FISSION PRODUCT RELEASE MECHANISMS AND GROUPINGS

F.C. Iglesias, A.C. Brito, Y. Liu
Ontario Hydro

M.A. Petrilli, R. Hu, M.J. Richards
Hydro-Quebec

R.A. Gibb, P.J. Reid
New Brunswick Power

P. Elder, D.S. Cox
Atomic Energy Of Canada Limited

B.J. Lewis
Royal Military College

Abstract

During CANDU postulated accidents the reactor fuel is estimated to be exposed to a variety of conditions. These conditions are dynamic and, during the course of an accident, the fuel may experience a wide range of temperatures and conditions from highly oxidizing to mildly reducing environments. The exposure of the reactor fuel to these environments and temperatures may affect its stoichiometry and release performance.

In this paper a review of the important fission product release mechanisms is presented, the results of three out-of-pile experimental programs are summarized, and fission product release groups, for both oxidizing and reducing conditions are proposed.

1. INTRODUCTION

During CANDU postulated accidents the reactor fuel is estimated to be exposed to a variety of conditions. These conditions are dynamic and, during the course of an accident, the fuel could be exposed to temperatures ranging between 600 to 2400°C and from highly oxidizing to mildly reducing environments.

The exposure of fuel to these environments and temperatures will affect its release performance. For example the exposure of fuel to oxidizing environments will increase the oxygen potential of the fuel after the Zircaloy sheath is totally oxidized. As a result, the fuel stoichiometry will increase, changing its thermal and material properties. This stoichiometric modification will also have an effect on the fission product chemical speciation and consequently, the release characteristics.

In reducing environments, due to the low oxygen concentration in the coolant, the Zircaloy sheath may extract oxygen from the UO_2. This attack will produce a reduction in the fuel stoichiometry that will also affect the fuel thermal-mechanical properties and fission product speciation.

In the assessment of the source term to containment, individual release calculations for about 800 fission product and actinide radionuclides are not practical. This is due in part to the significant amount of computer time needed for a full core analysis. Since many isotopes have similar release characteristics, the concept of fission product release groups has been used in safety analysis for more than 20 years to reduce necessary computation requirements.

Several experimental in-pile and out-of-pile research programs are actively studying the fission product release characteristics for all observable fission products. These programs provide evidence of the release characteristics of certain fission products and help in the integration of release groups. Also, equilibrium thermodynamic calculations are very powerful tools in the assessment of the most likely chemical speciation and consequently, in the expected release behaviour.

In this paper, Section 2 contains a review of the important fission product release mechanisms. Section 3 describes the test facilities and summarizes the results of three out-of-pile experimental programs. The proposed fission product release groups are presented in Section 4.

2. FISSION PRODUCT RELEASE MECHANISMS

2.1 Diffusion in Fuel Matrix

The intrinsic mobility will depend on the charge state of the atomic species that migrates by volume diffusion through the lattice of the fuel. When fission product atoms reach a free surface they may form thermodynamically-favoured compounds. The chemical form will determine the subsequent gas-phase mass transport (*i.e.*, vaporization). The mobility in the fuel is also determined by the solubility of the fission product in the UO_2 lattice. In oxide fuels, the chemical state can be typically grouped as: volatile fission products (Kr, Xe, Br, I); metallic precipitates (alloys) (Mo, Tc, Ru, Rh, Pd, Ag, Cd, In, Sn, Sb, Te); ceramic precipitates (oxides) (Rb, Cs, Ba, Zr, Nb, Mo, Te); and oxides dissolved in the fuel (Sr, Zr, Nb, Y, La, Ce, Pr, Nd, Pm, Sm).[1] During irradiation, the noble gases are distributed dynamically between a fission-induced solution within the oxide lattice and their precipitation into intragranular and intergranular bubbles.

The release of short-lived fission gases from uranium dioxide during irradiation has been extensively studied in a number of experiments with single and polycrystalline fuel specimens,[2-5] and with swept assemblies in which the fuel-to-sheath gap of an intact operating fuel element was continually purged.[6-9] These experiments generally demonstrate that diffusion of noble gas atoms and iodine in UO_2 is the rate-determining mechanism for release during steady-state operation. At lower fuel temperatures (< 1000°C) diffusion is independent of temperature (athermal) but is enhanced as a result of the fission process;[4,10] however, for the shorter-lived isotopes, recoil effects can also become important.[11,12] As shown in these various experiments, the diffusion coefficients of krypton, xenon and iodine were found to be similar in magnitude and in their temperature-dependent behaviour. Both thermally-activated and athermal diffusion are implicated as the main release mechanisms in these studies since the release-to-birth rate (R/B) ratio is observed to vary inversely as the square root of the decay constant. This type of behaviour was predicted over thirty years ago by Booth using diffusion theory.[13-15]

An increase in the oxygen-to-uranium (O/U) ratio results in the direct enhancement of the diffusional release of fission products from the fuel matrix.[16-20] Experimental work has indicated that xenon diffusion occurs as a neutral tri-vacancy in uranium dioxide,[19] in agreement with the theoretical calculations of Grimes and Catlow.[21] These calculations also indicate that in hyperstoichiometric fuel (UO_{2+x}), the most stable solution site is the uranium vacancy.[21] This finding supports the model of Killeen and Turnbull for the noble gas diffusion coefficient in UO_{2+x} (for x in the range of 0.005 to 0.1), where it has been assumed that the gas atom

mobility is influenced by the presence of the uranium cation vacancies in which Frenkel and Schottky equilibria govern the isolated point defects.[20] This model for the diffusion coefficient is in agreement with annealing test results in CO/CO_2, and with the experimental work of Lindner and Matzke.[16,20] The model has been used to describe the in-pile steady-state release of fission gas from defective fuel rods.[22] This treatment has also been successful in describing the cesium release kinetics in out-of-pile experiments conducted at high temperature in steam; *i.e.*, a reduced release from Zircaloy-clad fuel specimens, compared to that with bare fuel fragments, can be attributed to limited fuel oxidation, arising from a lower oxygen potential due to hydrogen production from metal-water reaction.[23,24]

A diffusional release of volatile fission products (*e.g.*, Kr, Xe, I, Cs, Te) has been observed in a number of high-temperature, post-irradiation, annealing experiments with trace-irradiated polycrystalline UO_2 fuel samples,[25] and high-burnup specimens taken from commercial spent fuel rods.[26-35] In an annealing experiment with spent fuel that was conducted in a hydrogen atmosphere, the measured release kinetics (and hence diffusivities) of I, Cs and Ba were similar; in a steam test, where the Zircaloy cladding had been completely oxidized, similar release kinetics were observed for I, Cs, Xe and Te.[36] An idealized model originally introduced by Booth,[37] has been used extensively to interpret the diffusive release of the more volatile fission products in these post-irradiation annealing experiments. A square-root behaviour is theoretically predicted for the release fraction as a function of the anneal time. The equivalent-sphere model has been extended for a non-uniform distribution that develops in the fuel grains during the irradiation period when the fuel temperature is sufficiently high to allow for diffusion to occur.[38] The model has also been generalized to account for a time-dependent diffusivity that may arise from changing temperature and fuel stoichiometry conditions.[24,29,34] Several empirical models, based on a diffusion treatment and annealing test data, have been developed for source-term analysis.[29,34,39,40] However, in many out-of-pile experiments, the release kinetics are found to be much more rapid than that expected from diffusion theory alone; for example, enhanced kinetics, observed during temperature ramp-up, may result from a release of the stored inventory on the grain boundaries (see Section 2.3).[24,30-32,41] Following this initial release, a slower diffusional component is typically observed.

2.2 Fission Product Vaporization from Fuel Surfaces

The release kinetics of the volatile or relatively volatile fission products (Xe, Kr, Cs, I, Te, Sb) can be described by a rate-limiting process of solid-state diffusion through the UO_2 fuel matrix.[36,42] However, for non-volatile fission products (*e.g.*, Sr, Y, Zr, Nb, Mo, Tc, Ru, Rh, Pd, Ba, La, Ce, Pr, Nd), their escape from free surfaces into the gas phase may be so difficult that surface or gas-phase transport processes can control the overall kinetics.[25] This rate-limiting step is related to the chemical state of the fission products (*i.e.*, vapour pressure of the thermodynamically-favoured compounds) that are formed at the fuel surface, and to the mass transfer from the free surface of the fuel to the bulk, hydrogen-steam, gas flow.[36,39,43-46] The chemical state of the fission products will depend on the temperature and oxygen potential of the gas environment. The oxygen potential can change as a result of hydrogen production from the steam oxidation of structural materials (Zircaloy) within the damaged core. The equilibrium chemical composition can be obtained (where thermodynamic data permit) by a minimization of the free energy for a multi-component system consisting of a condensed phase (*i.e.*, fuel plus fission products) and a gas phase (steam, hydrogen and gaseous fission product species).[44-48] The vapour species released into the bulk environment may, typically, be found in either an elemental/compound form, or as an oxide or hydroxide.

