

OVERVIEW OF EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS ON CORE MELT PROGRESSION AND FISSION PRODUCT RELEASE BEHAVIOUR

B.J. Lewis,¹ R. Dickson² and F.C. Iglesias³

¹Royal Military College of Canada, P.O. Box 17000, Kingston, Ontario, Canada K7K 7B4

²Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, Chalk River Laboratories, Chalk River, Ontario, Canada K0J 1J0

³Candesco Corporation, 230 Richmond Street, 10th Floor, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5V 1V6

Abstract

An overview of experimental programs that have been conducted to better understand core melt progression phenomena and fission product behaviour during severe reactor accidents in light water reactors is presented. This discussion principally focuses on the melting and liquefaction of core materials at different temperatures, materials oxidation and relocation, hydrogen generation behaviour, and the release and transport of fission products and aerosols. A comparison of fission product release results from annealing and in-reactor experiments is also presented.

1. Introduction

Numerous in-pile^[1-27] and out-of-pile experiments^[28-39] have been conducted to better understand light water reactor (LWR) severe accident progression following the accident at the Three Mile Island Unit 2 (TMI-2) nuclear power plant. These experiments have principally focused on high-temperature core melt progression and fission product release behaviour. Specifically, the experiments were designed to investigate: (i) how the core loses its original geometry as a result of interactions between core materials and fuel liquefaction; (ii) the relocation behaviour of the core with melt formation leading to partial core blockage, fuel debris beds and molten pools; (iii) how much hydrogen is produced by the steam oxidation of core materials with relocation; (iv) the influence of core degradation on the release, transport and deposition of fission products and aerosols; and (v) the fragmentation of the degraded core with cool down and/or quenching.^[40-47]

This paper reviews previous separate-effects and integral-effects experiments conducted to better understand core melt progression phenomena (see Section 2). The understanding and experience gained in these various experiments for core melt phenomena (Section 3) and fission product release behaviour (Section 4) are discussed and compared. This discussion is also presented in light of the phenomena inferred from examination of the damaged TMI-2 reactor core.^[16]

2. Review of Melt Progression and Fission Product Release Experiments

Table 1 provides a summary of in-pile and out-pile experiments used to investigate core melt progression phenomena and fission product release behaviour during severe accident conditions. The in-pile experiments include: the Source Term Experiments Project (STEP), the Annular Core Research Reactor (ACRR) Source Term (ST) tests, the ACRR Damaged Fuel (DF) Relocation Experiment, the Power Burst Facility (PBF) Severe Fuel Damage (SFD) tests, the Full Length High Temperature (FLHT) tests, the Loss-of-Fluid Test Facility (LOFT) Fission Product (FP) test, and the Phebus Fission Product (FP) and Severe Fuel Damage (SFD) tests. The out-of-pile experiments include: the CORA, QUENCH and CODEX integral programs, and annealing experiments conducted at the Oak Ridge National Laboratories (ORNL) (i.e., the Horizontal Induction (HI) and Vertical Induction (VI) test series), Commissariat à l'Énergie Atomique (CEA) (i.e., the Heva and Vercors test series) and the Verification Experiments of radionuclides Gas/Aerosol release (VEGA) program at the Japan Atomic Energy Research Institute (JAERI).

Various sizes of bundles (see Fig. 1) were used in the fuel-degradation experiments. The bundles varied from four rods to up to 100 rods with rod lengths between 0.15 to 4 m. The experiments were carried out without fuel irradiation, as well as over a wide range of fuel burnups from trace irradiation to commercial burnup conditions of up to 60 GWd/tU. The effect of system pressure from ~0.2 to 8 MPa on bundle degradation was considered. The steam flows spanned steam-limited to steam-rich conditions to determine how such flows affect the oxidation

Table 1: Summary of single effect and integral LWR severe accident tests^a

Test or Accident	Burnup (GWd/tU)	Control Materials	Spacer Grids	Maximum Temp. (K)	Steam Input (g/s)	Atmosphere	No. Rods/ Length (m)	Heating Method	Pressure (MPa)	Ref.
<i>In-Pile Tests</i>										
STEP-1	33 to 36	None	None	2900	Limited	Steam	4/1.0	Fission	0.32	1
STEP-2	31	None	None	2600	Limited	Steam	4/1.0	Fission	0.16-1.24	1
STEP-3	36	None	None	2200	Limited	Steam	4/1.0	Fission	8.00	1
STEP-4	36	Ag-In-Cd	None	2200	Limited	Steam	4/1.0	Fission	7.86	1
ACRR ST-1	47	None	None	2450	None	Argon/H ₂	4/0.15	Fission	0.16	2
ACRR ST-2	47	None	None	2450	None	Argon/H ₂	4/0.15	Fission	1.9	2
ACRR DF-1	Trace	None	Inconel		Limited	Steam	9/0.5	Fission	0.28	3
ACRR DF-2	Trace	None	Inconel		Limited	Steam	9/0.5	Fission	1.72	4
ACRR DF-3	Trace	Ag-In-Cd	Inconel		Limited	Steam	8/0.5	Fission	0.62	4
ACRR DF-4	Trace	B ₄ C	Inconel	2700	Limited (0.88)	Steam	14/0.5	Fission	0.69	5
PBF SFD-ST	Trace	None	Inconel	2800	Excess (16)	Steam	32/0.9	Fission	6.9	6
PBF SFD 1-1	Trace	None	Inconel	2800	Limited (0.7-1.0)	Steam	32/0.9	Fission	6.8	7
PBF SFD 1-3	35 to 42	None	Inconel	2800	Limited (0.6-2.4)	Steam	28/1.0	Fission	6.85 & 4.7	8
PBF SFD 1-4	29 to 42	Ag-In-Cd	Inconel	2800	Limited (0.6-1.3)	Steam	28/1.0	Fission	6.95	9,10
FLHT-1	Trace	None	Inconel		Excess	Steam	12/4.0	Fission	1.38	11
FLHT-2	Trace	None	Inconel		Limited (1.4)	Steam	12/4.0	Fission	1.38	12
FLHT-4	Trace to 28	None	Inconel	2500	Limited (1.26)	Steam	12/4.0	Fission	1.38	13
FLHT-5	Trace to 28	None	Inconel+Zircaloy	2600	Limited (1.23)	Steam	12/4.0	Fission	1.38	14
LOFT FP-2	0.45	Ag-In-Cd+H ₃ BO ₃	Inconel	2800	Excess (180)	Steam	100/1.7	Decay	1.1	15
TMI-2	3	Ag-In-Cd+H ₃ BO ₃	Inconel	2800	Excess	Steam	36816/4.0	Decay	5-15	16
FPT-0	Trace	Ag-In-Cd	Zircaloy	~2870 ^d	Limited (0.5-3.0)	Steam	20/1.0	Fission	0.2	20
FPT-1	23.4	Ag-In-Cd	Zircaloy	2500 ^d	Limited (0.5-2.2)	Steam	20/1.0	Fission	0.2	21
<i>Out-of-Pile Tests</i>										
CORA ^b	None	Ag-In-Cd/B ₄ C	Inconel+Zircaloy	≤2200-2700	Variable (2-12)	Steam	25-57/1.0	Electric	0.2-1.0	28,29
HI 1 to 6	10 to 40	None	None	1675-2275	(8 to 500)×10 ⁻⁶	Steam	1/0.15-0.20	Anneal	0.1	30
VI 1 to 7	40 to 47	None	None	2000-2700	0 to 0.021	Steam/H ₂ /Air	1/0.15-0.20	Anneal	0.1	31
HEVA 1 to 8	19 to 37	None ^c	None	1900-2370	0 to 0.10	Steam/H ₂	1/0.080	Anneal	0.1	32
VERCORS 1 to 6,	38 to 55	None	None	2130-2620	0 to 0.025 ^e	Steam/H ₂	1/0.080-.087	Anneal	0.1	33
HT 1-3, RT 1 to 8	39 to 70	None/Ag-In-Cd/Boric oxide	None	2970-fuel melting	Variable	Steam/H ₂ /Air	1/0.080	Anneal	0.1	37
VEGA 1 to 10	43 to 56	None	None	2770-3120	Variable	Helium/Steam	1/	Anneal	0.1 or 1	38,39

(a) Adapted from Ref. 10, 33, 42 and 43. (b) The CORA test matrix includes 19 tests. (c) HEVA 7 had an Ag-In-Cd control rod exclusively, and HEVA 8 had both control rod and fuel materials. (d) The temperatures for the Phebus FPT-0 and FPT-1 tests correspond to the maximum measured temperatures during the oxidative phase. The quoted value for Phebus FPT-1 is also close to that estimated for fuel relocation during the heatup phase. It is likely, however, that higher temperatures (> 2800 K) were reached in the molten pool of these tests. (e) VERCORS 1 and 2.

behaviour of the fuel rod and structural materials and the hydrogen generation behaviour. Different heating methods were employed including: internal electrical heaters, annealing furnaces, fission heating and decay heat. Structural materials (i.e., Inconel and Zircaloy spacer grids) and absorber materials (i.e., Ag-In-Cd or B_4C control rods within Stainless Steel tubes or blades) were also used in the in-pile experiments to investigate their effect on the core meltdown progression and aerosol production.




Figure 1. Bundle configurations and relative scale (adapted from Ref. 42).

In pile tests provided data on core melt progression and fission product release behaviour. The STEP experiments were designed to principally focus on fission product and aerosol chemistry. The ST tests were separate-effects experiments to study fission product and aerosol release from highly irradiated fuel in a reducing atmosphere (hydrogen-inert gas mixture). The DF tests investigated the effect of coolant flow rate, system-fuel rod relative pressure and degree of initial cladding oxidation on the core damage. The SFD tests examined fuel bundle behaviour, hydrogen generation, and the release, transport and deposition of fission products. The FLHT tests studied oxidation and hydrogen generation in full-length rods. The LOFT FP-2 test was a relatively large experiment to determine fission product transport and the effect of steam supply and reflood for a severely damaged core assembly. The Phebus FP experiments simulate the core, cooling system and containment response for a severe accident, including the fission product release, transport and (long term) deposition behaviour. The out-of-pile CORA test matrix focused on the temporal behaviour of core melt progression and reflood characteristics, using electrically-heated and instrumented rods. The annealing experiments, conducted at the ORNL (HI and VI tests) and CEA (HEVA and VERCORS tests), were principally designed to investigate fission product release from spent fuel under various atmospheric conditions (i.e., hydrogen, steam and air). In addition, the VEGA annealing tests at JAERI investigated oxidation, dissolution and fission product release behaviour for Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR), Boiling Water Reactor (BWR) and mixed oxide (MOX) fuels at high temperatures in helium and helium/steam mixtures at pressures of 0.1 and 1.0 MPa.^[39]

The in-pile Phebus Fission Product and Severe Fuel Damage (Phebus FP) program is detailed in Table 2 and consists of five in-pile tests to study the early phase behaviour of in-vessel core melt degradation over various atmospheric (i.e., oxidizing and reducing) conditions and system pressures (0.5 to 3.5 MPa) in a temperature range up to 2800 K.^[48] For instance, the first two Phebus FP experiments were designed to provide information on the differences between the degradation of fresh (FPT-0) and irradiated (FPT-1) fuel rods (see Table 1 and Table 2) for a low-pressure transient (~ 0.2 MPa).^[20,21] The FPT-4 test was performed to investigate semi-volatile fission product and actinide release from a UO_2/ZrO_2 rubble bed. Each of these tests employed 21 fresh PWR fuel rods with bundles of 0.8 m in active length. The objective of this program was to investigate severe accident phenomena and

Table 2: PHEBUS FP test matrix^a

Test no.	System pressure	Fuel bundle		Primary circuit	Containment vessel	Comments
		Burnup (GWd/tU)	Sweep gas H ₂ /H ₂ O ratio			
FPT-0 (Dec 93)	low	fresh + P/C ^b (~9 d)	low	Steam generator (SG), no steam condensation	closed, pH=5, buffered	First test with fresh fuel (~50% liquefied fuel, >80% volatile FPR ^c)
FPT-1 (Jul 96)	low	23 + P/C (~7.4 d)	low	same as FPT-0	as FPT-0 but with higher humidity	Previously irradiated fuel with conditions similar to FPT-0 (~20% liquefied fuel, ~70-80% volatile FPR)
FPT-4 (Jul 99)	low	33	low	filter package in the in-pile section	vessel not used	Investigated semi-volatile FP and actinide release from UO ₂ /ZrO ₂ rubble bed
FPT-2 (Oct 2000)	low	32 + P/C	high	same as FPT-0 with boric acid aerosols	as FPT-1 but with sump evaporation (hydrogen recombiner coupons)	Similar to FPT-1 but conducted under steam-starved conditions with boric acid injection
FPT-3 (Nov 2004)	low	23 + P/C	high	same as FPT-0	as FPT-2	Stainless steel clad B ₄ C control rod

