ANP-10311NP-A
Revision 0

COBRA-FLX: A Core Thermal-Hydraulic Analysis Code

Topical Report

January 2013

AREVA NP Inc.

Non-Proprietary

Non-Proprietary

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

January 29, 2013

RECEIVED
FEB 05 2013
By TMWUS
NRC-IC-13-001

Mr. Pedro Salas, Manager
Site Operations and Regulatory Affairs
AREVA NP Inc.
3315 Old Forest Road
Lynchburg, VA 24501

SUBJECT: FINAL SAFETY EVALUATION FOR AREVA NP, INC (AREVA) TOPICAL REPORT (TR) ANP-10311P, REVISION 0, "COBRA-FLX: A CORE THERMAL-HYDRAULIC ANALYSIS CODE TOPICAL REPORT" (TAC NO. ME3909)

Dear Mr. Salas:

By letter dated March 31, 2010 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML101550173), AREVA submitted Topical Report (TR) ANP-10311P, Revision 0, "COBRA-FLX: A Core Thermal-Hydraulic Analysis Code Topical Report," to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff for review. By letter dated August 12, 2011 (ADAMS Accession No. ML11129A275), an NRC draft safety evaluation (SE) regarding our approval of TR ANP-10311P, Revision 0, was provided for your review and comments. By letter dated September 20, 2011 (ADAMS Accession No. ML112640538), AREVA commented on the draft SE. The NRC staff's disposition of AREVA comments on the draft SE are discussed in the Attachment 2 to the final SE enclosed with this letter.

The NRC staff has found that TR ANP-10311P, Revision 0, is acceptable for referencing in licensing applications to the extent specified and under the limitations and conditions delineated in the TR and in the enclosed final SE. The final SE defines the basis for acceptance of the TR.

Our acceptance applies only to material provided in the subject TR. We do not intend to repeat our review of the acceptable material described in the TR. When the TR appears as a reference in license applications, our review will ensure that the material presented applies to the specific plant involved. License amendment requests that deviate from this TR will be subject to a plant-specific review in accordance with applicable review standards.

In accordance with the guidance provided on the NRC website, we request that AREVA publish accepted proprietary and non-proprietary versions of this TR within three months of receipt of this letter. The accepted versions shall incorporate this letter and the enclosed final SE after the title page. Also, they must contain historical review information, including NRC requests for additional information and your responses. The accepted versions shall include a "-A" (designating accepted) following the TR identification symbol.

If future changes to the NRC's regulatory requirements affect the acceptability of this TR, AREVA and/or licensees referencing it will be expected to revise the TR appropriately, or justify its continued applicability for subsequent referencing.

Sincerely,

Sher Bahadur

Sher Bahadur, Deputy Director
Division of Policy and Rulemaking
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Project No. 728

Enclosure:
Final SE

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

FINAL SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

TOPICAL REPORT ANP-10311P, REVISION 0

"COBRA-FLX: A CORE THERMAL-HYDRAULIC-ANALYSIS CODE TOPICAL REPORT"

AREVA NP, INC.

PROJECT NO. 728

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated March 31, 2010, AREVA NP, Inc. (AREVA) submitted Topical Report (TR) ANP-10311P, Revision 0, "COBRA-FLX: A Core Thermal-Hydraulic Analysis Code Topical Report" (Reference 1), to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for review and approval. The purpose of this TR is to support stand-alone application[1] of the COBRA-FLX code for nuclear core thermal-hydraulic simulations. The COBRA-FLX code is intended to replace the current subchannel codes XCOBRA-IIIC (TR XN-75-21(P)(A), Revision 2) and LYNXT (TR BAW-10156-A, Revision 1), within the methodology applications where these codes are currently used. The general application of the COBRA-FLX code for safety-related analyses includes determining core flow distribution (including lateral crossflow velocities), core and fuel assembly pressure drop, local core coolant conditions, minimum departure from nucleate boiling ratio (MDNBR), and steady-state or transient core thermal-hydraulic conditions.

The NRC staff sent an initial Request for Additional Information (RAI) dated November 17, 2010 (Reference 2). AREVA responded to the RAI by the submittal of "Response to Request for Additional Information on ANP-10311P, 'COBRA-FLX: A Core Thermal-Hydraulic Analysis Code Topical Report'" (Reference 3).

2.0 REGULATORY EVALUATION

This safety evaluation (SE) reviews the COBRA-FLX thermal-hydraulic code for stand-alone application to nuclear core thermal-hydraulic analysis for steady-state and transient conditions. The transient analysis capabilities of this code are as defined in Table 1-1 of Reference 1.

The extent of review and approval requested by AREVA (as per Table 1-1 of Reference 1) is specified as the following:

a) application to pressurized water reactors (PWRs) only

b) MDNBR calculations using eight AREVA-specific critical heat flux (CHF) correlations previously approved for use with LYNXT or LYNX2 and revalidated with COBRA-FLX

[1] The COBRA-FLX code is the thermal-hydraulic module for the core simulator ARTEMIS within the ARCADIA® code package developed for world-wide application of a converged code system within AREVA for neutronic and thermal-hydraulic core design and safety evaluation. Application of the COBRA-FLX code within the ARCADIA® package is supported by a separate submittal (TR ANP-10297P), and is not considered in this evaluation.