The chemical form (*e.g.*, metal versus oxide) of the fission product can significantly affect its volatility. The oxygen potentials required for the formation of fission product oxides can be obtained from an Ellingham diagram.[1,36,47,49] Here, the most stable oxides (*e.g.*, Ce_2O_3 and La_2O_3) are formed at low oxygen potentials. Also quite stable are the oxides BaO, SrO and Eu_2O_3. On the other hand, oxides requiring relatively high oxygen potentials for formation include the species TeO_2, Sb_2O_3 and RuO_4. Consequently, for typical, high-

temperature, reactor accident conditions (with atmospheric ratios of H_2/H_2O of-ten to one-tenth), the La, Ce, Eu, Sr, and Ba fission products should be in the form of oxides, while the Ru, Te, and Sb fission products should be found as metals.

Small releases of Ba, Sr and Eu are therefore expected in a steam environment from the low-volatility oxides in the fuel. For example, in the Vertical Induction (VI) tests at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, small releases of Eu have been observed in steam (< 0.01%).[35,42] Releases of Ba, Sr and Eu measured in the Severe Fuel Damage tests in the Power Burst Facility and Three Mile Island Unit 2 accident were also small (typically 1% or less).[49] In contrast, much higher Eu releases (19-57%) were observed in the VI hydrogen tests, under similar temperature conditions, where higher-volatility metallics may have formed.[35,42] Similarly, in-pile measurements of fission product releases in the ST-1 and ST-2 hydrogen experiments at the Sandia National Laboratories indicate much higher Ba and Sr releases of several percent and up to 15% for Eu.[49,50]

For the refractory metals, Ru and Mo, the oxides (RuO_4 and MoO_2) are much more volatile than the elements, so that high releases would be expected only under strongly oxidizing conditions (high oxygen potentials). In the VI-3 test (2700K in steam) only 5% of the Ru was released from the fuel,[35,42] while at 1600 K almost 100% of the Ru was released in experiments conducted in air at the Chalk River Laboratories following significant oxidation of bare fuel samples.[51] The observed Ru releases are consistent with thermodynamic arguments.[52]

2.3 Fission Product Release During Temperature Ramps

In-pile power-ramp tests have produced greater gas (Xe and Kr) release than expected from a pure diffusion mechanism. The gas release rates are also higher that those measured during steady state irradiations.[53] To assess the fuel behaviour and fission power release during power ramps and accident conditions, in which the fuel is subjected to fast temperature excursions, several experiments have been performed out-of-pile, in direct electric heating tests,[54] with central line heating rates between 6 and 76°C/s. It was concluded for heating rates higher than 50°C/s that the most probable mechanism of release was grain boundary separation. Enhanced releases from the grains were required to supply the grain boundaries with the required fission product inventories to match the observed releases. The most probable cause of this higher release was due to the production and movement of over-pressurized intra-granular bubbles.

The results of Kashibe and Une,[41,55,56] using an induction furnace, also point to a higher saturated grain boundary inventory (by a factor 2 to 4) in order to match the experimental results. During the heating phase of each experiment, a Kr burst was detected followed by a slower diffusional process. They interpreted their observed release as controlled by grain boundary bubble interconnection and tunnel formation. However, using fractographic techniques, they determined that up to heating rates of 10°C/s, no grain boundary separation was observed. This is in agreement with the results of Rest and Gehl.[54]

Small[57,58] has studied the release during ramps between 1 and 50°C/s, which indicates maximum releases around 10°C/s. The enhanced release from the grains is attributed to the thermal resolution of intragranular small bubbles and accelerated migration of larger bubbles close to the periphery of the grain.

A physical mechanism is needed to account for enhanced releases during temperature ramps. Phenomenological approaches can be adopted[24] until a mechanistic model is available. This extra grain boundary inventory may be released by the standard grain boundary bubble interconnection for heating rates up to 10°C/s, or by grain boundary separation at higher heating rates. As most of the measurements were performed on Kr, no clear role has been attributed to other volatile fission products (Cs, I, Rb, Br). Also, no experimental information has been obtained about the release behaviour during temperature ramps on non-stoichiometric fuel.

2.4 Matrix Stripping (Volatilization)

Alexander[59] has observed that in oxidizing environments at temperatures of 2100 K or higher, the volatilization of diverse species like Mo, Y, La and Ba exhibited the same activation energy for release. Neither the nature of the species nor the nature of the solid state in the UO_2 matrix showed a significant effect. Cox *et al.*[60] also reported significant weight loss of UO_2 in steam after a certain period of time. The weight loss increased with increasing temperature. These two observations indicate a volatilization of uranium mass which, in turn, will result in a release of fission products from the fuel matrix.

If the Zircaloy sheath is severely oxidized, the oxidizing environment can react with UO_2, and, under these conditions, the UO_2 will incorporate excess oxygen to form hyperstoichiometric UO_{2+x} or be converted to a higher oxide. At temperatures above 1800 K, UO_{2+x} is the stable condensed phase in both air and steam. A significant vapour pressure of uranium bearing species is predicted at equilibrium. Since the gases in contact with the fuel do not constitute a closed system, the condensed phase is vaporized at a relatively rapid rate due to incongruent vaporization of the UO_{2+x} matrix. As the matrix is volatilized, the remaining noble gases (Xe, Kr) and volatiles (Cs, I, Br, Rb) will be released from the volatilized fuel volume. The low volatility fission products that were previously inside the fuel matrix become concentrated at the fuel surface, where they can accumulate or else be vaporized (see Section 2.2) or entrained in the flowing gases as particulates. This process has been described by Alexander[59,61] as "matrix stripping" or by Cox *et al.*[60,62,63] as volatilization.

UO_3 or $UO_2(OH)_2$ were identified at the most likely uranium-bearing species in the volatilization process. However, the maximum calculated rate of volatilization for both UO_3 and $UO_2(OH)_2$ (using a Langmuir formalism), exceeded the measured rate of mass loss. The vapour pressure of $UO_2(OH)_2$ (and volatility of this species) exhibit less of a sensitivity to temperature than UO_3 (in stoichiometric steam). In fact, the temperature dependence of the observed mass loss process shows better agreement with calculations based on UO_3.[60] As the Langmuir formalism over predicts the observed behaviour, phenomena such as re-condensation and mass transport effects are also believed to be important. Conditions close to the fuel, like flow velocity and oxygen partial pressure, become important for the mass transfer calculation.[63]

Ceramographic examination of both irradiated and un-irradiated samples showed that volatilization and pore growth occurred preferentially along some grain boundaries, while other boundaries do not participate as readily in the reaction.[63] This preferential reaction at localized sites is an indication that a surface-sensitive process is limiting the overall kinetics of formation of gaseous UO_3 at the UO_{2+x} surface.

For the case of high-volatility fission products, in which the release process is controlled by diffusion through the fuel grains, the volatilization will decrease the time required for these fission products to reach the open surfaces. An instantaneous release of the volatile fission products contained in the volatilized UO_2 volume is supported by the observations.

In the case of the low-volatile fission products, for which the controlling process is vaporization from open surfaces (see Section 2.2), the volatilization process will increase the concentration of these fission products in the open surfaces. However, the effect of this increased concentration of low-volatile fission products on the uranium volatilization rate has not yet been determined.

2.5 Fuel Dissolution

2.5.1 UO_2/Zircaloy Interaction

Uranium and zirconium can form an alloy. The melting point of the alloy varies with its composition, and can be as low as ~1150°C. This alloy can be formed through reduction of the UO_2 (to UO_{2-x} + U) by Zircaloy

which is still in the solid phase.

With contact between Zircaloy and UO_2, a series of metallographic structures will develop,[64-66] *i.e.*, outward from the fuel pellet surface one observes: (i) a mixture of $Zr_\alpha(U)$ and (U,Zr); (ii) a layer of (U,Zr); (iii) a layer of $Zr_\alpha(O)$; and (iv) the remaining of the Zircaloy sheath. It has been shown that the presence of a CANLUB layer can inhibit the chemical attack of UO_2 by the Zircaloy.[66] In this process, some fuel "liquefaction" may result in the fuel element, well below the melting point of UO_2. The occurrence of this liquified fuel can contribute to an enhanced fission product release as a consequence of the fuel reduction.

2.5.2 UO_2 Dissolution by Molten Zircaloy

If fuel heatup in an accident is sufficient to produce molten Zircaloy, the Zircaloy can act to reduce the UO_2, producing a liquid (U,Zr)O + $(U,Zr)O_{2-x}$ mixture. The (U,Zr)O is a liquid at temperatures which are significantly below the melting point of UO_2 (~1150°C). This dissolution and liquefaction of the UO_2 matrix will result in large fission product release of all isotopes which either have a large partial pressure or which can form volatile compounds in the prevailing environment.

