

INTERMEDIATE ENERGY NUCLEAR REACTIONS CODE INTERCOMPARISON APPLICATIONS TO TRANSMUTATION OF LONG LIVED REACTOR WASTES

P. Nagel and J. Rodens
OECD Nuclear Energy Agency
Le Seine Saint-Germain
12, Boulevard des Iles
F-92130 Issy-les-Moulineaux
Paris, France
Tel 33 (1)4524 1082
email nagel@frneab51

M. Blann, L-289
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
P.O. Box 808 L-289
Livermore, CA 94550
Tel (510) 422-4515

H. Gruppelaar
Netherlands Energy Research Foundation (ECN)
Postbus 1
NL-1 775 ZG Petten
Netherlands
Tel 31 (2246) 4083

H. Küsters
Kernforschungszentrum Karlsruhe
Postfach 3640
D-7500 Karlsruhe
Germany
Tel 49 (7247)82 2481

D. Filges
Institut für Kernphysik
Forschungszentrum Jülich
Postfach 1913
D-5170 Jülich 1
Germany
Tel 49 (2461)61 5232

Abstract

We summarize results of an international code intercomparison designed to evaluate codes to provide the nuclear data necessary for schemes for the accelerator driven transmutation of long lived reactor wastes. This comparison of intermediate energy nuclear reaction codes has been organized by the OECD - NEA Nuclear Science Committee. Results are for thin target double differential (p, xn) and (p, xp) cross sections on ^{90}Zr and ^{208}Pb targets at incident energies of 25 to 1600 MeV. Thick Target neutron yields for 800 MeV protons on Pb and W targets were also calculated. We summarize the degree of dependability of these codes for thin and thick target measurements by use of a few comparisons of calculated and experimental yields.

1. Introduction

Consideration is being given to the incineration/transmutation of long lived reactor wastes using high flux reactors,¹ or by secondary spallation neutrons produced by high intensity intermediate energy (800 to 1600 MeV) charged particle beams.² These feasibility studies

involve the burnup of both transactinide and long lived fission products. If the schemes were successful, they would provide a permanent solution to the long term storage problem by reduction of long lived wastes to short lived or stable isotopes.

Evaluation of these proposals requires a very large body of nuclear data, much of which goes beyond present power reactor needs. This includes fission probabilities of transactinides for neutrons of up to a few MeV, and excitation functions for interaction of energetic neutrons with long lived fission products and reactor components. In this work we are concerned with data needs for proposals using intermediate energy accelerators to produce copious spallation neutrons to drive the transmutation processes. The first consideration is the flux and spectra of neutrons produced when an intermediate energy beam is stopped in a spallation target (e.g. Pb or W); a second question is the distribution of yields formed from the interaction of the primary beam with the spallation target, and by the secondary reaction products interacting both within the target and with surrounding materials.

The present experimental data base is inadequate for the needs of these proposals.

Furthermore, the number of facilities and physicists with which additional measurements could be made is steadily decreasing. We will have to depend largely on nuclear modeling codes to generate the cross sections and spectra necessary for these design studies. With this in mind the NEA/OECD has been charged with conducting a code inter-comparison to assess the uncertainties associated with such nuclear reaction codes. The exercise has been conducted in two parts. The first requests calculation of double differential cross sections for thin target ^{90}Zr , ^{208}Pb (p, xn) (p, xp) reactions for incident energies of 25, 45, 80, 160, 256, 800 and 1600 MeV.³ This exercise will test the microscopic nuclear physics in the different energy regimes. The second part of the exercise requests calculation of neutron spectra and product yields from 800 MeV protons on stopping length Pb and W targets.⁴ This will test the combined microscopic nuclear physics and transport aspects of the codes in giving integral results.

In the present report we summarize participation in part 1 of this exercise, thin target yields, and make some preliminary analyses of the reliability and limitations of the codes. The participation and codes used are summarized and discussed in section 2; preliminary results are given in section 3, with conclusions in section 4.

