

EACR-A-133

SUMMARY REPORT  
13K MEETING  
RICHLAND (WASH.)  
July 1970

Hannum asked the Secretariat to be alert on other means of obtaining the desired enlargement of the committee. He also expressed hope for a flexible attitude from the Steering Committee so that a change in membership can be made at short notice and not only each fourth year.

The Committee's view on the Scope of EACRP was extensively discussed at the Berlin meeting and summarized as part of "The Committee's Recommendations on the Future of the EACRP", Annex 9 of the Minutes of that meeting. Potter reported back that certain parts of the discussion had been interpreted by the CREST Secretariat as an effort from EACRP to extend its scope to include areas covered by CREST. In the general discussion that followed it was emphasized that the Committee had no such intentions. It is clear, however, that the problems of reactor physics to-day cannot be satisfactorily solved without a proper understanding of the interfaces to adjoining fields and that therefore a certain overlap of fields of interest of the two Committees exists. This should be of mutual benefit as should a strengthening of the contact between CREST and EACRP.

Potter recommended that if the Committee wanted the Scope changed to cover a broader view of reactor physics, the changes should be well defined to avoid misinterpretation.

On the Chairman's suggestion a subgroup was formed (Hannum, Küsters, Tyror) with the task of presenting before the end of the meeting a revised text of the Scope, better complying with the Committee's present views. A proposal was put forward by the group and was after minor changes approved by the Committee. The full text is given in Annex 8.

Potter reported that the legal office of ENEA had raised objections to the wording of some of the paragraphs in the document defining the mandate of the Committee (Terms of Reference, Limitations etc.). In particular, it wanted to remove the whole section III, Limitations, mainly because the content of that section must be considered self-evident.

Several members expressed interest in the thorium cycle and it was agreed to put up the matter as an item on the agenda two meetings from the present one. To be able to identify problem areas those interested should prepare papers for that meeting.

### 3. NEW BUSINESS

#### 3.1 Biennial Report

A draft of the biennial report had been prepared by Critoph and Farinelli. The report was discussed and with minor changes accepted by the Committee.

#### 3.2 Discussion of the Priority Criteria in the RENDA List

This item was dealt with in detail in connection with the report from the Joint Subcommittee Meeting. A summary of the discussion is given under A:3.4.

#### 3.3 Relations with CREST

The Committee agreed that there is a lack of efficient contact between EACRP and CREST. This was exemplified by the fact that the CREST sponsored specialist meeting on reactivity effects in large power reactors of interest to nuclear reactor safety, to take place at Ispra, October 28-30 was not known to most members of EACRP despite the Committee's strong interest in the subject matter of the meeting.

Ways of improving the relations with CREST were discussed. Farinelli suggested that the Committee should make a couple of statements a) expressing the desirability of a closer contact, b) pointing out to CREST the readiness of the committee to express its opinion on reactor physics questions related to safety.

Küsters stressed the importance of discussing overlapping activities with CREST. Tyror suggested that the Committee's views should be expressed in a letter to the Chairman of CREST. An action was put on Campbell to do this.

An action was also put on all members to contact their CREST-representatives to ensure proper representation at the CREST meeting. Furthermore, an EACRP observer should attend the meeting and Campbell was asked to take this up with the Chairman of CREST. Küsters volunteered to represent EACRP at the meeting.

#### 3.4 Report on the Joint Subcommittee

The 5th Joint Subcommittee meeting was held in London, June 10-12, 1970 and was attended by Campbell as the EACRP representative. The meeting had been useful in many respects and Campbell reported on several items of particular interest to the EACRP. One of these concerned means of improving cooperation between evaluators. A considerable manpower is involved in evaluation work at present but there is a need for increased exchange of information between different groups especially in Europe. Ribon, France, has taken a good initiative to improve the situation in publishing an Evaluation Newsletter to appear each fourth month, starting July 1st this year. The Newsletter should be distributed among the ENEA countries for a period of one year after which a decision concerning its continuation will be made. Ribon has promised to take the responsibility for the first year.

Another means of improving the cooperation would be to organize meetings between evaluators. Such meetings could preferably be arranged in connection with other, larger meetings, such as the IAEA panel meeting on evaluation in 1971.