(a) Adapted from Ref. 19. (b) P/C = pre-conditioned by irradiation in the Phebus reactor prior to the test to restore the short-lived fission product inventory. (c) FPR = Fission product release.

fission product release and transport in the core, primary circuit and containment. These experiments specifically provide information on: (i) core melt progression, and materials oxidation and hydrogen generation; (ii) release of volatile fission products from overheated/liquefied fuel and their interaction with structural material aerosols; (ii) aerosol depletion in the primary circuit and containment (including iodine re-volatilization effects in containment); and (iii) the influence of condensation, pool boiling and containment sprays on the source term.^[17] The facility is also designed so that it is a 1/5000 reduction of scale of the primary circuit and containment building of an actual pressurized water reactor. This facility therefore offers several advantages, compared to the other in-pile facilities in Table 1, which include: a complete integral design (including a simulated primary circuit and containment vessel); complete instrumentation to assess the temporal and spatial progression of the core-melt sequence, including on-line and sequential sampling of solid, liquid and gaseous effluents at various points in the experimental train (e.g., fission product, aerosol and iodine speciation sampling); the possibility of conducting the experiment over extended periods of time (at high temperature); and complete pre and post-test examination (including gamma scanning, and transmission and emission tomography). The data obtained from this program, as well as the out-of-pile Vercors program, have been extensively used for verification of codes for source term analyses.^[25,27,49-51]

Other experiments not included in Table 1 include Melt Progression MP-1 and MP-2 tests that were also conducted in the ACRR reactor.^[52,53] These experiments address the basic mechanisms involved in the behaviour of ceramic melt pools in blocked core accidents as occurred in the TMI-2 accident. The MP experiments demonstrate the growth of a ceramic pool in a pre-formed particulate ceramic (UO₂-ZrO₂) debris bed, which was supported by a pre-cast metallic crust across 32 clad fresh-rod stubs in an inert helium environment. The QUENCH program^[54] used arrays of 21 fuel element simulators containing ZrO₂ pellets in a follow on of the CORA program to study the consequences of reflooding and cooling of a degraded core.^[55] The CODEX program^[56,57] used arrays of seven or nine fuel element simulators containing UO₂ pellets and tungsten bar heaters to investigate reflooding and air oxidation behaviour. The CODEX simulators were clad with Zr-1% Nb when used in VVER configuration, and with Zircaloy-4 when used in PWR configuration.

In-reactor tests of CANDU fuel and fission product behaviour under accident conditions were also performed in the Blowdown Test Facility (BTF) program in Canada. In the BTF-107 experiment, a three-element cluster of CANDU-sized fuel elements was subjected to severely degraded cooling conditions resulting in a high-temperature

(≥ 2770 K) transient.^[58,59] A flow blockage developed during the test due to relocation of U-Zr-O alloy and the high-temperature transient was terminated with a cold water quench. The other three experiments in the BTF program, BTF-104, BTF-105A and BTF-105B, were conducted with single CANDU-sized fuel elements at maximum temperatures of 1800-2200 K in a steam-rich environment (~ 5 g/s steam supply flow). The BTF-104 experiment provided data on fuel behaviour, and volatile fission-product release and transport (Kr, Xe, I, Cs, Te and Ba) from a previously irradiated fuel element at a fuel temperature of about 1800 K.^[60-62] The primary objectives of the BTF-105A experiment were to obtain data for validation of transient fuel performance codes and to test instrumentation for the BTF-105B experiment.^[63,64] The BTF-105B experiment had thermalhydraulic boundary conditions which were better quantified and was performed to investigate fission-product release and transport from a previously irradiated fuel element at a fuel temperature of 2100 K.^[65,66]

In addition to the in-pile experiments, a further summary of the major out-of-pile annealing test programs is further presented in Section 2.1. Results from the various in-pile and out-of-pile experiments are compared to both core samples taken from the TMI-2 reactor and an extensive analytical analysis of the reactor accident (Section 3).

2.1 Single Effects (Out-of-pile) Fission Product Release Experiments

As shown in Table 1, extensive single-effects annealing tests have been conducted at the ORNL in the United States of America (Section 2.1.1), the Centre d'Études Nucléaire de Grenoble (CENG) of the CEA in France (Section 2.1.2), and the Chalk River Laboratories (CRL) of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL) in Canada (Section 2.1.3). These tests were designed to investigate the release behaviour of fission products in high-temperature accidents with variable atmospheric conditions.

2.1.1 ORNL Experiments

Important tests conducted at the ORNL include the HI and VI series,^[30,31] as detailed in Table 3 and Table 4, respectively. Zircaloy-clad UO_2 fuel samples 15-20 cm long (100-200 g) and irradiated to typical LWR burnups were used in these tests. The fuel specimens were heated under atmospheric pressure up to 1700-2700 K using induction furnaces where the time at temperature varied from 2-60 min. Major differences between the VI and HI tests were that: (i) the VI tests were oriented vertically whereas the HI test were horizontal; (ii) the fuel burnups in the VI tests were for the most part higher than those used in the HI tests; and (iii) 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, and air and steam in VI-7) was varied so that the influence of the atmosphere on the fission product release could be studied.

Measurements made in these tests included: (i) test sample temperature versus time by optical pyrometry; (ii) thermal gradient tube measurements downstream of the fuel sample to collect condensing vapors; (iii) use of graduated filters and impregnated charcoal cartridges to collect particulates and volatile iodine species; (iv) a charcoal cold trap to collect and measure fission gases; and (v) radiation detector measurements to monitor fuel location and provide on-line measurements of cesium species in the thermal gradient tubes and Kr-85 in the gas traps. All test components were also sampled and analyzed by gamma-ray spectrometry neutron activation analysis, spark-source mass spectrometry, and emission spectrometry after each test. These tests showed similar release rates for noble gases, Cs and I; however, a difference in transport behavior was noted for Cs in steam relative to hydrogen. Reactive vapor forms of Cs predominate in hydrogen conditions, while transportable aerosols were noted in steam conditions. The releases of Te and Sb appear to occur from the UO_2 at fractional release rates similar to those for the volatile fission products, 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 temperature.^[31] 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.^[67]

There was limited on-line measurements of fission product release rates (only Cs-137 and Kr-85). Since a segmented furnace tube was used in the tests to allow for rapid heating, there was not good containment of the test environment and there is evidence of oxidation of the graphite susceptor in some tests.^[34] The samples were typically at temperature for a relatively short period of time (about 20 min), which may not have been long enough to see oxidative releases, especially at lower temperature.

Table 3: 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	H.B. Robinson	H.B. Robinson	H.B. Robinson	Peach Bottom 2	Oconee 1	Monticello
Specimen length (mm)	203	203	203	203	152	152
Specimen mass (g) ^a	168	166	167	306	133	170
Fuel burnup (GWd/MgU)	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/h)	0.81	0.76	0.31	0.29	0.03	1.7 ^b
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 (min) ^c	33.8	22.5	21.3	21.6	21.5	2.5
UO ₂ grain size (µm)	2.8	2.8	2.8	6.6	9.2	-
Pre-test	3.4	3.9	4.3	6.6	8.9	-
Post-test						
Fuel-cladding interaction	None	Minor	Yes	Yes	Minor	Yes
Fission Product Release (% of inventory)						
Kr-85 ^d	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 ^e	~0.3	2.9	0.02	>0.09	18.0	6.0
Sb-125 ^f	0.02	1.55	>0.001	0.01	0.33	0.06
Te (elemental) ^g	~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. Total of UO₂ and Zircaloy; b. Average value over test time (rate varied from 0.2 to 2.4 g/min during test); c. Includes estimates for heatup and cooldown effects; d. Includes Kr-85 released during operation; e. Ag-100m data for tests HI-2 through HI-4 are probably low; f. Sb-125 are probably biased low for all tests; g. Determined by chemical analysis

Table 4: ORNL VI-series test conditions and results

Test characteristic	Test number						
	VI-1	VI-2	VI-3	VI-4	VI-5	VI-6	VI-7
Specimen source, reactor	Oconee 1	BR3	BR3	BR3	BR3	BR3	Monticello
Fuel burnup (GWd/MgU)	40	44	44	47	42.	42	40
In-pile Kr release (%)	0.7	~2	0.3	~5	~2	~2	~2
Test temperature (K)	2020,2300 ^a	2300	2000,2700 ^a	2440	2000,2720 ^a	2310	2025,2310 ^a
Effective time at test temperature (min)	20,20	60	20,50	20	20,20	60	20,20
Atmosphere	Steam	Steam	Steam	Steam	Hydrogen	Hydrogen, steam ^c	Air,steam
Fission Product Release (% of inventory)							
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)	-	-	99	-	82	63	-
Sr (elemental)	-	-	3	-	34	6	1
Ba (elemental)	-	19	30	27	76	33	4
Sn (clad)	-	94	76	0.63	-	-	-
Mo (elemental)	43	86	77	6.9	2.3	12.6	-
Ce-144	-	-	<0.2	-	2.0	-	-

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

2.1.2. CEA-CENG Experiments

Fission-product and structural material releases from PWR fuel specimens have been studied in out-reactor experiments by the CEA-CENG.^[32-37] 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. The temperature of the impactor was varied in the HEVA tests (but not in the VERCORS test series). 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/H₂ and pure H₂ have been used as the environments for the HEVA tests. Table 5 details the HEVA test conditions and fission product release results.

Table 5: CEA Grenoble HEVA series test conditions and results

Test characteristic	Test number							
	HEVA-1	HEVA-2	HEVA-3	HEVA-4	HEVA-5	HEVA-6	HEVA-7	HEVA-8
Specimen source, reactor ^a	CAP/2	CAP/2	BR3	Fes 1/2	Fes 1/2	Fes 1/2		Fes 1/2
Fuel burnup (GWd/MgU)	19.4	19.4	27.7	36.7	36.7	36.7		36.7
Test temperature (K)	1900	2140	2070	2270	2070	2370	2070	2070
Test temperature plateau (s)	900	900	1800	420	5760	1800	1800	600
Flow rate (mg/s)								
H ₂	0	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.5	0.5
H ₂ O	100	30	37	30	30	0	25	25
Fission Product Release (% of inventory)								
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 ^b
Sb-125	1	41	20	18	-	0 (Sb127)	-	15 ^b
Mo-99	-	-	-	21	55	~4	-	16 ^b
Eu-154	-	~15	<3	-	-	~5	-	-
Ce-144	-	9 ^b	<3.2	-	-	0 (Ce143)	-	-
Ru-106	-	5 ^b	<1.5	-	-	0 (Ru105)	-	-
Ba-140	-	-	-	5.6	-	27	-	6 ^b

a. Reactor: Fes = Fessenheim; b. detection limit

The VERCORS program was an extension of the HEVA tests from 1989 to 1994 using a modified apparatus and augmented instrumentation. The fuel sample consisted of three spent PWR pellets with two half pellets of depleted uranium placed at either end which were held in place by crimping the cladding so that the fuel specimens were not fully sealed. In most of the more recent tests in the HEVA-VERCORS program, the fuel specimens were re-irradiated in the SILOE or OSIRIS research reactors after a period of decay following discharge from the power reactor, which permits detection of short-lived fission products such as I, Te, Mo, Ba and La. Six tests were completed in the VERCORS program to study volatile fission product behaviour up to a maximum temperature of 2620 K. Extensive post-test gamma scanning (including gamma tomography) were completed after each test. Test conditions and results from the VERCORS test series are detailed in Table 6.

