Designation: E 2006 – 99

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR TESTING AND MATERIALS
100 Barr Harbor Dr., West Conshohocken, PA 19428
Reprinted from the Annual Book of ASTM Standards. Copyright ASTM

# Standard Guide for Benchmark Testing of Light Water Reactor Calculations[1]

This standard is issued under the fixed designation E 2006; the number immediately following the designation indicates the year of original adoption or, in the case of revision, the year of last revision. A number in parentheses indicates the year of last reapproval. A superscript epsilon (ϵ) indicates an editorial change since the last revision or reapproval.

## 1. Scope

1.1 This guide covers general approaches for benchmarking neutron transport calculations in light water reactor systems. A companion guide (Guide E 706–IIE1) covers use of benchmark fields for testing neutron transport calculations and cross sections in well controlled environments. This guide covers experimental benchmarking of neutron fluence calculations (or calculations of other exposure parameters such as dpa) in more complex geometries relevant to reactor surveillance. Particular sections of the guide discuss: the use of well-characterized benchmark neutron fields to provide an indication of the accuracy of the calculational methods and nuclear data when applied to typical cases; and the use of plant specific measurements to indicate bias in individual plant calculations. Use of these two benchmark techniques will serve to limit plant-specific calculational uncertainty, and, when combined with analytical uncertainty estimates for the calculations, will provide uncertainty estimates for reactor fluences with a higher degree of confidence.

1.2 *This standard does not purport to address all of the safety concerns, if any, associated with its use. It is the responsibility of the user of this standard to establish appropriate safety and health practices and determine the applicability of regulatory limitations prior to use.*

## 2. Referenced Documents

2.1 *ASTM Standards:*

E 170 Terminology Relating to Radiation Measurements and Dosimetry[2]

E 261 Practice for Determining Neutron Fluence Rate, Fluence, and Spectra by Radioactivation Techniques[2]

E 262 Test Method for Determining Thermal Neutron Reaction and Fluence Rates by Radioactivation Techniques[2]

E 482 Guide for Application of Neutron Transport Methods for Reactor Vessel Surveillance, E 706 (IID)[2]

E 560 Practice for Extrapolating Reactor Vessel Surveillance Dosimetry Results, E 706 (IC)[2]

E 706 Master Matrix for Light Water Reactor Pressure Vessel Surveillance Standards, E 706 (O)[2]

E 844 Guide for Sensor Set Design and Irritation for Reactor Surveillance[2]

E 853 Practice for Analysis and Interpretation of Light-Water Reactor Surveillance Results, E 706 (IA)[2]

E 854 Test Method for Application and Analysis of Solid State Track Recorder (SSTR) Monitors for Reactor Surveillance, E 706 (IIB)[2]

E 910 Test Method for Application and Analysis of Helium Accumulation Fluence Monitors for Reactor Vessel Surveillance, E 706 (IIIC)[2]

E 944 Guide for Application of Neutron Spectrum Adjustment Methods in Reactor Surveillance, E 706 (IIA)[2]

E 1006 Practice for Analysis and Interpretation of Physics Dosimetry Results for Test Reactors, E 706 (II)[2]

E 1018 Guide for Application of ASTM Evaluated Cross Section Data File, E 706 (IIB)[2]

## 3. Significance and Use

3.1 This guide deals with the difficult problem of benchmarking neutron transport calculations carried out to determine fluences for plant specific reactor geometries. The calculations are necessary for fluence determination in locations important for material radiation damage estimation and which are not accessible to measurement. The most important application of such calculations is the estimation of fluence within the reactor vessel of operating power plants to provide accurate estimates of the irradiation embrittlement of the base and weld metal in the vessel. The benchmark procedure must not only prove that calculations give reasonable results but that their uncertainties are propagated with due regard to the sensitivities of the different input parameters used in the transport calculations. Benchmarking is achieved by building up data bases of benchmark experiments which have different influences on uncertainty propagation. For example, fission spectra are the fundamental data bases which control propagation of cross section uncertainties, while such physics-dosimetry experiments as vessel wall mockups, where measurements are made within a simulated reactor vessel wall, control error propagation associated with geometrical and methods approximations in the transport calculations. This guide describes general procedures for using neutron fields with known characteristics to corroborate the calculational methodology and nuclear data used to derive neutron field information from measurements of neutron sensor response.

---

[1] This test method is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee E-10 on Nuclear Technology and Applications and is the direct responsibility of Subcommittee E10.05 on Nuclear Radiation and Metrology.

Current edition approved Feb. 10, 1999. Published April 1999.

[2] *Annual Book of ASTM Standards*, Vol 12.02.

