Post-test analyses of LIFUS5 Test#3 experiment

Marica Eboli [a,*], Alessandro Del Nevo [b], Nicola Forgione [a], Maria Teresa Porfiri [c]

[a] *DICI, University of Pisa, Largo Lucio Lazzarino 2, 56122 Pisa, Italy*
[b] *ENEA FSN-ING-PAN, C.R. Brasimone, Camugnano, Bologna 40032, Italy*
[c] *ENEA FSN-FUSTEC-TEN, via E. Fermi 45, Frascati, 00044, Italy*

HIGHLIGHTS

- Preliminary code assessment process of SIMMER-III for fusion application.
- LIFUS5 Test#3 post-test analyses performed.
- Improved knowledge of the experiment and execution procedures.
- Relevance of correct I&B conditions on the predictive capabilities of SIMMER code.

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

The interaction between lithium-lead and water is a major concern of Water Cooled Lithium Lead (WCLL) breeding blanket design concept, therefore deterministic safety analysis of the in-box LOCA postulated accident is of primary importance. The paper presents the preliminary code assessment process of the modified version of SIMMER-III code for fusion application by means of LIFUS5 Test#3 post-test analyses. A series of sensitivity calculations are performed to overcome uncertainties in the test data and experiment execution, and to investigate the capability of the code in predicting the phenomena occurring during PbLi/water interaction. Results show agreement between numerical results and experimental data. Besides, differences are observed in the first second of the transient due to imperfect knowledge of initial and boundary conditions, and test execution procedure.

1. Introduction

The safety issues connected with the lithium-lead/water interaction in WCLL breeding blanket [1] is a potential hazard that shall be considered. Therefore, the availability of qualified system code for deterministic safety analysis of in-box LOCA (Loss of Coolant Accident) is of primary importance. The modified version of SIMMER-III code for fusion application, which implements the PbLi/water chemical reaction, has been developed by University of Pisa and ENEA CR Brasimone [2] and currently is under validation process.

The aim of the paper is to describe the preliminary code assessment of SIMMER-III Ver. 3F Mod.0.1 code by means of LIFUS5 Test#3 post-test analyses. To address this objective, Section 2 briefly describes the Test#3 experiment, then the nodalization of the facility is reported in Section 3. Post-test analyses results are illustrated in Section 4, in which considerations about the comprehension of experimental data are discussed. Finally, conclusions are reported in the final section.

2. Description of LIFUS5 Test#3

2.1. Facility description

LIFUS5 [3,4] was designed and operated at ENEA CR Brasimone to experimentally investigate the consequence of LOCA accidents in liquid metal pools. Fig. 1 shows the Process and Instrumentation Diagram (P&ID) of the facility, descripted in detail in literature [3,4]. The reaction vessel S1 contained a mock-up of U shaped cooling tubes, as foreseen in previous design of WCLL BB for DEMO [5]. The water injection device was placed in the bottom of S1 below the tube bank sector and had an orifice diameter of 4 mm. Several pressure transducers and thermocouples were placed both in S1 and in the expansion vessel S5 to follow the pressure and temperature evolution during the interaction.

Fig. 1. P&ID of LIFUS5 facility.

Table 1
Test #3 operating conditions.

Parameter	Test #3
PbLi temperature	330 °C
Water injection pressure	155 bar
Water temperature	295 °C
Sub-cooling	50 °C
Free volume in S5	5 l
Time of injection	6 s

2.2. Test#3 conditions

Before the execution of the test, vacuum was generated between the valve V14 and the water injector. At the start of the test, valve V14 opened and hot pressurized water was discharged from the water tank S2 to S1 through the injection line. The water injection pressure was fixed at 155 bar and kept constant through a constant pressurization of the vessel S2. After 6 s, the injection was interrupted closing the valve. The main operating conditions of Test#3 are summarized in Table 1.

2.3. Open issues

The experimental results described in Ref. [3] are not exhaustive. Moreover, on the basis of the review of available documents, the execution of the experiment is affected by uncertain data in relation to:

- *Layout of the injector device* and relative position in respect to the U-tube mock-up. No geometrical drawings or dimensional information was found in literature (Refs. [3,4]).
- *Injected mass of water*, because no mass flow meter was installed in the injection line. In literature, this value was reported as 1.3 kg

([3,4]) but no accuracy is reported as well as no reference on the procedure used for the evaluation. This value is considered unreliable.
- *Layout of the expansion tubes.* No document was found for the configuration of the expansion tubes and a 3″ pipe connecting S1 and S5, but only the expansion tubes main dimensions are available (Refs. [3,4]).

3. LIFUS5 nodalization by SIMMER-III

The nodalization of LIFUS5 by SIMMER-III Ver. 3F Mod.0.1 code (the version for fusion application which implements PbLi/water chemical reaction) [1] is developed in 2D axisymmetric geometry, despite the limitation of representing the asymmetries of LIFUS5 facility. It is constituted by 5 main parts (Fig. 2) representing:

- the water tank S2 and the S2-S1 pipeline,
- the injector device and its orifice,
- the reaction vessel S1, the U-tube mock-up and two plates dividing S1 into four sectors,
- the S1-S5 link which preserves the flow area of the expansion tubes,
- the expansion vessel S5.

