

Verification of different Monte Carlo approaches for the neutronic analysis of a stellarator



André Häußler^{a,*}, Ulrich Fischer^a, Felix Warmer^b

^a Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT), Institute for Neutron Physics and Reactor Technology (INR), 76344 Eggenstein-Leopoldshafen, Germany

^b Max Planck Institute for Plasma Physics (IPP), 17491 Greifswald, Germany

HIGHLIGHTS

- Verification of three different CAD to MCNP geometry approaches for the neutronic analysis of a stellarator.
- Simplified stellarator based geometry was designed.
- Approaches give the same results within statistical uncertainty.
- A preferred CAD to MCNP geometry approach for the neutronic analysis of a stellarator was identified.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 30 September 2016

Received in revised form 26 January 2017

Accepted 3 April 2017

Available online 26 April 2017

Keywords:

Stellarator

CAD

MCNP

DAGMC

Neutronics

Verification

ABSTRACT

Three different approaches were investigated for the use of CAD models with Monte Carlo transport simulations of a simplified stellarator type verification geometry. These include the traditional Constructive Solid Geometry (CSG) approach with the geometry translated into Monte Carlo representation, the use of Unstructured Mesh (UM) geometry as available with MCNP6, and the direct particle tracking technique of DAGMC. The three methods were shown to be both applicable and suitable to represent the verification geometry and provide comparable results. With regards to the later application to a real stellarator geometry, the DAGMC and the UM approaches are preferred over the CSG approach due to the inherent limitations of the latter.

© 2017 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The Helical-Axis Advanced Stellarator (HELIAS) is a conceptual design of a fusion power reactor proposed by the Institute for Plasma Physics (IPP) in Greifswald, Germany. HELIAS-5B is a specific 5-field-period concept using the Deuterium-Tritium fusion reaction with a fusion power of 3000 MW [1]. A thorough neutronic design analysis has to be performed for this stellarator in order to provide the input required for the reactor design.

A stellarator confines the hot plasma with external magnetic fields only produced by non-planar shaped modular field coils. The use of specific non-planar shaped modular field coils is necessary to generate the rotational transform of the magnetic field in the plasma chamber. This type of fusion reactor represents a

challenging task for the design and maintenance of technological components such as the breeder blanket and the radiation shield as outlined in Fig. 1.

The standard approach to develop geometry models for neutronics design analysis is to use computer aided design (CAD). The developed models are usually not directly applicable for Monte Carlo (MC) particle transport codes and need preprocessing with regard to the geometrical simplification and adaption to the requirements of neutronic simulations including the decomposition of complex CAD models.

The CAD model of the HELIAS reactor is very complex and contains mostly spline surfaces which are commonly used in CAD geometry. Spline surfaces are higher order surfaces and not directly applicable from CAD geometry in MC simulations. This makes a translation approach for CAD to MC geometry necessary in order to take into account the spline surfaces in the processing of the models.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: andre.haeussler@kit.edu (A. Häußler).




Fig. 1. HELIAS-5B CAD model including material layers and last closed flux surface.

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the feasibility and suitability of three different CAD to MC geometry translation approaches on the example of a dedicated verification geometry model. The comparison of the three methods enables to conclude on their applicability to design analyses of a stellarator type reactor.

2. Methodology

Three different approaches to generate a CAD based MC geometry will be discussed in this paper. First, the translation approach with KIT's CAD to MC conversion tool McCad [2]; second, the unstructured mesh geometry description approach [3]; third, the direct usage of CAD geometry in MC codes with DAGMC (DAG = direct accelerated geometry) [4].

The first approach uses McCad to translate the CAD geometry into constructive solid geometry (CSG) which most MC particle transport codes use as geometry representation. This is the standard geometry translation approach for fusion neutronic calculations and needs to be investigated for the application to stellarator reactors. In the CSG description mainly first and second order surfaces are allowed, e.g. planes, cylinder and sphere as adopted by the MC particle transport codes. Spline surfaces are not supported and McCad does not translate them. For a complex geometry like the stellarator, the CSG method, without CAD model simplification and modification, is not useable. Nevertheless, this MC geometry description is the best verified and validated method of all three investigated methods.

MCNP6 includes as a new feature the capability to use an unstructured mesh (UM) geometry representation in the particle tracking simulation. This feature enables the possibility to construct an UM model which allows using all types of surface descriptions in the CAD model. This leads to the advantage of this method that very complex geometries can be handled in MC simulations without profound simplification or decomposition. The limitations are mainly given by MCNP6, because only one specific mesh type can be handled in one simulation at the same time. In this work, ANSYS Workbench 16.2 [5] was used as meshing tool to generate the unstructured mesh geometry. It is thus possible to adapt the generated mesh to the limitations of MCNP6.