3.2 The bases for benchmark field referencing are usually irradiations performed in standard neutron fields with well known energy spectra and intensities. There are, however, less well known neutron fields that have been designed to mockup special environments, such as pressure vessel mockups in which it is possible to make dosimetry measurements inside of the steel volume of the "vessel". When such mockups are suitably characterized they are also referred to as benchmark fields. A benchmark is that against which other things are referenced, hence the terminology "to benchmark reference" or "benchmark referencing". A variety of benchmark neutron fields, other than standard neutron fields, have been developed, or pressed into service, to improve the accuracy of neutron dosimetry measurement techniques. Some of these special benchmark experiments are discussed in this standard because they have identified needs for additional benchmarking or because they have been sufficiently documented to serve as benchmarks.

3.3 One dedicated effort to provide benchmarks whose radiation environments closely resemble those found outside the core of an operating reactor was the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Light Water Reactor Pressure Vessel Surveillance Dosimetry Improvement Program (LWR-PV-SDIP) **(1)**[3]. This program promoted better monitoring of the radiation exposure of reactor vessels and, thereby, provided for better assessment of vessel end-of-life conditions. An objective of the LWR-PV-SDIP was to develop improved procedures for reactor surveillance and document them in a series of ASTM standards (see Matrix E 706). The primary means chosen for validating LWR-PV-SDIP procedures was by benchmarking a series of experimental and analytical studies in a variety of fields (see Matrix E 706 IIE1).

## 4. Particulars of Benchmarking Transport Calculations

4.1 Benchmarking of neutron transport calculations involves several distinct steps that are detailed below.

4.1.1 Nuclear data used for transport calculations are evaluated using differential data or a combination of integral and differential data. This process results in a library of cross sections and other needed nuclear data (including fission spectra) that, in the opinion of the evaluator, gives the best fit to the available experimental and theoretical results. Some of information used in evaluating the cross sections may be the same as that used directly for benchmarking transport calculations for LWR systems (see 4.1.2). The cross section benchmarking itself is not addressed in this standard. It is assumed that the cross-section set is derived in this fashion to be applicable to a variety of calculational geometries and may not give the most accurate answer for LWR geometries. Thus further benchmarking in LWR geometries is required.

4.1.2 Transport calculations in LWR geometries may be benchmarked using measurements made in well-defined and well-characterized facilities that each mock-up part of an LWR-type system. These facilities have the advantage over operating plants that the dimensions and material compositions can be more accurately defined, the neutron source can be well characterized, and measurements can be made in a large number of locations that would not be accessible in actual power systems. In power reactors, one is interested in the transport of neutrons from the distributed source in the fuel, through the reactor internals and water to the vessel, and through the vessel to the reactor cavity. Three mockups that together encompass this entire transport problem are described in 5.1. Modeling and calculating of neutron transport in these various geometries can be expected to identify any bias in specific parts of the calculations. Biases that can be detected include those due to modeling the irregular fuel geometry and distributed neutron source, those due to errors in the cross-sections or neutron spectra, and those due to calculational approximations.

4.1.3 The benchmarking described above does not provide checks on geometries identical to actual plants and does not include bias that may exist in the definition of a specific plant model. Identification of these types of bias can only be accomplished using actual plant measurements. Benchmarking using these measurements is described in 5.2 and 5.3.

4.1.4 The final aspect of benchmarking is the benchmarking of the dosimetry results. This aspect is treated in Matrix E 706(IIE1). It is assumed that the measurements in the benchmarked facilities and in the actual operating plants are carried out using benchmarked reactions and dosimeters. This involves using reactions whose cross sections have been shown to be consistent with results in these types of neutron environments. Also, the dosimeters and measurement facilities must be of adequate quality and have measurement accuracies that have been verified (such as through round-robin testing). Periodic recalibration of laboratory measurement devices is also required using appropriate reference standards.

4.1.4.1 Selection and use of dosimetry should be according to Guide E 844, and evaluation of the dosimetry results should be in accordance with Practice E 261 and Test Method E 262. In particular, to compare measured dosimetry results with calculated reaction rates or fluences, the following effects must be accounted for: effects of dosimetry perturbations, position or gradient corrections, gamma attenuation in counted foils, differences in counting geometry from that of calibration standards, dosimeter or reaction product burnup, effects of competing reactions in impurities and photofission or photoinduced reactions, and proper treatment of the irradiation history.

4.1.4.2 The benchmarking of the dosimetry results will also have indicated any bias that exists in the dosimetry cross sections. These cross sections are essentially independent of the transport cross sections discussed in 4.1.1. Recommended dosimetry cross sections are given in Guide E 1018.

4.1.5 The use of the benchmark data to determine bias in calculations and to determine best values for fluence in complex geometries is not straightforward. It often is not clear how to eight the impact of the different types of information when inconsistencies exist. Although, most calculations produce results that agree with measurements within acceptable tolerance, the cause of discrepancies within the tolerance may not be apparent from the available information. In this case, there is not universal agreement on the "best" answer, and the

[3] The boldface numbers given in parentheses refer to a list of references at the end of the text.

various approaches to use of the benchmark data can be adopted. Some of these approaches are described in Section 6. Caution should be used if it is necessary to extrapolate beyond the limits of the benchmarks.