Many experiments have been carried out using unirradiated UO_2 to investigate this phenomenon. Dienst *et al.*[64] and Nikolopoulos *et al.*[67] give the results of crucible experiments in argon for temperatures in the range 1800°C to 2000°C. In these experiments, the chemical attack of the UO_2 was sufficient to disintegrate the crucibles. This large-scale chemical attack of the UO_2 by the Zircaloy required intimate contact between the fuel and the molten cladding for a period of >100 seconds. This requirement is due to the fact that O-poor Zircaloy does not wet the UO_2. Therefore, the molten Zircaloy must be oxidized by the UO_2 before it can wet the UO_2, penetrate along cracks and over the entire available surface area and significantly affect the UO morphology. Oxidation of the Zircaloy by the UO_2 occurs as quickly as oxidation of Zircaloy by steam, since the rate-limiting step is diffusion of the oxygen in the Zircaloy.

Kim *et al.*[68] reports the results of experiments similar to those described above. These experiments confirm that the chemical attack of UO_2 by Zircaloy acts along exposed surfaces and cracks so that the wetting behaviour of the molten Zircaloy is important. The interaction therefore develops in layers for simple geometries, and the layer growth can be described using parabolic rate kinetics. These experiments also confirm the expected result that, while O-rich Zircaloy wets the UO_2 more completely, the dissolution rate is reduced due to the fact that the molten Zircaloy already contains some O and so the reaction with O from the UO_2 is less energetically favourable.

Rosinger *et al.*[69] and Hayward *et al.*[70,71] report experiments which are intended to more closely represent CANDU fuel. These experiments examine dissolution of unirradiated UO_2 by molten Zircaloy for temperatures of 1970°C to 2350°C. These experiments indicate that, if heatup is slow enough (*i.e.*, the Zircaloy oxidation is sufficient to allow it to wet the fuel element), the molten Zircaloy will not drip off of the fuel element and will then reduce the UO_2. The reduction of the UO_2 will dissolve a percentage of the fuel element which depends on the temperature of the melt and the initial oxygen content of the Zircaloy. These experiments indicate that O-free Zircaloy will dissolve ~60% more UO_2 than $Zr_\alpha(O)$ if it is able to wet the fuel.

Indications of dissolution of UO_2 by molten Zircaloy in fission product release experiments has been limited to experiments in reducing environments. This is due to the fact that, in oxidizing environments, experiments which have heated up to temperatures sufficient to melt Zircaloy in an oxidizing environment have heavily oxidized the Zircaloy cladding before reaching these high temperatures. ZrO_2 does not reduce UO_2. Only in experiments in which Zr or $Zr_\alpha(O)$ is present in significant quantities at the time of melting does significant UO_2 dissolution take place.

The ST-1[72,73] and VI-4[74] experiments were both LWR fuel experiments in which fuel was heated to 2400-2500 K in a H-rich gas flow. These experiments showed evidence of attack of UO_2 by molten Zircaloy and formation of the low melting point (U,Zr) eutectic. The attack was sufficient that macroscopic dissolution of the UO_2 matrix occurred. These processes occur at such high temperatures, however, that any additional fission product release is swamped by the already high release rate associated with high temperatures for volatile fission products and noble gases. Release of non-volatiles did not seem to be affected, except in the case of Eu, which had its release enhanced, and Sb and Te, which were released in much lower amounts than would be expected in an oxidizing environment in which molten Zircaloy-UO_2 interaction does not take place. The reduced release of Sb and Te is not directly related to attack of the UO_2 by molten Zircaloy, but to the presence of metallic Zircaloy to react with. The enhanced release of Eu is attributed to the reducing chemical environment and not to the attack of the UO_2 by molten Zircaloy.

2.5.3 UO_2 Melting

At sufficiently high temperatures, UO_2 melts. Stoichiometric UO_2 melts congruently at a unique temperature[75], but hypo- or hyper-stoichiometric UO_2 does not and has separate solidus and liquidus temperatures. Latta & Fryxell[76] have determined the solidus and liquidus lines for $UO_{2\pm x}$ experimentally. Non-stoichiometric UO_2 has solidus and liquidus lines which are lower in temperature than the congruent melting point of $UO_{2.00}$, and a monotectic forms at an O/U ratio of ~1.65, with a melting point of ~2425 °C. Their experimental data extends to $UO_{2.23}$, which allows reasonable extrapolation to $UO_{2.25}$ The solidus/liquidus lines are as shown in Figure 1, along with the high temperature U-O phase diagram.




Figure 1 - High Temperature O-U Phase Diagram,
Showing Measurements of Solidus and Liquidus Lines by Latta & Fryxell

The solidus and liquidus lines are also affected by the presence of fission products which are produced in the UO_2 as burnup increases. These fission products can be grouped into three broad classes. In the first, the fission products are insoluble in either solid or liquid UO_2. Since these fission products do not interact with the UO_2 in any way, they do not affect the melting point. Examples of these fission products are Cs, I, Kr and Xe, as they all behave as gases diffusing through the fuel matrix, as well as noble metals such as Mo, Rh, Ru, etc., which are present in power reactor fuel as metallic precipitates which do not interact with the fuel matrix.

The second class of fission products are materials, such as Sr and Ba, which are soluble in the liquid phase and are hence able to form eutectic alloys. Adamson[77] assessed this impact on melting temperatures using data from Koizumi *et al.*[78] and Boyle *et al.*[79] If his results are extrapolated to CANDU fuel conditions, the estimated decrease in UO_2 melting temperature is <5 K at 225 MW·h/kgU and ~12 K at 700 MW·h/kgU. Hence it can be concluded that there is no significant impact on the fuel melting temperature due to the influence of eutectic-forming fission products, although the presence of these fission products does complicate the assessment of UO_2 melting by metallographic examination, since they can cause features such as rounded grains which can be misinterpreted as indications of the onset of melting.

The third class of fission product which can affect the melting behaviour of UO_2 includes the actinide oxides, rare earth oxides and Zr. The element in this class which is produced in the greatest quantities in CANDU fuel is Pu. The impact of Pu on the solidus and liquidus lines can be assessed[80] using the assumption of an ideal solution. Using this, in conjunction with experimental data, the effect on the solidus and liquidus lines can be estimated. This effect results in a decrease in the melting temperature of <5 K for CANDU fuel at a burnup of 700 MW·h/kgU.

Assessment of the impact of fission products produced as a function of burnup indicates that they have a much smaller effect than changes in stoichiometry do. The effect at a burnup of 700 MW·h/kgU is <17 K. At more usual burnups for CANDU fuel, the impact is <3 K.

When the UO_2 melts, fission product release is very similar to the case of UO_2/Zircaloy interaction (see Section 2.5.1) or UO_2 dissolution by molten Zircaloy (see Section 2.5.2). Any fission products which are volatile or whose chemistry is such that, in the prevailing environment, they can form a volatile compound, will be released. Other fission products will be released based upon their vapour pressure at that temperature.

2.6 Fuel Frothing

In Section 2.5, various processes were described which "liquify" the UO_2, that is, they result in a significant disruption of the UO_2 matrix. This will lead to a release of fission gases and volatile fission products which are retained in the fuel matrix at the time of "liquefaction".

The pressure of fission gases and highly volatile fission products in the intact fuel matrix can be very high. If the matrix is suddenly disrupted, these fission products can form large bubbles since the restraint of the UO_2 matrix is no longer available to restrict the fission product volume. This process results in a large increase in the volume of the fuel, a phenomenon which is referred to as fuel frothing.

Fuel frothing has been observed in experiments with irradiated fuel in which the fuel has been liquified either by melting or by dissolution of UO_2 by molten Zircaloy. The amount of UO_2 affected by the UO_2/Zircaloy solid state interaction (see Section 2.5.1) is sufficiently small that fuel frothing does not occur. Dissolution of UO_2 by molten Zircaloy (see Section 2.5.2) has been observed in significant quantities in tests in a reducing environment, such as ST-1[72,81] and VI-4[74], since these tests had significant amounts of non-oxidized Zircaloy available to wet the UO_2 at temperatures above the Zircaloy melting point. Most

experiments which heat up to such high temperatures in an oxidizing environment do not result in fuel frothing[82], since these tests are of long duration and the Zircaloy is fully oxidized by the time the melting temperature is reached.

An exception to this general trend is BTF-107[83]. In this test, a flow blockage occurred which resulted in rapid temperature escalation for the fuel sheaths to temperatures well in excess of the Zircaloy melting point. The escalation was sufficiently rapid that the Zircaloy was not fully oxidized before reaching the melting temperature. Therefore, molten metallic Zircaloy was available to wet the UO_2 and reduce it to UO_{2-x}. Post-test examination of the fuel shows that the molten Zircaloy wetted the UO_2 along all exposed surfaces, including the cracks, and formed the molten (U,Zr)O eutectic phase. Large scale dissolution of the UO_2 matrix appears to have occurred, resulting in fuel frothing.