As third method the DAGMC approach for the direct use of CAD geometry in the MC transport simulation was used. DAGMC adaptations to different MC radiation transport codes are available. For this work, the DAGMC patch for MCNP was applied. DAGMC converts the CAD geometry into faceted solids for the tracking of particles. The tracking algorithm implemented in DAGMC is based on the established ray-tracing technique. With this technique it is possible to perform simple calculations to determine the next surface boundary, depending on the particle position and its movement trajectory [4]. DAGMC can solve analytically a number of lower order surfaces, but higher order surfaces require iterative numerical root-finding approaches which are implemented in DAGMC with a number of acceleration techniques and approximations [4]. This ensures that the method can be efficiently used for high order




Fig. 2. Verification geometry with layers; the red line indicates the tally locations used for the verification calculations.

spline surfaces. The CAD geometry is prepared with Trellis 16 [6] to ensure that all bodies and surfaces are preprocessed and faceted in the correct way for the use with DAGMC.

MCNP is a general-purpose Monte Carlo N-Particle code which is used worldwide, very well validated and applied in the fields of fission, fusion and accelerator calculations. In this work MCNP6.1.1beta [7] was used for CSG and UM calculations. For the use with DAGMC calculations it is important to apply a special patch to MCNP. The latest version which is supported by DAGMC is MCNP5.1.60 [8] thus was used for all DAGMC calculations.

3. CAD verification geometry development

The methods discussed for creating a suitable MC particle transport geometry need to be tested and verified. To this end, a dedicated CAD verification geometry was designed which fits into all limitations of the discussed methods. In fact, the traditional CAD to MCNP translation approach gives the boundary conditions for the CAD geometry, because the CSG description has the most limitations.

In the verification geometry only cylinders and planes are included which represent the boundary conditions for the CSG geometry with first- and second-order surfaces. The verification geometry is based on a bean-shaped cross-section of the stellarator as shown in Fig. 2. It has a total height of about 1030 cm, a width at the equatorial plane of about 480 cm and a depth of 100 cm.

The radial build of the verification geometry along the red line shown in Fig. 2 is given in Table 1.

These layers represent the first preliminary geometry requirements for the HELIAS-5B. Each layer contains a homogenized material mixture. For the breeder zone the helium cooled pebble bed (HCPB) blanket concept [9] is assumed as one option to breed tritium in the stellarator and is represented with its homogenized material composition. The back support structure is a mixture of the back plate, made of low activation steel, and the manifold. It thus contains mostly steel with a lower density to take the cooling

Table 1
Radial build of the verification geometry at the mid-plane.

Thickness [cm]	Component/Material
0.2	Tungsten Armor
2.5	First Wall
50	Breeding Zone
30	Back Support Structure
6.0	Inner Vacuum Vessel
20	Vacuum Vessel Shield
6.0	Outer Vacuum Vessel




Fig. 3. Verification geometry shown in CSG, in Unstructured Mesh and in DAGMC representation.

channels into account. As shielding layer inside the vacuum vessel, a mixture of 60% stainless steel and 40% water is used.

A volumetric 14.1 MeV neutron source is included inside the plasma chamber with a length of 100 cm in y direction to fill up the space in the geometry. It contains in total four different neutron emission probability areas to represent the similar behavior as the plasma source of the HELIAS-5B [10]. Reflecting boundary conditions are set on both open sides of the verification geometry.

4. Computation and results

The CAD verification geometry was processed in three different ways to generate a suitable MCNP geometry description. This can be seen in Fig. 3.

In the unstructured mesh geometry, only a limited number of standard tallies in MCNP6 are supported. These are cell tallies for “Flux averaged over a cell” and “Energy deposition averaged over a cell” [3]. In addition, two different mesh tallies were superimposed over the geometry during the simulations. One mesh tally covers the whole verification geometry with a resolution of $1 \times 1 \times 1 \text{ cm}^3$. The other mesh tally is parallel to the x axis and crosses the y axis at 50 cm and the z axis at 0 cm. It has also a resolution of $1 \times 1 \times 1 \text{ cm}^3$ and is indicated as red line in Fig. 2.

To get tally results for all single material zones, the cell tallies were applied on all of the 14 solids of the geometry. In order to find differences or mismatches between the investigated methods the tally results are compared. All calculations were performed at the KIT Institutscluster II (IC2) [11].

In total 10^9 particles were used in each calculation and significant differences in the computational time were obtained. The CSG method needed ~29,000 CPU minutes, UM ~57,000 CPU minutes and DAGMC ~58,000 CPU minutes. Thus there is a factor of two higher computational time of UM and DAGMC geometry description compared to the calculations with the traditional CSG geometry.

In Fig. 4 the neutron fluence per source neutron and the corresponding relative error in the whole verification geometry is shown. It is a cut along the xz plane at $y = 50 \text{ cm}$.

The distribution of the neutron flux is clearly seen and also its attenuation in direction from the plasma chamber to the vacuum vessel. The homogenized material compositions show a constant




Fig. 4. Neutron fluence per source neutron and corresponding relative error in the verification geometry calculated with the CSG method.