ENCLOSURE

c) two numerical solution methods, specifically:

   i. SCHEME-Pressure (P) solution method (with two optional Successive Over-Relaxation (SOR) solvers)

   ii. Pressure-Velocity (PV) solution method

d) steady-state applications for safety-related hydraulic and thermal-hydraulic calculations

e) *transient applications for safety-related analyses where the core surface heat flux is* specified as a boundary condition obtained using an NRC approved code

The fuel rod model in COBRA-FLX and the rewetting model for post-CHF heat transfer will not be used for safety-related analysis, and are specifically excluded from this review. Additional limitations are specified for the empirical correlations that will be used in licensing calculations. These empirical correlations are listed in Table 1-2 and Appendix A of the TR (Reference 1) and are summarized as the following:

a) water properties (from the International Association for the Properties of Water and Steam-Industrial Formulation 97 (IAPWS-IF97))

b) friction factor correlation constants

   i. Lehman friction factor (with or without Szablewski correction)

   ii. wall viscosity correction option

c) two-phase friction multiplier – homogeneous model only

d) bulk void correlation – Chexal-Lellouche (using the full curve fit routine or tables with interpolation)

e) subcooled void correlation – Saha-Zuber

f) subcooled boiling profile fit correlation – Zuber-Staub

g) nucleate boiling forced convection heat transfer correlation – Chen

h) post-departure from nucleate boiling (DNB) forced convection heat transfer correlation – Groeneveld 5.7

i) single-phase convection heat transfer correlations

   i. Sieder-Tate for normal flow conditions

   ii. McAdams natural convection correlation for very low flow conditions

The numerous other bulk void correlations, subcooled boiling correlations, two-phase friction multiplier correlations, and heat transfer correlations in the code are specifically excluded from consideration for use in licensing calculations.

This SE is based on regulations applicable to steady-state and transient analysis methods found in Sections 50.34 and 50.46 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) as well as Chapter 15 of the Standard Review Plan (SRP) (Reference 4). SRP 15.0.2, "Review of Transient and Accident Analysis Methods," describes areas of NRC staff review for transient and accident analysis methods such as Required Documentation, Evaluation Model, Code Assessment, and Uncertainty Analysis. The NRC staff's review of this TR submittal on the COBRA-FLX code is based on the SRP guidance in the areas of Required Documentation and Code Assessment, independent evaluation of the technical merit of the submittal, and other applicable regulations associated with the review of TRs. The COBRA-FLX code is intended for application to steady-state and transient conditions.

3.0 TECHNICAL EVALUATION

The COBRA-FLX code models fluid flow and heat transfer in the reactor core. Local flow and heat transfer behavior determines the rate of heat removal from the nuclear fuel, which directly determines the local surface temperature on the fuel rods and temperature distribution within the fuel. COBRA-FLX predicts the axial and lateral flow, pressure, and temperature (enthalpy) distributions in rod bundle arrays for flow conditions where wall shear forces predominate fluid-fluid shear forces. Typical applications of the COBRA-FLX code include predictions of core-wide flow and enthalpy distributions as well as the pressure drop for steady-state and transient conditions. The code is also used for CHF calculations and DNB ratio (DNBR) predictions.

COBRA-FLX was developed from the COBRA 3-CP code, which is a thermal-hydraulic code used in support of reactor core reload applications. COBRA 3-CP was developed by Siemens/Kraftwerk Union (KWU) from the COBRA-IIIC/MIT-2 code. These codes utilize the subchannel analysis concept developed for reactor core analysis, solving conservation equations for mass, momentum, and energy to obtain fluid enthalpy and flow distributions as well as momentum pressure drop. The flow field is assumed to be incompressible and homogeneous, with constitutive models incorporated to account for subcooled boiling and liquid/vapor slip. Surface heat flux and wall temperatures are calculated using empirical correlations for forced convection heat transfer. DNB is determined in the thermal-hydraulic solution using empirical CHF correlations. In addition, CHF correlations can be used to calculate DNBR values, as the ratio of predicted CHF versus calculated heat flux at the fuel rod surface, to assess thermal margin during normal operations.

3.1 Basic Conservation Equations

Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the TR (Reference 1) present the transient conservation equations for mass, energy, and momentum for a single-component two-phase mixture. The governing equations for subchannel geometry are derived from an integral balance on an arbitrary fixed (Eulerian) control volume. The formulation of the basic equations and simplifying models for two-phase flow and lateral momentum exchange are consistent with well established and well verified approaches for subchannel analysis of reactor cores. The derivation of the conservation equations is essentially identical to that of earlier subchannel codes (e.g., COBRA-IIIC, XCOBRA-IIIC, COBRA-IIC/MIT, VIPRE-1, LYNX2, and LYNXT), reflecting the historical development of the subchannel analysis methodology.

