Lessons Learned in ICFMP Project for Verification and Validation of Computer Models for Nuclear Plant Fire Safety Analysis

Dr. Monideep K. Dey

Deytec, Inc.
Nuclear Engineering Services

Presented at the ISO TC 92 SC-4, WG 7 Meeting, Paris, France, April 3, 2011

Objective of Presentation

- Present "lessons learned" in conduct of "blind" validation exercises in International Collaborative Fire Model Project (ICFMP)
- Recommend "blind" V&V procedures be included in ISO standard
- Capabilities & limitations of fire models derived in ICFMP presented elsewhere

International Collaborative Fire Model Project (ICFMP)

- Conducted 1999-2008 by USNRC
- I Led project from 1999 to 2006
- Evaluate fire models for NPP applications through 5 benchmark exercises (BE)
  - Code to Code
  - Code to experimental data
  - Simple to challenging scenarios

ICFMP Cont'd

- Five countries participated, typically 7 organizations exercised fire models
  - **Germany – GRS, iBMB (COCOSYS, FDS, CFX, CFAST)**
  - **France – IRSN, EdF, CTICM (FLAMME-S, MAGIC)**
  - **UK – BRE (JASMINE, CFAST)**
  - **USA – NRC, NIST (CFAST, FDS, FDTs)**
    - **Assigned as guest researcher at NIST**
    - **Analyst for NRC**
- 10 organizations participated in peer review
- 12 international workshops over 10 years
- 5 ICFMP benchmark reports and summary report

ICFMP Benchmark Exercise No. 1 – Cable Tray Fires



ICFMP Benchmark Exercise No. 2 – Pool Fires in Large Halls




‘beam targets’
(0.15 m (x) x 0.006 m (y) horizontal slab
located 0.5 m below ceiling)
power cables
(0.05 m diameter)
1
1
15
9
z
y
1
25
1
power cables
(0.05 m diameter)
‘beam targets’
(0.15 m (x) x 0.006 m (z) horizontal slab)
thermocouple
column T3
4
fire source (dike)
located at centre of
lower deck
(7 m x 7 m)
thermocouple
column T2
50
25
thermocouple
column T1
x
y
1
1
12.5
25

ICFMP Benchmark Exercise No. 3 – Full Scale Compartment Fire Tests





ICFMP Benchmark Exercise – No. 4
Large Fire Experiments



ICFMP Benchmark Exercise No. 5 – Pool Fires in a Trench



V&V Process to Determine Fire Model Predictive Errors

- ICFMP established to conduct “blind” benchmark exercises
- Need credibility of V&V process by determining true predictive errors

“Blind” vs “Open” Predictions

- In a priori (aka *blind)* modeler has no access to experimental data
- In a posteriori (aka *open*) modeler has access to the experimental data and measurements of predicted parameters
- Comparison of *blind* vs *open* calculations
  - Dalmarnock fire test project
  - Possible to match measured parameters by adjusting model input data

Bias in V&V Process

- Natural bias exists in *open* predictions
- Most fire model validations conducted a posteriori (*open*)
- Extent of bias presently unknown & currently being researched
- Need true predictive errors to establish safety margins
- “Real World” Fires

V&V Procedures in ICFMP

- Recognized need to conduct *blind* validations to determine "true" predictive errors essential to establishing safety factors
- Minimize debate about input parameter values through detailed specifications of the benchmark exercises

Challenges of *Blind* V&V Overcome in ICFMP

- Replication of experiments
- Conduct of tests according to test plan
- Uncertainty in model input data
- Sensitivity & uncertainty analysis
- Need to establish "optimal" prediction



BE # 3 Replicate Tests 2 & 8
Compartment Temperature Tree 7-1
Temperature (C)
Time (s)
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
0
200
400
600
800
1000
1200
Test 2: 7-1
Test 2: 7-5
Test 2: 7-9
Test 8: 7-1
Test 8: 7-5
Test 8: 7-9

Issues Identified in V&V Process

- Lack of agreement among participants on measurements & data needed as input to fire models being exercised;
- Lack of established formal procedure for submission & collection of *blind* calculations from participants.