Another important question that was discussed at the meeting was the way to introduce requests in the RENDA list. The UK request list will in the future be split into two parts, one being requests for measurements, one for evaluations. This would help in displaying where the main effort is needed. The Subcommittee agreed to the desirability of including evaluation requests in RENDA but most members felt it best to retain a single list. The Subcommittee recommended that the matter should be discussed within EACRP and EANDC.

Campbell clarified the point by stressing the fact that the request is for better data which by no means implies a need for more measurements. According to his view evaluation of existing measurements including careful examination of systematic and random errors is needed in many cases rather than new measurements. New measurements

ANNEX 8

PROPOSED REVISED SCOPE OF THE EACRP

The European-American Committee on Reactor Physics (hereinafter called the "Committee") shall essentially be concerned with the nuclear aspects of reactor physics which are of general and mutual relevance to nuclear energy programmes.

Questions relating to the space, time and energy distribution of neutrons and radiations in different media fall within the scope of the Committee, but determinations of differential nuclear cross sections do not. Since reactor physics is but one component of integrated reactor performance, some consideration to adjoining fields such as engineering, materials and computer technology will be necessary to ensure that the implications for reactor physics are understood and appropriately covered.

MEMORANDUM

A  
To Mr. J. Rosen

De  
From W.T. Potter

Paris,

24th July,

1970

Objet  
Subject

13th EACRP MEETING - RICHLAND, JULY 1970

Référence

Agenda Item, Part A, 3.3. - Relations with CREST

You will recall that during the 12th Meeting of EACRP in Berlin, the view was expressed that the time had come for EACRP to consider extending its interest into other fields relating to reactor physics. Subsequently, the specific reference in the Minutes to heat transfer and fission product control as examples of subjects which might be studied led to some concern being felt in the Technical Division who saw a possible danger of overlap between EACRP and CREST.

It was on this basis that I introduced this Item on the Agenda and some lively discussion ensued. The essential points arising were as follows:-

1. EACRP is not satisfied that there is sufficient liaison between CREST and EACRP to ensure that EACRP is kept informed of CREST activities which may have an interest for EACRP. I was under the impression that Minutes of CREST Meetings were sent routinely to EACRP members, just as EACRP Minutes are sent to CREST members, but this was denied. Dr. Smets had provided me with copies of SEN/CREST (69) 2, (the Summary Record of the 5th Meeting of CREST, Paris, 12th-14th November, 1969) which I distributed at the Meeting. I promised to arrange for EACRP members in future to receive CREST Minutes routinely.
2. EACRP is, however, satisfied that if the right degree of liaison can be established between the two Committees, the possibility of overlap and thus of duplication would no longer be a problem.

To: Mr. J. Rosen

24th July, 1970

3. I also distributed copies of ENEA's letter dated 22nd June 1970 (a copy is attached herewith) announcing the arrangements for a specialist meeting on "Reactivity Effects, ~~Enlarged~~ Power Reactors of Interest to Nuclear Reactor Safety".

EACRP felt strongly that this was a matter about which they should at least have been consulted, if not invited to co-sponsor. This was regarded as a good example of where lack of liaison could lead to misunderstanding. The Committee wish to record formally with ENEA that EACRP would be glad to be of assistance in setting up any future meetings where the interface with CREST or any other ENEA Committee is so close.

4. As the Chairman of EACRP and the Chairman of CREST are both members of the UKAEA, it seemed sensible to me to suggest that they discuss the general problem together. Dr. Campbell undertook to do this and no doubt we shall be hearing further shortly.
5. Meanwhile you may wish to use this note as a basis for discussions with the Technical Division.

W. J. Rosen

OCDE

OECD

MEMORANDUM

A  
To Mr. L. Boxer

De  
From J.A.G. Rosén

Paris, 27th July

1970

Objet  
Subject

RELATIONS CREST/EACRP

Référence

Further to the enclosed memorandum copy, I recently had a telephone conversation with Graham Campbell. He had consulted with Dr. Farmer about the desirability of making the CREST meeting 28th-30th October on "Reactivity Effects in Large Power Reactors of Interest to Nuclear Reactor Safety". Both of them had agreed that this would be a good thing and Dr. Campbell proposed that the Secretariat should issue a supplementary note making this a joint undertaking, and in particular that the proposed test cases should be circulated to the EACRP members. Participation in the specialist meeting would then be ensured through the CREST or EACRP member, as each country may decide to be appropriate. I suggest that the new approach should be made by the CREST Secretariat.

*Johnny Rosén.*