3.2 Numerical Solution Methodology

Section 2.3 of the TR (Reference 1) presents detailed descriptions of the two numerical solution methods used in the COBRA-FLX code to solve the thermal-hydraulic equations derived from the mixture balance laws. This includes a detailed derivation of the finite difference formulation of the subchannel equations from the basic conservation equations presented in Section 2.2 of the TR (Reference 1), and development of the matrix formulation for the solution of each of the conservation equations (i.e., mass, momentum, and energy). The two solution methods are defined as the SCHEME solution method (also referred to as the P-solution method) and the PV-solution method. Both methods solve the same set of finite differential equations, using the same models and correlations for heat transfer, friction losses, fluid state, and two-phase flow. The two methods differ mainly in their treatment of the flow and pressure fields, and in the solution of the energy equation.

In the SCHEME solution method, developed originally for normal upflow in the reactor core, the solution begins by solving the momentum equations (lateral and axial), then the continuity and energy equations at each axial level in succession. In the PV-solution, the momentum equations are used to obtain a tentative flow solution based on the results at the previous level, then flow and pressure are adjusted to satisfy continuity using a Newton-Raphson iteration. The converged flow and pressure solution is then used to solve the energy equation.

When properly implemented, both methods yield the same results for a given set of boundary conditions. In general, the SCHEME solution is somewhat faster than the PV-solution method, and consequently is the recommended approach for most applications. However, the PV-solution method is required for conditions where axial flows can be locally very small, in a reverse direction during the simulation, or if the magnitude of the crossflow velocities is large relative to the axial flows.

These solution methods have been implemented successfully in a number of subchannel codes, and have been shown to be robust and reliable when applied within the appropriate range of their underlying assumptions. The addition of optional SOR solvers to the P-solution method does not substantially change the nature of the numerical solution. However, it does introduce additional steps in the verification of this solution method, as it must be shown to yield the same results when used with the alternative solvers.

3.3 Verification and Validation

Section 5 of the TR (Reference 1) presents results of verification and validation of COBRA-FLX for the intended range of application of the code. The document appropriately recognizes that there are two main aspects to verification and validation of the code. First, it must be verified that the solution methods are correctly implemented and yield the same results for the same boundary conditions. Second, it must be shown that the solution methods in the code yield results that are in good agreement with relevant experimental data modeling fluid behavior in rod bundle geometries.

As presented in Section 5 of the TR (Reference 1), the documentation is incomplete for the verification that the solution methods yield the same results for the same boundary conditions. However, additional information supplied in responses to RAI A.1 and RAI A.2 (Reference 3), provided detailed documentation of a range of test cases showing the equivalence of results obtained with the different solution options and solvers available in COBRA-FLX. For a summary of all of the RAI questions developed in this review, see Attachment 1 of this SE.

Similarly, the documentation of the validation of the solution methods in COBRA-FLX presented in Section 5 of the TR (Reference 1) is limited and incomplete. The TR ANP-10311P, Revision 0 (Reference 1) appropriately takes credit for prior work on validation of the general subchannel code capabilities, based on the referenced documentation for the LYNX2, LYNXT, and COBRA 3-CP codes. However, additional work is required to support the validation specific to the COBRA-FLX code. This was supplied in the responses to RAIs B.3, B.4, B.5, and B.6 (Reference 3). The detailed results presented in the RAI responses show that the COBRA-FLX code can appropriately represent the flow and enthalpy distribution in a subchannel array for the range of boundary conditions for typical applications of the code. The RAI responses also develop important user guidance for input parameters defining lateral flow resistances in the rod array as well as appropriate placement of axial resistances representing grid spacer losses within the finite node divisions of the model; in order to assure consistency between the results obtained with the two main solution options in the code.

3.4 Constitutive Models

Empirical correlations comprise the constitutive models required to achieve closure of the set of conservation equations solved by the COBRA-FLX code. Appendix A of the TR (Reference 1) lists and describes the empirical correlations available in the code for fluid state, friction losses in single- and two-phase flow, and the void/quality relationship. As noted above in Section 2.0 of this SE, this review evaluated only the specific correlations identified for use in licensing calculations. These are summarized as following:

a. water properties (from IAPWS-IF97)

b. friction factor correlation constants

    i. Lehman friction factor (with or without Szablewski correction)

    ii. wall viscosity correction option

c. two-phase friction multiplier – homogeneous model only

d. bulk void correlation – Chexal-Lellouche (using the full curve fit routine or tables with interpolation)

e. subcooled void option – Saha-Zuber

f. subcooled boiling profile fit – Zuber-Staub

g. nucleate boiling forced convection heat transfer correlation – Chen

h. post-DNB forced convection heat transfer correlation – Groeneveld 5.7

i. single-phase convection heat transfer correlations

    i. Sieder-Tate for normal flow conditions

    ii. McAdams natural convection correlation for very low flow conditions

3.4.1 Water Properties

The properties for water, which are used in the COBRA-FLX code to determine the fluid state (e.g., density, enthalpy, viscosity, and thermal conductivity) as a function of pressure and temperature, are based on the industrial standard for water and steam, IAPWS-IF97. This is a database developed and qualified by an international organization, similar to the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Steam Tables typically used in the United States for specifying fluid properties in a subchannel code, and contain essentially the same values for water properties. The IAPWS database is as acceptable as the ASME Steam Tables for this purpose.