Parameter Issues

- Heat Release Rate (HRR)
- Radiative Fraction
- Thermal Parameters of Compartment Boundary

Heat Release Rate (HRR)

- Knowledge of combustion process/need to input parameter to models
- Predominantly determines magnitude of fire effects
- Major source of uncertainty



Figure 2.12 Fuel Pan with Spray Nozzle

Figure 3.3 Hot Gas Layer in Test 3

Table 3-1 Evolution of Heat Release Rate for Benchmark Exercise No. 3, Test 3

Release Date	July 2, 2003**	July 21, 2003	September 9, 2003	April 4, 2004	June 2005
HRR - from fuel flow	1050*	1050	1150	1150	1150
HRR - from calorimetry	1150	1260	1260	1260	1190

* HRR specified in kW

** Prior to release of experimental data

Radiative Fraction

- Radiative fraction of heat from fire must also be input to models
- Not measured for BE # 2, values of 0.4 used by some analysts (0.2 specified)
- Considerable effort made in BE # 3 to measure parameter but still disputed & adjusted by some analysts
- Similar issues in BE # 4 & 5

Table 3-2 Combustion Properties of the Test Fuels for Benchmark Exercise No. 3

Fuel	Hc (kJ/g)[1]	Combustion efficiency[2]	Radiative fraction[3]	Soot yield[2]	CO yield[2]	CO_2 yield[2]
Heptanes	45.0	1.0 ± 0.06	0.35 ± 0.08	$0.0149 \pm .0033$	<0.006	3.03 ± 0.37
Toluene	40.3	0.76 ± 0.05	0.36 ± 0.08	0.194 ± 0.062	0.070 ± 0.016	2.53 ± 0.31

1. Report of Test Results, Galbraith Labs, March 2003. The expanded uncertainty is not reported but is typically 5 %.
2. The Global Combustion Behavior of 1 MW to 3 MW Hydrocarbon Spray Fires Burning in an Open Environment (Hamins, 2003d).
3. Hamins, Kashiwagi and Buch in Fire Resistance of Industrial Fluids (Eds.: Totten and Reichel), ASTM STP 1284, 1996

Thermal Properties of Compartment Boundary

- Not measured & controversial for Benchmark Exercise No. 2
  - Properties adjusted to reduce thermal inertia by 50 % by some analysts
- Considerable effort made in BE # 3 to measure parameters but still disputed & adjusted by some analysts

Table 3-6 Material and Optical Properties of Marinite.

T (^oC)	K (W/m K)*	α (m^2/s)*	c_p(J/kg K)*	ε **
23	0.111	2.13×10^{-7}	778	0.74±0.04
50	0.114	2.15×10^{-7}	795	
100	0.126	2.17×10^{-7}	871	
200	0.140	2.17×10^{-7}	965	
300	0.153	2.18×10^{-7}	1047	
400	0.160	2.21×10^{-7}	1082	
500	0.175	2.26×10^{-7}	1160	
600	0.190	2.36×10^{-7}	1205	
650	0.198	2.42×10^{-7}	1223	

* Taylor, R.E., Groot, H., and Ferrier, J., *Thermophysical Properties of PVC, PE and Marinite*, Report TPRL 2958, April 2003.
** Hanssen, L., Report of Optical Test Data, March 2003.

Procedure Issues in ICFMP V&V

- Submission & collection of *blind* calculations were not conducted per an established formal procedure or standard
- Informal due to collegial nature of collaborative project & lack of standard
- Participants were permitted to categorize their calculations as *blind* or *open*.

Conclusion of *Blind* V&V

- Participants modified model input data based on their determination of the appropriate values
- Assumed this would still constitute as a *blind* calculation
- Some confusion on definition of "*blind*" calculation
- *Blind* & *Open* calculations could not be distinguished

Conclusion of *Blind* V&V – Cont'd

- Predictions by analysts differed:
  - Up to 45 % difference when same model used
  - Up to 40 % difference when models of same sophistication used
- ICFMP exercises failed as *blind* exercises

Recommendations for Fire Model V&V Standard

- Establish consensus on measurement methods for parameters needed as input to fire models
- Develop consensus on values for parameters input to fire models
- Establish procedure for conducting & ensuring that *blind* calculations are used to establish predictive model errors & safety margins
- Examine and include "third party validation" as an option for establishing true model errors

Conclusion

- V&V process in ICFMP project was very beneficial in many respects
- Benchmark exercises allowed different models to be analyzed & compared against each another & experimental data for a wide range of NPP fire scenarios
- Capabilities & limitations derived from such comparisons