## 5. Summary of Reference Benchmarks for Reactor Pressure Vessel Surveillance Dosimetry

5.1 *Special Benchmark Irradiation Fields*:

5.1.1 One dedicated effort to provide benchmarks whose radiation environments closely resemble those found outside the core of an operating reactor was the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's LWR-PV-SDIP **(1)**. This program promoted better monitoring of the radiation exposure of reactor vessels and, thereby, provided for better assessment of vessel end-of-life conditions. In cooperation with other organizations nationally and internationally this program resulted in three benchmark configurations, VENUS **(2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**, PCA/PSF **(9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15)**, and NESDIP **(16, 17, 18, 19)**.

5.1.1.1 To serve as benchmarks, these special neutron environments had to be well characterized both experimentally and theoretically. This came to mean that difference between measurements and calculations were reconciled and that uncertainty bounds for exposure parameters were well defined. Target uncertainties were 5 % to 10 % (1σ). To achieve these objectives, benchmarked dosimetry measurements were combined with neutron transport calculations, and statistical uncertainty analysis and spectral adjustment techniques were used to establish the uncertainty bounds.

5.1.1.2 Taken together, the three benchmarks provide coverage from the fuel region to the vessel cavity. The VENUS facility was set up to measure spatial fluence distributions and neutron spectra near the fuel region and core barrel/thermal shield region. The PCA/PSF measurements looked at surveillance capsule effects and the fluence fall-off within the vessel itself. The NESDIP measurements overlap the PCA/PSF measurements and extend into the cavity behind the vessel. Investigations of axial streaming in the cavity were also conducted in NESDIP.

5.1.2 *The VENUS Benchmark*:

5.1.2.1 The special benchmark field was developed at the VENUS Critical Facility CEN/SCK Laboratories, Belguim **(2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**. The facility can mock up PWR fuel geometries to investigate the flux distributions in regions affected by the deviations from cylindrical symmetry. In addition, measurements on the VENUS fuel can investigate the edge effects on power produced by individual pins at the outside of the fuel region and thus better establish the neutron source. These data provide verification of both the flux magnitude and the azimuthal flux shape. The mock up includes a simulated core barrel and thermal shield.

5.1.2.2 There were several phases to the VENUS program. The first PV mockup configuration studies (VENUS-I) provided a link between the PCA and PSF tests and the actual environments of LWR power plants. Indeed for actual power plants, the azimuthal variation of the power distribution determined largely by complex stair-step-shaped core peripheries and by the core-boundary fuel power distributions could not be ignored, otherwise the calculations could contain undetected biases. Such biases could be further exacerbated by the use of low-leakage fuel-management schemes.

5.1.2.3 A second configuration, VENUS-2, contained a plutonium-fueled zone at the periphery of the core (to simulate burned fuel), and its objective was to investigate how much the fast neutron fluence is affected by such a core loading, and if changes in calculational modeling are necessary to account for any effects. The VENUS facility can also provide data to be used in validation of other sources asymmetries, such as those due to loading of absorber pins or dummy fuel rods in external assemblies to limit neutron leakage.

5.1.3 *The PCA/PSF Benchmark*:

5.1.3.1 The task of developing benchmark fields to meet surveillance dosimetry needs began with the construction, adjacent to the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) Pool Critical Assembly (PCA), of a full-scale-section mockup of a pressure vessel wall in passive and active dosimetry measurements (including neutron spectroscopy) could be made both outside and within the steel mockup **(9, 10, 20)**. Measurement positions corresponding to the 1⁄4, 1⁄2, and 3⁄4 thicknesses of the pressure vessel were provided. A simulated surveillance capsule was added to the mockup also. Extensive measurements and calculations provided sufficient characterization of the PCA benchmark experiment so that it was used for a blind test of neutron transport calculations **(9)**.

5.1.3.2 The PCA benchmark also served as the critical facility for a higher fluence model of the PCA built at the Pool Side Facility (PSF) of the 30 MW Oak Ridge Research Reactor (ORR). The PSF made it possible to perform simultaneous dosimetry and metallurgical irradiations at the simulated surveillance capsule position and positions within the vessel wall. Such measurements within the vessel wall are not possible in an operating power reactor. The PSF measurements consisted of a startup experiment to confirm similarity with the PCA results, a long-term vessel wall irradiation with extensive dosimetry contained in capsules with dosimetry specimens, and three additional experiments to investigate surveillance capsule effects. The PSF irradiation facility consisting of the pressure vessel simulator is identified as the Simulated Dosimetry Measurement Facility (SDMF). The SDMF irradiations were carried out at high-flux with the Oak Ridge Reactor at 30 MW in a series of seven experiments; refer to Appendix A of reference 13 for the identification of each of these experiments and reference 15 for additional summary commentary on the SDMF Experiments 1, 2, 3 and 4.