Because of the smaller fission gas production in the relatively low burnup CANDU-type fuel used in BTF-107, the amount of fuel frothing was less in BTF-107 than in ST-1 and VI-4. The volume expansion in BTF-107 can be estimated at ~10%, as compared to 50-100% in the higher burnup LWR experiments. As would be expected in CANDU fuel, this is due to the lower gas quantity generated in the fuel matrix during irradiation.

Fuel frothing is a mechanism whereby a small amount of highly volatile fission products can be retained in the fuel, trapped in the bubbles. At these high temperatures, most of the volatile fission products would be released even in an oxidizing or inert environment, so the dissolution of the fuel matrix does not have as large an effect on fission product release as would initially be expected. However, the volume increase associated with fuel frothing could have an impact on the accessability of coolant to the fuel, which could result in more severe temperature transients than would be the case if frothing did not occur. These higher temperatures could also have a feedback effect on fission product releases. Therefore, it is important that this process be considered in accident scenarios in which it is possible for Zircaloy to exceed its melting temperature of 1760°C.

3. EXPERIMENTAL DATABASE

There are three main programs wich have conducted out-reactor tests on fission product release: at Oak Ridge National Laboratories (ORNL) in the U.S., at the Centre d'études nucléaire de Grenoble (CEN-G) in France, and at the Chalk River Laboratories (CRL) of AECL in Canada. The experimental apparatus and approach to fission product measurement has varied at the three sites. The following is a brief description of the results of the three programs with comments on the usefulness of the data.

3.1 ORNL Experiments

The major recent ORNL tests are in the HI and VI series[26,29]. Conditions for these tests and important test results are summarized in Tables 1 and 2. Both test series used highly-irradiated Zircaloy-clad UO_2 fuel samples that were 15-20 cm long (100-200 g). In these tests, fuel specimens have been heated under atmospheric-pressure conditions at temperatures up to 1700 to 2700 K using induction furnaces; times at test temperatures were varied from 2 to 60 minutes. Major differences in the VI and HI tests were that: a) the VI tests had the test sample oriented vertically (all other ORNL tests had horizontally-oriented samples), b) the fuel burnups in the VI tests were for the most part higher than those used in the HI tests, and c) VI test temperatures (2300-2700 K) were higher than HI test temperatures (1675-2275 K). The VI-3, VI-5 and VI-6 tests were performed at maximum test temperatures of approximately 2700 K; the test atmosphere (steam in VI-3, hydrogen in VI-5, hydrogen followed by steam in VI-6, air and steam in VI-7) was varied so that the influence of atmosphere on high-

temperature fission product release could be evaluated.

Measurements made in the HI and VI tests included: a) test sample temperature versus time by optical pyrometry, b) thermal gradient tube measurements downstream of the fuel sample, to collect condensing vapours, c) a package of graduated filters and impregnated charcoal cartridges to collect particulates and volatile iodine species, d) a charcoal cold trap to collect and measure fission gases, e) radiation detector measurements to monitor fuel location and to provide on-line measurements of cesium species in the thermal gradient tubes and Kr-85 in the gas traps. In addition, all test components were sampled and analyzed (by gamma-ray spectrometry, neutron activation analysis, spark-source mass spectrometry, and emission spectrometry) after each test.

Some of the key findings include confirmation of the similar release rates for noble gases, I and Cs. A difference in transport behaviour was noted for Cs in steam relative to hydrogen. Reactive vapour forms of Cs predominate in hydrogen conditions and transportable aerosols were noted in steam conditions. The releases of Te and Sb appear to occur from the UO_2 as for a volatile fission product, but these elements are retained by metallic Zircaloy, so their release is delayed until cladding oxidation is nearly complete. Both Eu and Sb showed a sensitivity to the oxygen potential at high temperatures[29]. Sb release rates were observed to increase in steam conditions relative to hydrogen at higher temperatures while hydrogen-rich conditions caused higher releases of Eu compared with steam environments[90].

There was limited on-line measurement of fission product release rates (only Cs-137 and Kr-85) in these experiments. Since a segmented furnace tube was used in the tests (to allow for rapid heating), there was not good containment of the test environment. There is evidence of oxidation of the graphite susceptor in some of the tests. In most of the tests the samples were at temperature for a relatively short period of time (about 20 min), this time may not have been long enough to see oxidative releases (especially in the tests at lower temperature).

3.2 CEN-Grenoble Experiments

Fission-product and structural material releases from PWR fuel specimens have been studied in out-reactor experiments by the French CEA at Grenoble[34,84]. The HEVA program was conducted between 1983 and 1989, and consisted of 8 tests in the temperature range 1800-2370 K. An induction furnace was used to heat Zircaloy-clad specimens of PWR fuel, and gamma spectrometry was used to measure the fission product releases from the fuel and transport to different locations in the apparatus. In most of the tests, aerosols were collected in a heated cascade impactor and in filters. Control rod materials were used in the last two tests (HEVA-07 with Ag-In-Cd exclusively and HEVA-08 with both control rods and fuel). Mixtures of steam/H_2 and pure H_2 have been used as the environments for HEVA tests. Tables 3 summarizes the HEVA test conditions.

The VERCORS program is an ongoing extension of the HEVA tests using a modified apparatus with augmented instrumentation. To-date, six tests have been completed in this program, up to a maximum temperature of 2300°C. Extensive post-test gamma scanning (including gamma tomography) has been done after the VEROCRS tests. Most of the more recent tests in the HEVA-VERCORS program have used spent PWR fuel that was re-irradiated in the SILOE research reactor, after a period of decay following discharge from a power reactor. This permits the detection of short-lived fission products such as I, Te, Mo, Ba and La. Results for the six tests are no presently available in the open literature.

The post-test gamma scanning done in these experiments enable a complete fission product mass balance to be conducted. However, there have been similar problems to the ones at ORNL in the control of the environment where there is no on-line measurement of the atmosphere (i.e., oxygen potential) during the tests.

3.3 CRL Experiments

Six different types of furnaces have been used in experiments at CRL, depending on the temperature range and size of specimen to be heated. For all experiments, monitoring and control of the gas environment have been a priority; in particular, control of the oxygen potential to which the fuel is exposed. One of the key features of the AECL program has been on-line measurements of the oxygen potential in the gas stream which allows for the fuel oxidation kinetics to be calculated[85]. Another key feature of these tests has been a direct measurement of the fission-product release rates, using a gamma-ray spectrometer which views the heated specimen through a collimated aperture[86]. A second spectrometer is used to monitor activity in the exhaust gas swept out of the furnace[87].

The fuel specimens include UO_2 fragments (0.2 to 1.5 grams each) that were extracted from irradiated fuel elements after discharge and subsequent cutting. These tests have provided information on fission-product release from bare UO_2 without any Zircaloy barrier. The role of Zircaloy on fission-product release has been investigated using fragments of UO_2 enclosed in Zircaloy foil bags, and short segments of Zircaloy-clad fuel elements with end caps fitted onto one or both ends of these samples to exclude the surrounding atmosphere from direct contact with the UO_2.

Experiments have been done on UO_2 fragments in steam, air and inert environments to temperatures up to 2350 K[88]. In total over 150 tests have been conducted on fragments of irradiated fuel[91]. About 40 tests have been conducted with Zircaloy-clad fuel segments to temperature up to 2200 K. It has been shown that the presence of the Zircaloy sheath can either inhibit or delay the release of volatile fission products, compared to tests under the same conditions using bare UO_2 [89]. The delay is primarily associated with the time required to oxidize the Zircaloy cladding, after which the UO_2 begins to oxidize and cause enhanced release rates. Table 4 summaries the test conditions and key results from a selected number of CRL tests. In more recent experiments with Zircaloy-clad segments, in addition to release from the fuel, deposition and transport of fission products have been studied. It is planned to do experiments in hydrogen-rich environments in the future.

Since the oxygen potential of the environment is known in the CRL tests, it has been possible to develop models for steam and air oxidation of UO_2. Enhanced release of Xe, Kr, I, and Cs has been observed during oxidation. Significant release of fission products such as Ru and Nb have been observed only in oxidizing environments and after the UO_2 has oxidized to an equilibrium state[51]. As well, the volatilization of the fuel matrix in oxidizing conditions has been modelled and identified as an important release mechanism for low-volatile fission products (eg., Zr, La, Ba, Ce, Pr, Eu) in highly oxidizing environments or small fragments[88,91].

4. PROPOSED FISSION PRODUCT GROUPS

More than 800 fission product and actinide radionuclides are produced during fuel irradiation. However, in early approaches to safety analysis, attention has predominantly focused on just two groups, namely the iodines (specifically I^{131}) and a "smeared average" of the noble gases. Subsequent analyses separated the noble gases into specific isotopes with the addition of several more radionuclides, although the selections were somewhat empirical. As part of an industry-wide attempt in the early 1990's to refine the source term, efforts were undertaken to methodically select representative subgroups from all the radionuclides that would be "sufficiently complete", and yet tractable for analysis.