3.4.2 Friction Factor Models

The friction factor correlations for single- and two-phase flow are for the most part venerable and well validated models in widespread general use in subchannel codes. The exception is the Lehmann correlation for the friction factor, which corrects the standard Reynolds number correlation to account for surface roughness, and the additional correction to the Lehmann correlation to account for the "entrance effect" of the grid spacers on turbulence in the flow field. The usefulness of these corrections when applied to the discretized numerical mesh of a finite difference model is arguable, but it is inarguable that they do attempt to capture physical effects that are generally ignored in subchannel modeling.

On a purely mathematical basis, these factors result in very small corrections to the "standard" friction factor values, when applied in the range typical of reactor operations. It does no harm to include them in the code, and could, in the long run, prove helpful as increasing computational resources allow more detailed and finer scaled models of the flow field in the reactor core.

3.4.3 Void Models

The void correlation in a subchannel code of this type is extremely important, in that it must compensate for the effects of the physical modeling simplification resulting from assuming that two-phase flow can be treated as a homogeneous fluid. The void correlation is relied upon to capture the effects of subcooled boiling and phase slip, to appropriately represent the relationship between thermodynamic quality and void fraction. Licensing calculations with the COBRA-FLX code use the Chexal-Lellouche model, which is a well-known and well validated correlation based on the drift flux representation of two-phase flow. This correlation has been qualified against a large range of steady-state two-phase or two-component (air/water) test data for thermodynamic conditions in geometries typical of PWR and boiling water reactor fuel assemblies.

This model is an excellent choice for representing the two-phase flow behavior in COBRA-FLX. However, as implemented in the COBRA-FLX code, the Chexal-Lellouche model is not consistent with the model as described in the primary reference. Two components of the model, consisting of the correlation for the initiation of subcooled void formation, and the profile-fit correlation relating local quality and void fraction, are not the models presented in the primary reference for these components of the Chexal-Lellouche model. The specific correlations used in COBRA-FLX are Saha-Zuber (for the initiation of subcooled void), and Zuber-Staub (for the profile-fit correlation).

This discrepancy between the COBRA-FLX code and the published form of the Chexal-Lellouche model generated RAI C.7, requesting justification for the substitution of these two correlations for the corresponding components of the original model. The response provided this justification by comparison of COBRA-FLX code calculations to measured data for two-phase flow conditions. In these calculations, the Chexal-Lellouche void correlation was used with the Saha-Zuber and Zuber-Staub correlations. The response included comparisons to steady-state and transient data. The steady-state data was for the ATRIUM 10XM fuel design obtained in AREVA's thermal-hydraulic test loop KATHY at Karlstein, Germany in 2009. The transient data consisted of Nuclear Power Engineering Group (NUPEC) transient boiling experiments for a single channel.

Evaluation of these comparisons showed that for a wide range of conditions, the results obtained with the Chexal-Lellouche model, as implemented in COBRA-FLX, gives very good agreement with the two-phase experimental measurements. Of particular significance is the agreement shown between the COBRA-FLX predictions and measured void fraction from the steady-state tests. Over the range of conditions with void fractions near zero (subcooled boiling) to void fractions near 1.0 (saturated steam), the calculated results match the measured data within the measurement uncertainty. These results indicate that for the intended application of the COBRA-FLX code, the modified version of the Chexal-Lellouche model is acceptable.

3.4.4 Heat Transfer Models

In subchannel codes such as COBRA-FLX, forced convection heat transfer correlations are used to calculate surface temperatures, including cladding surface temperatures, for steady-state and transient conditions. COBRA-FLX uses the typical approach of specifying different correlations for the different regions of the boiling curve, consisting of single-phase liquid, nucleate boiling, post-CHF film boiling, and single-phase vapor. In applications of COBRA-FLX for licensing calculations, heat transfer coefficients in the nucleate boiling region use the Chen correlation, which is formulated to capture both subcooled boiling and fully developed bulk boiling conditions. For post-CHF conditions, licensing calculations use the Groeneveld 5.7 correlation. Both of these correlations are appropriate for the range of conditions of licensing calculations, and are widely used in subchannel codes throughout the nuclear industry.