Post-test gamma scanning enabled a complete fission product mass balance. The VERCORS program confirmed a nearly total release of such volatile species as Cs, I, Te and Sb. Their release kinetics are very sensitive to the environment oxygen potential; however, the Te and Sb fission product were observed to be trapped in the unoxidized cladding although their level of release eventually reached that of the other volatiles. Furthermore, their release kinetics is also sensitive to fuel type (UO₂, MOX) and burnup. The semi-volatile fission products included Mo, Pd, Tc, Rh and Ba, whose chemical forms inhibit their release to nearly half that of the volatiles, exhibiting a sensitivity to the atmospheric conditions. Interaction between these group members and the sample burnup can affect the release of some of these species. Ba can be trapped by the Zr in the cladding and Mo can react with Cs reducing its volatility. The Mo release was observed to increase in oxidizing conditions (e.g., 92% release in VERCORS 5 versus only 47% in VERCORS 4) while, in contrast, Ba and Rh releases increased in reducing conditions (e.g., 45 and 80% of Rh and Ba, respectively, in VERCORS 4 as compared with only 20 and 55% in

VERCORS 5). The low-volatile fission product and actinide species consisted of Ru, Nb, Sr, Y, La, Ce, Eu, U, Np, and Pu with releases between 0.2 and 17%. An increase in sample burnup was shown to enhance the release of some members of this group. Also, their releases are sensitive to the environmental oxygen potential despite the observation of no clear enhancement in release for Np, Ce and Ru (VERCORS 4 and 5). Ru releases are known to be significantly enhanced in air.^[68]

Table 6: CEA Grenoble VERCORS series test conditions and results

Test characteristic	Test Number					
	VERCORS-1	VERCORS-2	VERCORS-3	VERCORS-4	VERCORS-5	VERCORS-6
Date of test	11-1989	06-1990	04-1992	06-1993	11-1993	09-1994
Specimen source, reactor	Fessenheim	Bugey	Bugey	Bugey	Bugey	Gravelines
Fuel burnup (GWd/MgU)	42.9	38.3	38.3	28.3	38.3	54.8
Reirradiation (Siloe)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Test temperature (K)	2130	2150	2570	2570	2570	2620
Test temperature plateau (min)	17	13	15	30	30	30
Atmosphere (end of test)	Mixed H ₂ O+H ₂	Mixed H ₂ O+H ₂	Mixed H ₂ O+H ₂	Hydrogen	Steam	Mixed H ₂ O+H ₂
Flow rate (g/min)						
H ₂	0.15	1.5	1.5	1.5-0	1.5	1.5
H ₂ O	0.003	0.027	0.03	0.01230	0	0.03
Time at last plateau (min)	17	13	15		30	30
Fission Product Release (% of inventory)				86		
Xenon	33	23	77	87	87	100
Iodine	30	23	70	93	93	97
Cesium	42	30	70	100	93	97
Tellurium	4	18	76	97	>98	97
Antimony	2	7	69	47	98	96
Molybdenum		15	42	47	92	79
Barium	4	4	13	80	55	28
Rhodium			0.52	45	20	4
Yttrium			17	<6		
Strontium				<5	<6	<6
Europium			<6	7	<3	<4
Ruthenium			0.36	6	6	0.6
Cerium				6	<3	0.2
Neptunium	0.006	0.016	0.4	<3	<4	0.3
Lanthanum			<4	<3	<3	<3
Zirconium					<4	<4
Niobium				2		0.3
Uranium ^a				0.2	2	
Plutonium ^{da}					0.2	

a. Approximate values from ICPOES measurements of aerosols on impactor plates, corrected with ¹³⁷Cs measurements

There was no significant releases of the non-volatile fission products of Zr, Nd and Pr under the temperature range studied in the VERCORS 1 to 6 experiments. In the VERCORS 6 test performed with high burnup fuel, although early fuel collapse and partial liquid corium was observed, there was no significant enhancement in release, where the liquid phase retained a fraction of semi and low-volatile fission products. There were similar problems due to flow bypass in the VERCORS tests as for the ORNL tests with the control of the environment (atmospheric conditions) and measurement of the oxygen potential.

From 1996 to 2002, the VERCORS (High Temperature) HT and RT (Release of Transuranics) program in Table 7 was carried out to improve the database and to study the release of fission products and actinides during the later phase of an accident with the occurrence of fuel liquefaction.^[36,37] This program also provided information on the release behaviour of fission products as influenced by the nature of the fuel type (UO₂ versus MOX), the morphology of the fuel (intact pellets versus debris fragments), the effect of fuel burnup, the impact of control materials (Ag, In, Cd and boric oxide) and the influence of the environmental sequence of the accident (oxidizing or reducing conditions). In the more severe VERCORS HT and RT test series, Nb and La have been observed to be released more readily from the fuel. These latter tests also investigated the temperature of fuel collapse, which occurred over a temperature range of 2400 to 2600 K for fuel burnups of 47-70 GWd/tU, which is about 500 K below the melting temperature of UO₂. The observed differences may be explained by the stoichiometric change of the fuel samples during the tests.

Table 7: CEA Grenoble VERCORS HT-RT text matrix parameters

Test characteristic	Test Number										
	HT-1	HT-3	HT-2	RT-1	RT-2	RT-5	RT-4	RT-3	RT-7	RT-6	RT-8
Date of test	June 1996	June 2001	Apr 2002	Mar 1998	Apr 1998	Dec 1998	June 1999	Nov 1999	Apr 2000	Sept 2002	Nov 2002
Fuel	UO ₂	UO ₂	UO ₂	UO ₂	MOX	UO ₂	UO ₂ /ZrO ₂ debris bed	UO ₂ debris bed	MOX	UO ₂	UO ₂
Fuel burnup (GWd/tU)	49.4	49.3	47.7	47.3	45.6	61	37.6	39	43	71.8Osiris	70
Reirradiation	Siloe	Osiris	Osiris	No	No	Osiris	No	Osiris	Osiris	s	Osiris
Test temperature (K)	2900	2680	2423	2570	2440	~ 2970	2520	2970	2890	2473	2650
Flow rate (g/min)											
H ₂	0.012	0.012	0	0.027	0.027	0.027	0.024	0.075	0.012	0.027	0
H ₂ O	1.5 - 0	1.5 - 0	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5 - 0	0.876	0.075	0	1.5	0
Air	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.048
Main objective	H ₂ atm., high temperature, HT reference test	Boric oxide and SIC injection	Boric oxide and SIC injection	RT reference test	MOX fuel	High burnup	Phebus FPT4 support	Fuel volatilization	MOX fuel	High burnup fuel	High burnup fuel/air injection
Fission Product Release (% of inventory)											
Xenon											
Iodine	100						>96	100			
Cesium	100						55	100			
Tellurium	100						89	60 - 95			
Antimony	100						100	33	7		
Molybdenum	49	33	100	70	53		50	93	64		
Barium	49	85	38				45	16			
Paladium				34	42		42				
Technitium				21	11		>70				
Rhodium											
Yttrium											
Strontium							1				
Europium	9	11	1				<1.5	~1 - 2			
Ruthenium	8	6	65		5.4		<1.5	~1 - 2	2	28	17
Cerium	5	0.8	1	~1 - 2	~1 - 2		<1.5	~1 - 2	14		
Neptunium	7										
Lanthanum	8	13	5								
Zirconium	8						1	~1			
Niobium	9	18	10					40		high	
Uranium							10	2			
Plutonium							0.1				

In summary, the VERCORS tests have shown that release kinetic of the volatile species is sensitive to the environment oxygen potential, burn-up and fuel type.

2.1.3. AECL-CRL Experiments

Six different types of furnaces have been used in experiments at AECL-CRL, depending on the temperature range and size of specimen. For all experiments, monitoring and control of the gas environment have been a priority in order to determine the oxygen potential of the atmosphere. One of the key features of the AECL program has been on-line measurement of the oxygen potential in the gas stream, which allows for the fuel oxidation kinetics to be calculated.^[69] 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.^[70] A second spectrometer is used to monitor activity in the exhaust gas swept out of the furnace.^[71]

The fuel specimens include UO₂ fragments (0.2-1.5 g each) that were extracted from irradiated fuel elements after discharge and subsequent cutting. These tests provided information on fission-product release from bare UO₂ 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 the ends of the samples to exclude the surrounding atmosphere from direct contact with the UO_2 .

More than 300 annealing tests of fission product release from clad and unclad irradiated fuel samples have been conducted at temperatures from 800 to 2350 K in Ar/H_2 , steam and air atmospheres.^[68-78] Table 8 details the test conditions and key results from a selected number of CRL tests. 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 . 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. The release rates of volatile fission products from clad fuel samples after complete clad oxidation are almost independent of temperature in the range 1670 to 2140 K.^[75] In more recent experiments with Zircaloy-clad segments, in addition to release from the fuel, deposition and transport of fission products have been studied.^[79,80] This work shows that releases of volatile fission products (Kr, Xe, I, Cs and Te) are relatively low in inert or reducing atmospheres but increase significantly after clad oxidation in oxidizing atmospheres. In some of the high temperature tests on unclad fuel samples, large fractions of the UO_2 fuel was volatilized in highly oxidizing environments, leading to releases of low-volatile fission products (e.g., Zr, La, Ba, Ce, Pr, Eu) via a “matrix stripping” process, where these products are normally soluble in the UO_2 .^[72,73] The low-volatile fission products released in hydrogen-rich atmospheres (Eu, Ba, etc.) are different from those released in steam (Mo, Ru, Nb, etc.) due to chemical effects on the fission product volatility. 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 .^[34,73,77] 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.^[78]

Table 8: CRL selected test conditions and results

Test characteristic	Test number							
	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	Segment
Fuel burnup (MWh/kgU)	257	257	257	457	457	544	457	370
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	$\text{Ar}/2\%\text{H}_2$	Air	Steam	Steam	Steam	Air	Steam
Fission Product Release (% of inventory)								
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	1.0	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

a. Bare fragment of UO_2 ; b. Isotope was not present in fuel at time of test; c. Zircaloy-sheathed section of a fuel element (2-5 cm long)

3. Degraded Core Accident Phenomena

The important melting and chemical interaction temperatures which result in the formation of liquid phases during severe accident conditions in LWRs are shown in Fig. 2. Depending on the accident sequence, the important physico-chemical material behaviour in Pressurized Water Reactors include:^[41,47]

- (i) melting of the Ag-In-Cd absorber alloy at ~1073 K (and, on melting of the stainless steel alloy cladding of the control rod at 1720 K, chemical interactions with the Zircaloy guide tube and fuel rod cladding),
- (ii) plastic deformation and bursting of the cladding at ~1020 to 1370 K (depending on the system pressure),
- (iii) steam oxidation of structural materials (e.g., stainless steel and Inconel) and fuel rod materials (e.g., Zircaloy and UO_2) at ~1470 K, leading to a rapid temperature escalation and the possibility for fuel rod fragmentation,

- (iv) eutectic interactions of Zircaloy with stainless steel (e.g., control rod cladding) and/or Inconel (e.g., grid spacers) at 1573 K, interaction of Zircaloy with UO_2 (with hard solid contact) below ~ 1770 K, and melting of stainless steel or Inconel by ~ 1720 K,
- (v) melting of the as received metallic Zircaloy-4 cladding (2030 K) or the metallic oxygen-stabilized $\alpha\text{-Zr(O)}$ phase (2245 K),
- (vi) reduction of the UO_2 fuel due to interactions with solid and/or molten metallic Zircaloy (i.e., starting at 2030 K), resulting in a partial dissolution of UO_2 with the formation of a metallic Zr-U-O melt (containing ceramic $(\text{U,Zr})\text{O}_{2-x}$ precipitations at higher oxygen concentrations),
- (vii) relocation of the liquid and solid materials with formation of immiscible metallic and ceramic melts in different parts of the reactor core (>2030 K),
- (viii) melting of the ZrO_2 (2960 K) and UO_2 (3120 K) forming a ceramic melt.