A methodology for selecting subgroups must be defined. The selection may be based on ranking the radionuclides according to their relative contributions to a particular type of dose. This ranking process includes the establishing for an ordered list of radionuclides according to their total inventories, their release

characteristics from the fuel and their radiobiological impact. At one or more stages in this process, the list of isotopes may be shortened by eliminating those radionuclides that do not contribute significantly to the selected type of dose. This type of exercise generally results in a final group of about 40 radionuclides or less that belong to no more than 20 chemical elements.

Within the context of this work, fission product groups are proposed in accordance with their release characteristics from the fuel. For example, the individual groupings follow from the experimentally observed release behaviour, on the knowledge of the release mechanisms, chemical similarities[92] and estimated vapour pressure of the most likely chemical forms[44,45,46].

As discussed in Section 2, the environment surrounding the fuel elements has a major impact on the fission product release, i.e., the controlling release mechanism and the vapour pressure of the chemical species are also strongly influenced by the environment. In view of this fact , the groups are proposed for two limiting conditions: oxidizing and reducing environments. In oxidizing conditions (see Table 5), release mechanisms are diffusion in stoichiometric or hyperstoichimetric fuel, matrix stripping and fission product vaporization from the fuel surfaces. For the case of reducing conditions,(see Table 6), the dominant release mechanisms includes diffusion in stoichiometric and hypostoichiomeric fuel, fuel dissolution and fission product vaporization from the fuel surfaces. In both tables, for each chemical element, a brief description of the basis for their inclusion in a particular group is given.

As more experimental information becomes available, the proposed groupings can be modify accordingly.

5. SUMMARY

1. A review of important fission product release mechanisms has been presented. These mechanisms include : (i) diffusion in stoichiometric and non stoichiometric fuel; (ii) fission product vaporization from fuel surfaces; (iii) releases during temperature ramps; (iv) matrix stripping; and (v) fuel dissolution.

2. The experimental results of the out-of-pile experiments performed at ORNL (USA), CEA-Grenoble (France) and CRL (Canada) have been summarized.

3. A grouping of fission products, for both oxidizing and reducing conditions, has been proposed.

REFERENCES

1. H. KLEYKAMP, "The Chemical State of the Fission Products in Oxide Fuels", J. Nucl. Mater. 131 (1985) 221.
2. C.A. FRISKNEY and M.V. SPEIGHT, "A Calculation on the In-Pile Diffusional Release of Fission Products Forming a General Decay Chain", J. Nucl. Mater. 62 (1976) 89.
3. C.A. FRISKNEY and J.A. TURNBULL, "The Characteristics of Fission Gas Release from Uranium Dioxide during Irradiation", J. Nucl. Mater. 79 (1979) 184.
4. J.A. TURNBULL, C.A. FRISKNEY, J.R. FINDLAY, F.A. JOHNSON and A.J. WALTER, "The Diffusion Coefficients of Gaseous and Volatile Species during the Irradiation of Uranium Dioxide", J. Nucl. Mater. 107 (1982) 168.
5. J.A. TURNBULL, R.J. WHITE and C. WISE, "The Diffusion Coefficient for Fission Gas Atoms in Uranium Dioxide", Proceedings of the International Atomic Energy Agency Technical Committee Meeting on Water Reactor Fuel Element Computer Modelling in Steady State, Transient and Accident Conditions, Preston, England, 18-22 September 1988.
6. I.J. HASTINGS, C.E.L. HUNT and J.J. LIPSETT, "Release of Short-Lived Fission Products from UO_2 Fuel: Effects of Operating Conditions", J. Nucl. Mater. 130 (1985) 407.
7. B.J. LEWIS, C.E.L. HUNT and F.C. IGLESIAS, "Source Term of Iodine and Noble Gas Fission Products in the Fuel-to-Sheath Gap of Intact Operating Nuclear Fuel Elements", J. Nucl. Mater. 172 (1990) 197.

8. A.D. APPELHANS and J.A. TURNBULL, "Measured Release of Radioactive Xenon, Krypton, and Iodine from UO_2 at Typical Light Water Reactor Conditions, and a Comparison with Release Models", Report NUREG/CR-2298, US Nuclear Regulatory Commission (1981).
9. I. URSU, C. GHEORGHIU, C. SOARE and E. GHEORGHIU, "Behaviour of Short-Lived Fission Products in UO_2 Fuel Elements during Steady Power Operation", Rev. Roum. Phys., Tome 32, No. 9, p. 951-960, 1987.
10. H. MATZKE, "Diffusion in Ceramic Oxide Systems", Adv. Ceramics 17 (1986) 1.
11. C. WISE, "Recoil Release of Fission Products from Nuclear Fuel", J. Nucl. Mater. 136 (1985) 30.
12. B.J. LEWIS, "Fission Product Release from Nuclear Fuel by Recoil and Knockout", J. Nucl. Mater. 148 (1987) 28.
13. A.H. BOOTH, "A Suggested Method for Calculating the Diffusion of Radioactive Rare Gas Fission Products from UO_2 Fuel Elements and a Discussion of Proposed In-Reactor Experiments that may be used to Test its Validity, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited Report, AECL-700 (1957).
14. G.V. KIDSON, "A Generalized Analysis of the Cumulative Diffusional Release of Fission Product Gases from an Equivalent Sphere of UO_2", J. Nucl. Mater. 88 (1980) 299.
15. B.J. LEWIS and H.E. SILLS, "Fission-Product Transport and the Diffusion Approximation", J. Nucl. Mater. 184 (1991) 107.
16. R. LINDNER and H. MATZKE, Z. Naturforschg 14a (1959) 582.
17. W. MIEKELEY and F. FELIX, J. Nucl. Mater. 42 (1972) 297.
18. G.T. LAWRENCE, "A Review of the Diffusion Coefficient of Fission-Product Rare Gases in Uranium Dioxide", J. Nucl. Mater. 71 (1978) 195.
19. H. MATZKE, "Gas Release Mechanisms in UO_2 - A Critical Review", Radiation Effects 53 (1980) 219.
20. J.C. KILLEEN and J.A. TURNBULL, "An Experimental and Theoretical Treatment of the Release of ^{85}Kr from Hyperstoichiometric Uranium Dioxide", Proc. Workshop Chemical Reactivity of Oxide Fuel and Fission Product Release, Gloucestershire, England, April 7-9, 1987, p. 387, Central Electricity Generating Board.
21. R.W. GRIMES and C.R. CATLOW, "The Stability of Fission Products in Uranium Dioxide", Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. A 335 (1991) 609.
22. B.J. LEWIS, F.C. IGLESIAS, D.S. COX and E. GHEORGHIU, "A Model for Fission Gas Release and Fuel Oxidation Behaviour for Defected UO_2 Fuel Elements", Nucl. Technol. 92 (1990) 353.
23. B.J. LEWIS, D.S. COX and F.C. IGLESIAS, "A Kinetic Model for Fission-Product Release and Fuel Oxidation Behaviour for Zircaloy-Clad Fuel Elements Under Reactor Accident Conditions", J. Nucl. Mater. 207 (1993) 228.
24. P.L. PURDY, B.J. LEWIS, W.S. ANDREWS, D.S. COX and F.C. IGLESIAS, "A Model for Fuel Oxidation and Diffusion-Based Fission Product Release Under Severe Nuclear Reactor Accident Conditions", 4th International Conference on CANDU Fuel, Pembroke, Ontario, October 1-4, 1995.
25. S.G. PRUSSIN, D.R. OLANDER, W.K. LAU and L. HANSSON, "Release of Fission Products (Xe, I, Te, Mo and Tc) from Polycrystalline UO_2", J. Nucl. Mater. 154 (1988) 25.
26. M.F. OSBORNE, J.L. COLLINS and R.A. LORENZ, "Experimental Studies of Fission Product Release from Commercial Light Water Reactor Fuel Under Accident Conditions", Nucl. Technol. 78 (1987) 157.
27. M.F. OSBORNE, R.A. LORENZ, J.L. COLLINS and T. NAKAMURA, "Time-Dependent Release of Fission Products from LWR Fuel Under Severe Accident Conditions", Proc. Int. Conf. Thermal Reactor Safety, Avignon, France, October 2-7, 1988, p. 1293.
28. T.S. KRESS, R.A. LORENZ, T. NAKAMURA and M.F. OSBORNE, "Correlation of Recent Fission Product Release Data", Fission Product Transport Processes in Reactor Accidents, J.T. Rogers, Ed., Hemisphere Publishing Corporation, New York (1990).
29. M.F. OSBORNE and R.A. LORENZ, "ORNL Studies of Fission Product Release Under LWR Severe Accident Conditions", Nucl. Safety 33 (1992) 344.
30. M. PEEHS, G. KASPAR and K.H. NEEB, "Cs and I Source Terms of Irradiated UO_2", Proc. Topl. Mtg. Fission Product Behaviour and Source Term Research, Snowbird, Utah, July 15-19, 1984, Electric Power Research Institute (1985).
31. M. PEEHS, G. KASPAR and F. SONTHEIMER, "Cs and I Source Terms of Irradiated UO_2", IAEA Technical Committee on Fuel Rod Internal Chemistry and Fission Product Behaviour, Karlsruhe, FRG, November 11-15, 1985, IWGFPT/25.
32. G. KASPAR and M. PEEHS, "Transient Release of Iodine and Cesium from Irradiated UO_2 in Presence of Zircaloy and Oxygen", Proc. Workshop Chemical Reactivity of Oxide Fuel and Fission Product Release, Gloucestershire, England, April 7-9, 1987, p. 441, Central Electricity Generating Board.

