

**OAK RIDGE  
NATIONAL LABORATORY**

MANAGED BY UT-BATTELLE  
FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

**ORNL/SUB/00-85B99398V-5**

**VENUS-2 Experimental Benchmark  
Analysis with MCU-REA**

**Project Manager**

**A. M. Pavlovichev**

**E. Gomin  
M. Kalugin  
D. Shkarovsky**

**A Russian Contribution to the  
Fissile Materials Disposition Program**

## DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY

Reports produced after January 1, 1996, are generally available free via the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Information Bridge:

**Web site:** <http://www.osti.gov/bridge>

Reports produced before January 1, 1996, may be purchased by members of the public from the following source:

National Technical Information Service  
5285 Port Royal Road  
Springfield, VA 22161  
**Telephone:** 703-605-6000 (1-800-553-6847)  
**TDD:** 703-487-4639  
**Fax:** 703-605-6900  
**E-mail:** [info@ntis.fedworld.gov](mailto:info@ntis.fedworld.gov)  
**Web site:** <http://www.ntis.gov/support/ordernowabout.htm>

Reports are available to DOE employees, DOE contractors, Energy Technology Data Exchange (ETDE) representatives, and International Nuclear Information System (INIS) representatives from the following source:

Office of Scientific and Technical Information  
P.O. Box 62  
Oak Ridge, TN 37831  
**Telephone:** 865-576-8401  
**Fax:** 865-576-5728  
**E-mail:** [reports@adonis.osti.gov](mailto:reports@adonis.osti.gov)  
**Web site:** <http://www.osti.gov/contact.html>

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

**VENUS-2 EXPERIMENTAL BENCHMARK ANALYSIS  
WITH MCU-REA**

**Project Manager**

A. M. Pavlovitchev

**Executed by**

E. Gomin  
M. Kalugin  
D. Shkarovsky

Date Published: May 2001

Prepared by  
RUSSIAN RESEARCH CENTER “KURCHATOV INSTITUTE”  
Institute of Nuclear Reactors  
under subcontract 85B-99398V

OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY  
P.O. Box 2008  
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831-6285  
managed by  
UT-BATTELLE, LLC  
for the  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY  
under contract DE-AC05-00OR22725



## CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
LIST OF FIGURES .....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
ABSTRACT .....	ix
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. MCU-REA MODEL OF THE VENUS-2 CRITICAL FACILITY .....	3
2.1 GEOMETRY.....	3
2.2 CROSS SECTION REPRESENTATION.....	4
2.3 STATISTICAL UNCERTAINTIES .....	4
3. CALCULATIONAL RESULTS.....	7
3.1 CELL CALCULATIONS .....	7
3.2 CORE CALCULATIONS.....	9
4. COMPARISONS WITH EXPERIMENT AND OTHER CALCULATIONS .....	11
5. CONCLUSIONS.....	15
REFERENCES .....	17
Appendix A. MCU-REA CODE INFORMATION.....	A-1



## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>Figure</b>		<b>Page</b>
2.1	MCU-REA 2-D model of the VENUS-2 experiment.....	3
4.1	Comparison of pin power distribution in the horizontal row .....	11
4.2	Comparison of pin power distribution in the diagonal row.....	11



## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2.1	Statistical uncertainties for core and cell calculations.....	4
2.2	Cross section representation of the nuclides and elements in the MCU-REA	
	VENUS-2 Model.....	5
3.1	$k_{\infty}$ values for cell calculations .....	7
3.2	Energy integrated reaction rates in 2.0/2.7 wt. % MOX, 3.3 wt. % $UO_2$ , and 4.0 wt. % $UO_2$ cells.....	7
3.3	Three group absorption and fission reaction rates in 2.0/2.7 wt. % MOX cell.....	8
3.4	Three group absorption and fission reaction rates in 3.3 wt. % $UO_2$ cell.....	8
3.5	Three group absorption and fission reaction rates in 4.0 wt. % $UO_2$ cell.....	9
3.6	VENUS-2 calculated core fission rate distribution .....	10
4.1	Comparison of $k_{\infty}$ values from Monte Carlo cell calculations .....	12
4.2	Comparison of core $k_{eff}$ values from Monte Carlo core calculations.....	12
4.3	Relative fission rate average deviation (in percent) from the experimental value and associated standard deviations for each type of fuel.....	13
5.1	Summary of MCU-REA deviation from the cell calculation average and the VENUS-2 experiment.....	15