5.1.3.3 The SDMF-1 Startup Experiment, with dosimetry in dummy surveillance capsules in place of the instrumented ones, was performed prior to the metallurgical irradiation to determine accurately the irradiation times needed to reach the target fluence. A set of calculations was performed to account for 52 different core loadings and their associated irradiation histories. Calculations were performed for each of three exposures: two surveillance capsules (SSC-1 and SSC-2) and a pressure vessel capsule. Comparisons of the ORNL-calculated end-of-life dosimeter activities with measurements indicated agreement, generally within 15 % for the first surveillance capsule, 5 % for the second capsule, and 10 % for the three locations (1⁄4T, 1⁄2T/ and 3⁄4T) in the pressure vessel capsule **(20)**.

5.1.3.4 NUREG/CR-3320, Vol 2 **(12)** provides documentation of the SDMF-1 Experiment and the results of dosimetry measurements and studies by the LWR-PV-SDIP participants. The following laboratories participated in radiometric analyses of the dosimeters: HEDL; ORNL; CEN/SCK (Mol); KFA (Julich); Harwell (England - counting for Rolls Royce Assoc. Ltd.); PTB (Federal Republic of Germany); Petten (Netherlands). NBS Certified Fluency Standards were supplied.

5.1.3.5 The results of the SDMF-1, SDMF-2, and SDMF-3 experiments are primarily based on radiometric sensor measurements. The SDMF-4 experiment provided benchmark referencing data for the full complement of dosimetry sensors (radiometric, solid state track recorders, helium accumulation fluence monitors, and damage monitors) under development and testing for PWR and BWR surveillance program applications **(15)**. Therefore, the SDMF-4 measured results are particularly appropriate for benchmarking the methodology, nuclear data, and accuracy of derived neutron exposure parameter for surveillance applications.

5.1.3.6 The later SDMF experiments were specialized geometry experiments to study the effects on dosimeter response caused by placement of the surveillance capsules in the water environment of the reactor downcomer region.

5.1.4 *The NESDIP Benchmark*—The NESTOR Shielding and Dosimetry Improvement Program (NESDIP) was started in 1982 **(16, 17, 18)**. NESDIP experiments have been divided into three phases, the third of which is simulation of actual commercial LWR cavity configurations in accord with cooperative interests of the NRC and US utilities and reactor vendors **(19)**. The emphasis was on an internal study of the accuracy of transport theory methods, $S_N$ and Monte Carlo methods, for predicting neutron penetration and attenuation for the radial shield and cavity region of LWRs.

5.1.5 *Other Benchmarks*—Other benchmarks exist which may be used for comparisons for special geometries or for other reactor types. These benchmarks include those described in the benchmark referencing standard (E 706-IIE1). Additional benchmarks that may be applicable include the DOMPAC benchmark **(21, 22)**, the OSIRIS benchmark **(23, 24)**, the LR-0/VVER440 benchmark **(25, 26**), the TAPIRO source reactor benchmark **(27)**, the KORPUS benchmark **(28)**, the concrete benchmark **(29)**, and the KUCA/KUR/UTR-KINKI benchmarks **(30, 31)**

5.2 *Benchmarks at Power Reactor Facilities*:

5.2.1 In parallel with the PV mockup experiments were efforts in the Arkansas Power and Light Reactor ANO-1 to initiate ex-vessel cavity dosimetry as a supplement or replacement for vessel monitoring dosimetry in the surveillance capsule **(32)**. This led to benchmarking, by LWR-PV-SDIP of cavity dosimetry in special experiments in the H.B. Robinson nuclear power reactor **(33)** as well as a number of others **(34)**.

5.2.2 The H.B. Robinson measurements have the advantage that simultaneous dosimetry results were obtained from a dummy surveillance capsule and from ex-vessel capsules irradiated during a single reactor cycle. Thus direct comparisons may be made with calculations on both sides of the reactor vessel.

5.3 *Specific Plant Measurements*:

5.3.1 The use of actual plant measurements to obtain fluence results is covered in Practice E 1006. However, these results are seen in the benchmark context as part of the overall benchmarking process to obtain the evaluated plant specific fluence.

5.3.1.1 In recent years a large body of data, including both surveillance capsule and ex-vessel dosimetry measurements, has been obtained. Evaluation of these data in a systematic fashion has indicated excellent self-consistency among plants of the same types **(35, 36, 37)**. This indicates that the changes in neutron source with changes in fuel loading are being correctly handled, and that calculational bias is most probably due to systematic (not random) effects. Use of the data bases of surveillance dosimetry results can provide additional confidence in treatment of any results that appear to lie outside the normal error tolerance.

## 6. Applications of Benchmark Results

6.1 *Comparisons of Calculations and Measurements*—Three methods can be used for comparisons of calculations and measurements, These are described in the following sections.

6.1.1 The first method is to calculate the measured dosimeter disintegrations per second. Use of this method involves calculations of the reactions per second from the calculated fluence rate and subsequent derivation of the activity using the irradiation history, This method enables various segments of the irradiation to be summed to get the total activity, The disadvantage of this method is that experimental results from different irradiations cannot be directly compared without using the transport calculated results. An overall comparison of calculation and experiment can be made by a suitably weighted average of the calculation/measurement (C/M) ratios.