33. B.J. LEWIS, F.C. IGLESIAS, C.E.L. HUNT and D.S. COX, "Release Kinetics of Volatile Fission Products Under Severe Accident Conditions", Nucl. Technol. 99 (1992) 330.
34. A.C. HARNDEN-GILLIS, B.J. LEWIS, W.S. ANDREWS, P.L. PURDY, M.F. OSBORNE and R.A. LORENZ, "Modelling of Cesium Release from Light Water Reactor Fuel Under Severe Accident Conditions", Nucl. Technol. 109 (1995) 39.
35. B.J. LEWIS, B. ANDRE, B. MOREL, P. DEHAUDT and D. MARO, "Modelling the Release Behaviour of Cesium During Severe Fuel Degradation", 4th International Conference on CANDU Fuel, Pembroke, Ontario, October 1-4, 1995.
36. B.J. LEWIS, B. ANDRE, G. DUCROS and D. MARO, "A Model for Non-Volatile Fission Product Release During Reactor Accident Conditions", 4th International Conference on CANDU Fuel, Pembroke, Ontario, October 1-4, 1995.
37. A.H. BOOTH, "A Method for Calculating Fission Gas Diffusion from UO_2 Fuel and its Application to the X-2-f Loop Test", Atomic Energy of Canada Limited Report, AECL-496 (1957).
38. B.J. LEWIS and F.C. IGLESIAS, "A Model for Calculating Fission Gas Diffusion in Annealing Experiments", J. Nucl. Mater. 154 (1988) 228.
39. M. RAMAMURTHI and M.R. KUHLMAN, "Refinement of CORSOR - An Empirical In-Vessel Fission Product Release Model", U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Battelle report, 1990.
40. B. ANDRE, G. DUCROS, J.P. LEVEQUE, D. MARO, M.F. OSBORNE and R.A. LORENZ, "Fission Product Releases at Severe LWR Analysis Conditions: ORNL/CEA Measurements Versus Calculations," Nucl. Technol., in press.
41. K. UNE and S. KASHIBE, "Fission Gas Release During Postirradiation Annealing of UO_2-2wt% Gd_2O_3 Fuels", J. Nucl. Mater. 189 (1992) 210.
42. M.F. OSBORNE and R.A. LORENZ, "ORNL Studies of Fission Product Release Under LWR Severe Accident Conditions", Nucl. Safety 33 (1992) 344.
43. A.B. REYNOLDS, J.L. KELLY and S.T. KIM, "Role of Surface Vaporization in Low-Volatility Fission Product Release Experiments," Nucl. Technol. 74 (1986) 76.
44. D. CUBICCIOTTI, "Vaporization Thermodynamics of Fission Products from Fuel Under Nuclear-Accident Conditions," Advances in Ceramics, Vol. 17, American Ceramic Society, Columbus, Ohio, 1986, p. 211.
45. D. CUBICCIOTTI and B.R. SEHGAL, "Vapour Transport of Fission Products in Postulated Severe Light Water Reactor Accidents," Nucl. Technol. 65 (1984) 267.
46. D. CUBICCIOTTI, "Vapour Transport of Fission Products Under Nuclear Accident Conditions," J. Nucl. Mater. 154 (1988) 53.
47. E.H.P. CORDFUNKE and R.J.M. KONINGS, "Chemical Interactions In Water-Cooled Nuclear Fuel: A Thermochemical Approach", J. Nucl. Mater. 152 (1988) 301.
48. J.M. GITTUS, J.R. MATTHEWS and P.E. POTTER, "Safety Aspects of Fuel Behaviour During Faults and Accidents in Pressurized Water Reactors and In Liquid Sodium Cooled Fast Breeder Reactors", J. Nucl. Mater. 166 (1989) 132.
49. R.R. HOBBINS, D.A. PETTI and D.L. HAGRMAN, "Fission Product Release From Fuel Under Severe Accident Conditions", Nucl. Technol. 101 (1993) 270.
50. M.D. ALLEN, H.W. STOCKMAN, K.O. REIL, A.J. GRIMLEY and W.J. CAMP, "ACRR Fission Product Release Tests ST-1 and ST-2", Proc. Int. Conf. Thermal Reactor Safety, Avignon, France, October 2-7, 1988, Vol. 5 (1988).
51. F.C. IGLESIAS, C.E.L. HUNT, F. GARISTO and D.S. COX, "Ruthenium Release Kinetics from Uranium Oxides", Proc. ICHMT Conf. Fission Product Transport Processes in Reactor Accidents, Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia, May 22-26, 1989, pp. 187-196, Hemisphere, New York (1990).
52. F. GARISTO, "Thermodynamic Behaviour of Ruthenium at High Temperatures", Atomic Energy of Canada Limited report, AECL-9552, 1988.
53. M. SONTHEIMER, R. MANZEL and H. STEHLE, "Transient Spaltgasfreisetzung und UO_2-mikrostruktur bei Leistungsrampen " , Jour. Nucl. Mat. **124**(1984)33
54. J. REST and S.M. GEHL, "The Mechanistic Prediction of Transient Fission-Gas Release from LWR Fuel",Nucl. Engin. and Design **56**(1980) 233.
55. S. KASHIBE and K. UNE, "Effects of Temperature Cycling and Heating Rate on Fission Gas Release of BWR Fuels", Jour. Nucl. Scien. And Tech. **28**(1991)1090.
56. K. UNE and S. KASHIBE, "Fission Gas Release During Postirradiation Annealing of UO_2-2wt% Gd_2O_3 Fuels", Jurn. Nucl. Mat. **189**(1992)210.

