



**5th UPM/CEIDEN Workshop on
“Impact of recent nuclear data evaluations on energy and non-energy
nuclear applications”**

May 23, 2023
Universidad Politécnica de Madrid
Instituto de Fusión Nuclear “Guillermo Velarde”
ETS de Ingenieros Industriales de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

O. Cabellos (UPM/SP) opened the meeting and welcomed all participants (Agenda of the meeting is Appendix 1, a list of participants is in Appendix 2).

1. Welcome and introduction to the meeting.

J. Dies (CSN/SP) opened the meeting with an overview on the current status of the nuclear energy in the world. He highlighted the central role of nuclear data for validation and verification of codes and applications methods for design, operation and nuclear safety. In addition, he mentioned the importance of nuclear data for the back-end fuel cycle.

A. Plompen (JRC/BE) presented the status of the JEFF project. He pointed out the importance of this meeting for identifying nuclear data needs, completeness in current evaluations and improvements in methodologies. The JEFF-4.0 library is expected in December 2024.

2. Technical presentations.

- **A. Jiménez-Carrascosa (PSI)**, “Assessment of nuclear data libraries performance for SFR simulation”
He concludes the importance of nuclear data adjustment for nuclear data assessment. This works has selected a suite of benchmarks from ICSBEP/IRPhEP with high similarity to SFRs not only keff but reactivity coefficients and control rod worths. TSURFER/SCALE tool is used **showing major adjustments for the following JEFF-3.3 nuclear reactions: U238(n,gamma), U238(n,n’), U238(n,fission) and Pu239/PFNS**. Finally, he pointed out as major task in the future an “Accurate estimation of correlations in experiment uncertainties” to be used in conjunction with assimilation techniques.
- **P. Romojaro (SCK-CEN)**, “Nuclear data requirements for an accurate estimation of the neutron production rate of spent nuclear fuel”.

He started with an introduction on different PIE programs (ARIANE, MALIBU and REGAL) and importance for the validation of any characterisation scheme (e.g. neutron emission, decay heat, etc...) based on depletion calculations. Depletion codes (ALEPH, SCALE and SERPENT2.2.0) were introduced, and depletion calculations were performed for an irradiated segment sample (at 54.3 MWd/kg) with different nuclear data libraries (ENDF/B-VII.0, VII.1 and VIII.0, JEFF-3.1.2, JEFF-3.3 and JEFF-4T1 and T2, JENDL4.0u and JENDL-5.0). The impact of nuclear data is reviewed for the isotopic prediction of ¹³⁷Cs, ²⁴⁴Cm and Burnup, and for the neutron emission. He concluded that:

- **Recommended decay and neutron emission data not always adopted in evaluated data libraries**
- **¹⁴⁷Nd(n,g) cross section in JEFF-3.3 and ENDF/B-VIII.0 are too high (important for normalisation of PIE data)**
- **Fission yields for ¹⁴⁸Nd in JENDL-5.0 are too low**
- **²⁴²Pu(n,g) and ²⁴³Am(n,g) cross sections require a re-evaluation (use of available experimental data)**

– **C. Ratero (SCK-CEN), “Benchmarking of JENDL-5 and JEFF-4T2 in depletion calculations against isotopic inventories”**

She presented a depletion calculation for the MOX/GM1 sample (at 66.8 MWd/kgHM) from Gösgen Reactor (PWR), measured by PSI Laboratory. Calculations are performed with ALEPH code.