6.1.2 The second method is to derive the average full-power reaction rate for each dosimeter using the irradiation history. These “saturated” reaction rates are independent of the length of irradiation or the time at less than full power. It is important to use a history that represents the variance of the actual rate of activation at the dosimeter location and not just the reactor power history. Comparisons of calculated and measured reaction rates indicate possible bias in the calculation and a weighted average of the results may be used as in the method in 6.1.1.

6.1.3 The final method is to derive a fluence rate from the average reaction rates at each location. This enables a direct comparison with then calculated fluence results. The fluence-rate may be derived from the measurements using least squares procedures. Several computer codes exist to carry out this process including LSL **(38)** and FERRET **(39)**. The calculations should be carried out in accordance with Guide E 944. The use of the least squares procedures enables relations between the part of the neutron spectrum measured by the dosimeters and the part to be used to evaluate irradiation effects to be included in the weighting, in addition to measurement uncertainties. More extensive use of the least squares method to evaluate fluence is described in 6.2.3.

6.2 *Use of Measurement Comparisons for Determination of Best-Estimate Fluence*—Depending on the confidence in measurements or calculations, several approaches can be used to develop a final fluence results.

6.2.1 Once the measurements and calculations are compared, one course of action is to merely use the measurements as a test of the calculational result. The calculation would then be considered adequate if it reproduced the measurements within some tolerance. If the results are outside the tolerance, corrective action would be required. This method, while the simplest in checking methods using both benchmark and plant specific data, does not produce the best estimate result and the uncertainty in the result will be that evaluated for the calculation alone.

6.2.2 The second method is to use the plant specific measurements to renormalize the calculations. Use of this method will normally produce the best result at actual dosimetry measurement locations and at locations suitably close to the measurement locations. The plant specific measurements reflect unknown errors in geometry parameters used in the calculations of fluence that cannot be benchmarked in any other way. Translation of the results to locations away from measurement points can be guided by both the plant specific and special irradiation field benchmark comparisons. Fluence results benchmarked in this way will come close to best estimates using more sophisticated methods.

6.2.3 The most sophisticated method for fluence determination is to include both the calculation results and uncertainty and the measurements and uncertainty to get a best estimate result using a least squares procedures. One way to accomplish this is by use of the LEPRICON code **(40)**.

6.2.3.1 In the LEPRICON procedure, benchmark experiments are first incorporated into a database of integral dosimetry measurements of high quality. These are measurements which, in so far as possible: have been performed in simple geometries amenable to accurate descriptions for calculational purposes; have large sensitivities to only a few differential parameters; and involve integral quantities and parameters which are highly correlated with many of those parameters used in the analyses of experiments performed in the more complex geometries of light water reactors.

6.2.3.2 The benefit of simultaneously combining heavily weighted benchmark results with those from more complicated-geometry experiments into a more self-consistent data base comes about because of the correlations induced by data sharing sensitivities to common parameters.

6.2.3.3 The data required to implement the least-squares adjustment procedure includes measured and calculated values of a dosimeter's response, sensitivities of that response to the more important differential data used in calculations, the standard deviation of each measurement along with correlations between measurements that are being combined (that is the covariances), and the covariances of the differential data among the various parameters.

6.2.3.4 It should be evident that such an undertaking is not an easy task and definition of the covariances may be difficult. For example, it was already mentioned above that the LWR benchmarks may have been used by the cross section evaluators to influence the cross section shape or magnitude; the benchmark data may be included a second time in the unfolding process. However, when a concerted effort is made to accomplish the uncertainty definition in a rigorous and well documented manner, the result can have a significantly higher degree of certainty. Such evaluations can then be used to estimate uncertainties in similar cases without repeating the entire process.

## 7. Precision and Bias

NOTE 1—Measurement uncertainty is described by a precision and bias statement in this practice. Another acceptable approach is to use Type A and B uncertainty components (see ISO Guide on the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement and Ref **(46)**. This Type A/B uncertainty specification is now used in International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standards, and this approach can be expected to play a more prominent role in future uncertainty analyses.

7.1 The benchmarking processes outlined above will serve to indicate the calculational bias and allow uncertainty estimates to be made. Typical calculational (analytic) uncertainty estimates are 15 to 20 % ($1\sigma$) **(9, 11, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45)** at the inside of the reactor vessel in the beltline region and may be as large as 30 % in the cavity. Using the benchmark results can be expected to lower the uncertainty to 10 to 15 %.

7.2 Error propagation with integral detectors is complex because such detectors do not measure neutron fluence directly, and because the same measured detector responses from which a neutron fluence is derived are also used to help establish the neutron spectrum required for that fluence derivation.