57. G.J. SMALL, "Fission Gas Release and Bubble Development in UO2 During High Temperature Transients", Proceedings of the IAEA Specialist Meeting on Water Reactor Fuel Element Computer Modelling in Steady State, Transient and Accident Conditions, Preston, 1988 p.209.
58. J.R. MATTHEWS and G.J. SMALL, "Towards a Mechanistic Understanding of Transient Fission Gas Release", Proceedings of the IAEA Specialist Meeting on Water Reactor Fuel Element Computer Modelling in Steady State, Transient and Accident Conditions, Preston, 1988 p.209.
59. C.A. ALEXANDER, J.S. OGDEN, L.CHAN and R.W. WRIGHT, "Matrix Stripping and Fission Product Release at High Temperatures", Proceedings on an IAEA/OECD International Symposium on Severe Accidents in Nuclear Power Plants, March 12-25 1988, Sorrento, Italy (IAEA -SM-296/99).
60. D.S. COX, F.C. IGLESIAS, C.E.L. HUNT, N.A. KELLER, R.D. BARRAND, J.R. MITCHELL and R.F. O'CONNOR, "Oxidation of UO2 in Air and Steam with Relevance to Fission Product Releases", Proceedings of the American Chemical Society Symposium on Chemical Phenomena Associated with Radioactivity Release During Severe Nuclear Plant Accidents, Anaheim Ca, 1986 Sept. 7-12 (NUREG/CP-0078).
61. C.A. ALEXANDER and J.S. OGDEN, "Vaporization of UO2 at High Temperatures and High Pressures. A Generic Relation for Volatilization", High Temp.-High Pres. **21** (1990) 149.
62. D.S. COX, C.E.L. HUNT, R.F. O'CONNOR, R.D. BARRAND and F.C. IGLESIAS, "High Temperature Oxidation Behaviour of UO2 in Air and Steam", Proceedings of the International Symposium on High-Temperature Oxidation and Sulphidation Process, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, 1990 August 26-30, Pergamon Press, ISBN 0-18-040415-4.
63. D.S. COX, C.E.L. HUNT, Z. LIU, F.C. IGLESIAS, N.A. KELLER, R.D. BARRAND and R.F. O'CONNOR, "A Model for the Release of Low-Volatility Fission Products in Oxidizing Conditions", July 1991, AECL-10440.
64. W. DIENST, P. HOFMANN and D. KERWIN-PECK, "Chemical Interactions Between UO_2 and Zircaloy from 1000 to 2000°C", Nuclear Technology, **65** 1984 109.
65. A.R. PAUL, M.C. NAIK and K.S. VENKATESWARIU, "Kinetics of Interfacial Reaction Between Uranium Dioxide and Zircaloy-2", Bhaba Atomic Research Centre Report 1087, 1980.
66. H.E. ROSINGER, "A Study of the Pellet/Clad (Uranium Dioxide/Zircaloy-4) Interaction at 1373 K and 1473 K", AECL-7785, February 1983.
67. P. NIKOLOPOULOS, P. HOFMANN and D. KERWIN-PECK, "Determination of the Interfacial Energy and Work of Adhesion in the UO_2/Zircaloy-4 Diffusion Couple", Journal of Nuclear Materials **124** 106-113, 1984.
68. K.Y. KIM and D.R. OLANDER, "Dissolution of Uranium Dioxide by Molten Zircaloy", Journal of Nuclear Materials **154** 85-101, 1988.
69. H.E. ROSINGER, K. DEMOLINE and R.K. RONDEAU, "The Dissolution of UO_2 by Molten Zircaloy-4 Cladding", presented at the Fifth International Meeting on Thermal Nuclear Reactor Safety, Karlsruhe, FRG, September 1984. Also published as AECL-8387, March 1985.
70. P.J. HAYWARD, I.M. GEORGE and M.C. ARNESON, "Dissolution of UO_2 Fuel by Molten Zircaloy-4", presented at the 32nd Annual CNS Conference, Saint John, NB, June 1992
71. P.J. HAYWARD and I.M. GEORGE, "Dissolution of CANDU Fuel by Molten Zircaloy-4 Cladding", presented at the 3rd Annual Conference on CANDU Fuel, Chalk River, ON, October 1992.
72. M.D. ALLEN, H.W. STOCKMAN and K.O. REIL, "Fission Product Release and Fuel Behavior of Irradiated Light Water Reactor Fuel Under Severe Accident Conditions: The ACRR ST-1 Experiment", SAND89-0308, NUREG/CR-5345, September 1991.
73. M.D. ALLEN, H.W. STOCKMAN, K.O. REIL and A.J. GRIMLEY, "Fission Product Release and Fuel Behavior of Irradiated Light Water Reactor Fuel Under Severe Accident Conditions: The ST-1 Experiment", Nuclear Technology **92** 214-228, November 1990.
74. M.F. OSBORNE, R.A. LORENZ, J.L. COLLINS, J.R. TRACIS, C.S. WEBSTER and T. NAKAMURA, "Data Summary Report for Fission Product Release Test VI-4", ORNL/TM-11400, NUREG/CR-5481, January 1991.
75. M.H. RAND, R.J. ACKERMAN, F. GRONWOLD, F.L. OETTING and A. PATTORET, Rev. Int. Hautes Temp. Refract. **15** 355, 1978.
76. R.E. LATTA and R.E. FRYXELL, "Determination of Solidus-Liquidus Temperatures in the $UO_{2\pm x}$ System ($-0.50<x<0.20$)", Journal of Nuclear Materials **35** 192-210, 1970.
77. M.G. ADAMSON, E.A. AITKEN and R.W. CAPUTI, "Experimental and Thermodynamic Evaluation of the Melting Behaviour of Irradiated Oxide Fuels", Journal of Nuclear Materials **130** 349, 1985.
78. M. KOIZUMI and M. SATOH, "Phase Study on Solid Fission Products, Ba, Sr and Zr in Oxide Fuels", Journal of Nuclear Materials **51** 90, 1974.

79. D.R. BOYLE, F.L. BROWN and J.E. SANECKI, "Solid Fission Product Behaviour in Uranium-Plutonium Oxide Fuel Irradiated in a Fast Neutron Flux", Journal of Nuclear Materials **29** 27, 1968.

80. L.F. EPSTEIN, Journal of Nuclear Materials **22** 340, 1972.

81. M.D. ALLEN, H.W. STOCKMAN, K.O. REIL and A.J. GRIMLEY, "Fission Product Release and Fuel Behavior of Irradiated Light Water Reactor Fuel Under Severe Accident Conditions: The ST-1 Experiment", Nuclear Technology **92** 214-228, November 1990.

82. M.F. OSBORNE, J.L. COLLINS, R.A. LORENZ, J.R. TRAVIS and C.S. WEBSTER, "Data Summary Report for Fission Product Release Test VI-2", ORNL/TM-11105, NUREG/CR-5340, September 1989.

83. R.D. MACDONALD, J.W. DEVAAL, D.S. COX, L.W. DICKSON, M.J. JONCKHEERE, C.E. FERRIS, N.A. KELLER and S.L. WADSWORTH, "An In-Reactor Loss-of-Coolant Test with Flow Blockage and Rewet", presented at the International Topical Meeting on Thermal Reactor Safety, Portland, Oregon, July 1991. Also issued as AECL-10464, October 1991.

84. J.-P LEVEQUE, B. ANDRE, G. DUCROS, G. LE MAROIS AND G. LHIAUBET, "The HEVA Experimental Program", Nucl. Technol. **188** 1994 Oct. p.33.

85. D.S. COX, R.F. O'CONNOR and W.W. SMELTZER, "Measurement of Oxidation/Reduction Kinetics to 2100°C Using Non-Contact Solid-State Electrolytes," Solid State Ionics, 53-56, (1992) 238.

86. C.E.L. HUNT et al., "Fission Product Release During UO_2 Oxidation," International Conference on CANDU Fuel, Chalk River Nuclear Laboratories, Chalk River, Ontario, Canada, October 6-8, 1986, page 508.

87. D.S. COX, Z. LIU, R.S. DICKSON and P.H. ELDER, "Fission-Product Release During Post-Test Annealing of High-Burnup CANDU Fuel," Third International Conference on CANDU Fuel, Pembroke, Ontario, Canada, October 4-8, 1992.

88. D.S. COX et al., "Fission-Product Releases from UO_2 in Air and Inert Conditions at 1700-2350°K: Analysis of the MCE-1 Experiment," Proceedings of the American Nuclear Society International Topical Meeting on Safety of Thermal Reactors, Portland, Oregon, USA, July 21-25, 1991, also as AECL report AECL-10438.

89. DICKSON, R.S., Z. LIU, D.S. COX, N.A. KELLER, R.F. O'CONNOR and R.D. BARRAND, "Cesium Release from CANDU Fuel in Argon, Steam and Air: The UCE12 Experiment," Proceedings of the 15th Annual Canadian Nuclear Association Meeting, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, 1994 June.

90 R.A. LORENZ AND M.F. OSBORNE, "A Summary of ORNL Fission Product Releas Test with Recommended Release Rate and Diffusion Coefficients," NUREG/CR-6261, 1995.

91 Z. LIU, D.S. COX, R.S. DICKSON and P. ELDER, "A Summary of CRL Fission-product Release Measurements from UO_2 Samples During Post-Irradiation Annealing (1983-1992)," COG-92-377, 1994.

92 "CRC Handbook iof Chemistry and Physics," 70th Edition, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, USA, 1990-1991.

Table 1 : ORNL HI-Series Test Conditions and Results

Test Characteristic	Test Number					
	HI-1	HI-2	HI-3	HI-4	HI-5	HI-6
Specimen source, reactor[a]	HBR	HBR	HBR	PB	Oco	Mont
Specimen length (mm)	203	203	203	203	152	152
Specimen mass[b] (g)	168	166	167	306	133	170
Fuel burnup (GWd/Mg U)	28.1	28.1	25.2	10.1	38.3	40.3
In-pile gas release (%)	0.3	0.3	0.3	10.2	4.1	2.0
Steam flow rate (g/hr)	0.81	0.76	0.31	0.29	0.03	1.7[c]
Test heatup rate (K/s)	1.2	1.3	2.1	2.3	1.1	2.3
Test temperature (K)	1675	2000	2275	2200	2025	2250
Effective time at test temperature[d] (min)	33.8	22.5	21.3	21.6	21.5	2.5
UO_2 grain size (μm)						
Pre-test	2.8	2.8	2.8	6.6	9.2	-
Post-test	3.4	3.9	4.3	6.6	8.9	-
Fuel-cladding interaction	None	Minor	Yes	Yes	Minor	Yes
Fission Product Release (% of inventory)						
Kr-85[e]	3.13	51.8	59.3	31.3	19.9	31.6
I-129	2.04	53.0	35.4	24.7	22.4	24.7
Cs-137	1.75	50.5	58.8	31.7	20.3	33.1
Ag-110m[f]	~0.3	2.9	0.02	>0.09	18.0	6.0
Sb-125[g]	0.02	1.55	>0.001	0.01	0.33	0.06
Te (elmental)[h]	~0.25	~0.5	~0.3	<0.4	-	-
Ba	~0.008	-	-	<0.4	~0.08	-
Sr	<0.002	-	-	<0.005	-	-
Eu-154	-	-	-	<0.6	~0.02	-
Mo	-	~5.9	-	-	-	-
Sn (clad)	-	-	~1.7	~1.1	~0.5	-
Zr (clad)	~0.006	~0.002	~0.0001	~0.0016	-	-
La	~0.023	-	<0.0002	-	-	-

[a] Reactors: HBR = H.B. Robinson 2, PB = Peach Bottom 2, Oco = Oconee 1, Mont = Monticello.
[b] Total of UO_2 and Zircaloy.
[c] Average value over test time (rate varied from 0.2 to 2.4 g/min during test).
[d] Includes estimates for heatup and cooldown effects.
[e] Includes Kr-85 released during reactor operation.
[f] Ag-110m data for tests HI-2 through HI-4 are probably low.
[g] Sb-125 data are probably low for all tests.
[h] Determined by chemical analysis.