For single-phase flow conditions, the COBRA-FLX code uses the Sieder-Tate correlation, rather than the Dittus-Boelter correlation typically used in this region. In addition, for very low flow conditions, the code uses a natural convection heat transfer correlation developed by McAdams. The TR, ANP-10311P, Revision 0 (Reference 1), does not document the applicability of these correlations to typical code applications, which resulted in the generation of RAI C.10 in Reference 2. Additional information in the response to RAI C.10 (Reference 3) on the development and range of applicability of these correlations provided appropriate justification for their use in the COBRA-FLX code for licensing calculations.

3.4.5 CHF Correlations

The COBRA-FLX code includes eight CHF correlations previously developed using the LYNXT or LYNX2 subchannel codes. The specific correlations are listed in Table 1 below.

CHF Correlation	Developed For	Developed Using
ACH-2	US EPR	LYNXT
BHTP	HTP fuel design	LYNXT
BWU-Z	Mark-BW17 fuel with MSMGs	LYNXT
BWU-Z	Mark-BW17 fuel without MSMGs	LYNXT
BWCMV-A	Mark BW17 fuel with or without MSMGs	LYNXT
BWCMV	AREVA 15x15, 17x17; and WE 17x17 OFA	LYNX2
BWU-N	Non-mixing vane fuel designs	LYNX2
BWC	15x15 fuel designs	LYNX2

Table 1: CHF Correlations Included in COBRA-FLX

These correlations have been approved by the NRC for reload licensing calculations, but because the CHF correlations use local subchannel conditions predicted by either the LYNXT or LYNX2 code, NRC approval is limited to applications only with the specific subchannel code used in the correlation's derivation and to other codes for which an application extension has been approved by the NRC. In order to use these correlations with the COBRA-FLX code in licensing calculations, it is necessary to demonstrate that each correlation can be expected to yield essentially the same results for the local subchannel conditions predicted with COBRA-FLX as it would with its base code.

Appendix C of TR ANP-10311P, Revision 0 (Reference 1), presents a detailed validation for each of these correlations, with the original databases used to develop the correlations with the LYNXT or LYNX2 code. The measured to predicted ratio (M/P) for each test point was calculated using each correlation in COBRA-FLX and evaluated using statistical methods used to assess the original M/P results obtained with the LYNXT or LYNX2 code. The statistical properties of the fit to the database were compared to those of the original fit with LYNXT or LYNX2, as was the resulting DNBR limit value obtained with the COBRA-FLX results.

This is the appropriate approach for qualifying a CHF correlation with a subchannel code different from the code used to derive it. The results presented in TR ANP-10311P, Revision 0 (Reference 1), show that these eight CHF correlations give essentially the same results as were obtained in the original development of the correlation, and the DNBR limits for applications with the COBRA-FLX code are equivalent to the limits developed for these correlations when used with their original subchannel code.

4.0 LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS

1. The fuel rod model in COBRA-FLX and the rewetting model for post-CHF heat transfer will not be used for safety-related analysis, and are specifically excluded from this review. Additional limitations are specified for the empirical correlations that will be used in licensing calculations. These empirical correlations are listed in Table 1-2 and Appendix A of the TR (Reference 1) and are summarized as the following:

a) water properties (IAPWS-IF97)

b) friction factor correlation constants

   i. Lehman friction factor (with or without Szablewski correction)

   ii. wall viscosity correction option

c) two-phase friction multiplier – homogeneous model only

d) bulk void correlation – Chexal-Lellouche (using the full curve fit routine or tables with interpolation)

e) subcooled void correlation – Saha-Zuber

f) subcooled boiling profile fit correlation – Zuber-Staub

g) nucleate boiling forced convection heat transfer correlation – Chen

h) post-departure from nucleate boiling (DNB) forced convection heat transfer correlation –Groeneveld 5.7

i) single-phase convection heat transfer correlations

   i. Sieder-Tate for normal flow conditions

   ii. McAdams natural convection correlation for very low flow conditions

2. This review examined only the specific models and correlations requested by the applicant, as summarized in Section 2.0 of this SE. These are the only models and correlations that may be used in licensing calculations with the COBRA-FLX subchannel code. The fuel rod model in COBRA-FLX and the rewetting model for post-CHF heat transfer shall not be used for safety related analysis, and are specifically excluded from this review.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The documentation provided in TR ANP-10311P, Revision 0 (Reference 1), and in responses to the RAI questions (see Attachment 1 of this SE) demonstrate that the COBRA-FLX thermal-hydraulic code is suitable for stand-alone application to nuclear core thermal-hydraulic analysis for steady-state and transient conditions. The basic equation set and numerical solution methods are correctly implemented and appropriate to the widely used subchannel methodology. This review examined only the specific models and correlations requested by the applicant, as summarized in Section 2.0 of this SE. These are the only models and correlations that may be used in licensing calculations with the COBRA-FLX subchannel code. The fuel rod model in COBRA-FLX and the rewetting model for post-CHF heat transfer shall not be used for safety related analysis, and are specifically excluded from this review.