In general, JEFF-4T2 has a good C/E performance. Some discrepancies in C/E were investigated for the JENDL-5 library concluding that:

- **The ²⁴⁴Pu prediction by JENDL-5 can be improved by including files corresponding to:**
 - **²⁴³Pu neutron transport**
 - **^{244m}Am radioactive decay data**
- **Discrepancies for Sm isotopes will be reduced with the inclusion of:**
 - **¹⁴⁷Pm branching ratio for radiative capture.**

– **F. Grimaldi (SCK-CEN), “Neutron data benchmarking at the VENUS-F zero power reactor for MYRRHA”.**

He performed a sensitivity analysis for the VENUS-F and MYRRHA systems. The similarity between both systems is assessed using the representativity formula based on sensitivity profiles and covariance data. He concluded that:

- The keff Sensitivity profiles computed with different nuclear data libraries are rather consistent.
- Big differences from the evaluated covariance matrices and their availability.
- keff representativity of VENUS-F to MYRRHA v1.8: **0.96 (JEFF-3.3); 0.82 (ENDF/B-VIII.0); 0.92 (JENDL-4.0u). These differences may be attributed to the differences in the nuclear data covariances.**

– **C. Guerrero (US), “Neutron absorption in the Cr isotopes of structural materials affects the criticality of fast reactor assemblies”**

He presented the motivation of new measurements of ^{50,53}Cr(n,γ) isotopes for criticality safety issues which can be found at the OECD/NEA-HPRL (<https://www.oecd-nea.org/dbdata/hprrl>). Additionally, discrepant data for the ⁵³Cr(n,γ) in MACS(30) is presented, as well. The differences between nuclear data evaluations are discussed. A summary of different experiments are shown, highlighting the new ones (thick and thin samples) at the nTOF. **Preliminary results are presented with a comparison of recent evaluations JEFF-3.3 and CENDL-3.2.** In addition, preliminary results for the experimental value of ⁵⁰Cr(n,γ)-MACS(30) measured at HISPANoS

@CNA are presented. **This 50Cr(n,gamma)/MACS(30) value shows a good agreement with the KADONIS value.**

- Y. Huang (Xi'an Jiaotong University), “Uncertainty Quantification Comparisons in Different Evaluated Libraries Based on the ENDF-6 Formatted Sampling Method”.

The NECP-SOUL methodology is presented which is able to generate random ENDF-6 files based on original ENDF-6 file and covariance data. A comparison with SANDY tool is performed for the Jezebel benchmark, uncertainty results show a good agreement between NECP-SOUL and SANDY. He presented some uncertainty quantification analysis in JEZEBEL, GODIVA and PWR-Pin cell. In this exercise, covariance data are taken from: ENDF/B-VIII.0, JEFF-3.3, JENDL-5.0 and TENDL-2021. He concluded that:

- **PWR-pin cell (TMI-1 HFP): Largest uncertainties are found using ENDF/B-VIII.0. JENDL-5 has shown the smallest uncertainties.**
 - **Godiva: JEFF-3.3 and TENDL-2021 have the similar results. Lower uncertainties in JENDL-5.**
Large impact of uncertainties due to U-235/MF34 only provided in ENDF/B-VIII.0
 - **Jezebel: JEFF-3.3 and TENDL-2021 show similar uncertainties. As for ENDF-B/VIII.0, the uncertainty result of MF 33 is more large than other libraries.**
- Y. Qiu (KIT), “Current status and urgent needs of nuclear data and experiments for the IFMIF-DONES design analysis”
- He introduced the IFMIF-DONES (International Fusion Material Irradiation Facility – Demo- Neutron Source) facility and the current issues with nuclear data and experiments. He concluded as main issues for IFMID/DONES:
- **d-Li neutron production- discrepancies between FZK-2005 and JENDL-DEU 2020**
 - **d-Li activation (7Be, 3H): Li(d,x)7Be and Li(d,x)3H (see NEA/HPRL: <https://www.oecd-nea.org/dbdata/hprl>)**
 - **natCu(d,x)64Cu with break-model implemented by M. Avrigeanu in TENDL-2023?**
 - **Cu(d,Xn) angular distributions by P. Sauvan in TENDL-2023?**
 - **other deuteron transport/activation libraries/gas production/ heating**
 - **needs on integral experiments:**
 - **experimental benchmarks for the high-energy neutrons (DONES: 25% neutrons >14 MeV) are not still lacking. The only one performed is the TIARA shielding experiment for Iron and concrete.**
 - **activation cross section on the high neutron energy needs dedicated benchmarks for DONES application, which is important for safety-relevant evaluation, e.g. Shutdown dose.**