In general, as a consequence of these temperature-dependent phenomena, the core melt will propagate with increasing temperature. It will initiate with the melting of the Ag-In-Cd absorber alloy at ~ 1073 K. With any localized contact between stainless steel and Zircaloy, liquid phases can form around ~ 1420 to 1570 K (initiating liquefaction of both the Inconel grid spacer and absorber rod materials). With failure of the absorber cladding, the molten absorber alloy can come into contact with the Zircaloy of the guide tube and surrounding fuel rods resulting in a chemical destruction of the Zircaloy cladding, and further localized damage as the molten alloy relocates. At temperatures above ~ 1470 K, the rapid steam oxidation of Zircaloy and stainless steel produces a significant temperature escalation, yielding peak temperatures over 2270 K. When the remaining metallic Zircaloy and/or $\alpha\text{-Zr(O)}$ starts to melt (~ 2030 to 2270 K), the solid UO_2 may be chemically dissolved and hence liquefied ~ 1000 K below its melting temperature. Metallic and ceramic melts can then develop and relocate, forming blockages on solidification, which lead to extended core damage. With the melting of the fuel and oxidized cladding from ~ 2870 to 3120 K, a ceramic melt will form with a complete meltdown of the core itself.




Figure 2. (a) Severe accident melting and chemical interaction temperatures and (b) growth rates of various reaction couples of reactor material components (Zry = Zircaloy-4 and ss = stainless steel (AISI 316)). (Taken from Ref. 47.)

3.1 Comparison of Integral Experiments

Many of the physical and chemical processes identified in Section 3.0 have been identified in separate-effects tests, out-of-pile and in-pile integral severe fuel damage experiments, and the TMI-2 core material examinations. All of the integral tests and TMI-2 core examination indicate that the core melt progression is a non-coherent process which takes place over various locations and a considerable period of time. In particular, the small-scale tests that were terminated while melts are still forming and relocating show evidence of multiple melt relocation and oxidation events.

Although various pressures can result depending on the accident scenario, core melt progression phenomena do not vary greatly with pressure as evidenced from the fission-driven experiments (i.e., Phebus FPT-0 and FPT-1 tests were conducted at a relatively low pressure of ~ 0.2 MPa and the PBF SFD tests near ~ 7 MPa), the decay-driven LOFT FP-2 experiment (at ~ 1 MPa), the electrically-heated CORA experiments (from ~ 0.2 to 1 MPa), as well as the TMI accident (with most core damage resulting between 5 and 15 MPa).^[42] In the higher-pressure CORA-9 test (at 1 MPa), no full-length clad collapse was observed, and the flowering behaviour of the fuel rods was not substantially different from the lower-pressure tests.^[29] However, ballooning of the cladding and clad failure is enhanced at low pressure where such failure occurred relatively early, even with trace-irradiated fuel, in the Phebus FPT-0 test at ~ 1008 K. The release of the gap inventory on clad failure was measured in the PBF-SFD tests, LOFT FP-2 test and Phebus FP tests.

Numerous experiments at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL),^[81] Kernforschungszentrum Karlsruhe (KfK),^[29,41,47] U.K. Atomic Energy Establishment (AEE) Winfrith,^[82] and Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL)^[40] have been conducted to investigate the degradation behaviour of Ag-In-Cd control rods during severe accident conditions. As indicated in Fig. 2(a), the Ag-In-Cd alloy melts between 1070 and 1120 K (i.e., $\sim 800^\circ\text{C}$). Although the molten absorber rod alloy is chemically stable with the stainless steel cladding, these experiments indicate that at low system pressures, the control rod can fail as a consequence of localized physical contact between the stainless steel clad and the Zircaloy guide tube, which leads to chemical interaction and a liquid phase around 1420 K.^[40,47] Such contact arises from the ballooning of the stainless steel cladding due to the high vapour pressure of cadmium. After failure of the absorber rod cladding, the molten absorber alloy is forcibly ejected from the control rod by the high cadmium vapour pressure.^[40] As shown in the CORA tests, this molten material can therefore contact the Zircaloy guide tube and chemically dissolve it, as well as the Zircaloy cladding of the surrounding fuel rods it comes in contact with, well below the melting point of Zircaloy (~ 2030 K).^[29] In particular, as shown in Fig. 2(b), separate effects tests have demonstrated that at temperatures greater than 1470 K, the chemical interaction of Ag-In-Cd and Zircaloy will result in a sudden and complete liquefaction,^[83] with the further possibility of low-temperature UO_2 fuel dissolution. The relocating Ag-In-Cd alloy will therefore propagate and enhance core-melt progression at a relatively low temperature. On the other hand, at high system pressures, the control rods with Zircaloy guide tubes will fail at a higher temperature when the stainless steel melting point is reached (~ 1720 K). In fact, in the low-pressure Phebus tests FPT-0 and FPT-1, the control rod failure occurred at ~ 1390 K and 1620 K, respectively, (as detected by an activity release of $^{116\text{m}}\text{In}$) below the melting point of the stainless steel as consistent with the low-pressure scenario.

Metallic melts result from interactions of spacer grids, fuel rod cladding and control materials which flow down until a location is reached where the temperature is low enough for solidification to occur forming a partial metallic blockage. Metallic blockages have been observed in earlier in-pile experiments (e.g., PBF SFD 1-1 and 1-4 tests, LOFT FP-2 test, DF-4 test), the out-of-pile CORA tests, the TMI-2 reactor accident and Phebus FP tests. The spacer grid can particularly trap debris if it is at a temperature below the freezing point of the relocating melt.^[42] In the PBF SFD experiments and TMI-2 accident, the blockage formed just below the coolant level. On the other hand, in experimental tests where liquid coolant is not present in the bundle (i.e., LOFT FP2, Phebus FP and CORA), such blockages result in the lower (cooler) regions of the bundle. In particular, the freezing temperatures of the melt range from ~ 1070 K for the Ag-In-Cd alloy to 1220 K for the Zr-Fe eutectic, 1230 K for the Zr-Ni eutectic and elemental silver, 1420 K for the Fe-C eutectic and 1460 K for the Zr-Ag eutectic.^[42] The metallic blockages formed in the various integral tests are similar to those formed in the TMI-2 accident but are not as extensive since the experiments were of shorter duration.^[84] Silver and alloys of silver and zirconium are found in the lower blockages of the test bundles of the PBF SFD 1-4 test and LOFT FP-2 test, and in the TMI core. Similarly, control rod material has been identified at the bottom of the bundles in the Phebus tests, FPT-0 and FPT-1, frozen in between the fuel rods. Moreover, a post-irradiation metallographic examination of the FPT-0 bundle indicated that the liquid

Ag-In material had relocated to the lower part of the bundle, whereas most of the Cd was volatilized on account of its high vapour pressure. The composition of this material, i.e., Zr (20 to 40 wt%), Ag (10 to 50 wt%), In (10 to 40 wt%), U (less than 15 wt%), O (less than 10 wt%) and stainless steel (less than 5 wt%), clearly showed an attack of the Zircaloy cladding by the molten Ag-In-Cd alloy and limited fuel dissolution.^[20] These results indicate the role that the control rod plays in the early formation of melts during a reactor accident.

The oxidation of the Zircaloy cladding by steam can result in accelerated heatup rates ≥ 10 K/s at temperatures above ~ 1500 to 1700 K, depending on steam availability, due to the exothermic nature of the reaction (6.45 kJ/g Zr oxidized). Such heatup rates have been seen in several in-pile tests (e.g., PBF SFD tests and the LOFT FP-2 test) and out-pile tests (e.g., CORA tests).^[29,42] Similar observations were made in the Phebus FP tests. The heatup rate is important since it can influence the in-vessel melt propagation. For instance, a lower rate of ~ 1 K/s can permit the solid ZrO_2 layer that is formed during heatup to contain molten Zircaloy, resulting in some UO_2 dissolution, whereas this layer may be too thin at a higher heatup rate (> 5 K/s) to contain the molten Zircaloy after which mechanical or chemical breach can result in a relocation of this molten material.^[47] Heavy oxidation for instance was observed in the post irradiation examination near the top of the FPT-0 bundle at ~ 0.9 m, with the occurrence of significant fuel dissolution by the molten Zircaloy and stainless steel cladding of the absorber rod and upper plug.^[20]

The majority of the hydrogen generation in the Phebus FPT-0 and FPT-1 tests occurred during the runaway oxidative phase. This result is principally attributed to steam availability. The Zircaloy oxidation and hydrogen generation behaviour observed in the fission-driven experiments (PBF-ST and Phebus FPT-0 and FPT-1) and decay-driven experiments (LOFT FP-2) are compared in Table 9.

Table 9: Summary of Zircaloy Oxidation and Hydrogen Generation Behaviour in Various In-Pile Experiments^a

Test	Oxidation of Zircaloy (%)	Time (s)	Partitioning of H_2 Generation (%)	
			Before Reflood	After Reflood
LOFT FP-2	49 ^b	~ 300 ($T \geq 1700$ K)	20	80
PBF-ST	75 ^b	~ 600 ($T \geq 1700$ K)	77	23
Phebus FPT-0	85 ^c	~ 1200 ^d	82 ^e	-
Phebus FPT-1	68 ^c	~ 900 ^d	91 ^e	-

a. Adapted from Ref. 44.

b. Based on total bundle inventory of Zircaloy cladding, shroud inner liner and Zircaloy guide tubes.

c. Total bundle zirconium mass not including Zircaloy support plate.

d. Time duration of the oxidation phase. For FPT-0, the bundle remained over 2200 K for ~ 6000 s.

e. Fraction of H_2 generation up to the end of the runaway oxidative phase (~ 13000 s for FPT-0 and ~ 12000 s for FPT-1).

More extensive oxidation, and a correspondingly greater degree of hydrogen partitioning before reflood, is noted for the PBF-ST and Phebus FP tests due to the combined effects of a highly steam-rich environment and a relatively longer time available for oxidation during the experiment. A large fraction of the bundle inventory of the LOFT FP-2 bundle was available for subsequent oxidation during reflooding. The latter data demonstrate that significant H_2 generation can be expected during reflooding, which is largely dependent on the degree of prior oxidation and reflood thermalhydraulic conditions. Without the occurrence of a significant Zircaloy-oxidation event (and hence exothermic chemical heatup) on reflood, there is also less fission product release on cooldown in the Phebus FP tests compared to that observed in the LOFT FP-2 test. The slightly enhanced fission product release in the Phebus FP tests presumably resulted from molten pool movement with a local heatup of some of the partial fuel rods in the lower bundle locations.

As previously mentioned in Section 3, UO_2 and ZrO_2 are rapidly dissolved by the molten Zircaloy cladding significantly below the melting points of the UO_2 and ZrO_2 (see Fig. 2).^[85-93] For instance, $\sim 45\%$ of the fuel in the TMI-2 core was liquefied in the accident,^[94] while smaller amounts were observed in the integral tests including 15 to 18% in the four PBF SFD tests and 15% in the LOFT FP-2 test.^[42] The Phebus FP tests, however, were more severe in which $\sim 20\%$ of the fuel bundle was liquefied in FPT-1 and up to 50% in FPT-0.^[20,21] This dissolved material is able to relocate downwards to the cooler parts of the core to form channel blockages, i.e., as this material

relocates, it is oxidized by the steam and can accumulate more mass with incorporation of solid UO_2 and ZrO_2 debris into the melt. Eventually, ceramic blockages will form at cooler locations, where a separation between this material blockage and the metallic one results since the ceramic $(\text{U,Zr})\text{O}_2$ melt freezes at a higher temperature of ~ 2800 K (and hence higher elevation). The accumulating ceramic material on top of the metallic blockage also has a poorer heat transfer because of the diversion of steam around the blockage and the relatively low thermal conductivity of the ceramic. Consequently, with either decay heating from remaining fission products (e.g., as occurred in the TMI-2 reactor) or increased fission/electrical heating in the integral experiments, the ceramic material will heat up, forming a molten pool within a ceramic crust (see Fig. 3). The smaller accumulations of ceramic melts in most of the integral tests represented earlier stages of molten pool formation. The observed fuel damage in the more severe integral test of Phebus FPT-0 is consistent with that observed in the TMI-2 accident where there is a molten pool under a cavity which is surrounded by a uranium-rich crust (see Fig. 3).