In summary, the NRC staff finds it acceptable to use the COBRA-FLX code in place of the current subchannel codes XCOBRA-IIIC and LYNXT, within the methodology applications where these codes are currently used. The validation of the eight CHF correlations listed in

Appendix C of TR ANP-10311P, Revision 0 (Reference 1), shows that these correlations can be used with the COBRA-FLX code, with the DNBR limit values calculated for their respective databases using the COBRA-FLX code.

6.0 REFERENCES

1. AREVA NP, Inc., "ANP-10311P, Revision 0, 'COBRA-FLX: A Core Thermal-Hydraulic Analysis Code Topical Report,'" March 31, 2010, ADAMS Accession No. ML101550172.

2. Cruz, Holly D., letter to Salas, Pedro, AREVA NP Inc., "Request for Additional Information on ANP-10311P, Revision 0, 'COBRA-FLX: A Core Thermal-Hydraulic Analysis Code,'" November 17, 2010, ADAMS Accession No. ML103350388.

3. Salas, Pedro, AREVA NP Inc., letter to U.S. NRC, Document Control Desk, "Response to a Request for Additional Information (RAI) on ANP-10311P, 'COBRA-FLX: A Core Thermal-Hydraulic Analysis Code Topical Report,'" January 28, 2011, ADAMS Accession No. ML110310596.

4. U.S. NRC, "Standard Review Plan for the Review of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants," NUREG-0800, December 2005.

Principal Contributor: A. Attard

Date: 1|29|13

AREVA

March 31, 2010
NRC:10:024

Document Control Desk
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Request for Review and Approval of ANP-10311P, "COBRA-FLX: A Core Thermal-Hydraulic Analysis Code Topical Report"

AREVA NP Inc. (AREVA NP) requests the NRC's review and approval of the topical report ANP-10311P, "COBRA-FLX: A Core Thermal-Hydraulic Analysis Code Topical Report," dated March 2010, for referencing in licensing actions. A proprietary and non-proprietary version of the report is enclosed.

This report is being submitted for NRC approval for application to current operating plants only at this time. AREVA NP requests the NRC approve the enclosed topical report by June 30, 2011 to support commercial reloads.

AREVA NP considers some of the material contained in the enclosed document to be proprietary. As required by 10 CFR 2.390(b), an affidavit is enclosed to support the withholding of the information from public disclosure.

In support of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation's prioritization efforts, the prioritization scheme matrix was completed and is attached for your use.

If you have any questions related to this submittal, please contact Ms. Gayle F. Elliott, Product Licensing Manager, at 434-832-3347 or by e-mail at gayle.elliott@areva.com.

Sincerely,

Ronnie L. Gardner

Ronnie L. Gardner, Manager
Corporate Regulatory Affairs
AREVA NP Inc.

Enclosures

cc: H. Cruz
Project 728

ANP-10311P, Revision 0
COBRA-FLX: A Core Thermal-Hydraulic Analysis Code Topical Report

TR Prioritization Scheme Matrix *Industry input on shaded areas was not requested.			
Factors	**Select the Criteria that the TR Satisfies**	**Points Assigned for Each Criteria**	**Total Points (if points are cumulative, total them for each factor in this column)**
TR Classification (Points are cumulative)	Generic Safety Issue	6	1
	Emergent Technical Issue	3	
	Standard TR	1	
Applicability (Points are not cumulative)	Industry-Wide Implementation	3	2
	Applicable to entire groups of licensees (BWROG, PWROG, BWRVIP, etc.)	2	
	Applicable only to partial groups of licensees	1	
Specialized Resource Availability (Points are cumulative)	NRC staff expertise is readily available (The NRC staff will evaluate this criteria)	1.5	0.5
	Technical data is available/readily accessible (The NRC staff will evaluate this criteria)	1	
	TR approval is needed by a certain date to support a licensing activity. Explain when and why.	0.5	
Total Points (Add the total points from each factor and total here):			3.5

ELLIOTT Gayle (CORP/QP)

From: Cruz, Holly <Holly.Cruz@nrc.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2010 2:30 PM
To: ELLIOTT Gayle (CORP/QP)
Subject: COBRAFLX RAIs
Attachments: RAIs_for_COBRA-FLX_Review_draft_R2-11-17-2010.doc

Gayle,

Please find the attached draft RAIs. Please note these are preliminary. The format will change, but the content should stay the same. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Holly Cruz, Project Manager
Licensing Processes Branch (PLPB)
Division of Policy and Rulemaking
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Phone: (301) 415-1053
Location: O12F12
M/S: O12E1
email: holly.cruz@nrc.gov

U.S.NRC
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Protecting People and the Environment

Request for Additional Information to support technical review of Topical Report ANP-10311P, Revision 0, ***COBRA-FLX: A Core Thermal-Hydraulic Analysis Code***, AREVA NP Inc., March 2010.