# **VENUS-2 EXPERIMENTAL BENCHMARK ANALYSIS WITH MCU-REA**

**Project Manager**

A. M. Pavlovitchev

**Executed by**

E. Gomin

M. Kalugin

D. Shkarovsky

## **ABSTRACT**

The VENUS critical facility is a zero power reactor located at SCK-CEN, Mol, Belgium, which for the VENUS-2 experiment utilized a mixed-oxide core with near-weapons-grade plutonium. In addition to the VENUS-2 Core, additional computational variants based on each type of fuel cycle VENUS-2 core (3.3 wt. % UO<sub>2</sub>, 4.0 wt. % UO<sub>2</sub>, and 2.0/2.7 wt. % MOX) were also calculated. The VENUS-2 critical configuration and cell variants have been calculated with MCU-REA, which is a continuous energy Monte Carlo code system developed at Russian Research Center “Kurchatov Institute” and is used extensively in the Fissile Materials Disposition Program. The calculations resulted in a  $k_{\text{eff}}$  of  $0.99652 \pm 0.00025$  and relative pin powers within 2% for UO<sub>2</sub> pins and 3% for MOX pins of the experimental values.



## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Since 1999 Russia specialists from the Russian Research Center “Kurchatov Institute” (RRC-KI) have participated in TFRPD (Task Force on Reactor Based Plutonium Disposition) NEA/OECD experts group. The purpose of this group is to facilitate the exchange expertise and data among its international members that can aid in the disposition of plutonium. Currently, the TFRPD is performing a benchmark exercise involving the VENUS-2[1] experiment. The VENUS critical facility is a zero power reactor located at SCK-CEN, Mol, Belgium and utilized a mixed-oxide core with near-weapons-grade plutonium. In addition to the VENUS-2 Core, additional computational variants based on each type of fuel cycle VENUS-2 core (3.3 wt. %  $\text{UO}_2$ , 4.0 wt. %  $\text{UO}_2$ , and 2.0/2.7 wt. % MOX) were also calculated.


In this report MCU-REA[2] results as well as comparison of MCU-REA results with other codes and with experiment data are presented. The MCU-REA code is a continuous energy Monte Carlo code system developed at RRC-KI and is used extensively in the Fissile Materials Disposition Program. Additional details regarding the MCU-REA code are provided in Appendix A.



## 2. VENUS-2 CRITICAL FACILITY CALCULATION BY MCU CODE

### 2.1 GEOMETRY

The 2-D model, shown in Fig. 1, is based on the benchmark specification provided in the document prepared by the OECD/NEA entitled: “BLIND BENCHMARK ON THE VENUS-2 MOX CORE MEASUREMENTS, NEA/SEN/ NSC/WPPR (99)2” without any approximation except of the neutron pad. The neutron pad outer radius was taken as 65.073 cm instead of value in the benchmark specification. This approximation does not influence on the criticality and fission rate distribution. Core criticality calculation was performed with vertical buckling value 2.4E-03 cm<sup>-2</sup>, as provided in the specifications.



**Fig. 2.1. MCU-REA 2-D model of the VENUS-2 experiment.**

## 2.2. STATISTICAL UNCERTAINTIES

The number of particle histories and the associated standard deviations for the calculations are presented in Table 1. The number of histories performed result in sufficiently small statistical uncertainties for benchmarking purposes.

**Table 2.1. Statistical uncertainties for core and cell calculations**

	Core Calculation	Cell Calculations
Neutron histories	10,000,000	1,000,000
Uncertainty <sup>a</sup> for $k_{\infty}$	0.00025	0.0007
Uncertainty <sup>a</sup> for fission rates in fuel rod	0.8%–1.2%	0.1%

<sup>a</sup>One standard deviation.

## 2.3 CROSS SECTION REPRESENTATION

The MCU-REA code has various cross section models that can be used for different elements and nuclides. Table 2 provides the detailed information about the cross section representation for each nuclide in the VENUS-2 model. Note that in this table the parameters MODS, BLOC and EMAX are defined as follows:

MODS - denotes the model of calculation of scattering cross-section in the thermal energy region:

- MODS=G – gas model;
- MODS=T – heavy gas model;
- MODS=H2O – model name if the cross-sections are calculated considering chemical bonds, when S( $\alpha, \beta$ ) treatment is used; ENDF phonon spectrum of hydrogen in water.