Examination of the formerly molten pool in the TMI-2 core revealed that the pool is principally made of $(\text{U,Zr})\text{O}_2$, containing transition metal oxides of Cr_2O_3 and Fe_3O_4 in the grain boundaries.^[95] The melting point of the pure $(\text{U,Zr})\text{O}_2$ ceramic is 2800 K, however, as found in the TMI-2 examination, the transition metal oxides can react eutectically with ZrO_2 and lower the liquidus temperature of the ceramic melt by about ~ 100 K.^[96] Similarly, the molten pool of the Phebus FPT-0 test had an average composition of U (62 wt%), Zr (22 wt%) and O (14 wt%),




Figure 3. Schematic of the end-state configuration of the damaged TMI-2 core. (Taken from Refs. 42 and 84.)

with smaller amounts of Fe (~ 0.6 wt%) (typically as a second phase inclusion or grain boundary precipitate), and traces of Y and Ce from melt interaction with the shroud.^[20] This composition corresponded to $(\text{U}_{0.51}, \text{Zr}_{0.46}, \text{Fe}_{0.03})\text{O}_{2\pm x}$ in a $(\text{U,Zr})\text{O}_2$ lattice. The melting point of the molten pool in the Phebus FPT-0 test is in good agreement (~ 2720 K) with that estimated for TMI-2 (~ 2700 K).^[97]

The ceramic crust in the TMI-2 accident failed by thermo-mechanical loading in which 20 tonnes of melt flowed into the lower plenum (see Fig. 3).^[42] It is also possible during the later stages of a severe accident for the ceramic crust surrounding the pool to thin, weaken and fail although most of the integral tests have been terminated too early during their high-temperature phase for such late-phase behaviour to occur. However, in the Phebus FPT-0 test, a downward motion of the molten pool from the lower grid spacer position (i.e., at 0.20 to 0.30 m) was observed at ~ 18100 s.^[20] In fact, as evidenced in the destructive examination and chemical analysis, two main mixtures resulted

near the bottom of the bundle, corresponding to metallic material from the control rod/cladding interaction and the previous molten ceramic that had also been observed higher up at the lower grid position.^[20] At the time of this movement, there was an induced steam redistribution in the external gap of the shroud due to an increased flow blockage, an increase in the lower bundle temperature, an increase in reactivity (due to a possible hafnium movement with the melt mixture to the bottom of the bundle), and an increased aerosol release as detected by the on-line monitoring indicating a mixing of the molten pool with the lower part of the bundle.^[20] This behaviour is similar to that observed in the MP experiments.^[52,53] In these latter experiments, the ceramic pool is contained by a crust in the ceramic ($\text{UO}_2\text{-ZrO}_2$) particulate debris bed with local crust melting and refreezing occurring in the debris bed as the crust and pool grew. Although the ceramic crust in the MP experiments had migrated into the fuel rod stubs, it did not fail.

In the TMI-2 accident, a debris bed was formed on top of the molten pool and in the lower plenum region (see Fig. 3).^[16] An upper debris bed was also observed in the SFD-ST^[6] and LOFT FP-2^[98,99] tests when coolant was introduced into the hot bundle, resulting in a thermal shock and fragmentation of the oxidized fuel rods. In less steam-rich transients, however, as seen for example in the SFD 1-4^[9,10] and Phebus FPT tests^[20,21], a debris bed in the upper part of the bundle of decladded fuel and fragments was formed by the melting (as enhanced by interactions from structural and control rod materials) and relocation of the Zircaloy fuel rod cladding.

4. Fission Product Release Behaviour

The fission product release behaviour under severe accident conditions has been reviewed for in-pile (integral-effects) experiments (e.g., ST tests, STEP tests, PBF SFD tests, FLHT tests and LOFT FP-2 test) and the TMI-2 examination,^[45,84] and more recently for out-of-pile annealing tests (e.g., HI, VI, HEVA, VERCORS and annealing experiments at the CRL) used to investigate single-effects behaviour (see, for example, Table 10 and Table 11).^[35] The non-coherent nature of the melt progression as detailed in Section 3.0 generally masks the individual release mechanisms. As such, complementary separate-effects experiments were performed in the out-of-pile Vercors program (i.e., Vercors 1-6 and Vercors HT1-3 and RT 1-8) to provide additional information in order to help interpret the in-reactor results.^[37]

The fission product releases from the in-pile PBF tests (i.e., SFD-ST (steam-rich), SFD 1-1 (steam-starved) and SFD 1-4 (steam-starved)) and Phebus FPT-1 test (steam-rich) are compared to those in the TMI-2 accident in Table 11. These results indicate very low release fractions for cerium and actinides (typically <0.01%); ruthenium, strontium, and antimony generally less than one percent; barium less than a few percent; molybdenum up to 50%; similar volatile release behaviour of iodine, cesium and noble gases up to ~90%; and tellurium between 1 to 83%. These findings are also consistent with those observed for the annealing experiments in Section 2.1.^[35] However, there is a difference for the barium release between the in-reactor Phebus FPT-0 and FPT-1 experiment (~1%) and the ORNL and VERCORS annealing tests (>40%) (see Table 10 and Table 11).¹⁰⁰ A qualitative thermochemical analysis suggests that this difference may be due to: (i) the short duration of the temperature escalation in the in-pile tests, where there is no “high temperature plateau” as in the annealing tests but rather a temperature escalation due to the formation of a molten pool in the Phebus experiment; and (ii) the presence of a significant amount of ZrO_2 in the fuel melt (~47 mol%) as well small amounts of iron oxide in the in-reactor test which can reduce the volatility of Ba.¹⁰⁰ Moreover, thermochemical calculations with the GEMINI2 code specifically suggests that the Ba vapor pressure is reduced in the solidus-liquidus transition zone in the U-Ba-O phase diagram (~2400-3100 K).¹⁰⁰

As indicated in Table 11, the tellurium release is dependent on the extent of Zircaloy oxidation, where large releases occur when the Zircaloy cladding is nearly completely oxidized. Although tellurium is released from the fuel on heatup, it will chemically react with the Zircaloy cladding and become trapped.^[101-104] During Zircaloy oxidation, the tin constituent in the cladding is segregated as a thin band in the zirconium oxide layer, which advances with the metal/oxide interface, because of its lower solubility in the oxide than in the metal. After complete oxidation, there is a production of elemental tellurium and zirconium oxide from reaction of zirconium telluride with oxygen; however, as a consequence of the tin segregation process, an enhanced formation of SnTe ultimately leads to a release of tellurium. A SnTe compound has in fact been observed by Collins et al. under accident conditions.^[105] Only at high oxygen partial pressures, which are above the equilibrium value of Sn/SnO_2 , will tellurium be released in its elemental form. This delayed release behaviour for tellurium has been observed in numerous annealing experiments.^[31,33,35,45,106]

Table 10: Conditions and Ba release data for ORNL (HI and VI) and CEA (HEVA, VERCORS and VERCORS HT) annealing tests and Phebus tests^a

Test	Temperature (K)	Duration (min)	Atmosphere	Ba release (%)
HI-4	2200	20	H ₂ O	<1
HI-5	2025	23	H ₂ O	<1
VI-2	2300	60	H ₂ O	19
VI-3	2700	20	H ₂ O	30
VI-4	2440	20	H ₂	27
VI-5	2720	20	H ₂	76
HEVA-4	2270	7	H ₂ O+ H ₂	6
HEVA-6	2370	30	H ₂	27
VERCORS-1	2130	17	H ₂ O+ H ₂	4
VERCORS-4	2570	30	H ₂	80
VERCORS-5	2570	30	H ₂ O	55
VERCORS HT-1	3070	7	H ₂	49
Phebus FPT-0	~2700	-	H ₂ O/H ₂	1
Phebus FPT-1	~2500	-	H ₂ O/H ₂	1

a. Taken from Refs. 25 and 100.

Table 11: Comparison of Fission Product Release Fractions from In- and Out-Pile Experiments and TMI-2^a

Element and Experimental Conditions	Fission Product Release Fractions (%)									
	PBF Experiments			Phebus		TMI-2	Annealing ORNL and VI tests			
	SFD-ST	SFD 1-1	SFD 1-4	FPT-0	FTP-1		VI-3	VI-5	VERCORS-4	VERCORS-5
T _{max} (K)	2800	2800	2800	~2870	2500	2800	2700	2720	2570	2570
Atmosphere	H ₂ O	H ₂ O	H ₂ O	H ₂ O/H ₂	H ₂ O/H ₂	H ₂ O/H ₂	H ₂ O	H ₂	H ₂	H ₂ O
Krypton, xenon	50	2.6 – 9.3	23 – 52	96	77	54	100	100	86	87
Iodine	51	12	24	100	87	55	79	70	87	93
Cesium	32	9	39 – 51	84	84	55	100	100	93	93
Tellurium	40	1	3	100	83	6	99	82	100	>98
Barium	1.1	0.6	0.8	1	1		30	76	80	55
Strontium	0.002		0.88			0.1				
Antimony			0.13	62	31	0.16	99	18	97	98
Ruthenium	0.03	0.02	0.007	4	1	0.5	5	0	7	6
Cerium	0.0002	0.009	0.013			0.01				
Europium			0.08			<0.1				
Zirconium/niobium					<1					
Molybdenum				No data	56		77	2	47	92
Actinides			<0.001		<1					
Zirconium oxidized (%)	75 ^b	28	38 ^b	85	68	45 ^b				
Fuel Melted (%)	15	16	18	50	20	45				
Test Environment	Steam-rich	Steam-starved	Steam-starved	Steam-rich	Steam-rich	Steam-rich	Steam-rich	Steam-starved	Steam-starved	Steam-rich
Fuel Burnup (GWd/tU)	Trace	Trace	29 – 42	Fresh	23	3	44	47	38	38

(a) Adapted from Refs. 25 and 45. (b) Test bundle inventory (core inventory for TMI-2) taken from Ref. 44.

Comparison of the volatile releases in Table 11 for the comparable tests, PBF SFD 1-1 and 1-4, indicate that the release is enhanced in high-burnup fuel compared to trace-irradiated fuel because of the presence of grain boundary tunnels that serve as pathways for gaseous release. Enhanced release rates (due to fuel morphology) occur primarily during the initial heatup, while this difference diminishes afterwards (i.e., above ~2200 K), where releases are now dominated by dissolution of the fuel by the molten Zircaloy cladding.^[45] Interestingly, in the Phebus FPT-1 test, the two fresh (instrumented) fuel rods underwent considerably less damage than the 18 irradiated fuel rods.^[19] Significant swelling also occurred in the irradiated fuel rods (~22%) but not the fresh fuel rods from the buildup of gaseous fission products. The ST, FLHT and VI tests have shown that significant swelling occur when fuel rods are subjected to high temperature in a reducing environment. The large swelling observed in Phebus FPT-1 implies that similar conditions probably existed during this test.

Release rates of volatile fission products were large during the temperature escalations in the PBF SFD 1-1 and 1-4 tests and the Phebus FPT-0 test. The highest mass flow rates of aerosol and fission products (i.e., ^{131}I , ^{139}Xe , ^{140}Xe , ^{90}Kr and ^{92}Kr), as well as structural materials (such as tin, silver and indium), detected in the Phebus FPT-0 test were observed at about 12000 s when a peak temperature of $\sim 2770\text{ K}$ was reached at a bundle elevation of 0.7 m. Significant tellurium release also occurred in both Phebus FP tests because of the extent of cladding oxidation. Although antimony like tellurium is readily released from the fuel during heatup in a severe accident, a lower release is observed since the antimony most likely sequesters in metallic melts (as it alloys with other metals such as nickel and silver).^[45] The oxygen potential (dictated by the hydrogen to steam ratio in the gas atmosphere) plays an important role, principally in the release characteristics of the low-volatile fission products.^[35] Indeed, only small releases of barium and strontium were observed in the steam experiments of Table 11 as the prevailing atmosphere typically hindered the formation of the more volatile metallic species but favoured low-volatility oxides and hydroxides;^[107] in fact, releases for these species occurred in the Phebus FPT-0 test during the temperature escalation phase when hydrogen generation was at a maximum.^[20] This observation is consistent with the in-pile ACRR ST experiments, where higher releases of several percent for barium and strontium, and up to 15% for europium, were observed in a reducing environment which would promote higher-volatile metallic forms of these species.^[2] These results are also supported by those from the out-of-pile SASCHA experiment at KfK,^[108] and the VI, HEVA and VERCORS annealing tests.^[31,33,35] Since ruthenium has the highest oxygen potential of all fission products, the higher-volatile oxides cannot form for the given steam-hydrogen mixtures of the experiments in Table 11 or in the TMI-2 accident. The formation of uranium-bearing vapour species (e.g., UO_3) depends roughly on the square root of the oxygen partial pressure.^[107,109] Fuel release in Table 11 is therefore small for the given conditions of the integral experiments and the TMI-2 accident since only a small amount of hydrogen is required to significantly lower the oxygen partial pressure, and hence partial pressure of the uranium bearing species.