- Sonia Panizo (CIEMAT) *Impact of nuclear data library uncertainties in MYRRHA v1.8 with SUMMON. Library intercomparison*

She presented the SUMMON (Sensitivity and Uncertainty Methodology for MONte carlo codes) tool developed at CIEMAT which has been verified with SANDY code. The MYRRHA system is used to propagate uncertainties in keff for different nuclear data evaluations (JEFF-3.3, ENDF/B-VIII.0 and JENDL-4.0). Differences are shown in the presentation. It can be seen a large contribution in **JEFF-3.3 for the covariance Pu240(n,fission)**. Additionally, the **uncertainty propagation for the neutron multiplicity is presented**. Evaluations may provide only total and/or prompt or both, with or without correlations. She concluded that uncertainties associated with v_{total} and v_{prompt} should not

be dismissed a priori as redundant, in the cases where the correlation data between them exists. The contribution to the uncertainty could be distributed among the four terms of the covariance matrix.

Then, INGENIA/UPM activities were presented:

- *Blanca Aguado (INGENIA/UPM), “Overview of INGENIA activities: Course 2022-2023”*
Activities of the INGENIA/NUCLEAR course are presented. This course is a CDIO course of the UPM. She gave an overview of the content of the course with special mention to our Guest lectures who have been participating this year. She also mentioned the GreatPioneer (<https://great-pioneer.eu/>) course on nuclear data life cycle. Finally social media activities are also mentioned via @IngeniaNuclear.
- *Antonio Silván (INGENIA/UPM), “EXFOR – Outlier identification (EXFOR - ENDF)”*
He presented the Data Mining developed at UPM to search and process EXFOR entries and evaluated data which allow to perform a data analysis to identify potential outliers in EXFOR. The Assessing of Outlier Detection is presented. Different techniques are explored: DBSCAN, Multivariate normal distribution and Distance-based technique. In total, 207 599 EXFOR subentries for isotopes were reviewed (4 398 164 EXFOR energy-points) and 4 288 EXFOR Subentries for natural elements (1 125 858 EXFOR energy-points). This work has provided a total of 139 EXFOR subentries to be reviewed.
- *Alejandro Velasco (INGENIA/UPM), “Mapping of ND Evaluations. An example with JEFF-4T2.2”*
He presented the UPM tool developed to trace and identify the origin (MF/MT) in nuclear data evaluations. JEFF-4.0T2.2 is analysed using a total of 29 previous nuclear data evaluation. This work shows that 172 files in JEFF-4.0T2.2 are new evaluations of a total of 564 files. Graphical examples are shown. Finally, a new tool has been developed to identify missing JEFF data in the JEFF-4T2.2, an example new JEFF-4T2.2 evaluation for 90Zr and 186W are presented. It shows a lack of data for MF12, MF14 and MF15 which were already in previous JEFF evaluations.
- *Álvaro Antón (INGENIA/UPM). “Processing & Benchmarking JEFF-4T2.2 – A comparison with other evaluations”*
He presented the UPM processing tool for evaluated data into ACE format. Two suites of benchmarks are shown, the criticality Mosteller 123 benchmarks and the Oktavian/shielding suite. Calculations are performed with MCNP6.1 using JEFF-4T2.2. This work shows a deterioration in criticality benchmarks: U233, HMI6, LST7, PMF5, PST9. For shielding calculations in OKTAVIAN Benchmark the JEFF-4T2.2 shows a deterioration for Al, Mo, Cu and Zr at high energies.
- *José Miras (INGENIA/UPM), “Benchmarking & Validation JEFF-4T2.2 – A comparison with other evaluations”*
He presented the results in two different calculations:
 - The Benchmark Phase-VII (2008- WPNCS- Expert Group on Burnup Credit) with a good agreement for the JEFF-4T2.2.
 - A comparison with the critical boron let-down for the NNPP- Almaraz PWR, cycle1. The burnup issue (loss of reactivity along burnup) is shown for the JEFF-3.3 and JEFF-4T2.2. Better agreement is shown for ENDF/B-VII.1 within the +-50 ppm of the acceptance limit.