7.3 The information content of uncertainty statements determines, to a large extent, the worth of the effort. A common deficiency in many statements of uncertainty is that they do not convey all the pertinent information. One pitfall is over simplification, for example, the practice of obliterating all the identifiable components of the uncertainty, by combining them into an overall uncertainty, just for the sake of simplicity.

7.4 Many "measured" dosimetry results are actually derived quantities because the observed raw data must be corrected, by a series of multiplicative adjustment factors, to compensate for other than ideal circumstances during the measurement. It is not always clear after data adjustments have been made and averages taken just how the uncertainties were taken into account. Therefore, special attention should be given to discussion of uncertainty contributions when they are comparable to or larger than the normally considered statistical uncertainties. Futhermore, benchmark procedures owe their effectiveness to strong correlations which can exist between the measurements in the benchmark and study fields. Other correlations can also exist among the measurements in each of those types of fields. It is, therefore, vital to identify those uncertainties which are correlated, between fields, among measurements, and in some cases where it may be ambiguous, those uncertainties which are uncorrelated.

## 8. Documentation

8.1 The procedures followed to benchmark the calculations should be extensively documented. This must include, as a minimum, the following: a description of the methods used including codes and options selected, a reference to the nuclear data used, a description of the models applied, and a listing of the benchmark data utilized.

## 9. Keywords

9.1 benchmark testing; calculational methods; least-square adjustment; neutron transport calculations; nuclear data; reactor pressure vessel; uncertainty estimates

## REFERENCES


(**1**) Gold, R. and McElroy, W.N., "The Light Water Reactor Pressure Vessel Surveillance Dosimetry Improvement Program (LWR-PV-SDIP): Past Accomplishments, Recent Developments, and Future Directions", *Reactor Dosimetry: Methods, Applications, and Standardization, ASTM STP 1001*, 1989.

(**2**) Fabry, A. et al., "VENUS PWR Engineering Mockup: Core Qualification, Neutron and Gamma Field Characterization," *Proc. of the 5th ASTM-EURATOM Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry, Geesthacht, Federal Republic of Germany*, September 24-28, 1984, EUR 9869, Commission of the European Communities, Vol 2, 1985.

(**3**) Fero, A.H. *Neutron and Gamma-Ray Flux Calculations for the VENUS PWR Engineering Mockup*, WCAP-11173, Westinghouse Electric Company, January 1987.

(**4**) Fabry, A. et al., "Improvement of LWR PV Steel Embrittlement Surveillance: 1984-1986 Progress Report on Belgian Activities in Cooperation with the USNRC and other R&D Programs," *Reactor Dosimetry: Methods, Applications, and Standardization, 6th ASTM-Euratom Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry, Jackson Hole Wyoming, May 31-June 6, 1987*, STP 1001, American Society for Testing and Materials, May 1989.

(**5**) D'hondt, P. et al., "Contribution of the VENUS Engineering Mock-up Experiment to the LWR-PV Surveillance", *Proc. of the 7th ASTM-Euratom Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry, Strasbourg, France, August 27-31, 1990*, EUR 14356 EN, Commission of the European Communities, 1992.

(**6**) Maerker, R.E. et al., "Analysis of the VENUS-3 Experiments", *Proc. of the 7th ASTM-Euratom Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry, Strasbourg, France, August 27-31, 1990,* EUR 14356 EN, Commission of the European Communities, 1992.

(**7**) Blaise, P.D. de Wouters, R.M. and Ait Abderrahim, H. "Analysis of the VENUS Out-of-Core Activation Measurements Using MCBEND", *Proc. of the 8th ASTM-Euratom Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry, Vail Colorado, Aug. 29-Sept 3, 1993*, STP 1228, ASTM, Dec. 1994.

(**8**) Ait Abderrahim, H. and Hort, M, "Analysis of the VENUS Ex-Core Neutron Dosimetry Using the Lepricon Code System", *Proc. of the 8th ASTM-Euratom Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry, Vail Colorado, Aug. 29-Sept 3, 1993*, STP 1228, ASTM, Dec. 1994.

(**9**) McElroy, W. N. Ed., *LWR-PV-SDIP: PCA Experiments and Blind Test*, NUREG/CR-1861, HEDL-TME 80-87, NRC, Washington, DC, July 1981.

(**10**) McElroy, W. N. Ed., *LWR-PV-SDIP: PCA Experiments, Blind Test, and Physics-Dosimetry Support for the PSF Experiments*, NUREG/CR-3318, HEDL-TIME 84-1, NRC, Washington, DC, Sept. 1984.

(**11**) McElroy, W. N. Ed., *LWR-PV-SDIP: PSF Experiments Summary and Blind Test Results*, NUREG/CR-3320, Vol 1, HEDL-TIME 86-8, NRC, Washington, DC, July 1986.

(**12**) McElroy, W. N. Gold, R. and McGarry, E.D. Eds., *LWR-PV-SDIP: PSF Physics-Dosimetry Program*, NUREG/CR-3320, Vol 2, WHC-EP-0204, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Battelle Memorial Institute, July 1992.