With the occurrence of fuel liquefaction, the crystal structure of the UO_2 is destroyed so that the release of fission products will be governed by atom and bubble migration in the melt. Although this migration mechanism is faster than diffusion in the solid fuel, a release enhancement is not necessarily observed in the integral tests because of the non-coherent nature of the melt progression. In addition, the fuel and fission-product-containing liquids will relocate and freeze at lower, cooler elevations, on top of the metallic blockage formed earlier (see Section 3). As seen in TMI-2, the decay heat from fission products trapped in the ceramic blockage can heat up the blockage so that a molten pool can form. The release of fission gases and volatile fission products residing in this molten pool can be further delayed since they must nucleate into bubbles, and then coalesce and grow in the liquid medium by Brownian motion and buoyancy-biased motion, before they can rise by buoyancy to the pool surface for eventual release.^[34,110,111] Gas bubbles can also be trapped at the interface between the pool and the crust that surrounds the pool.^[45] The oxygen potential of the molten pool will again influence the fission product chemical form, i.e., the presence of iron oxides in the melt of the TMI-2 establishes a lower limit of about -120 kJ/mol at 2800 K so that fission products such as lanthanum, cerium and strontium should exist as an oxide (i.e., La_2O_3 , Ce_2O_3 or CeO_2 , and SrO) that is soluble in the $(\text{U,Zr})\text{O}_2$ ceramic, whereas ruthenium and antimony would be present as metals immiscible in the ceramic melt.^[45] Although iodine and cesium are identified as volatile fission products, and should therefore be released through bubble coalescence and buoyancy in molten material, small fractions (3 to 10%) have been observed in previously molten ceramics in the PBF SFD experiments and the TMI-2 reactor.^[45] In agreement with this observation, gamma spectroscopy was able to detect cesium, e.g., ^{134}Cs and ^{137}Cs , (as well as ^{125}Sb and ^{106}Ru) in previously molten material in the Phebus FTP-0 and FPT-1 tests.^[20,21]

The formation of the molten pool can also result in a flow restriction and a reduced aerosol flow as evidenced in the Phebus FPT-0 test. Fuel movements can significantly affect the dynamics of the aerosol flow and fission product release. Slightly enhanced releases were also observed in the FPT-0 test coincident with the test cool down, as seen for example by the increased activity in containment of ^{132}I , which may be attributed to fuel movement at the end of the test. In comparison, although 3% of the volatile fission product inventory was released in the LOFT FP-2 test during the rapid oxidation transient to 2200 K (i.e., when reflood was initiated), $\sim 12\%$ of the inventory was released during and after reflood.^[84] In this case, the reflood with water injection produced a rapid local oxidation of the unoxidized Zircaloy in the upper part of the bundle, and this local heating led to significant fission product release.

In the PBF SFD 1-4 test that was conducted with high-burnup fuel rods, the aerosol composition in the upper plenum (at $\sim 600\text{ K}$) was shown to contain significant percent levels of volatile fission products (i.e., iodine, tellurium and especially cesium) (~ 25 to 50%), with the remainder being control rod materials (i.e., silver and cadmium) and structural materials (i.e., tin). As such, the fission product release, vaporization of control materials

and release of tin from the oxidized Zircaloy were all important aerosol sources in this experiment.^[46] Comparable findings were seen in the Phebus FPT-0 test, except for the significant presence of volatile fission products in the aerosol composition. In particular, a post-test SEM/EDX analysis of aerosol particles collected on the filters and impactors located in the experimental circuit revealed that the particles were composed of mainly thermocouple materials (21-59% of rhenium and 1-10% of tungsten), control rod materials (17-42% of silver, 3-6% of indium and 1-3% of cadmium) and fuel rod materials (7-10% of tin from the oxidized cladding and 1-13% of uranium), with a much smaller amount of fission products (1-2% of molybdenum).^[20] Correspondingly, a similar composition was found in containment with a decreasing mass percent of: Ag (30%), Re (20%), Sn (13%), In (7%), Ni (7%), Cd (6%), U(6%) and a few percent of Fe, Mo and W.^[20] In this trace-irradiated test, the mass of the released structural material was several orders of magnitude greater than that of the fission products. A total aerosol mass of 155 g (~1% of the total test bundle mass) was generated and transported through the facility.^[20] However, structural materials also played the dominant role in aerosol formation in the Phebus FPT-1 test which used high-burnup fuel. Thus, this result suggests that perhaps the relatively lower fission product content of the aerosols seen in the Phebus FP tests may be a result of a higher silver release as a consequence of the different system pressures between the PBF SFD 1-4 (~7 MPa) and Phebus FP (~0.2 MPa) tests rather than just a burnup effect.^[97]

5. Conclusions

In-pile and out-pile experimental programs have been reviewed, indicating that melt progression is a non-coherent process as a result of non-homogeneous conditions which exist in the core throughout the transient. The Phebus FPT-0 and -1 tests were performed for a longer period of time at high temperature than earlier in-pile experiments and provide additional information on late-phase behaviour with the presence of irradiated fuel material. Control rod failure leads to a local propagation of the core melt progression at a relatively low temperature. Metallic blockages result from interactions of the spacer grids, fuel rod cladding material and control rod materials that flow down the bundle and solidify at a lower (cooler) position. A separation between the metallic and ceramic blockages arises due to the freezing of the (U,Zr)O₂ melt at a higher temperature. The observed melting temperature of the ceramic blockage in the Phebus FPT-0 test (~2720 K) is slightly lower than that of the pure ceramic (~2800 K) due to possible eutectic interaction with the transition metal oxides. This result is consistent, however, with that seen in the TMI-2 examination. As observed in several in-pile experiments, a molten pool is formed which is originally held in place by a ceramic crust. This pool forms due to increased fission heat generation, in which there is a reduced heat transfer due to partial steam blockage from the underlying solidified material and a reduced thermal conductivity in the ceramic. Some molten material relocation was observed to occur in the later phases of the Phebus FP tests. These features are also similar to that observed in the damaged TMI-2 core.

The fission product release behaviour observed in the in-pile and out-of-pile tests has been compared and examined, as well as that determined in the TMI-2 core examination. Consistent release behaviour of the volatile (Xe, Kr, I, Cs, Te and Sb), semi-volatile (Mo, Rh, Ba), low volatile (Ru, Ce, Np, Sr and Eu) and non-volatile (Zr, Nb, La and Nd) fission products was observed in the annealing experiments at the ORNL, CEA and CRL and the various in-pile tests except for the release of barium, where a reduced volatility was observed in the in-reactor experiments compared to the annealing tests due to thermochemical effects as a result of the presence of iron and zirconium oxides. It is seen that the prevailing local atmospheric conditions (i.e., oxygen potential) particularly influence the release characteristics of the low-volatile fission products. Moreover, the non-coherent nature of melt progression tends to mask individual release mechanisms as identified in the out-of-pile experiments. A significant enhancement of release due to fuel liquefaction is not typically observed in the separate effects experiments.

A slightly elevated release of volatile fission products was observed with termination of the Phebus FPT-1 test; however, this release was considerably smaller than that observed in the LOFT FP-2 test where a rapid oxidation of the unoxidized Zircaloy (and local heating) followed on reflooding in the latter test. The Phebus FP tests further provided an opportunity to study the long-term aerosol and containment release behaviour, e.g., aerosols in the trace-irradiated Phebus FPT-0 test were principally composed of control rod (Ag, In, Cd), thermocouple (Re) and fuel rod (Sn, U) materials. These aerosol particles contained only minor quantities of fission products (Mo), which contrasted to that found in the earlier PBF SFD 1-4 test where the fission products (I, Te, Cs) had played a more important role in the aerosol formation due to the presence of high-burnup fuel. Only a small fraction of iodine in containment was volatile in the FPT-0 (~2%) and FPT-1 (0.3%) tests.

6. Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank L. Dickson (AECL-CRL) for many helpful discussions. The work at the Royal Military College was supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

7. References

1. L. Baker, Jr., J.K. Fink, R. Simms, B.J. Schlenger and J.E. Herceg, "Source Term Experiments Project (STEP): A Summary," NP-5753M, Electric Power Research Institute (March 1988).
2. 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).
3. R.D. Gasser, C.P. Fryer, R.O. Gauntt, A.C. Marshall, K.O. Reil and K.T. Stalker, "Damaged Fuel Relocation Experiment DF-1: Results and Analyses," NUREG/CR-4668, SAND86-1030, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (January 1990).
4. K.O. Reil, A.C. Marshall, R.O. Gauntt, R.W. Ostensen, P.S. Pickard, C. Fryer and K.T. Stalker, "Results of the ACRR-DFR Experiments," Proc. Int. Topl. Mtg. Thermal Reactor Safety, San Diego, California, February 2-6, 1986, Vol. 3, American Nuclear Society (1986).
5. R.O. Gauntt, R.D. Gasser and L.J. Ott, "The DF-4 Fuel Damage Experiment in ACRR with a BWR Control Blade and Channel Box," NUREG/CR-4671, SAND86-1443, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (November 1989).
6. A.D. Knipe, S.A. Ploger and D.J. Osetek, "PBF Severe Fuel Damage Scoping Test – Test Results Report," NUREG/CR-4683, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (March 1986).
7. Z.R. Martinson, D.A. Petti and B.A. Cook, "PBF Severe Fuel Damage Test 1-1 Test Results Report," NUREG/CR-4684, EGG-2463, Vol. 1, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (October 1986).
8. Z.R. Martinson, M. Gasparini, R.R. Hobbins, D.A. Petti, C.M. Allison, J.K. Hohorst, D.L. Hagrman and K. Vinjamuri, "PBF Severe Fuel Damage Test 1-3 Test Results Report," NUREG/CR-5354, EGG-2565, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (October 1989).
9. D.A. Petti, Z.R. Martinson, R.R. Hobbins, C.M. Allison, E.R. Carlson, D.L. Hagrman, T.C. Cheng, J.K. Hartwell, K. Vinjamuri and L.J. Seifken, "Power Burst Facility (PBF) Severe Fuel Damage Test 1-4 Test Results Report," NUREG/CR-5163, EGG-2542, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (April 1989).
10. D.A. Petti, Z.R. Martinson, R.R. Hobbins and D.J. Osetek, "Results from the Power Burst Facility (PBF) Severe Fuel Damage (SFD) Test 1-4: A Simulated Severe Fuel Damage Accident with Irradiated Fuel Rods and Control Rods," Nucl. Technol. 94 (1991) 313.
11. W.N. Rausch, G.M. Hesson, J.P. Pilger, L.L. King and R.L. Goodman, "Coolant Boilaway and Damage Progression Program Data Report: Full-Length High Temperature Experiment 1," PNL-5691, Pacific Northwest Laboratories (September 1986).
12. N.J. Lombardo, D.D. Lanning and F.E. Panisko, "Coolant Boilaway and Damage Progression Program Data Report: Full-Length High Temperature Experiment 2," PNL-6551, Pacific Northwest Laboratories (April 1988).
13. D.D. Lanning, N.J. Lombardo, D.E. Fitzsimmons, W.K. Hensley and F.E. Panisko, "Coolant Boilaway and Damage Progression Program Data Report: Full-Length High Temperature Experiment 4," PNL-6368, Pacific Northwest Laboratories (January 1988).
14. D.D. Lanning, N.J. Lombardo, D.E. Fitzsimmons, W.K. Hensley and F.E. Panisko, "Coolant Boilaway and Damage Progression Program Data Report: Full-Length High Temperature Experiment 5," PNL-6540, Pacific Northwest Laboratories (April 1988).
15. M.L. Carboneau, V.T. Berta and M.S. Modro, "Experiment Analysis and Summary Report for OECD LOFT Project Fission Product Experiment LP-FP-2," OECD LOFT-T-3806, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (June 1989).
16. J.M. Broughton, P. Kuan, D.A. Petti and E.L. Tolman, "A Scenario of the Three Mile Island Unit 2 Accident," Nucl. Technol. 87 (1989) 34.
17. P. von der Hardt and A. Tattegrain, "The Phebus Fission Product Project," J. Nucl. Mater. 188 (1992) 115.
18. P. von der Hardt, A. Jones, C. Lecomte and A. Tattegrain, "The Phebus FP Severe Accident Experimental Programme" Nucl. Safety 35 (1994) 2.