BLOK - consideration of resonance effects:

- BLOK=0 – resonance effects not considered
- BLOK=1 – blocking in group's average (through f-factor)
- BLOK=2 – all resonances are considered in subgroup approximation
- BLOK=4 – calculation by resonance parameters from LIPAR at E<EMAX and in subgroup approximation at E>EMAX, EMAX – the upper energy boundary for calculation by resonance parameters.

**Table 2.2. Cross section representation of the nuclides and elements in the  
MCU-REA VENUS-2 model**

Material	MODS	BLOK	EMAX		Material	MODE	BLOK	EMAX	
			resonance boundary	(eV)				resonance boundary	(eV)
H	H2O	0	0		CO	T	2	21500	
B-10	T	0	0		NI	T	2	0	
B-11	G	2	0		ZR	T	2	10000	
C <sup>a</sup>	G	2	0		MO	T	2	0	
N	G	2	0		SN	T	0	0	
O	G	2	0		U-234	T	4	465	
NA	T	2	0		U-235	T	4	100	
AL	T	2	0		U-236	T	4	1000	
SI	T	2	0		U-238	T	4	2150	
P	T	2	0		Pu-239	T	4	465	
S	T	0	0		Pu-240	T	4	1000	
K	T	2	0		Pu-241	T	4	100	
CR	T	2	0		Pu-242	T	4	1000	
MN	T	2	100000		Am-241	T	4	46.5	
FE	T	2	0						

<sup>a</sup>Carbon calculation free gas model is used in pyrex zone.



### 3. MCU-REA CALCULATIONAL RESULTS

#### 3.1 CELL CALCULATIONS

The MCU-REA results for the cell benchmark variants are given in Tables 3.1–3.5. Note that the pin dimensions are different for the 3.3 wt. % and 4.0 wt. % UO<sub>2</sub> cells resulting in the lower  $k_{\infty}$  for the 4.0 wt. % UO<sub>2</sub> cell.

**Table 3.1.  $k_{\infty}$  values for cell calculations**

Cell	$k_{\infty}$
3.3 wt. % UO <sub>2</sub>	1.4071
4.0 wt. % UO <sub>2</sub>	1.3365
2.0/2.7 wt. % MOX	1.2549

**Table 3.2. Energy integrated reaction rates in 2.0/2.7 wt. % MOX, 3.3 wt. % UO<sub>2</sub> and 4.0 wt. % UO<sub>2</sub> cells** (reactions/cm<sup>3</sup>/sec normalized to 1 fission neutron/sec)

Material	MOX cell (2.0/2.7 wt. %)		UO <sub>2</sub> cell (3.3 wt. %)		UO <sub>2</sub> cell (4.0 wt. %)	
	Absorption	Fission	Absorption	Fission	Absorption	Fission
U-234	8.596E-04	2.437E-05	1.932E-03	4.362E-05	2.025E-03	5.229E-05
U-235	1.742E-01	1.386E-01	6.582E-01	5.461E-01	6.270E-01	5.133E-01
U-236	3.257E-04	1.160E-05	3.995E-04	1.347E-05	6.394E-04	2.212E-05
U-238	2.404E-01	2.981E-02	2.697E-01	2.693E-02	2.772E-01	3.084E-02
Pu-239	4.239E-01	2.772E-01	-	-	-	-
Pu-240	8.348E-02	7.781E-04	-	-	-	-
Pu-241	1.731E-02	1.268E-02	-	-	-	-
Pu-242	9.605E-04	1.487E-05	-	-	-	-
Am-241	3.939E-04	5.112E-06	-	-	-	-
O	2.437E-03	0.000E+00	2.166E-03	0.000E+00	2.465E-03	0.000E+00
B-10	-	-	1.763E-05	0.000E+00	-	-
B-11	-	-	9.819E-11	0.000E+00	-	-
Total	9.441E-01	4.592E-01	9.324E-01	5.730E-01	9.093E-01	5.442E-01

**Tables 3.3. Three group absorption and fission reaction rates in 2.0/2.7 wt. % MOX cell**  
 (reactions/cm<sup>3</sup>/sec normalized to 1 fission neutron/sec)