The geometrical domain is subdivided into 17 radial and 28 axial mesh cells. The overall volume of the model is obtained rotating the 2D SIMMER domain along the axis of symmetry. Colors distinguish the different fluids: PbLi represented in red, water in blue, cover gas (and the hydrogen produced by the reaction) in white. It is worth to underline that this nodalization considered as first attempt to validate the SIMMER-III code for fusion application is the same of past numerical activities, reported in Ref. [4].

Fig. 2. LIFUS5 facility nodalization by SIMMER-III.

The boundary conditions are applied in S2 cover gas cells to reproduce the continuous inflow of Argon from the cylinder, at the constant pressure of 155 bar. The initial conditions of pressure and temperature in S1, S5, and in the injection line, are set coherently with the data reported in Table 1. The reference run is set opening the virtual wall, which represent the valve V14 at t = 0 s, and it is maintained open for 6 s, coherently with the experimental specifications. The amount of water injected is not imposed, but calculated by SIMMER-III accordingly to pressure difference between the injector inlet and the reaction vessel.

4. Analysis of post-test calculation results

Three-step analysis is pursued as a part of the code assessment process. The initial condition results at the injection time are relevant for the characterization of the thermal-hydraulic conditions at the beginning of the experiment. The reference calculation "Run0" is not the best calculation because it is based on a former analysis set-up running the code without the chemical implemented model [4]. Sensitivity analyses are carried out to demonstrate the robustness of the calculation, to characterize the reasons for possible discrepancies between measured and calculated trends that appear in the reference calculation, to optimize code results and user option choices, to improve the understanding of experimental data, and to improve the knowledge of the code by the user.

4.1. Reference calculation results

The pressure transient can be divided into three characteristic phases of interaction [3], already recognized in BLAST experimental campaign [6]. Two additional phases (Phase 0 and Phase 4) are discussed as part of the calculation set up. The numerical and experimental pressure trends are reported in Figs. 3 and 4, while

Fig. 5 shows the water mass flow rate and the hydrogen generation calculated by the code.

4.1.1. Phase 0 [onset of valve opening – 0 ms]: water injection line pressurization

As soon as valve V14 opens, water starts to flow and to pressurize the pipeline upstream the injection cap. The design of the test specifies that the cap should be ruptured at the reference pressure (i.e. 155 bar). This implies that subcooled water at 295 °C will enter in S1. During this phase, no measured experimental datum is available. Therefore, according with the set up reference calculation, the start of the transient (t = 0 s) is supposed to be the time of the injection cap breaking. The simulation assumes that subcooled water at the design test conditions is injected directly in the reaction vessel S1.

4.1.2. Phase 1 [0 s–200 ms]: coolant flashing and S1 pressurization

The water injection and flashing in S1 causes a sudden steep pressurization. The code results evidence a faster pressure increase. The calculated pressure peak is 127 bar occurring at about 20 ms, whereas the experimental value is 100 bar at 200 ms. Different causes are identified for justifying these trends. However, considering the data of Test#6 [7] where the pressure was measured in the injection line, the most likely justification is an early rupture of the injection cap which may cause two phase flow conditions at the orifice in the experiment, resulting in a slower pressurization. This deviation from the test specification will be analyzed in sect. 4.2. The calculated amount of water injected during this phase is 1.58 g, which results from a sudden spike of mass flow rate at 0.79 kg/s.

4.1.3. Phase 2 [200 ms–800 ms]: S5 pressurization

The phase starts with the critical flow almost constant at about 0.45 kg/s. No measurement is available for comparison. The calculated pressure in the reaction vessel slightly decreases and then stabilizes at about 115–120 bar, which corresponds at the saturation temperature of about 325 °C. The simulation calculates this phase longer than in the experiment. This can be explained with a lower expansion volume in S5 (it is not clearly stated how the level is measured, and its accuracy) and a larger steam flow moving from S1 to S5. A pressure peak of 28 bar is also measured in the expansion vessel at 377 ms, following a sudden steep pressure increase, which seems connected to a sort of CCFL occurrence in the expansion pipe. Indeed, vapor gas, rising in the pipe, expands in S5 because the differential pressure and as consequence of the drag between the fluids may cause the formation of a plug of PbLi acting as temporary piston and, thus, compressing the steam of S5, which cannot condense because the low absolute pressure. This process in the simulation occurs at 600 ms. However, SIMMER-III overestimates the amount of PbLi transported in S5 and the expansion vessel is almost solid, causing pressure oscillations at the beginning of phase 3. The simulation predicts a linear hydrogen generation of about 67.7 g/s, up to 660 ms when the pressures are equalized and the injected water mass flow rate starts to decrease.