19. M. Schwarz, G. Hache and P. von der Hardt, "Phebus FP: A Severe Accident Research Programme for Current and Advanced Light Water Reactors," *Nuc. Eng. Des.* 187 (1999) 47.
20. N. Hanniet and G. Repetto, "Phebus PF, FPT0 - Final Report," CD Version, Suntech 10/99.
21. J. Bonnin, B. Berthet, S. Bayle, N. Hanniet, F. Jeury, S. Gaillot, Y. Garnier, C. Martin, M. Laurie and B. Siri, "Phebus PF, FPT1 - Preliminary Report," IPSN/DRS/SEA/LERES/97/727, Note Technique LERES no. 24/97, Document Phebus PF IP/97/334 (October 1997).
22. M.C. Anselmet, F. Jeury, G. Augier, S. Bayle, R. Berre, S. Bourdon, J.J. Cochaud, B. Cornu, Y. Garnier, J.C. Giacalone, J.M. Girard, G. Gregoire, M. Laurie, J.P. Mahue and E. Ragagli, "FPT4 Quick Look Report," Note Technique LEAC 39/99, Note Technique LEMRA 10/99, Document Phebus FP IP/99/453, October 21, 1999.
23. M. Schwartz, B. Clement and A.V. Jones, "Applicability of Phebus FP results to severe accident safety evaluations and management measures," *Nucl. Eng. Des.* 209 (2001) 173-181.
24. B. Clément, N. Hanniet-Girault, G. Repetto, D. Jacquemain, A.V. Jones, M.P. Kissane and P. von der Hardt, "LWR severe accident simulation: synthesis of the results and interpretation of the first Phebus FP experiment FPT0," *Nucl. Eng. Des.* 226 (2003) 5-82.
25. R. Dubourg, H. Faure-Geors, G. Nicaise and M. Barrachin, "Fission product release in the first two PHEBUS tests FPT0 and FPT1," *Nucl. Eng. Des.* 235 (2005) 2183-2208.
26. M.P. Kissane and I. Drosik, "Interpretation of fission-product behaviour in the Phébus FPT0 and FPT1 tests," *Nucl. Eng. Des.* 236 (2006) 1210-1223.
27. L.E. Herranz, M. Vela-García, J. Fontanet, C. López del Prá, "Experimental interpretation and code validation based on the PHEBUS-FP programme : Lessons learnt from the analysis of the containment scenario of FPT1 and FPT2 tests," *Nucl. Eng. Des.* (2007) doi:10.1016/j.nucengdes.2007.03.022.
28. S. Hagen, P. Hofmann, G. Schanz and L. Sepold, "Results of the CORA Experiments on Severe Fuel Damage With and Without Absorber Material," *Proc. 26th Natl. Heat Transfer Conf.*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, August 6-9, 1989, AIChE Symp. Ser., 85, 269 (1989).
29. P. Hofmann, S. Hagen, V. Noack, G. Schanz and L. Sepold, "Chemical-Physical Behavior of Light Water Reactor Core Components Tested Under Severe Accident Conditions in the CORA Facility," *Nucl. Technol.* 118 (1997) 200.
30. 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.
31. M.F. Osborne and R.A. Lorenz, "ORNL Studies of Fission Product Release Under LWR Severe Accident Conditions," *Nuclear Safety* 33 (1992) 344.
32. J.P. Leveque, B. Andre, G. Ducros, G. Le Marois and G. Lhiaubet, "The HEVA Experimental Program," *Nucl. Technol.* 108 (1994) 33.
33. B. Andre, G. Ducros, J.P. Leveque, D. Maro, M.F. Osborne and R.A. Lorenz, "Fission Product Releases at Severe LWR Accident Conditions: ORNL/CEA Measurements Versus Calculations," *Nucl. Technol.* 114 (1996) 23.
34. B.J. Lewis, B. Andre, B. Morel, P. Dehaut, D. Maro, P.L. Purdy, D.S. Cox, F.C. Iglesias, M.F. Osborne and R.A. Lorenz, "Modelling the Release Behaviour of Cesium during Severe Fuel Degradation," *J. Nucl. Mater.* 227 (1995) 83.
35. F.C. Iglesias, B.J. Lewis, P.J. Reid and P. Elder, "Fission Product Release Mechanisms during Reactor Accident Conditions," *J. Nucl. Mater.* 270 (1999) 21.
36. G. Ducros, P.P. Malgouyres, M. Kissane, D. Boulaud and M. Durin, "Fission product release under severe accidental conditions: general presentation of the program and synthesis of VERCORS 1-6 results," *Nucl. Eng. Des.* 208 (2001) 191-203.
37. Y. Pontillon, P.P. Malgouyres, G. Ducros, G. Nicaise, R. Dubourg, M. Kissane and M. Baichi, "Lessons learnt from VERCORS tests. Study of the active role played by UO₂-ZrO₂-FP interactions on irradiated fuel collapse temperature," *J. Nucl. Mater.* 344 (2005) 265-273.
38. T. Kudo, A. Hidaka, T. Nakamura and H. Uetsuka, "Influence of Pressure on Cesium Release from Irradiated Fuel at Temperatures up to 2773 K," *J. Nucl. Sci. and Technol.*, Vol. 38, No. 10, p. 910-911 (October 2001).

39. T. Kudo, T. Nakamura, M. Kida and T. Fuketa, "Enhancement of Cesium Release From Fuel Due to Fuel Oxidation and Dissolution Under Severe Accident Conditions," Technical Meeting on Severe Accident and Accident Management, Tokyo, Japan, March 14-16, 2006.
40. D.A. Petti, "Silver-Indium-Cadmium Control Rod Behavior in Severe Reactor Accidents," Nucl. Technol. 84 (1989) 128.
41. P. Hofmann, S.J.L. Hagen, G. Schanz and A. Skokan, "Reactor Core Materials Interaction at Very High Temperatures," Nucl. Technol. 87 (1989) 146.
42. R.R. Hobbins, D.A. Petti, D.J. Osetek and D.L. Hagrman, "Review of Experimental Results on Light Water Reactor Core Melt Progression," Nucl. Technol. 95 (1991) 287.
43. A.W. Cronenberg, "Severe Accident Zircaloy Oxidation/Hydrogen Generation Behavior Noted From In-Pile Test Data," Nucl. Technol. 93 (1991) 221.
44. A.W. Cronenberg, "Hydrogen Generation Behavior in the Loft FP-2 and Other Experiments: Comparative Assessment for Mitigated Severe Accident Conditions," Nucl. Technol. 97 (1992) 97.
45. R.R. Hobbins, D.A. Petti, and D.L. Hagrman, "Fission Product Release from Fuel Under Severe Accident Conditions," Nucl. Technol. 101 (1993) 270.
46. D.A. Petti, R.R. Hobbins and D.L. Hagrman, "The Composition of Aerosols Generated During a Severe Reactor Accident: Experimental Results from the Power Burst Facility Severe Fuel Damage Test 1-4," Nucl. Technol. 105 (1994) 334.
47. P. Hofmann, "Current Knowledge on Core Degradation Phenomena, A Review," J. Nucl. Mater. 270 (1999) 194.
48. C. Gonnier, G. Repetto and G. Geoffroy, "Phebus Severe Fuel Damage Program Main Experimental Results and Instrumentation Behaviour," in: The Phebus Fission Product Project, edited by W. Krischer and M.C. Rubinstein, Elsevier Applied Science, New York (1992), p. 108.
49. M.S. Veshchunov, V.D. Ozrin, V.E. Shestak, V.I. Tarasov, R. Dubourg and G. Nicaise, "Development of the mechanistic code MFPR for modeling fission product release from irradiated fuel," Nucl. Eng. Des. 236 (2006) 179-200.
50. M.S. Veshchunov, R. Dubourg, V.D. Ozrin, V.E. Shestak, V.I. Tarasov, "Mechanistic modeling of uranium fuel evolution and fission product migration during irradiation and heating," J. Nucl. Mater. 362 (2007) 327-335.
51. F. Martín-Fuertes, R. Barbero, J.M. Martín-Valdepeñas, M.A. Jiménez, "Analysis of source term aspects in the experimental Phebus FPT1 with the MELCOR and CFX codes," Nucl. Eng. Des. 237 (2006) 509-523.
52. R.D. Gasser, R.O. Gauntt and S. Bourcier, "Late-phase Melt Progression Experiment: MP-1: Results and Analysis," NUREG/CR-5874 (1996).
53. R.D. Gasser, R.O. Gauntt and S. Bourcier, "Late-phase Melt Progression Experiment: MP-2: Results and Analysis," NUREG/CR-6167 (1996).
54. L. Sepold, P. Hofmann, W. Leiling, A. Miassoedov, D. Piel, L. Schmidt and M. Steinbrueck, "Reflooding Experiments with LWR-Type Fuel Rod Simulators in the QUENCH Facility," Nuclear Engineering and Design 204(1-3) (2001) 205-220.
55. P. Hofmann et al., "Experiments on the Quench Behaviour of Fuel Rods," 1995 Annual Report on the Project of Nuclear Safety Research, Forschungszentrum Karlsruhe report FZK-5780 (1996).
56. Z. Hozer, "Summary of the Core Degradation Experiments CODEX," EUROSAFE Berlin 2002: International Forum for Nuclear Safety - Safety Problems in Nuclear Engineering and Nuclear Waste Management, Berlin, Germany, 4-5 Nov 2002.
57. Z. Hozer, L. Maroti, P. Windberg, L. Matus, I. Nagy, G. Gyenes, M. Horvath, A. Pinter, M. Balasko, A. Czitrovsky, P. Jani, A. Nagy, O. Prokopiev and B. Toth, "Behavior of VVER Fuel Rods Tested Under Severe Accident Conditions in the CODEX Facility," Nucl. Technol. 154 (2006) 302-317.
58. R.D. MacDonald, J.W. DeVaal, D.S. Cox, L.W. Dickson, M.G. Jonckheere, C.E. Ferris, N.A. Keller and S.L. Wadsworth, "An In-Reactor Loss-Of-Coolant Test with Flow Blockage and Rewet," Proceedings of the Thermal Reactor Safety Meeting, Portland, Oregon, 1991 July, also released as an AECL report AECL-10464, 1991 October.
59. J.W. DeVaal, N.K. Popov, R.D. MacDonald, L.W. Dickson, R.J. Dutton, D.S. Cox and M.G. Jonckheere, "Post-Test Simulations of BTF-107: An In-Reactor Loss-Of-Coolant Test with Flow Blockage and Rewet,"