- *Miguel López (INGENIA/UPM), “Processing into JANIS format: Uncertainty Quantification with different evaluations using NDaST code”.*

He presented the UPM processing tool for evaluated data into HENDF format used in JANIS tool. This HENDF database for JEFF-4T2.2 and JENDL-5.0upd are freely available for the nuclear data community thanks to this INGENIA work (links are provided in the presentation). Finally, he also presented the uncertainty quantification for the ICSBEP/PU Benchmarks using NDaST tool for JENDL-5.0

Appendix I. Agenda

Start - End	Presenter (Institution)	Title
9:00 – 9:15	O. Cabellos (UPM) J. Dies (CSN) A. Plompen (JRC)	Welcome Introduction (VIDEO) Introduction: JEFF Project
9:15 – 9:30	A. Jiménez-Carrascosa (PSI)	Assessment of nuclear data libraries performance for SFR simulation
9:30 – 9:45	P. Romojaro (SCK·CEN)	Nuclear data requirements for an accurate estimation of the neutron production rate of spent nuclear fuel
9:45 – 10:00	C. Ratero (SCK·CEN)	Benchmarking of JENDL-5 and JEFF-4T2 in depletion calculations against isotopic inventories
10:00 – 10:15	F. Grimaldi (SCK·CEN)	Neutron data benchmarking at the VENUS-F zero power reactor for MYRRHA
10:15 – 10:30	C. Guerrero (US)	Neutron absorption in the Cr isotopes of structural materials affects the criticality of fast reactor assemblies
10:30 – 10:45	Y. Huang (Xi'an Jiaotong University)	Uncertainty Quantification Comparisons in Different Evaluated Libraries Based on the ENDF-6 Formatted Sampling Method
10:45 – 11:00	Y. Qiu (KIT)	Current status and urgent needs of nuclear data and experiments for the IFMIF-DONES design analysis
11:00- 11:15 Coffee break and photo of participants		
11:15 – 11:30	Sonia Panizo (CIEMAT)	Impact of nuclear data library uncertainties in MYRRHA v1.8 with SUMMON. Library intercomparison
11:30 – 11:40	Blanca Aguado (INGENIA/UPM)	Overview of INGENIA activities: Course 2022-2023
11:40 – 11:50	Antonio Silván (INGENIA/UPM)	EXFOR – Outlier identification (EXFOR - ENDF)
11:50 – 12:00	Alejandro Velasco (INGENIA/UPM)	Mapping of ND Evaluations. An example with JEFF-4T2.2
12:00 – 12:10	Álvaro Antón (INGENIA/UPM)	Processing & Benchmarking JEFF-4T2.2 – A comparison with other evaluations
12:10 – 12:20	José Miras (INGENIA/UPM)	Benchmarking & Validation JEFF-4T2.2 – A comparison with other evaluations
12:20 – 12:30	Miguel López (INGENIA/UPM)	Processing into JANIS format: Uncertainty Quantification with different evaluations using NDaST code
12:30 – 12:35	Closing the meeting	

