Review of the Project Group: Group Code: EPR 44 (Pierre Dareys, Elise Poom) Full title: "EPR report"

Intonded learning and the second	C 1.	Evaluation for the on-line -fd 1 f 1
Intended learning outcome	Grade	Explanation for the grading of the evidences of achieving
(ILO)	(0-3)	respective ILO.
1. C. H		Suggestions for improvements and other comments
1. Collect information on		A very general, brief introduction to the EPR.
General design specification		More specific information about the reactor core, reactor vessel, primary/secondary loop, balance of plant, is missing (except for
of the nuclear power plant		what is given in one table).
with selected reactor type		what is given in one table).
(Task 1, ILO1, ILO2)	1	I also miss an emphasis on the features that makes the design
		unique and interesting.
		-
		Large figures, little text.
2.0 1.0		NB: Units should <u>not</u> be italicized!
2. Describe Operational		A very short description of the reactor operation during start-up and shut-down. The text provides no evidence of functioning
principles of the power plant.		knowledge.
(Task 2, ILO1, ILO2)		Mio mougo.
		Operation in base load and load-following scenarios is not clear.
	1	
		A description of the operational principles of the auxiliary
		systems is missing.
		No amphagic on the features that makes the design various
		No emphasis on the features that makes the design unique and interesting.
3. Explain Safety features of the power plant. (Task 3, ILO1, ILO2)		You briefly list some reactor protection systems. Elaborate and
		discuss them more in-depth. Why do we need them?
		Results from the reactor safety analysis are missing.
	1	
		You mention the core damage frequency, but are there other key
		safety parameters? A more elaborated discussion about the numbers would be in place.
		numbers would be in place.
		Large figures, little text.
4. Calculate Selected core		Very brief description of the models used. Go more into detail.
parameters (Task 4, ILO3)		
		Motivate and discuss the methods and models you have chosen.
		Be critical and try to analyze how your choices have affected the result. For example, why did you use HEM and not DFM when
	2	calculating the void fraction?
		NB1: Typo in the given number for outlet enthalpy (p. 17).
		ND 11 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
		NB2: Unit for second: s (p. 17).
		NB3: Units should <u>not</u> be italicized!
		·

5. Calculate CHF margins in a hot channel (Task 5, ILO4a)	2	You present the models used and comment somewhat on their applicability. However, you should adopt a more critical mind regarding the models. For example, how would the results change if you apply the Reddy and Fighetti correlation instead?  Erroneous results prevent you from calculating MDNBR $(q'' > q''[cr])$ for $z > 3.2$ .
		NB1: You mention that you use the Janson and Levy correlation when you in fact use the W-3 correlation (p. 20).  NB2: Units should <u>not</u> be italicized!
6. Calcaulte Maximum cladding and fuel pellet temperature (Task 6, ILO4b)	2	Very short results and discussion sections. Discuss the accuracy of the models, why certain models were chosen, and the expected effect on the results. To which input parameter is the temperatures most sensitive? Can you estimate the uncertainties of the calculated temperatures?
	2	Report the locations of the peak temperatures as mentioned in the introduction.
		NB1: Unit for degrees Celsius: °C.
		NB2: Units should <u>not</u> be italicized!