July 25, 2023

Wen Jiang, William F. Skerjanc Idaho National Laboratory

TRISO Fuel Performance Modeling in Bison

Modeling of TRISO coating layer fracture due to buffer debonding

DOE ART Gas-Cooled Reactor (GCR) Review Meeting Virtual Meeting July 25 – 27, 2023





- Background and overview of BISON
- BISON debonding modeling
- Coating layer fracture modeling
- Buffer partial debonding

BISON Overview

Lower-length scale modeling

- Fission gas release model: Xe, Kr diffusivity in UCO
- **Fission product diffusivity:** Silver diffusion in SiC, Pd Penetration

TRISO particle

- Thermal-mechanical modeling
 - Failure analysis: asphericity, IPyC cracking and debonding
- Fission product diffusion through layers

•

Pebble and Compact modeling

- Failure probability calculation: Monte Carlo and Fast Integration Approach
- Fission product diffusion through matrix
- Particle-Matrix interaction

TRISO Fuel Particle Modeling



Bison 700 ° C

–Bison 1300°C –PARFUME 700°C

PARFUME 1000 ° C

250

Coating layers debonding

Partial debonding of the IPyC from the SiC

- Partial debonding between the IPyC and the SiC has also been observed in PIE of the NP-MHTGR fuel particles.
- During irradiation, shrinkage of the IPyC layer induces a radial tensile stress at the interface between the IPyC and SiC layer.
- If the stress exceeds the bond strength between layers, then debonding of the IPyC from the SiC occurs.
- A stress concentration occurs in the SiC layer at the tip of the debonded region, containing tensile stress components that could contribute to failure of the SiC.

Buffer-IPyC partial debonding in AGR-1

- Buffer-IPyC partial debonding were found with intermediate frequency in AGR-1 compacts and it can lead to IPyC cracking and separation from SiC layer.
- □ Allows localized attack of SiC layer by fission products (especially Pd)
- Pd attack can eventually result in loss of FP retention by SiC layer.
- Degradation is worse at higher safety test temperatures





Debonding with cohesive-zone method







Fracture types observed in AGR-1 – Type A



Fracture types observed in AGR-1 – Type AB



Type ABi

Type ABf

Fracture types observed in AGR-1 – Type B



Buffer Partial Debonding



Phase-field Fracture Modeling

$$egin{aligned} \{m{u},\Gamma\} &= rgmin \Psi(m{u},m{
abla}m{u},\Gamma),\ m{u},\Gamma \end{aligned}$$
 subject to $m{u} &= m{g}, & orall m{x} \in \partial \Omega_D,\ \Gamma(t) \subseteq \Gamma(t'), & orall t' \in [t,T] \end{aligned}$

The objective function $\Psi(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{\nabla}\boldsymbol{u}, \Gamma)$ is defined as:



$$\Psi(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{\nabla}\boldsymbol{u},\Gamma) = \Psi_{\text{elastic}}(\boldsymbol{\nabla}\boldsymbol{u}) + \Psi_{\text{fracture}}(\Gamma) - \Psi_{\text{dissipation}}(\boldsymbol{u},\Gamma) - \Psi_{\text{external}}(\boldsymbol{u},\Gamma)$$

- Advantages of phase-field model
 - Avoids re-meshing
 - Determine crack nucleation and propagation automatically
 - Handle joining and branching of multiple cracks

Buffer Fracture Modeling



Bonding area: A > B > C

Fracture Strength: D > A > E

Buffer and IPyC fracture modeling





SiC fracture modeling







Story 176.18

TRISO coating layers fracture modeling



• Fracture stresses of buffer, IPyC and SiC were set to 300MPa, 300MPa and 400MPa respectively.