- Proceedings of the Third International Conference on CANDU Fuel, Pembroke, Ontario, Canada, 1992 October, also released as AECL Report AECL-10758, 1993 March.
60. L.W. Dickson, P.H. Elder, J.W. DeVaal, J.D. Irish and A.R. Yamazaki, "Preliminary Results of the BTF-104 Experiment: An In-Reactor Test of Fuel Behaviour and Fission-Product Release and Transport Under LOCA/LOECC Conditions," Proceedings of the Canadian Nuclear Society 1995 Annual Conference, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada, 1995 June.
 61. L.W. Dickson, J.W. DeVaal, J.D. Irish, P.H. Elder, M.G. Jonckheere and A.R. Yamazaki, "The BTF-104 Experiment: An In-Reactor Test of Fuel Behaviour, and Fission-Product Release and Transport Under LOCA/LOECC Conditions," Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on CANDU Fuel, Pembroke, Ontario, Canada, 1995 October.
 62. R.S. Dickson and L.W. Dickson, "Post-Test Analysis of the BTF-104 Severe Fuel Damage Experiment Using the VICTORIA Fission Product Transport Code," presented at Third OECD Specialist Meeting on Nuclear Aerosols in Reactor Safety, Cologne, Germany, 1998 June 15-18.
 63. J.W. DeVaal, J.D. Irish, L.W. Dickson, S.T. Craig, M.G. Jonckheere and L.R. Bourque, "Preliminary Results of the BTF-105A Test: An In-Reactor Instrument Development and Fuel Behaviour Test," Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on CANDU Fuel, Toronto, 1997 September 21-25.
 64. P.J. Valliant, J.D. Irish and S.T. Craig, "Post-Irradiation Examination Results from the BTF-105A LOCA/LOECC Test," Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on CANDU Fuel, Niagara Falls, Canada, 1999 September 26-29.
 65. J.D. Irish, S.T. Craig, L.R. Bourque, M.G. Jonckheere, G. Kyle, P.J. Valliant, L.W. Dickson and R.T. Peplinskie, "Preliminary Results of the BTF-105B Experiment: An In-Reactor Test of Fuel Behaviour and Fission-Product Release and Transport Under LOCA/LOECC Conditions," Proceedings of the 19th Annual Conference of the Canadian Nuclear Society, Toronto, 1998 October 18-21.
 66. J.D. Irish, S.T. Craig and P.J. Valliant, "Preliminary Fission-Product and Post-Irradiation Examination Results from the BTF-105B LOCA/LOECC Test," Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on CANDU Fuel, Niagara Falls, Canada, 1999 September 26-29.
 67. R.A. Lorenz and M.F. Osborne, "A summary of ORNL fission product release tests with recommended release rates and diffusion coefficients," NUREG/CR-6261, ORNL/TM-12801, July 1995,
 68. D.S. Cox, C.E.L. Hunt, Z. Liu, N.A. Keller, R.D. Barrand, R.F. O'Connor and F.C. Iglesias, "Fission-Product Releases from UO_2 in Air and Inert Conditions at 1700-2350 K: Analysis of the MCE-1 Experiment," Presented at the American Nuclear Society International Topical Meeting on the Safety of Thermal Reactors, Portland, Oregon, U.S.A., 1991 July 21-25.
 69. D.S. Cox, R.F. O'Connor, W.W. Smeltzer, Solid State Ionics 53-56 (1992) 238.
 70. C.E.L. Hunt, F.C. Iglesias, D.S. Cox, N.A. Keller, R.D. Barrand, J.R. Mitchell and R.F. O'Connor, "Fission product release during UO_2 oxidation," in Proc. of the International Conference on CANDU Fuel, Chalk River, Ontario, Canada October 6-8, 1986, p. 508.
 71. D.S. Cox, Z. Liu, R.S. Dickson and P.H. Elder, "Fission-Product Releases During Post-Irradiation Annealing of High-Burnup CANDU Fuel," Proc. Third International Conference on CANDU Fuel, Chalk River, Canada, 1992 October 4-8.
 72. R.S. Dickson, 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 UCE-12 Experiment," Proc. 15th Annual Canadian Nuclear Society Conf., Montreal, Quebec, 1994 June 5-8.
 73. 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," Proc. 12th Annual Conf. Canadian Nuclear Society, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, 1991.
 74. D.S. Cox, Z. Liu, P.H. Elder, C.E.L. Hunt and V.I. Arimescu, "Fission-Product Release Kinetics from CANDU and LWR Fuel During High-Temperature Steam Oxidation Experiments," Fission Gas Release and Fuel Rod Chemistry Related to Extended Burnup, IAEA-TECDOC-697, 1993.
 75. Z. Liu, D.S. Cox, R.S. Dickson, and P.H. Elder, "Release of Semi- and Low-Volatile Fission Products From Bare UO_2 Samples During Post-Irradiation Annealing," Proc. 15th Annual Canadian Nuclear Society Conf., Montreal, Quebec, 1994 June 5-8.

76. R.D. Barrand, R.S. Dickson, Z. Liu and D.D. Semeniuk, "Release of Fission Products from CANDU Fuel in Air, Steam and Argon Atmospheres at 1500-1900°C: The HCE3 Experiment," Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on CANDU Fuel, Niagara Falls, Canada, 1999 September 26-29.
77. D.S. Cox, C.E.L. Hunt, R.F. O'Connor, R.D. Barrand and F.C. Iglesias, "High temperature oxidation behaviour of UO_2 in air and steam," in Proc. of the International Symposium on High Temperature Oxidation and Sulphidation Process, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, August 26-30, 1990, Pergamon Press, New York, ISBN 0-18-040415-4.
78. F.C. Iglesias, C.E.L. Hunt, F. Garisto, D.S. Cox, "Ruthenium release kinetics from uranium oxides," in Proc. of the ICHMT Conference on Fission Product Transport Processes in Reactor Accidents, Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia, May 22-26, 1989, Hemisphere, New York, 1990, pp. 187-196.
79. R.S. Dickson, A.I. Belov, R.D. Barrand, D.D. Semeniuk, M.D. Gauthier, R.T. Peplinskie and S. Yatabe, "Experimental Measurements of Volatility of Fission-Product Iodine Released From Irradiated CANDU Fuel in High-Temperature Steam Environment: Tests I1 and I2 in the HCE5 Experiment," Ninth International Conference on CANDU Fuel, Belleville, Ontario, Canada, 2005 September 18-21.
80. A.I. Belov, R.S. Dickson, R.T. Peplinskie and M.D. Gauthier, "Release and Deposition of Fission Products From Sheathed CANDU Fuel Samples in Hot-Cell Experiment 5 TGT Tests," Proc. 27th Annual CNS Conference, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, 2006 June 11-14.
81. G.W. Parker, G.E. Creek and A.L. Sutton, "Influence of Variable Physical Process Assumptions on Core Melt Aerosol Release," Proc. Int. Mtg. Thermal Nuclear Reactor Safety, Chicago, Illinois, August 29-September 2, 1982, NUREG/CP-0027, Vol. 2, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
82. B.R. Bowsher, R.A. Jenkins, A.L. Nichols, N.A. Rowe and J.A.H. Simpson, "Silver-Indium-Cadmium Control Rod Behavior During a Severe Reactor Accident," AEEW-R-1991, U.K. Atomic Energy Establishment, Winfrith (April 1986).
83. P. Hofmann and M. Markiewicz, "Liquefaction of Zircaloy-4 by Molten (Ag, In, Cd) Absorber Alloy," J. Nucl. Mater. 209 (1994) 92.
84. R.W. Wright and S.J.L. Hagen, "Core Degradation and Fission Product Release," in: The Phebus Fission Product Project, edited by W. Krischer and M.C. Rubinstein, Elsevier Applied Science, New York (1992), p. 49.
85. W. Dienst, P. Hofmann and D. Kerwin-Peck, "Chemical Interactions Between UO_2 and Zircaloy from 1000 to 2000°C," Nucl. Technol. 65 (1984) 109.
86. P. Hofmann, H. Uetsuka, A.N. Wilhelm, E.A. Garcia, "Dissolution of Solid UO_2 by Molten Zircaloy and Its Modelling," in: Proceedings of the IAEA/OECD International Symposium on Severe Accidents in Nuclear Power Plants, Sorrento, Italy, 21-25 March 1988 (IAEA-SM-296/99), p. 3.
87. P. Nikolopoulos, P. Hofmann and D. K. Kerwin-Peck, "Determination of the Interfacial Energy and Work of Adhesion in the UO_2 /Zircaloy-4 Diffusion Couple," J. Nucl. Mater. 124 (1984) 106.
88. K.Y. Kim and D.R. Olander, "Dissolution of UO_2 by Molten Zircaloy," J. Nucl. Mater. 154 (1988) 85.
89. P.J. Hayward and I.M. George, "Dissolution of UO_2 Fuel by Molten Zircaloy-4, Part 1: Solubility from 2000 to 2200°C," J. Nucl. Mater. 208 (1994) 35.
90. P.J. Hayward and I.M. George, "Dissolution of UO_2 Fuel by Molten Zircaloy-4, Part 2: Phase Evolution During Dissolution and Cooling," J. Nucl. Mater. 208 (1994) 43.
91. P.J. Hayward and I.M. George, "Dissolution of UO_2 Fuel by Molten Zircaloy-4, Part 3: Solubility from 2000 to 2500°C," J. Nucl. Mater. 232 (1996) 1.
92. P.J. Hayward and I.M. George, "Dissolution of UO_2 Fuel by Molten Zircaloy-4, Part 4: Phase Evolution During Dissolution and Cooling of 2000 to 2500°C Specimens," J. Nucl. Mater. 232 (1996) 13.
93. M.S. Veshchunov, P. Hofmann and A.V. Berdyshev, "Critical Evaluation of Uranium Dioxide Dissolution by Molten Zircaloy in Different Crucible Tests," J. Nucl. Mater. 231 (1996) 1.
94. D.W. Akers and R.K. McCardell, "Core Materials Inventory and Behavior," Nucl. Technol. 87 (1989) 214.
95. R.R. Hobbins, M.L. Russell, C.S. Olsen and R.K. McCardell, "Molten Material Behavior in the Three Mile Island Unit 2 Accident," Nucl. Technol. 87 (1989) 1005.
96. C.S. Olsen, S.M. Jensen, E.R. Carlson and B.A. Cook, "Materials Interactions and Temperatures in the Three Mile Island Unit 2 Core," Nucl. Technol. 87 (1989) 57.
97. B. Clement, private communication, March 2000.

98. S.M. Jensen, D.W. Akers and B.A. Pregger, "Postirradiation Examination Data and Analysis for OECD LOFT Fission Product Experiment LP-FP-2," OECD LOFT-T-3810, Vol. 1, Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (December 1989).
99. R.R. Hobbins and G.D. McPherson, "A Summary of Results from the LOFT LP-FP-2 Test and Their Relationship to Other Studies at the Power Burst Facility and of the Three Mile Island Unit 2 Accident," Proc. Open Forum on the OECD/LOFT Project, Achievements and Significant Results, Madrid, Spain, May 9-11, 1990, Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (1991).
100. R. Dubourg and P. Taylor, "A qualitative comparison of barium behaviour in the PHEBUS FPT0 test and analytical tests," J. Nucl. Mater, 294 (2001) 32-38.
101. I. Johnson and C.E. Johnson, "Mass Spectrometry Studies of Fission Product Behaviour I. Fission Products Released from Irradiated LWR Fuel," J. Nucl. Mater. 154 (1988) 67.
102. B.R. Bowsher, S. Dickinson, R.A. Gomme, R.A. Jenkins, A.L. Nichols and J.S. Ogden, "The Interaction of Zircaloy Cladding with Fission Product Tellurium Released during a Severe Reactor Accident," in: Proc. Workshop on Chemical Reactivity of Oxide Fuel and Fission product Release, Gloucestershire, England, April 7-9, 1987, Central Electricity Generating Board, p. 455.
103. R. De Boer and E.H.P. Cordfunke, "The Chemical Form of Fission Product Tellurium during Reactor Accidents," J. Nucl. Mater. 240 (1997) 124.
104. R. De Boer and E.H.P. Cordfunke, "Reaction of Tellurium with Zircaloy-4," J. Nucl. Mater. 223 (1995) 103.
105. J.L. Collins, M.F. Osborne and R.A. Lorenz, "Fission Product Tellurium Release Under Severe Light Water Reactor Accident Conditions," Nucl. Technol. 77 (1987) 18.
106. B.J. Lewis, B. Andre, G. Ducros and D. Maro, "A Model for NonVolatile Fission Product Release During Reactor Accident Conditions," Nucl. Technol. 116 (1996) 34.
107. B.J. Lewis, B.J. Corse, W.T. Thompson, M.H. Kaye, F.C. Iglesias, P. Elder, R. Dickson and Z. Liu, "Low Volatile Fission-Product Release and Fuel Volatilization During Severe Reactor Accident Conditions," J. Nucl. Mater. 252 (1998) 235.
108. H. Albrecht and H. Wild, "Review of the Main Results of the SASCHA Program on Fission Product Release Under Core Melting Conditions," Proc. Topl. Mtg. Fission product Behavior and Source Term Research, Snowbird, Utah, July 15-19, 1984, NP-4113-SR, P. 3-1, Electric Power Research Institute (July 1985).
109. D.R. Olander, "Thermodynamics of Urania Volatilization in Steam," J. Nucl. Mater. 270 (1999) 187.
110. P.R. McClure, M.T. Leonard and A. Razani, "A Model for Fission Product Release from Liquid-Metal Pools: Development and Sensitivity Investigation," Nucl. Sci. Eng. 114 (1993) 102.
111. L. V  th, "Modelling Transient Fission Gas Behavior for Solid, Melting and Molten Fuel in the Computer Program LAKU," Nucl. Technol. 98 (1992) 44.