exists variance or standard deviation diagonal elements of the covariance – off-diagonal elements represent the cross terms for the different groups





Mubar mf=4 & mubar covariances mf=34

UK Atomic Energy Authority

ξ average logarithmic energy loss per collision

A >2 - $\xi \approx 2/(A+0.67)$

Collisions to moderate $n\xi \approx ln \frac{E_i}{E_f}$

H n \approx 18 + 3 (14-7-3 MeV) 14 MeV => 2 MeV 3 2 MeV => 0.025 eV 18



Mubar mf=4 & mubar covariances mf=34

UK Atomic Energy Authority



Mubar & library differences



UK Atomic Energy Authority

ENDF/B-VIII.1 and JEFF-4.0 mubar are similar but not with JENDL-5

Mubar & library differences





Mubar covariances JENDL-5 & ENDF/B-VIII.1

UK Atomic Energy Authority





9

Mubar & tritium production in Lithium



10

UK Atomic Energy Authority

¹⁶O 400-100 KeV negative mubar enhances tritium production in the Li⁶ 240 KeV resonance region

10-6 MeV ~50% difference in cosine **impact** the Li⁷(n,n't) plateau

Gamma rays from 14 MeV neutron interactions

UK Atomic Energy Authority

Knowledge of neutrons interactions and particle production in **thick** component is required to have confidence in the simulation of **T**ritium **P**roduction **R**ate **TPR** & **heating**

Open γ-producing channels

In ¹⁸⁶W, at $E_n = 25.3 \text{ meV}$; $\sigma_R(n+^{186}W @ E_n) = \sigma(n,\gamma)$ Fission range < 2 MeV

In ¹⁸⁶W, at $E_n = 14 \text{ MeV}$; $\sigma_R(n + {}^{186}W @ E_n) = \sigma(n,\gamma) + \sigma(n,n') + \sigma(n,np) + \sigma(n,2n) + ...$ Fusion range < 14 MeV

- More open channels @ 14 MeV
- Prompt (A*, A+1,..) and delayed γ-rays **Bagdad atlas & EGAF & ENSDF**
- missing excited states (A*)
- missing prompt primary & secondary
- incomplete de-excitation scheme
- →incomplete evaluated file



A=7 energy levels

12



⁷Li+n E_{lab}=18 MeV

UK Atomic Energy Authority

Products	Q-value (MeV)	Threshold	
⁸ Li + γ	2.032	0	
⁷ Li + n	0	0	<u>t</u>
α + n + <u>t</u> (n,n't)	-2.467	2.822	t out
⁵ He + <u>t</u>	-3.203	3.664	
⁴ H + α	-4.070	4.650	bold
⁶ Li + 2n	-7.251	8.294	n out
⁶ He + d	-7.749	8.864	
α + 2n + d	-8.724	9.980	fusion
⁵ He + n + d	-9.460	10.821	only
⁶ He + n + p	-9.973	11.409	
⁷ He + p	-10.384	11.878	
α + 3n + p	-10.949	12.525	
⁵ He + 2n + p	-11.684	13.366	
⁵ Li + 3n	-12.910	14.770	J

• Li evaluation uncertainty, integral experiments are needed to V&V fusion metrics

×

UK Atomic Energy

Authority

- ENDF/B-VIII, JENDL-5 Li evaluations rely on pseudo levels !!
- DDXs on ⁷Li (b) 6 MeV and (c) 14.2 MeV, exhibit C/E disagreements -log-lin@deg.



Neutron & fusion technology

 $\label{eq:2-1.00} \begin{array}{l} ^{2}\text{H}+{}^{3}\text{H}=({}^{5}\text{He})=>{}^{4}\text{He}+n+\textbf{17.6}\ \textbf{MeV} @~1.00\\ \text{D}+\text{T}=({}^{5}\text{He})=>{}^{5}\text{He}+\gamma_{0}\left(\textbf{16.75}\ \textbf{MeV}\right) @~4~10^{-5}\\ {}^{5}\text{He}^{*}+\gamma_{1}\left(\textbf{~13.5}\ \textbf{MeV}\right)\gamma_{1}:\gamma_{0}\sim2.1\ \text{in ICF}\\ ~\#\ \text{in MCF} \end{array}$



Tritium need to be breed, Deuterium 0.015% (150 ppm)

 $n + {}^{6}\text{Li} ===> {}^{4}\text{He} + {}^{3}\text{H} (\text{tritium}) + 4.8 \text{ MeV} - \text{gas emission - breakup}$ $n + {}^{7}\text{Li} ===> {}^{4}\text{He} + {}^{3}\text{H} + n - \text{still gas emission - breakup}$ $\stackrel{+4.8 \text{ MeV}}{\longrightarrow} \text{ exothermic +}$ $n \rightarrow \underbrace{\text{Li}^{6}}_{\text{L2.7 MeV}} \xrightarrow{\alpha 2.1 \text{ MeV}}_{\beta - {}^{3}\text{He}}$ $n \rightarrow \underbrace{\text{Li}^{7}}_{2.8 \text{ MeV}} \xrightarrow{\alpha}_{2.8 \text{ MeV}} \xrightarrow{\alpha}_{2.8 \text{ MeV}} \xrightarrow{\alpha}_{2.8 \text{ MeV}} \xrightarrow{\alpha}_{10} \xrightarrow$

In both cases, the target Li⁶, Li⁷ disappear, is burned, depleted