Material	Group 1 (E > 5 keV)		Group 2 (4 eV < E < 5 keV)		Group 3 (E < 4 eV)	
	Absorption	Fission	Absorption	Fission	Absorption	Fission
U-234	3.244E-05	2.279E-05	6.740E-04	6.400E-07	1.531E-04	9.403E-07
U-235	6.292E-03	5.317E-03	4.314E-02	2.749E-02	1.247E-01	1.058E-01
U-236	1.313E-05	7.804E-06	3.044E-04	3.691E-06	8.142E-06	1.040E-07
U-238	5.899E-02	2.981E-02	1.513E-01	0.000E+0	3.003E-02	0.000E+0
Pu-239	7.707E-03	6.835E-03	5.536E-02	3.182E-02	3.608E-01	2.386E-01
Pu-240	9.505E-04	7.317E-04	4.399E-03	3.059E-05	7.813E-02	1.576E-05
Pu-241	3.217E-04	2.909E-04	3.856E-03	2.819E-03	1.313E-02	9.572E-03
Pu-242	1.954E-05	1.461E-05	5.258E-05	1.824E-07	8.884E-04	7.197E-08
Am-241	6.379E-06	3.187E-06	4.905E-05	3.603E-07	3.384E-04	1.565E-06
O	2.431E-03	0.000E+0	4.538E-08	0.000E+0	6.026E-06	0.000E+0
Total	7.676E-02	4.304E-02	2.592E-01	6.217E-02	6.082E-01	3.540E-01

**Table 3.4. Three group absorption and fission reaction rates in 3.3 wt. % UO<sub>2</sub> cell**  
 (reactions/cm<sup>3</sup>/sec normalized to 1 fission neutron/sec)

Material	Group 1 (E > 5 keV)		Group 2 (4 eV < E < 5 keV)		Group 3 (E < 4 eV)	
	Absorption	Fission	Absorption	Fission	Absorption	Fission
U-234	5.351E-05	3.773E-05	1.105E-03	1.057E-06	7.729E-04	4.830E-06
U-235	9.390E-03	7.943E-03	6.588E-02	4.199E-02	5.829E-01	4.961E-01
U-236	1.468E-05	8.794E-06	3.603E-04	4.361E-06	2.452E-05	3.161E-07
U-238	5.287E-02	2.693E-02	1.416E-01	0.000E+0	7.520E-02	0.000E+0
O	2.150E-03	0.000E+0	4.333E-08	0.000E+0	1.553E-05	0.000E+0
B-10	3.458E-08	0.000E+0	6.548E-07	0.000E+0	1.694E-05	0.000E+0
B-11	2.862E-12	0.000E+0	2.930E-12	0.000E+0	9.240E-11	0.000E+0
Total	6.448E-02	3.492E-02	2.090E-01	4.199E-02	6.590E-01	4.961E-01

**Table 3.5. Three group absorption and fission reaction rates in 4.0 wt. % UO<sub>2</sub> cell**  
 (reactions/cm<sup>3</sup>/sec normalized to 1 fission neutron/sec)

Material	Group 1 (E > 5 keV)		Group 2 (4 eV < E < 5 keV)		Group 3 (E < 4 eV)	
	Absorption	Fission	Absorption	Fission	Absorption	Fission
U-234	6.759E-05	4.721E-05	1.349E-03	1.302E-06	6.081E-04	3.776E-06
U-235	1.369E-02	1.156E-02	9.147E-02	5.853E-02	5.218E-01	4.432E-01
U-236	2.489E-05	1.465E-05	5.872E-04	7.117E-06	2.731E-05	3.510E-07
U-238	6.191E-02	3.084E-02	1.581E-01	0.000E+0	5.716E-02	0.000E+0
O	2.453E-03	0.000E+0	4.879E-08	0.000E+0	1.172E-05	0.000E+0
Total	7.815E-02	4.246E-02	2.515E-01	5.854E-02	5.796E-01	4.432E-01

### 3.2 CORE CALCULATIONS

The VENUS-2 core calculation with MCU resulted in a  $k_{\text{eff}}$  of  $0.99652 \pm 0.00025$ . The corresponding fission rate distribution is given in Table 3.6.

