



Karlsruhe Institute of Technology

Karlsruhe Institute of Technology Institute for Neutron Physics and Reactor Technology Hermann-von-Helmholtz-Platz 1, 76344 Eggenstein-Leopoldshafen, Germany Internet: http://www.kit.edu E-mail (B. Weinhorst): bastian.weinhorst@kit.edu

Comparative assessment of different approaches for the use of CAD geometry in Monte Carlo transport calculations

B. Weinhorst¹, U. Fischer¹, L. Lu¹, Y. Qiu¹, P. Wilson²

¹Karlsruhe Institute of Technology. Institute for Neutron Physics and Reactor Technology

² University of Wisconsin-Madison, Computational Nuclear Engineering Research Group

Objectives

Single (unique) CAD geometry: ITER CAD benchmark model.



- Three different approaches for use of CAD geometry in MC transport calculations:
- McCad: Current standard approach, conversion of CAD geometry into MCNP representation using McCad developed at KIT.
- Using MCNP6's unstructured mesh geometry feature, meshing of CAD geometry with the tesselation-MCNP6&TT: tetrahedralization (TT) approach developed at KIT.
- DAGMC: Direct particle tracking on the CAD geometry using a patched version of MCNP developed at UW-Madison.
- Comparison with respect to performance and user-friendliness:

Installation (Installation guide, needed software, installation complexity).

Model preparation (repairing geometry error, time needed, user expertise).

Computation performance (calculation speed, accuracy).

McCad

Installation



Good installation guide.

Only one additional software package required.

Open Source software (except MCNP).

Simple installation.

MCNP6&TT



New development, up to now no installation guide. several software packages needed but not interdependent.

- Open Source Software (except MCNP).
- Moderate installation

Removing overlaps/gaps of solids.

optimization of meshing.

meshing of cells and

surfaces.

Tally definition difficult due to

DAGMC



- Installation guide available, but not sufficient.
- Interdependent software packages. Dependent on specific, older versions. Cubit and MCNP under license control.
- Complex installation.
- No user guide for repairing geometrical errors.

Model

preparation





Computation performance



solids. Substitution of spline surface with analytical surfaces mandatory.



- Iterative and time intensive.
- Extensive user expertise required.



Fastest calculation. Current standard approach for MCNP calculations, chosen as reference.



- Slowest calculation; speed depends mainly on mesh resolution.
- Superimposed mesh gives large deviation for deep penetration calculations.
- Cell tallys agree with McCad results within statistical errors.



Moderate speed, iterative steps required.

- User expertise essential.
- Tally definition very convenient, more userfriendly than standard MCNP.





First wall cell tallys within 1% of McCad results.





Table: Comparison of calculation performances.

	McCAD	MCNP6 & TT	DAGMC
Lost particles	4e ⁻⁶ %	2e ⁻⁴ %	3e ⁻⁴ %
CPU time per 1e5 histories (voided)	23 s	550 s	134 s
CPU time per 1e5 histories	294 s	1004 s	630 s

Comparison of nuclear heating in the inboard leg of the Toroidal Field Coil (TFC)



Conclusions

• McCad most useful for simple models or if model preparation has to be done only once. Small changes to the geometry can be done directly in the MCNP input file.

MCNP6&TT model preparation extremely fast and reliable. Problematic with regard to nuclear responses; for meshtally the deviation to McCad approach lager than statistical error. Statistical error in general larger than for McCad approach (same number of histories).

DAGMC most useful for complex models that need to be changed regularly.

KIT – University of the State of Baden-Wuerttemberg and National Research Center of the Helmholtz Association

28th Symposium on Fusion Technology, San Sebastian, Spain, September 29th - October 3rd, 2014