(**13**) McElroy, W. N. and Gold, R. Eds., *LWR-PV-SDIP: PSF Physics-Dosimetry Program*, NUREG/CR-3320, Vol 3, HEDL-TME 87-3, Hanford Engineering Development Laboratory, Oct. 1987.

(**14**) McElroy, W. N. and Gold, R. Eds., *LWR-PV-SDIP: PSF Metallurgy Program*, NUREG/CR-3320, Vol 4, HEDL-TME 87-4, Hanford Engineering Development Laboratory, Nov. 1987.

(**15**) McElroy, W. N. and McGarry, E. D. Eds., *LWR-PV-SDIP: Service Laboratory Procedures: Verification and Surveillance Capsule Perturbations*, NUREG/CR-3321, WHC-EP-0205, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Battelle Memorial Institute, April 1996.

(**16**) Austin, M. "Sense of Direction: An Observation of Trends in Materials Dosimetry in the United Kingdom", *Proc. of the 4th ASTM-Euratom Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry*, Gaithersburg, MD, March 22-26, 1982, NUREG/CP-0029, NRC, Washington, DC, Vol l, July 1982.

(**17**) Butler, J, et al., *The PCA Replica Experiment Part I: Winfrith Measurements and Calibrations*, NUREG/CR-3324, AEEW-R 1736, Part I, NRC, Washington, DC, January 1984.

(**18**) Carter, M.D. and Curl, I.J. *NESTOR Shielding and Dosimetry Improvement Programme*, AEEW-M 2329, 1986.

(**19**) Butler, J. et al.," Review of the NESTOR Shielding and Dosimetry Improvement Programme (NESDIP)", *Reactor Dosimetry: Methods, Applications, and Standardization, 6th ASTM-Euratom Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry, Jackson, Hole Wyoming, May 31-June 6, 1987*, STP 1001, ASTM, May 1989.

(**20**) McGarry, E. D. "PCA Experimental Results," *Minutes of the 15th LWR-PV-SDIP Meeting in Gaithersburg, MD on October 21-24, 1985 and NESDIP/VENUS/PWR Workshop at Raleigh, NC on September 15-18, 1986*, HEDL-7587, Section 4.2.1, Handford Engineering Development Laboratory, Richland, WA, November 1986.

(**21**) Alberman, A.A. et al., "Experience De Dosimetrie DOMPAC Simulation Neutronique De L' Epaisseur De La Cuve D'Un Reacteur P.W.R. - Caracterisation Des Dommages D'Irradiation, *Proc. Of the 3rd ASTM-Euratom Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry, Ispra, Italy, October 1-5, 1979*, EUR 6813 EN-FR, Commission of the European Communities, Vol 1, 1980.

(**22**) Alberman, A.A. et al., *DOMPAC Dosimetry Experiment Neutron Simulation of the Pressure Vessel of a Pressurized Water Reactor - Characterization of Irradiation Damage*, CEA-R-5217, Centre d'Etudes Nucleaires de Saclay, France, May 1993.

(**23**) Alberman, A.A. et al., "Etude de L'Influence Du Spectre Neutronique Sur La Fragilisation Des Aciers De Cuve De Reacteurs A Eau Pressurisee," *Proc. of the 7th ASTM-Euratom Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry, Strasbourg, France, August 27-31, 1990*, EUR 14356 EN, Commission of the European Communities, 1992.

(**24**) A.A. Alberman, et al., "Neutron Spectrum Effect on Pressure Vessel Embrittlement: Dosimetry and Qualification of Irradiation Locations in OSIRIS and SILOE Reactors", *Proc. of the 8th ASTM-Euratom Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry, Vail Colorado, Aug. 29-Sept 3, 1993*, STP 1228, ASTM, Dec. 1994.

(**25**) Osmera, B. and Holman, M, "Surveillance Neutron Dosimetry and Cavity Neutron Flux Monitoring at Czechoslovak VVER-440 Power Reactors, *Proc. of the 7th ASTM-Euratom Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry, Strasbourg, France, August 27-31, 1990,* EUR 14356 EN, Commission of the European Communities, 1992.

(**26**) Osmera, B. et al., "VVER-440 Reactor Vessel Exposure Monitoring in the Czech Republic", *Proc. of the 8th ASTM-Euratom Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry, Vail Colorado, Aug. 29-Sept 3, 1993,* STP 1228, American Society for Testing and Materials, Dec. 1994.

(**27**) Fabry, A. et al., "Learning from a Joint Italian-Belgian Neutronic Characterization of the Tapiro Source Reactor", *Proc. of the 7th ASTM-Euratom Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry, Strasbourg, France, August 27-31, 1990*, EUR 14356 EN, Commission of the European Communities, 1992.