2. Codes Tested In This Exercise

The nuclear models to be tested in this project are (1) intranuclear cascade (INC)⁵⁻⁷ plus evaporation (EVAP)⁸⁻⁹, (2) INC plus pre-equilibrium¹⁰(PE) plus EVAP¹¹, (3) PE + EVAP (4) quantal PE (using Feshbach, Kerman and Koonin theory)¹² plus EVAP, and (5) quantum molecular dynamics (QMD)¹³. In some cases more than one participant used either the same code or minor variations of the same code. The different code categories and participants are summarized in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1
Participation in Intercomparison by Code Name and Physics Models Employed

Code Name	Physics	Participant)	Figure Designation
HECC/MECC7 + EVAP-F	INC+EVAP	1	PSI: ∇ ∇
GEANT	INC+EVAP	2	CDF: ▼ ▼
HERMES (HETC - KFK2)	INC+PE+EVAP ^a	3	KFK: ► ►
LAHET	INC+PE+EVAP	4	BNL2:
LAHET	INC+PE+EVAP	5	LAS: X X XX
HETC-3 STEP	INC+PE+EVAP	6	KYU: □ □
CEM92M	INC+PE+EVAP	7	DUB: * *
CEM92	INC+PE+EVAP	8	IAE: Δ Δ
ALICE91	PE+EVAP	9	LNL: ■ ■
ALICE87 MOD	PE+EVAP	10	CJD: • •
ALICE F	PE+EVAP	11	JAE: ◀ ◀
PEQAG2	PE (EVAP VIA MASTER EQ)	12	SBA: • •
FKK-GNASH	FKK+EXCITON +EVAP	13	LAS2: o o
KAPSIES+GRAPE	FKK+EVAP	14	ECN: ▲ ▲
QMD	INC+2 Body Forces Between Collisions	15	LNL2: L L
SYSTEMATIC	SYSTEMATICS	16	BNL: + +

^a See Table 2 for identification.

Table 2
List of participants

Ref.	Participant & Affiliation	Ref.	Participant & Affiliation
1.	F. Atchison, H.U. Wenger PSI, Switzerland	9.	M. Blann LLNL, USA
2.	J. Maillard, F. Bacha College de France, Paris, France	10.	V.P. Luneev, Yu. N. Shubin Electric Power Inst., Obninsk Russia
3.	D. Filges, KFA Jülich, Germany	11.	T. Fukahori JAERI, Tokyo, Japan
4.	H. Takahashi, BNL, USA	12.	E. Betak Bratislava, Czech. Republic
5.	R. E. Prael LANL, USA	13.	M. Chadwick LANL, USA
6.	T. Nishida, H. Takada, Y. Nakahara Kyushu University, Japan	14.	A. J. Koning ECN, Netherlands
7.	S. G. Mashnik Dubna, Russia	15.	G. Peilert Inst. of Theoretical Physics, Frankfurt, Germany
8.	V. Konshin IAEA, Vienna, Austria	16.	S. Pearlstein BNL, USA

Table 3
Sources of Experimental Data

Experimental Data		Symbol	Source
$^{90}\text{Zr}(p, xn)$ $^{208}\text{Pb}(p, xn)$	25 MeV, 45 MeV 25 MeV, 45 MeV	-◆-◆-	R.R. Doering, D.M. Patterson and A. Galonsky, Phys. Rev. C12 (1975) 378.
$^{90}\text{Zr}(p, xn)$	80 MeV	-◆-◆-	M. Trabandt <i>et al.</i> , Phys. Rev. C39 (1988) 452.
$^{208}\text{Pb}(p, xn)$	160 MeV	-◆-◆-	W. Scobel <i>et al.</i> , Phys. Rev. C41 (1990) 2010.
Zr, Pb(p, xn)	256 MeV, 800 MeV	- + - + -	S. Stainer <i>et al.</i> , Phys. Rev. C (1993) in press.
Pb (p, xn)	800 MeV	-◁-◁-	W. B. Amian <i>et al.</i> , Nucl. Sci. and Eng. 112 (1992) 78.
Pb (p, xn)	256 MeV	-◁-◁-	M.M. Meier, C.A. Goulding, G.L. Morgan and J. Ullman, Nucl. Sci and Eng. 104 (1990) 339.
$^{90}\text{Zr}(p, xp)$	80 MeV	-◆-◆-	A.A. Cowley <i>et al.</i> , Phys. Rev. C43 (1991) 678.
$^{90}\text{Zr}(p, xp)$	160 MeV	-◆-◆-	J.J. Lawrie <i>et al.</i> , (Jan. 1993), to be published; W. A. Richter, R. Lindsay, A. A. Cowley, J. J. Lawrie, G. C. Hillhouse, S.V. Foertsch, J. V. Pilcher, R. Bonetti and P. E. Hodgson, NAC Annual Report, 92-01, (1992) 26.