This Request for Additional Information to support the review of the COBRA-FLX code consists of three main categories. These can be summarized as follows;

1. verification of the solution methods in COBRA-FLX
2. validation of the solution methods in COBRA-FLX
3. validation and documentation of flow and heat transfer models in COBRA-FLX

Verification of Solution Methods

1. The documentation provided in the above mentioned report does not fully demonstrate that the two solution methods under review (referred to as the SCHEME-Pressure (P) solution method and the Pressure-Velocity (PV) solution method, or more simply as the (P) solution method and the (PV) solution method), yield the same results for the same boundary conditions and model geometry. Section 5.1 *Conservation of Mass and Energy*, does not provide a meaningful comparison of the results obtained with the two solution methods for the four different modeling geometries considered in this analysis. For this evaluation to be complete, it is necessary to show that the two solution methods yield the same results, within convergence limits, for the same geometric models by comparison of flow and enthalpy distributions in both the radial and axial directions. Particular attention should be given to comparisons of the results obtained for the hot subchannel in the hot assembly.

2. Section 5.4, p. 5-26 and 5-27: It is not explicitly stated in Table 1-1 (p. 1-7) that the optional SOR solver (described in Section 2.3.1.4.1) and the [ ] SOR solver (described in Section 2.3.1.4.2) are to be included in the scope of this review. However, on p. 5-27, the report states that "The differences between the results of these SOR methods with the P-solution as opposed to the P solution are insignificantly small.... Therefore, the P solution results and conclusions supported by the Section 5.4 validation would be applicable to the SOR methods." Provide qualitative and quantitative technical justification to justify including the SOR solvers as part of the review of the (P) solution method. For this evaluation to be complete, it is necessary to show that

   a. the (P) solution method with its original solver and the two SOR solvers yield the same results, within convergence limits, for the range of geometric models evaluated in Section 5.1 by comparison of predicted flow and enthalpy distributions in both the radial and axial directions.

Validation of Solution Methods

3. Section 5.2.1 *Inter-Bundle Diversion Cross-Flow Tests*, does not provide a meaningful comparison to the measured data for the results obtained with the different solution

methods in the COBRA-FLX code. Further, the use of a geometry model in which the test section is represented with a single channel per bundle does not provide results demonstrating "that the fluid flow solution, on the scale of individual fuel assemblies *modeled as channels to the finer scale of individual subchannels modeled as channels* [italics added], is reliable for use for the type of flow redistributions encountered in core analysis", as stated in Section 5.2, p. 5-4. For this evaluation to be complete, it is necessary to show that

a. the two solution methods yield the same results for the test cases where both methods are applicable

b. each solution method yields results that are in good agreement with the measured data; in this case, pressure at measured axial locations, as reported on p. 5-4.

c. good agreement with the measured data can be obtained with detailed subchannel models of the test section, as well as with models in which a test bundle is represented with only a few channels or a single channel.

4. Section 5.2.1, p. 5-8: The discussion of the appropriate selection of the crossflow resistance factor for different channel sizes and different inlet flow profile conditions is incomplete and suggests potential problems when developing input models for reactor cores using varying channel sizes from subchannels to large channels encompassing entire fuel bundles or multiple bundles. It is insufficient to simply note that "The COBRA-FLX user is responsible to select the appropriate flow solution method and crossflow resistance factor whenever encountering severe flow differences during application."
   a. What criteria were used to select the value of $K_{ij} = 4.0$ for the severe inlet flow profile conditions of Test 147 of the IBDCF series?
   b. Are these criteria generally applicable to all assembly geometries and level of detail in channel modeling?
   c. How and where are these criteria documented?

5. Section 5.2.2 *MARGINAN Crossflow Tests*, is incomplete and does not provide a meaningful comparison to the measure data for the results obtained with the different solution methods in the COBRA-FLX code. For this evaluation to be complete, additional information is needed to describe the tests, the COBRA-FLX model, and the comparison of the code results to the measured data. Specifically, it is necessary to show
   a. the inlet flow conditions and operating temperature(s) for the tests used in the evaluation
   b. the geometry model used for the COBRA-FLX analyses
   c. the results obtained with the (P) and (PV) solution methods, for a range of test conditions, compared to the measured data
   d. direct comparison of results of each solution method with the measured data, instead of the normalized values of V/V_{mean} presented in Figures 5-12 through 5-15

e. comparison of code results with measured data over the full range of 21 axial locations where data was obtained, rather than only 4 selected locations

6. Section 5.2.2, p. 5-16: The document states that in comparison to the MARIGNON test data, "The COBRA-FLX axial velocity predictions were found to be within 5% of the measured values for 90% of the data." This is an insufficient description of the results of the validation of the COBRA-FLX solution methods with this data set.
   a. What is the basis for the 5% and 90% values given?
   b. What are the characteristics of the 10% of the data where the COBRA-FLX predictions are not within 5% of the measured values?