(**28**) Brodkin, E.B. et al.,“ The Irradiation Facility KORPUS for Irradiation of the Reactor Structure Materials”, *Proc. of the 8th ASTM-Euratom Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry, Vail Colorado, Aug. 29-Sept 3, 1993*, STP 1228, ASTM, Dec. 1994.

(**29**) Ait Abderrahim, H. et al., “Concrete Benchmark Experiment as Support to Ex-Vessel LWR Surveillance Dosimetry,” *Proc. of the 8th ASTM-Euratom Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry, Vail Colorado, Aug. 29-Sept 3, 1993*, STP 1228, ASTM, Dec. 1994.

(**30**) Sakurai, Y. et al., “Calculation and Measurement of Neutron and Gamma-Ray Fluxes in and Around Reactors”, *Proc. of the 7th ASTM-Euratom Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry, Strasbourg, France, August 27-31, 1990*, EUR 14356 EN, Commission of the European Communities, 1992.

(**31**) Kimura, I. et al., “Measurement and Analysis of Gamma-Ray Distributions in Kyoto University Critical Assmbly, KUCA”, *Proc. of the 8th ASTM-Euratom Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry, Vail Colorado, Aug. 29-Sept 3, 1993*, STP 1228, American Society for Testing and Materials, Dec. 1994.

(**32**) Maerker, R. E. et al., *Application of the LEPRICON Methodology to the Arkansas Nuclear One-Unit Reactor*, EPRI NP-4469, Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, CA, February 1986.

(**33**) McElroy, W. N., “1985 Summary Annual Report on the LWR Pressure Vessel Surveillance Dosimetry Improvement Program,” NUREG/CR-4307, Vol 2, April 1986.

(**34**) Lippincott, E. P. et al., “Evaluation of Surveillance Capsule and Reactor Cavity Dosimetry from H. B. Robinson Unit 2, Cycle 9,” WCAP-11104, NUREG/CR-4576, Westinghouse-Nuclear Technology Division, Pittsburgh, PA, February 1987.

(**35**) Lippincott, E. P. “Westinghouse Surveillance Capsule Neutron Fluence Reevaluation”, WCAP-14044, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Pittsburgh, PA, April 1994.

(**36**) Nimal, J. C. et al., “Determination des Caracteristiques Neutroniques du Programme de Surveillance des Tranches Francaises – Rep 900 Mwe,” *Proceedings of the Seventh ASTM-Euratom Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1992, pp. 161-169.

(**37**) Lippincott, E. P. Anderson, S. L. and Fero, A. H. “Application of Ex-Vessel Neutron Dosimetry for Determination of Vessel Fluence”, *Reactor Dosimetry: Methods, Applications, and Standardization, ASTM STP 1001*, 1989.

(**38**) Stallmann, F. W. “LSL - A Logarithmic Least-Squares Adjustment Method,” *Proc. of the 4th ASTM-EURATOM Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry, Gaithersburg, MD, March 22-26, 1982*, NUREG/CP-0029, Vol. 2, NRC, Washington, DC, pp. 1123-1128.

(**39**) Schmittroth, F. A. *FERRET Data Analysis Code*, HEDL-TME 79-40, Hanford Engineering Development Laboratory, Richland, WA, September 1979.

(**40**) Maerker, R. E. et al., *Revision and Expansion of the Data Base in the LEPRICON Dosimetry Methodology*, EPRI NP-3841, RP1399-01, Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, CA, January 1985.

(**41**) Lippincott, E. P. “Assessment of Uncertainty in Reactor Vessel Fluence Determination,” *Reactor Dosimetry, ASTM STP 1228*, Harry Farrar IV, E. Parvin Lippincott, John G. Williams, and David W. Vehar, Eds., American Society for Testing and Materials, Philadelphia, PA, 1994.

(**42**) Anderson, S. L., *Westinghouse Fast Neutron Exposure Methodology for Pressure Vessel Fluence Determination and Dosimetry Evaluation*, WCAP-13362, Westinghouse Electric Corp, Pittsburgh, PA, May 1992.

(**43**) Lippincott, E. P., *Palisades Nuclear Plant Reactor Vessel Fluence Analysis*, WCAP-13348, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Pittsburgh, PA, May 1992.

(**44**) Maerker, R. E., et al., “Application of LEPRICON Methodology to LWR Pressure Vessel Dosimetry”, *Reactor Dosimetry: Methods, Applications, and Standardization, ASTM STP 1001*, 1989, pp 405-414.

(**45**) Serpan. C. Z., “Standardization of Dosimetry Related Procedures for the Prediction and Verification of Changes in LWR-PV Steel Fracture Toughness During a Reactor’s Service Life: Status and Recommendations, *“Proceedings of the 3rd ASTM-Euratom Symposium on Reactor Dosimetry, Ispra, Italy*, October 1-5, 1979, EUR 6813 EN-FR, 1980.

(**46**) Taylor, B. N., and Kuyatt, C. E., *Guidelines for Evaluating and Expressing the Uncertainty of NIST Measurement Results*, NIST Technical Note 1297, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD, 1994.