**Table 3.6. VENUS-2 calculated core fission rate distribution**  
 (normalization mid-plane average = 1, normalized over all 640 pins in the  $\frac{1}{4}$  core)

#### 4. COMPARISONS WITH EXPERIMENT AND OTHER CALCULATIONS

Twelve solutions were submitted and the agreement is generally satisfactory [3]. The results are summarized as follows:

Average $K_{\text{eff}}$ over 12 solutions	$0.99758 \pm 0.0045$
Average $K_{\text{eff}}$ over transport calculations (5)	$0.99750 \pm 0.0044$
Average $K_{\text{eff}}$ over Monte-Carlo calculations (7)	$0.99983 \pm 0.0037$
Power(fission rate) distribution	5% deviation in the $\text{UO}_2$ regions 10% deviation in the MOX region.

Figures 4.1 and 4.2 show results of MCU calculations and experiments for horizontal and diagonal rows. Tables 4.1 and 4.2 present comparisons of  $k_{\infty}$  and  $k_{\text{eff}}$  values obtained from Monte Carlo core and cell calculations.




Fig. 4.1. Comparison of pin Power Distribution in the horizontal row.




Fig. 4.2. Comparison of pin power distribution in the diagonal row.

**Table 4.1. Comparison of  $k_{\infty}$  values from Monte Carlo cell calculations**

Participant	Code/Method	UO <sub>2</sub> (3.3 wt. %)		UO <sub>2</sub> (4.0 wt. %)		MOX (2.0/2.7 wt. %)	
		$k_{\infty}$	Dev. (%)	$k_{\infty}$	Dev. (%)	$k_{\infty}$	Dev. (%)
NEA+KAERI	MCNP-4B	1.4048	-0.22	1.3364	-0.22	1.2545	-0.28
JAERI	MVP	1.4112	0.23	1.3455	0.47	1.2631	0.41
RRC-KI	MCU	1.4071	-0.05	1.3365	-0.21	1.2549	-0.25
KFKI	MCNP-4B	1.4065	-0.10	1.3364	-0.21	1.2631	0.41
GRS	MCNP-4B (square cell)	1.4112	0.24	1.3437	0.33	1.2614	0.27
GRS	MCNP-4B (cyl. cell)	1.4095	0.12	1.3402	0.07	1.2543	-0.29
LJS-Jeraj	MCNP-4B	1.4048	-0.22	1.3361	-0.24	1.2547	-0.26
Average		1.4079		1.3393		1.2580	
St. dev.		0.0028		0.0040		0.0043	

**Table 4.2. Comparison of core  $k_{\text{eff}}$  values from Monte Carlo core calculations**

Participant	Code	$k_{\text{eff}}$	Dev. (%)	Data library
NEA+KAERI	MCNP-4B	1.00213(13)	0.21	ENDF/B-VI Rel.2
RRC-KI	MCU	0.99650(25)	-0.35	ENDF/B-VI, JENDL-3.2, BROND
KFKI	MCNP-4B	1.00050(26)	0.05	ENDF/B-VI, ENDF/B-V
GRS	MCNP-4B	1.00430(20)	0.43	JEF2.2, ENDF/B-VI, JENDL-3.1, BROND
IJS-Jeraj	MCNP-4B	0.99570(10)	-0.43	ENDF/B-VI, ENDL85

Table 4.3 presents averages of deviation (%) of the relative fission rate from the experimental value and associated standard deviations for each type of fuel cell in the VENUS-2 core.

**Table 4.3. Relative fission rate average deviation (in percent) from the experimental value and associated standard deviations for each type of fuel**

Participant	UO <sub>2</sub> (3.3 wt. %)		UO <sub>2</sub> (4.0 wt. %)		MOX (2.0/2.7 wt. %)	
	Average	St. Dev.	Average	St. Dev.	Average	St. Dev.
NEA	-2.42	1.51	-0.42	1.99	5.85	2.13
KAERI	-2.19	1.39	-0.37	1.88	4.92	2.10
ORNL	-0.60	1.53	-0.68	2.19	1.64	2.96
PSI	-2.65	1.56	-0.88	2.26	7.19	2.73
SCK	-2.37	1.51	-0.40	1.96	5.63	2.14
IJS-Trkov (JEF-2.2)	-2.36	2.00	-1.25	3.57	6.19	4.29
IJS-Trkov (ENDF/B-VI)	-2.36	1.96	-1.42	3.54	6.59	4.24
NEA+KAERI	-0.48	1.44	0.03	2.02	1.37	1.75
JAERY	-0.43	1.49	-0.95	1.80	3.15	2.09
KI	-0.54	1.65	-1.08	1.89	2.16	2.38
KFKI	-1.64	1.74	-0.99	2.25	6.66	2.32
GRS	-0.57	1.33	-1.05	1.77	3.33	2.05



## 5. CONCLUSIONS

The VENUS-2 Benchmark was calculated using the MCU-REA code. The MCU results show good agreement with experiment and other calculational results. A summary of the results are given in Table 5.1. The deviation of the MCU calculational  $k_{\text{eff}}$  value for the VENUS-2 critical facility is -0.35%.