7. The documentation of the COBRA-FLX mathematical modeling and solution algorithms does not discuss the potential limitations of using a profile-fit void/quality model in transient two-phase flow calculations. In the discussion of the mathematical model, this issue is dismissed on p. 2-20 with the statement that the two-phase flow structure is "fine enough" to allow void fraction to be specified "as a function of enthalpy, pressure, coolant flow rate, axial position, and time". Due to simplifications inherent in the continuity equations where two-phase flow is treated as a homogeneous mixture, the solution can become unstable or converge to a physically incorrect solution in transient calculations. This behavior is caused by physically unrealistic instantaneous changes in void with local conditions, due to calculating the relationship between void and quality based on a profile fit derived from steady-state data. How is this limitation in the 3-equation mixture model addressed in the COBRA-FLX code solution methods and applications?

Validation of Model Components

8. Section 5.3, p. 5-19 states that empirical correlations included in Table 1-2 have been used with the COBRA 3-CP code, and therefore "no experimental validation is being presented for these empirical correlations." However, the Chexal-Lellouche bulk void model, as implemented in COBRA-FLX, is not consistent with the model as described in the primary reference[1]. In COBRA-FLX, the two-phase flow model consists of three separate components; the void correlation, the correlation for the initiation of subcooled void formation, and the profile-fit correlation relating local quality and void fraction. The specific correlations under review for the two-phase flow model are Chexal-Lellouche (for the void correlation), Saha-Zuber (for the initiation of subcooled void), and Zuber-Staub (for the profile-fit correlation). Saha-Zuber and Zuber-Staub are not the models presented in the primary reference for these components of the Chexal-Lellouche model. Justify the use of Saha-Zuber and Zuber-Staub for these components of the Chexal-Lellouche model
   a. by comparison to the models for these components that are documented in the primary reference

---

[1] The primary reference for the Chexal-Lellouche model in the COBRA-FLX document is Reference A-12, B. Chexal, G. Lellouche, J. Horowitz, and J. Healzer, *A Void Fraction Correlation for Generalized Applications*, **Progress in Nuclear Energy**, Vol. 27, No. 4, 1992.

b. by comparison to relevant experimental data from the primary reference, showing that the void initiation point and the profile-fit obtained with Saha-Zuber and Zuber-Staub, respectively, produce comparable results to those obtained with the primary model

9. Section A.3.2.1 *Homogeneous Model*: The homogeneous two-phase flow friction multiplier, as documented in the COBRA-FLX report (p. A-5) is incomplete and appears incorrect. For this evaluation to be complete, this item must be addressed by
   a. verifying or correcting the correlation as documented in the code
   b. verifying that the implementation of the correlation in the code is correct

10. Section A.5 *Heat Transfer Coefficients*: The heat transfer package to be used in licensing application of the COBRA-FLX code is incompletely documented. For this evaluation to be complete, the following items must be addressed;
    a. justify the use of the Sieder-Tate heat transfer correlation (p. A-28) for single phase liquid forced convection applications; this correlation was derived as a modification to the Dittus-Boelter heat transfer correlation for high-temperature gas flows.
    b. justify the use of the McAdams heat transfer correlation (p. A-28) for single phase liquid forced convection applications; the formulation provided in the documentation is for natural convection in air.
    c. define explicitly and justify the heat transfer correlations that will be used in post-CHF heat transfer calculations in licensing or safety-related applications with COBRA-FLX. The documentation in Section A.5 on this is application is unclear and incomplete.

AREVA

January 28, 2011
NRC:11:009

Document Control Desk
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Response to a Request for Additional Information (RAI) on ANP-10311P, "COBRA-FLX: A Core Thermal-Hydraulic Analysis Code Topical Report"

Ref. 1: Letter, Ronnie L. Gardner (AREVA NP Inc.) to Document Control Desk (NRC), "Request for Review and Approval of ANP-10311P, 'COBRA-FLX: A Core Thermal-Hydraulic Analysis Code Topical Report'," NRC:10:024, March 31, 2010.

Ref. 2: Email, Holly D. Cruz (NRC) to Gayle F. Elliott (AREVA NP Inc.), "COBRA-FLX RAIs," November 17, 2010.

AREVA NP Inc. (AREVA NP) requested the NRC's review and approval of the topical report ANP-10311P, Revision 0, in Reference 1.

The NRC provided a preliminary Request for Additional Information (RAI) regarding the topical report in Reference 2. A conference call was held between AREVA NP and the NRC on November 30, 2010 to discuss the RAI. In response to the conference call, a few of the questions were amended. These are addressed within the responses to the RAI that are provided in the enclosure.

AREVA NP considers some of the material contained in the enclosed document to be proprietary. As required by 10 CFR 2.390(b), an affidavit is enclosed to support the withholding of the information from public disclosure. Proprietary and non-proprietary versions of the attached are provided.

If you have any questions related to this submittal, please contact Ms. Gayle F. Elliott, Product Licensing Manager at 434-832-3347 or by e-mail at gayle.elliott@areva.com.

Sincerely,

Pedro Salas, Manager
Corporate Regulatory Affairs
AREVA NP Inc.

Enclosures

cc: H. Cruz
Project 728