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“Novel Reactor Concepts”
Expert opinion on „novel“ reactor concepts

- Overview of currently internationally pursued technology lines and reactor concepts
- Assessment of technology readiness, safety, fuel supply, waste disposal and proliferation risks, as well as costs
- Small modular reactor concepts not considered in depth

→ Available at:

Project-Team

- Öko-Institut e.V.:
  - Dr. Christoph Pistner
  - Dr. Matthias Englert

- TU Berlin, Fachgebiet Wirtschafts- und Infrastrukturpolitik (Department of Economic and Infrastructure Policy, WIP):
  - Prof. Dr. Christian von Hirschhausen
  - Fanny Böse
  - Björn Steigerwald
  - Lukas Gast
Important definitions

- So-called „novel“ reactor concepts or „alternative“ reactor concepts
  - History of concepts is often decades old
  - Questioning the „linear“ generation concept of the GIF (Generation IV)
## Concept of reactor generations (within a technology line)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technologie Linie</th>
<th>Erste Experimentalreaktoren</th>
<th>Erste Leistungsreaktoren (Gen I)</th>
<th>Weiterentwickelte Leistungsreaktorkonzepte (Gen II)</th>
<th>Fortgeschrittene Reaktorkonzepte (Gen III)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PWR</td>
<td>MTR, S1W, S2W, MZFR</td>
<td>Shippingport, Obninsk, Obregheim</td>
<td>Konvoi</td>
<td>AP-1000, VVER-1200, EPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWR</td>
<td>BORAX-I bis -V, Kahl</td>
<td>Dresden I, Gundremmingen-A</td>
<td>SWR-72</td>
<td>(KERENA), ABWR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHWR</td>
<td>ZEEP, NRX, NRU</td>
<td>Rolphoton</td>
<td>CANDU 500, CANDU 6</td>
<td>(EC 6, ACR-1000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCR</td>
<td>CP-1, Windscale</td>
<td>Calder Hall, Marcoule</td>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHTR</td>
<td>Dragon, AVR, HTR-10</td>
<td>Peach Bottom, THTR, HTR-PM, (VHTR)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>Fermi I, Br-10, CEFR, KNK I und II, Rapsodie, TWR</td>
<td>BN-800, Monju, Super-Phoenix (BN-1200)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFR</td>
<td>(BREST-OD300)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFR</td>
<td>(GFR)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSR</td>
<td>ARE, MSRE</td>
<td>(LFTR, MCFR)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCWR</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>(CSR1000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADS</td>
<td>(MYRRHA)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quelle: (IAEA 2023c; Greenspan 2021; GIF 2002), geplante, jedoch bislang nicht in Betrieb befindliche Konzepte sind kursiv geschrieben und in Klammern gesetzt
Important definitions

- So-called „novel“ reactor concepts or „alternative“ reactor concepts
  - History of concepts is often decades old
  - Questioning the „linear“ generation concept of the GIF (Generation IV)

- Distinction between „technology lines“ vs. „reactor concepts“
  - Superordinate term for roughly similar concepts: „technology line“
  - Detailed concept within a technology line: „reactor concept“
„Technology lines“

- Accelerator Driven Systems, ADS
- Supercritical Water-cooled Reactors, SCWR
- Sodium-cooled Fast Reactors, SFR
- Lead-cooled Fast Reactors, LFR
- Gas-cooled Fast Reactors, GFR
- Very High Temperature Reactors, VHTR
- Molten Salt Reactors, MSR
## Systematization of technology lines and corresponding reactor concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology line</th>
<th>Distinguishing criteria</th>
<th>Reactor concept / Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MYRRHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCWR</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>CSR1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>Sodium</td>
<td>With Rep. BN-800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Without Rep. TWR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFR</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Brest OD-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHTR</td>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>Spherical FE HTR-PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Prismatic FE Prismatic HTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSR</td>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ADS: No
- SCWR: Water
- SFR: Sodium
- LFR: Lead
- GFR: Yes
- VHTR: Gas
- MSR: Salt