- a Data at 35 MeV and on other targets also available.
b Data at 120 MeV and on other targets also available.
c Data at 113, 597 MeV and on other targets also available.
d Data at 120 MeV and on other targets also available.

The QMD model¹³ is an INC approach for nucleon collisions. It differs in that between collisions nucleons each interact with all other nucleons via a two body force. This causes curved, rather than linear trajectories between collisions, and orders of magnitude increase in computation time. This approach may await massively parallel computers to become a practical tool. The quantal approaches on the other hand are starting to be useful tools for predictive nuclear modeling exercises. They retain one (energy dependent) free parameter, the strength of the nucleon-nucleon potential, and still require some work in treatment of multiple precompound decay. But steady progress is being made on making this a viable new model for prediction of precompound emission. All other codes listed in Table 1 should give predictive double differential cross sections (DDCS) using programmed global parameters. Questionnaires were returned with most entries giving details of the calculations and references to the literature for more complete discussions of the relevant physics of the various codes. These will be available in the final NEA report on Part 1 of the IEND code intercomparison exercise.

3. Results and discussions

The experimental data used are summarized in Table 3. An average of six angles for both neutron and proton exit channels were requested for each incident energy, for ⁹⁰Zr and ²⁰⁸Pb targets. This led to around 170 figures for DDCS. Most of these will be contained in the final report. We show only several illustrative examples here.

In fig 1 we show the ⁹⁰Zr(p, n) DDCS at 20° for 25 MeV incident energy. The end point energy comes at 18 MeV due to a -6.9 MeV Q value. We note that the INC codes show spectra to 25 MeV. This is due to the use of neutron and proton binding energies averaged over nuclides rather than use of thermodynamic values for each nuclide (as in the LAS and LNL results). While the PE + EVAP (or FKK + EVAP) models enjoy this advantage over the INC models at lower incident energies, they become inappropriate to use above 260 MeV because, unlike the INC codes, they lack pion and other particle production channels.

At incident energies of 80 and 160 MeV, for ⁹⁰Zr, both n and p emission channels have been measured at the same angles. This allows a test of the treatment of n and p emission branching and of the isopin physics in the different models. At forward angles many of the models are in quite good (within a factor of 2) agreement with experimental results. We show results for 69° in figures 2 and 3 for 160 MeV incident proton energy. At this angle the Dubna and PSI INC codes are in good to outstanding agreement with data; other codes may be seen to have significant deviations. Which codes do better changes with angle and incident energy; the conclusion at one angle and energy is not valid at all angles or incident energies. The comparisons of figs 2-3 are less favorable e.g. for 80 MeV incident energy.

In fig. 4 we present results for 800 MeV ⁹⁰Zr(p, n) spectra at 7.5° to illustrate one historic problem of the INC codes: overprediction of the quasi-elastic nucleon - nucleon scattering peak at very small angles. At the larger angles for which data are available (30, 60, 120, 150°) some of the INC codes do an outstanding job of predicting the DDCS. An example is e.g. fig. 5, for 800 MeV incident energy and at 60° exit angle.

4. conclusions

We have outlined the code intercomparison being undertaken by the NEA/OECD for codes relevant to spallation targets for actinide/ long lived fission product transmutation projects. In particular we have sketched the scope of part 1 of this exercise involving thin target double differential cross sections in reactions induced by 25-1600 MeV projectiles. Experimental data are available only up to 800 MeV; data at higher energies must be extrapolated from results at lower energies and estimates of reliability will have to be subjectively drawn from lower energy data.