Fig. 5. Neutron fluence per source neutron at the outboard side of the verification geometry.

decreasing of the neutron flux in each material layer. In the regions far away from the neutron source the neutron flux is lower, which is an effect of neutron interaction, like scattering and capture, with the material.

The described behavior can be seen in Figs. 5 and 6. Both figures show the neutron flux along the red line indicated in Fig. 2, one at the outboard (Fig. 5) and one at the inboard (Fig. 6).

Figs. 5 and 6 show that the neutron flux is decreasing from the plasma side to the outside of the vacuum vessel by five orders of magnitudes. The profile is related to the radial build (layer thickness and the material composition) as shown above.

It is noted that all three investigated geometry translation methods give identical results within the statistical uncertainty. The small differences of DAGMC in the vacuum vessel outer layer compared to CSG and UM are related to the usage of different MCNP versions. The results of DAGMC can be reproduced by running the CSG geometry with MCNP5.

The results for the cell tallies show basically the same behavior with nearly identical results between all three investigated methods. The largest difference can be detected in the tungsten layer in the outboard between CSG and UM method. For the flux tally 1.75 % and for the heating tally 1.58 % was found. All other differences between the methods are much smaller and negligible with respect to the corresponding relative error.




Fig. 6. Neutron fluence per source neutron at the inboard side of the verification geometry.

5. Conclusion and outlook

Three different geometry representation approaches for MC based nuclear analyses were investigated and successfully tested on a simplified geometry model. All three approaches give comparable results within statistical uncertainty despite significant differences in the geometry set-up.

All three methods seem thus to be suitable for neutronics design analysis of a stellarator. The CSG method, however, has the drawback that no spline surfaces are supported in the geometry description which requires manually simplification and decomposition of the CAD model. This is a long lasting and error prone process, because no automation so far is applicable for this procedure. The UM method is suitable, but it has a strict limitation of the supported tallies available currently with MCNP6. It is thus considered as a current additional approach, but not as the preferred method for calculations for the stellarator. DAGMC has the drawback that a lot of dependencies to different software suits are needed during the installation process which makes it complicate to install and run. The outstanding features of DAGMC are first, that it can handle very complex geometries and second, that all tallies from MCNP are supported.

The computational time of the three investigated methods differs. The traditional CSG geometry description is the fastest method. Compared to CSG, UM and DAGMC method have a factor of two higher computational time.

The investigated methods can be used for neutronic design analyses of HELIAS based on a suitable CAD model. The CSG method, however, has inherent limitations and is thus not the preferred method. The DAGMC method is preferred because it can handle the complex spline based geometry and it supports all tallies from MCNP.

Acknowledgments

This work has been carried out within the framework of the EUROfusion Consortium and has received funding from the Euratom research and training programme 2014–2018 under grant agreement No. 633053. The views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of the European Commission.

Sincere thanks to the DAGMC developers, mainly to Paul Wilson and Andrew Davis, for their very kind and patient help with problems of DAGMC.

References

- [1] F. Schauer, K. Egorov, V. Bykov, HELIAS 5-B magnet system structure and maintenance concept, *Fusion Eng. Des.* 88 (2013) 1619–1622.
- [2] L. Lu, U. Fischer, P. Pereslavtsev, Improved algorithms and advanced features of the CAD to MC conversion tool McCad, *Fusion Eng. Des.* 89 (9–10) (2014) 1885–1888.
- [3] R. Martz, The MCNP6 Book on Unstructured Mesh Geometry: User's Guide (2014), LA-UR-11-05668 Rev 8.
- [4] P.P.H. Wilson, et al., Acceleration techniques for the direct use of CAD-based geometry in fusion neutronics analysis, *Fusion Eng. Des.* 85 (10–12) (2010) 1759–1765.
- [5] Ansys WORKBENCH User Guide: https://www.sharcnet.ca/Software/Ansys/16.2.3/en-us/help/ai_sinfo/wb_intro.html (2016).
- [6] Trelis User Guide http://www.csimsoft.com/help/trelis_help.htm (2016).
- [7] T. Goorley, MCNP6.1.1-Beta Release Notes, LA-UR-14-24680 (2014).
- [8] X-5 Monte Carlo Team, MCNP—Version 5, Vol. I: Overview and Theory, LA-UR-03-1987 (2003).
- [9] P. Pereslavtsev, et al, Neutronic analyses for the optimization of the advanced HCPB breeder blanket design for DEMO, *Fusion Engineering and Design* (2017), Available online 8 February 2017, ISSN 0920-3796, <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.fusengdes.2017.01.028>. (<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0920379617300388>).
- [10] A. Häußler, U. Fischer, F. Warmer, Neutronics source modeling for stellarator power reactors of the HELIAS-type, in: *Compact at the 47th Annual Meeting on Nuclear Technology (AMNT)*, Hamburg, Germany, 2016.
- [11] InstitutsCluster II supercomputer at Steinbuch Centre for Computing (SCC) at Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT): <http://www.scc.kit.edu/dienste/jc2.php> (2016).