Comparison of the Phase-Change Models of Enthalpy-Porosity Methodology for Mushy Zone Problems in LIVE L7V test (22A-333)

KNS 2022 Fall Conference, Oct. 19-21, Changwon

Seokwon Whang^a, Kukhee Lim^{b,*} and Hyun Sun Park^a

- ^a Nuclear Research Institute for Future Technology and Policy, Seoul National University, Republic of Korea
- ^b Department of Nuclear Safety Research, Korea Institute of Nuclear Safety, Republic ok Korea

Introduction

- Severe accident
 - Partial or complete 'melt-down' of the reactor core
- Severe accident management strategy: In-Vessel Retention (IVR)
 - Integrity of reactor pressure vessel (RPV) is determined through ...
 - "thermal behavior" of the in-vessel core melts
 - Complex phenomena determining thermal behavior of the corium pool
 - Phase-change of the core melts (crust formation & mushy zone),

conjugate heat transfer (CHT), natural convective flow, turbulence, etc.

• Previous work

- Numerical conditions for LIVE simulation
 - OpenFOAM solver 'chtMultiRegionFoam' for fluid flow and solid heat conduction
 - along with **conjugate heat transfer**, is selected, and **modified** to include **EPM source** terms in the governing equations
 - **Numerical grid** is divided into two parts:
 - Working fluid region and vessel wall region
 - **Boundary conditions** :
 - Top surface of working fluid and side vessel wall: heat transfer coefficient (cooling)





Development of numerical platform which can simulate the important phenomena (phase change,

CHT, natural convection) to evaluate thermal behavior of core melts

- **Objective**:
 - **Comparison of the phase-change models** of enthalpy porosity methodology for mixture material with LIVE L7V test

Numerical Methodology

- Enthalpy-porosity methodology (EPM) for phase change application [1]
 - One of the representative methodologies to simulate phase-change problem in a fixed-grid system
 - Latent heat is contained as a heat source or sink in the energy equation, and various methodologies could be done to make the **velocity in the solid region as zero**
 - **EPM** considers a computational domain to be <u>a porous domain (ε, here liquid fraction (g))</u> and divides it into <u>a liquid (g=1), a solid (g=0)</u>, and regions where phase change is in progress (between 0 and 1).
- Governing equations (GE):



Source terms in the GE:

- Top surface of vessel wall: adiabatic condition

Numerical grid

Results

- **Results of LIVE-L7V**
 - **Temperature** and **velocity contour**:
 - Unstable, Stable zone & Crust region
 - Weakened descending flow
- Comparison of the EPM models
 - Melt temperature (MT) and Heat flux (HF): - Most EPM⁺ & EPM (T_{lig}) show similar tendency









- Constant, "C" is a sufficiently large value (10⁴ to 10⁷) to make the velocity of solid region zero
- **Liquid fraction (g)** is directly determined based on the field temperature as below:

g(1): for pure material

g(2): for mixture material

$$g_l = \begin{cases} 0 & T > T_m \\ 1 & T < T_m \end{cases}$$

$$g_l = \begin{cases} 0 & T > T_l \\ \left(\frac{T - T_s}{T_l - T_s}\right) & T_l > T > T_s \\ 1 & T < T_s \end{cases}$$

Model	g _l	Α	S _h
EPM(T _{liq})	g(1)	Λ(1)	S(1)
EPM(T _{sol})			
EPM ⁺ a		A(I)	
			C(2)

Melt temperature (MT) along the center

Heat flux (HF) along the vessel wall

• Crust thickness (CT):

- Crust thickness is a maximum at the bottom of the vessel and, thinning along the vessel wall - EPM⁺ can simulate the mushy zone (the liquid fraction (g_I) is between 0 and 1, while the liquid

fraction is 0 or 1 in the previous EPM)

- Results of EPM⁺ show similar tendency between the EPM results





Crust thickness (CT) along the vessel wall

Conclusion and Future plan

• Previously, the **numerical platform (with EPM for pure material)** which can simulate the oxide pool

behaviors was developed and validated with representative experiments (Gallium melting test, LIVE-L7V



- Internal heat generation (29 kW) \bullet
- Top and side cooling \bullet
- Simulant material

- cooling vessel Basket for heating plane LIVE facility
- Non-eutectic binary mixture of 20 mol% NaNO3 80 mol% KNO3

*Corresponding author

E-Mail: limkh@kins.re.kr

- and LIVE-L7W). In this work, the **EPM models for mixture material** are implemented in the previous numerical platform. The results of EPM+ are validated and compared in the LIVE-L7V.
- O As a future work, further study of the impact of <u>mushy zone</u>, property f(T), turbulence models,

boundary conditions (adiabatic, radiation, etc.) are required.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the Nuclear Safety Research Program through the Korea Foundation of Nuclear Safety (KoFONS) using the financial resource granted by the Nuclear Safety and Security Commission (NSSC) of the Republic of Korea (Grant No. 2106033-0222-CG100).

References

- [1] Brent, A.D., Voller, V.R., Reid, K.J., 1988. Enthalpy-porosity technique for modeling convection-diffusion phase change: Application to the melting of a pure metal. Numer. Heat Transf. 13, 297–318.
- [2] Miassoedov A, Gaus-Liu X, Cron T, Fluhrer B, 2014. LIVE experiments on melt pool heat transfer in the reactor pressure vessel lower head, HEFAT2014.
- [3] Gau, C., Viskanta, R., 1986. Melting and Solidification of a pure metal on a vertical wall. J. Heat Transfer 174-181.

ARTS Lab (https://anergz.com/) Department of Nuclear Engineering, NIFTEP, Rm#416, Bldg#31, Seoul National University, 1 Gwanak-ro, Gwanak-gu, Seoul 08826, Korea