Appendix II. List of Participants

#	Last Name, First Name	e-mail	Institution	Country
1	Cabellos, Oscar	oscar.cabellos@upm.es	UPM	Spain
2	Dies Llovera, Javier	Javier.Dies@csn.es	CSN	Spain
3	Soler, Amparo	amparo.soler@nfq.es	NFQ	Spain
4	Plompen, Arjan	Arjan.PLOMPEN@ec.europa.eu	JRC	Belgium
5	Heyse, Jan	Jan.HEYSE@ec.europa.eu	JRC	Belgium
6	Jiménez-Carrascosa, Antonio	antonio.jimenez@psi.ch	PSI	Switzerland
7	Pedroche, Gabriel	gpedroche@ind.uned.es	UNED	Spain
8	Romojaro, Pablo	pablo.romojaro@sckcen.be	SCK-CEN	Belgium
9	Ratero, Cristina	cristina.ratero@sckcen.be	SCK-CEN	Belgium
10	Vivancos, Arturo	avivancos@upv.es	UPV	Spain
11	Lerendegui Marco, Jorge	jorge.lerendegui@ific.uv.es	IFIC-UV	Spain
12	Hashemi, Mohammad	mohammad.hashemi@tum.de	TUM	Germany
13	Casas Molina, Victor	victor.casas.molina@sckcen.be	SCK-CEN	Belgium
14	BERMEJO ORTIZ, JAIME	jaime.bermejoo@csn.es	CSN	Spain
15	GUERRERO, CARLOS	cguerrero4@us.es	US	Spain
16	Čerba, Štefan	stefan.cerba@stuba.sk	STUBA	Slovak Republic
17	Muñoz Peña, Guillermo	ing.gmp23@hotmail.com	National Polytechnique Institute	Mexico
18	Xu, Ning	xuning@stu.xjtu.edu.cn	Xi'an Jiaotong University	China
19	Grimaldi, Federico	federico.grimaldi@sckcen.be	SCK-CEN	Belgium
20	Barrachina Celda, Teresa	tbarrachina@iqn.upv.es	UPV	Spain
21	Blanca Aguado Fernández	blanca.aguado.fernandez@alumnos.upm.es	UPM/INGENIA-EXFOR	Spain
22	Christian Bueno Fernandez	christian.bueno@alumnos.upm.es	UPM/INGENIA-EXFOR	Spain
23	Antonio Silván Suárez	antonio.silvan.suarez@alumnos.upm.es	UPM/INGENIA-EXFOR	Spain
24	Luis Garcia Moya	luis.gmoya@alumnos.upm.es	UPM/INGENIA-EXFOR	Spain
25	Jorge Rodríguez Pérez-Silva	jorge.rodriguez.perez-silva@alumnos.upm.es	UPM/INGENIA-EVALUATION	Spain
26	Alvaro Conejero Acero	alvaro.conejero.acero@alumnos.upm.es	UPM/INGENIA-EVALUATION	Spain
27	Alejandro Velasco Roales-Nieto	a.vroales-nieto@alumnos.upm.es	UPM/INGENIA-EVALUATION	Spain
28	Jose Antonio Miras Martinez	Ja.miras@alumnos.upm.es	UPM/INGENIA-BENCHMARKING	Spain
29	Álvaro Antón Izquierdo	alvaro.antonizq@alumnos.upm.es	UPM/INGENIA-BENCHMARKING	Spain
30	Javier Vazquez Periscal	javier.vazquez.periscal@alumnos.upm.es	UPM/INGENIA-BENCHMARKING	Spain
31	Luis Ignacio Barrio Tello	luis.barrio.tello@alumnos.upm.es	UPM/INGENIA-BENCHMARKING	Spain
32	María Astigarraga Santamaria	maria.astigarraga.santamaria@alumnos.upm.es	UPM/INGENIA-REACTORS	Spain
33	Gonzalo Nevado	gonzalo.nevado@alumnos.upm.es	UPM/INGENIA-REACTORS	Spain
34	Iñigo Luca de Tena	i.lucadetena@alumnos.upm.es	UPM/INGENIA-REACTORS	Spain
35	Javier Serrano	javier.serrano.servert@alumnos.upm.es	UPM/INGENIA-REACTORS	Spain
36	Miguel González Torre	miguel.gonzalez.torre@alumnos.upm.es	UPM/INGENIA-SA&UQ	Spain
37	Miguel López Soler	miguel.lopez.soler@alumnos.upm.es	UPM/INGENIA-SA&UQ	Spain
38	Emilio Mora Rodriguez	emilio.mora.rodriguez@alumnos.upm.es	UPM/INGENIA-SA&UQ	Spain
39	Ignacio Rojo Jiménez	ignacio.rojo.jimenez@alumnos.upm.es	UPM/INGENIA-SA&UQ	Spain
40	Huang, Yihan	huangyihan9@stu.xjtu.edu.cn	Xi'an Jiaotong University	China
41	González del Moral, Octavio	ogonzalezdm@essbilbao.org	ESS-Bilbao	Spain
42	Rashed Alnuaimi, Reem	U17100889@sharjah.ac.ae	KAIST	UAE
43	JESUS LOPEZ, ANTONIO	alopez@ind.uned.es	TECF3IR-UNED	Spain
44	Hawary, Mahmoud	myhawary@ncsu.edu	NCSU	US
45	HERRERO, Jose Javier	JJH@enusa.es	ENUSA	Spain
46	Terranova, Nicholas	nicholas.terranova@enea.it	ENEA	Italy
47	Navarro Más, Bárbara	barnama@upv.es	UPV	Spain
48	Cotelo, Manuel	manuel.cotelo@upm.es	UPM	Spain
49	Carter-Cortez, Patrick	ptc36@cam.ac.uk	University of Cambridge	UK
50	Qiu, Yuefeng	yuefeng.qiu@kit.edu	KIT	Germany
51	GONZALEZ ESCAPA, ALVARO	gescap_alvaro@hotmail.com	CSN	Spain
52	Fernandez, Alberto	albertofernandez@moltexenergy.com	MOLTEX	Canada
53	Gilbert, Mark R	Mark.Gilbert@ukaea.uk	UKAEA	UK
54	Kanth, Priti	priti.kanth@ukaea.uk	UKAEA	UK