4.1.4. Phase 3 [800 ms–6500 ms]: S1 and S5 pressures equilibrium

Once S1 and S5 pressures are equalized in the experiment, they increase up to the maximum pressure of 150 bar, occurring when the water injection is stopped. The pressure increase is driven by the water injected, which evaporates, after 3300 ms, in the zone where the chemical reaction affects the melt temperature above the saturation value. The simulation predicts pressure oscillations at beginning of the phase 3 in S5 and a fast pressure increase up to 155 bar, reached at 1000 ms. Once this pressure is reached, the injection stops. From this time on, the hydrogen generation becomes negligible. The code predicts an overall injected water

Fig. 3. Run7 vs Run0: pressure trends PK[S1] and PK[S5] and comparison with experimental data (PT4 in S1 and PT1 in S5).


Fig. 4. Run7 vs Run0: pressure trends PK[S1] and PK[S5] and comparison with experimental data. Zoom on 0–2 s.

mass equal to 0.367 kg, which result much lower than the value reported in the description document [3].

4.1.5. Phase 4 [6500 ms – EoT]: system pressure stabilization

During this phase the injection valve is closed and the parameters are stabilized. The pressures are almost constant (slightly decreasing) in the experiment and in the simulation.

Finally, some considerations about the overall water mass injected and chemical reaction are reported:

- *Water mass injected*. Literature [3] reports that the overall water mass injected in the system is 1.3 kg. This value is unreliable. Considering the volumes of S5 and the injection line, and assuming that all the water evaporates, the calculated water needed to reach 155 bar in saturated conditions is 0.350 kg. Assuming that this water reacts with PbLi producing H_2, the overall pressure should be between 100.8 bar and 201.5 bar, depending upon the chemical reaction prevailing. It can be concluded that the over-

all water injected in the system should be larger than 0.262 kg and lower than 0.525 kg. SIMMER-III code estimates a reasonable value being 0.367 kg.

- *Hydrogen generation*. Considering the same assumption, the expected mass of hydrogen generated shall be between 20.4 g and 40.8 g. The results of the simulation is, therefore, acceptable being 31.1 g.

4.2. Sensitivity calculations

Considering the reference calculation (Run0), tens of sensitivity analyses were carried out to understand the reasons of discrepancies between experimental and numerical results, fully documented in [7].

In all the runs, it was supposed to inject subcooled water. Nevertheless, after the revision of Test#6 [7], this condition seems to not reflect the real execution of the experiment because of an early rupture of the cap and the consequently two-phase flow injection.

Fig. 5. Run7 vs Run0: mass flow rate of injected water (M[inj]) and calculated hydrogen generation (H2TOT).

Therefore, Run7 was performed imposing a postulated pressure transient from vacuum to 155 bar at the injection device, and the early injector breaks at 53 bar. The sensitivity results are shown from Figs. 3 to 5. It can be noted how the pressure transient is more similar to the experimental trend. It might be said that the SIMMER-III code simulation is affected by the correct knowledge of the boundary conditions. In Test #3, these conditions resulting from experimental evidences are not available and can be taken only form test specifications.

5. Conclusions

The analyses of Test#3 experiment gave the following main results:

- The capability of SIMMER-III code for fusion application in predicting phenomena connected with PbLi/water interaction, considering also the chemical reaction and hydrogen production, has been demonstrated with satisfactory results;
- The post-test analyses permits to improve the knowledge of the experiments, i.e. the water mass injected in the system, the injection pressure trend, and the pressure of the injection cap rupture;
- The sensitivity analyses pointed out the relevance of the initial and boundary conditions on the predictive capabilities of SIMMER-III code to simulate phenomena connected with lithium-lead/water interaction.

Future perspective is to continue the validation process of the modified SIMMER-III code by means of the next LIFUS5/Mod3 experimental campaign in order to obtain reliable and reproducible experimental data with well-known I&B conditions.

References

[1] A. Del Nevo, et al., WCLL breeding blanket design and integration for DEMO 2015: status and perspectives, Fusion Eng. Des. 124 (2016) 682–686.
[2] M. Eboli, et al., Implementation of the chemical PbLi/water reaction in the SIMMER code, Fusion Eng. Des. 109–111 (2016) 468–473.
[3] A. Ciampichetti, et al., Water large leaks into liquid Pb-17Li: first experimental results on LIFUS 5 facility, Fusion Eng. Des. 69 (2003) 563–567.
[4] A. Ciampichetti, et al., Pb–16Li/water interaction: experimental results and preliminary modelling activities, Fusion Eng. Des. 88 (2013) 2392–2395.
[5] L. Giancarli, M. Dalle Donne, W. Dietz, Status of the European breeding blanket technology, Fusion Eng. Des. 36 (1997) 57–74.
[6] C. Savatteri, A. Gemelli, Lithium–lead/water interaction. Large break experiments, Fusion Eng. Des. 17 (1991) 343–349.
[7] M. Eboli, Safety Investigation of In-box LOCA for DEMO Reactor: Experiments and Analyses, PhD Thesis, 2017.