- Criticality
- Coolant
- Moderation
- Further features
- Facility
Evaluation Criteria
Technology readiness

Three levels each, “lowest“ classification defines overall level

- „Applied Research“
- „Development“
- „Deployment“
Technology readiness

Three levels each, „lowest“ classification defines overall level

- „Applied Research“
- „Development“
- „Deployment“

Indicators:
  - Fuel/Materials
  - Operational requirements, inspection, maintenance, aging management
  - I&C
  - Safety functions
  - Safety assessment
Other evaluation criteria

Reference is today‘s LWRs

Three levels:

- Advantage
- No significant advantage or disadvantage
- Disadvantage

Assessment

- is based on inherent properties (technology line)
- depends (mostly) on the specific design (reactor concept)
Safety

Indicators:

● Normal operation
● Safety functions:
  – Reactivity control
  – Cooling
  – Confinement of radioactivity
● Event spectrum
● Safety verification
Fuel supply and waste

Indicators:
- Fissile material demand/Fuel production
- Waste streams (qualitative)
- Waste inventories (heat production, activity, volume, mass)
- Long-term safety aspects
Proliferation

Indicators:
- Uranium enrichment requirements
- Reprocessing planned/necessary
- Pu vector and Pu quantities
Costs

Indicators:
- Investment costs
- Operation costs
- Construction times
- Investment risks
- Planned service life/load factors
Exemplary discussion
Sodium-cooled Fast Reactors (SFR)
**Major) Advantages/Disadvantages**

- Better utilization of uranium
- Low pressure of primary coolant (loss-of-coolant events less demanding)
- Higher operating temperature
- Opaque (non-transparent) coolant (problematic for inspection and maintenance)
- Reactivity control more demanding (positive feedback effects)
- Chemically reactive coolant (sodium fires)
- Higher proliferation risks with closed fuel cycle
- Higher investment costs
- Better utilization of uranium
- Low pressure of primary coolant (loss-of-coolant events less demanding)
- Higher operating temperature
- Opaque (non-transparent) coolant (problematic for inspection and maintenance)
- Reactivity control more demanding (positive feedback effects)
- Chemically reactive coolant (sodium fires)
- Higher proliferation risks with closed fuel cycle
- Higher investment costs
BN-800

Line: SFR
Name: Beloyarsk-4
Country: Russia
Developer: Rosenergoatom
Power: 820 MWe (Net) / 885 MWe (Gross)
Coolant: Sodium
Moderator: /
Fuel: MOX (with Rep.)
Neutron spectrum: Fast

Quelle: Nori, DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.31153.81761/1
SFR – A few conclusions

- Status: more than 20 prototype reactors and 400 years of operating experience for 70 years of research and development, but still no commercially viable system
- Fuel utilization: fundamental aspect of breeding of new fissile material, but not needed in the foreseeable future
- Safety: specific advantages as well as disadvantages, actual safety performance so far is poor
- Proliferation: potentially significant disadvantage, since weapons-grade fissile material can be produced, but highly dependant on actual technical design
(Very) High Temperature Reactors – (V)HTR

[Diagram of a (Very) High Temperature Reactor (V)HTR system, showing the reactor core, control rods, primary coolant (Helium), secondary coolant (Water or Gas), blower, heat exchanger, pump, turbine, generator, and electrical power output.]
(Major) Advantages/Disadvantages

- High working temperatures of the coolant
- Chemically inert and optically transparent coolant
- Strong negative reactivity feedback
- Possible passive residual heat removal from the reactor core
- Confinement by TRISO-fuel up to approx. 1600°C

- Limitation of the power size for passive properties
- Exclusion or control of other accident sequences needed (air/water intrusions, graphite fire)
- High amounts of graphite waste
HTR-PM (Tsinghua University, China)