As shown in Table 5.1, MCU-REA shows very good agreement with the experiment for the fission rate distribution. Maximum deviation for the pin fission rate does not exceed 0.5% for the UO<sub>2</sub> 3.3% region, 1.9% for the UO<sub>2</sub> 4.0% region and 2.2% for the MOX region.

**Table 5.1. Summary of the MCU-REA deviations (%) from the cell calculation average and the VENUS-2 experiment**

Functional	Variant	Deviation %	Deviation from
$k_{\infty}$	Cell UO <sub>2</sub> (3.3 wt. %)	-0.05%	Calculation average
	Cell UO <sub>2</sub> (4.0 wt. %)	-0.21%	
	Cell MOX	-0.25%	
$k_{\text{eff}}$	VENUS-2 Core	-0.35%	Experiment
Relative Fission Rate	UO <sub>2</sub> 3.3% region	-0.5%	Experiment
	UO <sub>2</sub> 4.0% region	-1.9%	
	MOX region	2.2%	



## REFERENCES

1. Byung Chan C. Na and Enrico Sartori, *Blind benchmark on the VENUS-2 MOX core measurements*, OECD Nuclear Energy Agency, NEA/SEN/ NSC/WPPR (99)2.
2. E. A. Gomin, L. V. Maiorov, "The MCU Monte-Carlo Code for 3-D Depletion Calculation," *Proc. of the International Conference on Mathematics and Computation, Reactor Physics and Environmental Analysis in Nuclear Applications*, M&C'99-Madrid, Madrid, Spain, 1999, 16.2-12.
3. *Benchmark on the VENUS-2 MOX Core Measurements*, OECD Nuclear Energy Agency, NEA/NSC/DOC(2000)7 (December 2000).



**Appendix A**

**MCU-REA CODE INFORMATION**



## Appendix A. MCU-REA CODE INFORMATION

MCU-REA is a general-purpose continuous energy Monte Carlo code for solving the neutron transport problems with depletion. It is used with both pointwise and step function representations of cross sections. For neutron-nuclear interaction modeling the code includes:

- inelastic scattering laws from evaluated nuclear data files;
- cross section temperature dependence in unresolved resonance region with the subgroup approximation;
- Doppler broadening of resonance cross sections in resolved resonance region using infinite number of energy points;
- $S(\alpha,\beta)$  scattering law depending on temperature.

The geometry module of the code is the combination of the following approaches:

- combinatorial method, body technique, hierarchy description;
- Woodcock method;
- algorithm to model fuel elements with thousands of micro-spheres included in one fuel element.

The hierarchy geometry option permits one to describe full scale 3-D reactor model (VVER, PWR, BWR, RBMK, etc) using only 0.25 MB of RAM.

The change of isotopic composition of reactor materials is modeled with a burnup module that includes 39 actinides and 165 fission products.

The MCU-REA code was certified by the Russian regulator authority Gosatomnadzor (GAN) for neutronic calculations of VVER reactors.

More than 500 3D benchmark experiments published in the Handbook of International Criticality Safety Evaluation Benchmark Project and Russian literature have been calculated. The discrepancies between calculation and experiment results are within the experiment errors estimated. The full-scale 3-D models of the different reactors (transport, production, space, research, energy production, VVER and RBMK) are elaborated and used widely to estimate their parameters and to verify the design codes.

MCU data libraries is DLC/MCUDAT-2.1 based on:

- ENDF/B-VI; JENDL-3.2; BROND
- MCU group own evaluations and compilations:
  - LIPAR - parameters of the fully resolved resonances
  - BFS - phonon spectra library including the ENDF data
  - KORT - cross-sections for  $E=0.0253$  eV, resonance integrals, etc.

The following data processing codes were used to obtain the cross-section data used:

- NJOY; GRUCON (IPPE, Russia)
- MCU group elaborations:
  - TERMAC - generation of the  $S(\alpha,\beta)$  multigroup library;
  - STEN - generation of the  $S(\alpha,\beta)$  pointwise library;
  - RAPAN - generation of the resonance cross sections;
  - SET OF MODULES for evaluating and analyzing the resonance parameters.

**INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION**

- |                      |                                |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1–5. B. B. Bevard    | 19. M. A. Kuliasha             |
| 6. M. D. DeHart      | 20. G. E. Michaels             |
| 7. F. C. Difilippo   | 21. C. V. Parks                |
| 8. M. E. Dunn        | 22–26. R. T. Primm III         |
| 9. R. J. Ellis       | 27. C. C. Southmayd            |
| 10–14. J. C. Gehin   | 28. I. Remec                   |
| 15. S. Goluglu       | 29. J. P. Renier               |
| 16. S. R. Greene     | 30. G. L. Yoder, Jr.           |
| 17. D. F. Hollenbach | 31. Central Research Library   |
| 18. D. T. Ingersoll  | 32. ORNL Laboratory Records-RC |

**EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION**

33. M. L. Adams, Department of Nuclear Engineering, Texas A&M University, Zachry 129, College Station, TX 77843
34. D. Alberstein, Los Alamos National Laboratory, P.O. Box 1663, MS-K551, Los Alamos, NM 87545
35. J. B. Briggs, Idaho National Environmental and Engineering Laboratory, P.O. Box 1625-3855, Idaho Falls, ID 83415-3855
36. K. Chidester, Los Alamos National Laboratory, P.O. Box 1663, MS-E502, Los Alamos, NM 87545
37. W. Danker, U.S. Department of Energy, NN-62, 1000 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20585
38. T. Gould, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, P.O. Box 808, MS-L186, Livermore, CA 94551
39. L. Jardine, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, P.O. Box 808, MS-L166, Livermore, CA 94551
40. Dr. Alexander Kalashnikov, Institute of Physics and Power Engineering, 1 Bondarenko Square, Obninsk, Kaluga Region, Russia 249020
41. Dr. S. L. Passman, Booz-Allen & Hamilton, 555 13th Street, NW, No. 480E, Washington, DC 20004
- 42–46. Dr. Alexander Pavlovitchev, Russian Research Center “Kurchatov Institute,” Institute of Nuclear Reactors, VVER Division, VVER Physics Department, 123182, Kurchatov Square, 1, Moscow, Russia
47. K. L. Peddicord, Associate Vice Chancellor, Texas A&M University, 120 Zachry, College Station, TX 77843-3133
48. P. T. Rhoads, Office of Fissile Materials Disposition, U.S. Department of Energy, NN-61, 1000 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20585
49. J. Thompson, Office of Fissile Materials Disposition, U.S. Department of Energy, NN-61, 1000 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20585
50. F. Trumble, Westinghouse Savannah River Company, Building 730R, Room 3402, WSRC, Aiken, SC 29808

51. Mr. R. H. Clark, Duke/Cogema/Stone & Webster, 400 South Tryon Street, WC-32G, P.O. Box 1004, Charlotte, NC 28202
52. Mr. S. Nesbit, Duke/Cogema/Stone & Webster, 400 South Tryon Street, WC-32G, P.O. Box 1004, Charlotte, NC 28202
53. M. S. Chatterton, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, MS O10B3, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001
54. R. W. Lee, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, MS O10B3, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001
55. U. Shoop, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, MS O10B3, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001
56. Dr. Alexandre Ermolaev; Balakovo Nuclear Power Plant, Saratov Region, Balakovo-26, Russia, 413866
57. Dr. Enrico Sartori; OECD Nuclear Energy Agency, Le Seine-Saint Germain, 12 boulevard des Iles, F-92130 Issy-les-Moulineaux, France
58. Nagao Ogawa; Director and General Manager; Plant Engineering Department; Nuclear Power Engineering Corporation; Shuwa-Kamiyacho Building, 2F; 3-13, 4-Chome Toranomon; Minato-Ku, Tokyo 105-0001, Japan
59. Dr. Kiyonori Aratani; Surplus Weapons Plutonium Disposition Group; International Cooperation and Nuclear Material Control Division; Japan Nuclear Cycle Development Institute; 4-49 Muramatsu, Tokai-mura, Naka-gun, Ibaraki-ken, Japan
60. Boris E. Volkov; Head of Division; EDO Gidropress; 21 Ordzhonikidze Street; Podolsk, Moscow district, Russia 142103