A small sample of the results from the final report has been presented to point out some of the problems in the existing codes. Space did not permit a presentation of many of the most successful comparisons. These may be seen in the final NEA/OECD report when available, anticipated for Fall of 1993. Subjectively the overall reliability of codes over

broad ranges of incident and exit energies is at present no better than to within a factor of two, and in many cases poorer. Scrutiny of results of this intercomparison should help identify problem areas in the models involved, and we hope lead to an overall improvement in the predictive power of the codes. In this summary we have discussed DDCS results. The final report will also have summaries of single differential cross sections, reaction cross sections, neutron and proton multiplicities, and product yields for many of the codes used. Part 2 will illustrate the combined nuclear reaction and radiation transport capabilities of certain of the codes for thick target applications. These are precisely the conditions relevant to the ATW proposals which prompted this exercise.




Fig 1 Calculated and experimental ^{90}Zr (p, xn) spectra at 20° for 25 MeV incident protons. Experimental results are connected by straight line segment. Calculated contributions are identified in Table 1.




Fig 2 As in Fig 1 for ^{90}Zr (p, xn) spectra at 69° for 160 MeV incident protons.




Fig 3 As in fig 2 for ^{90}Zr (p, xn) spectra.




Fig 5 ^{90}Zr (p, xn) spectra at 60° for 800 MeV incident proton energy.




Fig 4 ^{90}Zr (p, xn) spectra at 7.5° for 800 MeV incident proton energy.

References

1. T. NISHIDA et al., "Nuclear Data Needs Concerning the Omega Project" JAE RI memo.
2. C. D. BOWMAN, et al., "Nuclear energy generation and waste transmutation using an accelerator driven intense neutron source" NIMA320, 336 (1992).
3. P. NAGEL and M. BLANN, "Specifications for an International Code and Model Inter comparison for Intermediate Energy Reactions," NEA/NSC/DOC3 (92).
4. D. FILGES and H. KUSTERS, "Benchmark Specifications for Intercomparison of Thick Target Calculations for Transmutation Purposes" NEA /NSC / DOC 14 (92) .
5. R. SERBER, "Nuclear Reactions at High Energies" Phys.Rev.72, 1114 (1947) .
6. M. L. GOLDBERGER, "The Interaction of High Energy Neutrons and Heavy Nuclei" Phys. Rev. 74, 1269 (1948).
7. H. W. BERTINI, "Intranuclear Cascade Calculation of the Secondary Nucleon Spectra from Nucleon-Nucleus Interactions in the Energy Range 340 to 2900 MeV and Comparisons with Experiment" Phys. Rev. 188, 1711 (1969).
8. V. F. WEISSKOPF and D. H. EWING, "On the Yield of Nuclear Reactions with Heavy Elements," Phys. Rev. 57, 472 (1940).
9. I. DOSTROVSKY, Z. FRAENKEL and G. FRIEDLANDER, "Monte Carlo Calculations of Nuclear Evaporation Processes 111, Applications to Low - Energy Reactions" Phys. Rev. 116, 683 (1959) .
10. M. BLANN, "Preequilibrium Decay" Ann. Rev. Nucl. Sci. 25, 123 (1975).
11. K. K. GUDIMA, S. G. MASHNIK and V. D. Toneev, "Cascade Exciton Model of Nuclear Reactions" Nucl.Phys.A401, 329 (1983).
12. H. FESHBACH, A. KERMAN and S. E. KOONIN, "The Statistical Theory of Multi-step Compound and Direct Reactions," Ann. Phys. (N. Y.) 125, 429 (1980).
13. J. AICHELIN, G. PEILERT, A. BOHNET, A. ROSENHAUER, H. STOCKER and W. GREINER, "Quantum Molecular Dynamics Approach to Heavy Ion Data" Phys.Rev. C 37, 2451 (1988).