55	AHNERT IGLESIAS, Carolina	carolina.ahnert@upm.es	UPM	Spain
56	Panizo Prieto, Sonia	Sonia.Panizo@ciemat.es	CIEMAT	Spain
57	Carreter Ulecia, Mariano	mariano.carreter@enel.com	ENEL	Spain
58	Becares Palacios, Vicente	vicente.becares@ciemat.es	CIEMAT	Spain
59	Alvarez Velarde, Francisco	francisco.alvarez@ciemat.es	CIEMAT	Spain
60	Leon Lopez, Pablo Teofilo	pabloteofilo.leon@enel.com	ENEL	Spain
61	PELAYO, FERNANDO	fpl@csn.es	CSN	Spain
62	Vivancos Grau, Arturo	avivancos@upv.es	UPV	Spain
63	Canals, Irene	irene.canals@amphos21.com	AMPHOS21	Spain
64	Niranjana Mishra, Aum	aryan.aum@yandex.com	TU Berlin	Germany
65	BARBAS ESPA, Alfonso	BAE@enusa.es	ENUSA	Spain
66	Sole, Pierre	pierre.sole@irsn.fr	IRSN	France
67	SCHILLEBEECKX, Peter	Peter.SCHILLEBEECKX@ec.europa.eu	JRC	Belgium
68	PARADELA DOBARRO, Carlos	Carlos.PARADELA-DOBARRO@ec.europa.eu	JRC	Belgium
69	ICHOU, Raphaelle	raphaelle.ichou@irsn.fr	IRSN	France
70	MALVAGI, Fausto	fausto.malvagi@irsn.fr	IRSN	France
71	FERNEX, Frédéric	frederic.fernex@irsn.fr	IRSN	France
72	Ortego, pedro	p.ortego@seaingenieria.es	SEA Ingeniería	Spain
73	Andersson Sundén, Erik	erik.andersson-sunden@physics.uu.se	Uppsala University	Sweden

Appendix III. List of Participants