- Development (in China) since 2001, commissioning December 2021
- 210/2 MWe, gas cooled (Helium), graphite moderated pebble bed
- 8.5% enriched UO₂–TRISO fuel
- Partial passive safety properties (strongly negative temperature coefficients, high heat capacity)
- Continuous refuelling
- 750°C Output temperature
- No Containment
- Thermal neutron spectrum

Sources: GIF 2018, Kölzer 2011, IAEA ARIS 2018
According to manufacturer
(V)HTR – A few conclusions

- **Status:** 60 years of development, several ambitious research and development programs (USA, Germany, South Africa) have failed. New attempt in China.

- **Safety:** Possibly specific advantages with respect to loss-of-coolant events (passive heat removal), but other accident scenarios need to be considered in detail (air and water intrusion, graphite fires …)

- **Waste:** Comparable waste problem, but different waste properties (graphite) to be considered

- **Economics:** Limitation to low total power to maintain passive cooling characteristics. Temperature < 750°C and water-steam secondary cycle to minimize development time and risks.
Molten Salt Reactors, MSR
Many different reactor concepts possible

Figure MSR-1. The most studied MSR concepts, with key players (research & technology organization or vendors)
(Major) Advantages/Disadvantages

- High coolant temperature
- Low pressures in primary coolant
- Possibly strong negative reactivity feedback
- High and flexible fuel utilization

- Development of a suitable molten salt needed
- Corrosive properties of molten salt
- Free-flowing radioactive inventory (radiation protection, fissile material control)
- Required (on-site) reprocessing
MCFR

Line: MSR
Name: Molten Chloride Fast Reactor
Country: USA
Developer: TerraPower
Power: 1200 MWe
Coolant: Chlorid salt
Moderator: /
Fuel: U/Pu
Neutron spectrum: Fast

MSR – A few conclusions

- **Status:** considerable efforts between the 1940s and 1970s, revival after 2000, a commercially viable system not expected before ~2050

- **Safety:** Some advantages possible, but
  - significant technological development still needed (materials, instrumentation, safety assessment methods)
  - serious radiation protection aspects to be solved even in normal operation

- **Waste:** Different waste streams and other relevant radionuclides (Cl-36, C-14) to be taken into account

- **Proliferation:** specific problems due to the required (online) reprocessing of fuel salt
Conclusions
Conclusions I

- Principles of technology lines (SFR, VHTR, GFR, LFR, SCWR, MSR) known since 1950s (possible exception ADS)
- Development of technology lines not „linear“: classification as generation IV is highly questionable, generation II-B would often be more appropriate
- In terms of technological readiness, many technology lines and reactor concepts remain in early stages of development, no system has advanced to the „market penetration“ phase
  - no extensive findings from smaller experimental reactors available for GFR, SCWR, ADS
  - no demonstration reactor so far for LFR, MSR
  - most extensive technical experience available for the SFR and VHTR
Conclusions II

- Developers' schedules often characterized by overly optimistic assumptions, delayed by years or even decades, in many cases specific approaches are discontinued completely.
- Demonstration reactors to date are not yet suitable for widespread (market) deployment, additional FOAK reactors still needed.
- Fuel/material development in particular is time-limiting.
- Time still required for the development of novel reactor concepts is probably in the range of several decades.
Conclusions III

- Individual technology lines – with rigorous design – may deliver advantages over today's LWRs in individual evaluation criteria.

- With respect to wastes, an overall reduction of actinide inventories may be achieved, but no significant reduction in the requirements upon a geological repository is to be expected. At the same time, additional low- and intermediate-level radioactive waste streams would be generated. Some technology lines would also generate novel waste materials (such as salts) for which novel disposal pathways would have to be developed.

- None of the technology lines can be expected to have an advantage over today's LWRs in all areas, disadvantages compared to today's LWRs are possible in individual areas.
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