Table 2 : Conditions and Results for ORNL VI-Series Fission Product Release Tests

Parameter	Test Number						
	VI-1	VI-2	VI-3	VI-4	VI-5	VI-6	VI-7
Fuel Specimen	Oconee	BR3	BR3	BR3	BR3	BR3	Monticello
Burnup (GWd/MgU)	40	44	44	47	42	42	40
In-pile Kr release (%)	0.7	≈2	≈2	≈5	≈2	≈2	≈2
Test Conditions							
Test temperature (K)	2020, 2300[a]	2300	2000,2700[a]	2440	2000,2720[a]	2310	2025,2310[a]
Time at Temperature (min)	20, 20	60	20,20	20	20,20	60	20,20
Atmosphere	Steam	Steam	Steam	Hydrogen	Hydrogen	Hydrogen, steam[c]	Air, steam
Fractional release (%)							
Cs-137	63	67	100	96	100	80	71
Kr-85	57	31	100	85	100	75	69
I-129	37	33	b	71	74	67	b
Sb-125	33	68	99	6.4	18	64	52
Eu-154	0	0	~0.01	19	57	14	0.04
Ru-106	0	0	5.0	0	0	0	b
Te (elemental)	NA	NA	99	NA	82	63	-
Sr (elemental)	NA	NA	3	NA	34	6	1
Ba (elemental)	NA	19	30	27	76	33	4
Sn (clad)	NA	94	76	0.63	NA	NA	NA
Mo (elemental)	43	86	77	6.9	2.3	12.6	NA
Ce-144	NA	NA	<0.2	NA	2.0	NA	NA

[a] Test was conducted in two phases at two different temperatures.
[b] Analysis incomplete.
[c] Test VI-6 was heated at 2300 K in hydrogen, then switched to a steam atmosphere.

Table 3: Conditions and Results for CEA Grenoble HEVA Tests

Parameter	Test Number							
	HEVA 01	HEVA 02	HEVA 03	HEVA 04	HEVA 05	HEVA 06	HEVA 07	HEVA 08
Fuel Specimen								
Fuel type	CAP/2	CAP/2	BR3	Fessenheim 1/2	Fessenheim 1/2	Fessenheim 1/2		Fessenheim 1/2
Burnup (MWd/kgU)	19.4	19.4	27.7	36.7	36.7	36.7		36.7
Test Conditions								
Test Temp. plateau (K)	1900	2140	2070	2270	2070	2370	2070	2070
Time at temp. plateau (s)	900	900	1800	420	5760	1800	1800	600
Flow rate (mg/s)								
H2	0	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.5	0.5
H2O	100	30	37	30	25	0	25	25
Fractional Release (%)								
Cs-137	-2	68	38	44	66	30	-	15
I-131	-	-	-	43	62	30	-	12
Xe-135	-	-	-	~42	~65	15	-	-
Te-132	-	-	-	52	54	11	-	5 (detection limit)
Sb-125	1	41	20	18	-	0 (Sb-127)	-	15 (detection limit)
Mo-99	-	-	-	21	55	~4	-	16 (detection limit)
Eu-154	-	~15	< 3	-	-	~5	-	-
Ce-144	-	9 (detection limit)	< 3.2	-	-	0 (Ce-143)	-	-
Ru-106	-	5 (detection limit)	< 1.5	-	-	0 (Ru-103)	-	-
Ba-140	-	-	-	5.6	-	27	-	6 (detection limit)

Table 4 : Conditions and Results for selected CRL tests.

Parameter	Test Name							
	MCE1-1	MCE1-6	MCE1-7	MCE2-13	MCE2-19	HCE2-BM3	HCE2-CM4	UCE12-8
Fuel Specimen	Fragment[a]	Fragment	Fragment	Fragment	Fragment	Segment[c]	Segment	Segement
Burnup (MWh/kgU)	257	257	257	457	457	544	457	370
Test Conditions								
Test temperature (K)	1973	2273	2350	2080	2300	1775	1625	1675
Time at Temperature (min)	13	37	17	17	10	110	140	200
Heating Rate (K/s)	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.9
Atmosphere	Air	Ar/2% H_2	Air	Steam	Steam	Steam	Air	Steam
Releases (%)								
Cs-137	80	80	100	92	100	75	75	96
I-131	80	80	100	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nb-95	0	10	45	25	47	< 2	3	< 1
Zr-95	0	0	30	< 2	< 2	< 2	< 1	< 1
Ru-103	100	10	100	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ru-106	NA[b]	NA	NA	42	80	< 2	20	< 1
Ba-140	0	40	90	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
La-140	0	0	35	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ce-144	NA	NA	NA	< 5	20	< 2	< 2	< 2

Notes: [a] Bare fragment of UO_2.
[b] Isotope was not present in fuel at time of test.
[c] Zircaloy sheathed segment of a fuel element (2 to 5 cm long).

Table 5 : FISSION PRODUCT RELEASE GROUPS
(Oxidizing Conditions)

Group	Elements	Comments	References
1	Xe, Kr	Noble gases. No chemical compounds with fuel or other fission products.	CRC
2	Cs, I, Rb, Br	Cs and I showed similar releases (Table 1, 2, 3 and 4). Rb and Br volatilities are bounded by Cs release kinetics.	ORNL, CEN, CRL
3	Te, Sb, Sn	Delayed release due to interaction with the Zircaloy sheath. Lower releases of Sb than Te (Table 3). After complete sheath oxidation, releases similar to Group 2.	ORNL, CEN
4	Ba, Sr	Ba and Sr have similar chemical characteristics and similar release behaviour (Tables 1 and 2). Insignificant releases of Ba below 1900 °C.	ORNL, CRL
5	Ru	Releases after the sheath and the fuel have been oxidized. Faster releases in air than in steam (Tables 2,3 and 4) . High volatility due to the formation of oxides (RuO_4)	CRL CEN, ORNL
6	Mo	High volatility due to formation of oxides (Tables 1, 2 and 3). Volatility depends on chemical state and Cs concentration.	ORNL, CRC
7	Nb	High volatility due to the formation of oxides (Table 4). Higher releases in steam than in air.	CRL, CRC
8	Rh, Tc	Based on vapour pressure estimates.	VapTher
9	La, Ce, Pr, Y, Zr, Eu	Low volatility oxides. Partially release by matrix stripping for T> 1800 °C.	CRC, CRL
10	U, Pu, Np	Similar chemical characteristics. Released by matrix stripping (UO_3).	CRL

Notes:

CRC	CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics (Reference 92).
ORNL	ORNL Experimental Program
CEN	CEN-Grenoble Experimental Program
CRL	CRL Experimental Program
VapTher	Vaporization Thermodynamics (References 44, 45 and 46)

Table 6 : FISSION PRODUCT RELEASE GROUPS (Reducing Conditions)

Group	Elements	Comments	Reference
1	Xe, Kr	Noble gases. No chemical compounds with fuel or other fission products.	CRC
2	Cs, I, Rb, Br	Cs and I showed similar release (Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4). Rb and Br volatilities bounded by Cs release kinetics.	ORNL, CEN, CRL
3	Te, Sb, Sn	Reduced releases due to interaction with the Zircaloy sheath. Lower releases of Sb than Te (Table 3).	ORNL, CRL
4	Ba, Sr	Based on vapour pressure estimates. Estimated vapour pressure of Sr is lower than the vapour pressure for Ba. ORNL results (Tables 1 and 2) support these estimates.	ORNL, VapTher
5	Nb, Ru, Tc	Based on vapour pressure estimates. Estimated Nb vapour pressures are higher than Ba and Tc vapour pressures.	VapTher
6	Eu	Enhanced by reduction of stable chemical form (Table 2).	ORNL
7	Rh	Based on vapour pressure estimates	VapTher
8	Zr	Based on vapour pressure estimates	VapTher
9	La, Ce, Pr, Y	Based on vapour pressure estimates. Estimated vapour pressure of La is higher than the vapour pressures of Ce, Y and Pr.	VapTher
10	U, Mo	Based on vapour pressure estimates. Estimated vapour pressure of U is higher than the vapour pressure of Mo.	VapTher

Notes:

CRC	CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics (Reference 92).
ORNL	ORNL Experimental Program
CEN	CEN-Grenoble Experimental Program
CRL	CRL Experimental Program
VapTher	Vaporization Thermodynamics (References 44, 45 and 46)