The groundwork of current solutions

Nuclear waste management and processing: between legacy and anticipation

The aim of radioactive waste management is to protect humankind and its environment from the effects of that waste's constituent materials, particularly from radiological hazards. This management is governed by a few major principles: curbing quantities, by producing as little waste as practicable; sorting; safe conditioning, taking on board long-term aspects; and isolation from man and the environment. This takes the form of a deployment of pathways which, as a rule, involve, apart from the primary-waste generating stage (R&D, operation, maintenance, decommissioning), stages of processing—conditioning, possibly of interim storage, followed by final disposal.

What are the steps in the formation of a package?

A conditioned waste item is known as a package, and the latter must possess mechanical properties meeting the requirements of handling, transport, storage and disposal (see Box C, What stands between waste and the environment? p. 28; Box D, From storage to disposal, p. 50). Its formation thus involves an ensemble of steps, from raw waste characterization to characterization of the package itself, vouchsafing the function of durable radioactivity confinement, over the timescale considered.

Raw waste characterization consists in determining the quantity, nature and location of the radioactivity the waste bears, and its physical–chemical form, for the purposes of optimizing conditioning (matrix formulation…). The waste treatment step, after this, addresses two major objectives: on the one hand, volume reduction through specifically-designed methods (cutting, crushing, decontamination…) and processes (organic waste incineration, melting metallic waste, compaction…), and, on the other hand, adjustment of waste shape and form to suit it to process and conditioning matrix. Waste conditioning operations allow putting waste into a form suited for future manage-
ment purposes, through compaction, or incorpora-
tion, whether homogeneous (e.g. effluent cementa-
tion, vitrification of fission product and actinide solu-
tions, encapsulation in bitumen) or heterogeneous
(ENCASING IN CEMENT), into an appropriate confinement
matrix. Some radioactive waste is directly conditioned
in suitable containers. The following pages describe
the conditioning processes in use, and advances pre-
sently in hand, these being the outcome of research
efforts carried out, in the main, under the aegis of the

Package characterization allows the quantity, nature,
and location of the radioactivity contained to be acces-
sed, for the purposes of directing the package to the
most appropriate outlet (and for the purposes of veri-
fication that associated regulatory acceptance criteria
are met). These obligatory steps are complemented by
those relating to demonstration of safety for a package
type, in its storage or disposal site. The aim, for exa-
ample, may be to demonstrate the quality of confinement
over a timescale relevant to a pathway type (see Box D).
This is the object of investigations on the long-term
behavior of packages, covered in the second chapter
of this issue of Clefs CEA.

At the outcome of the process, primary waste has under-
gone a number of treatment and conditioning opera-
tions, bringing it to the final form of a waste package.
It may then be taken in by the final disposal site, for
short-lived intermediate- and low-level waste, and
very-low-level waste (provided, in France, that ANDRA
disposal specifications have been met, and that rele-
vant agreements have been issued), or be kept in stor-
age (for long-lived low- and intermediate-level waste),
pending deployment of long-term management path-
ways.

Management pathways and waste downgrading

With respect to day-to-day management, a distinction
must be made between operational pathways, i.e. for
which a final outlet is available (Aube Disposal Center,
Morvilliers Disposal Center; see Industrial solutions for
all low-level waste, p. 32), and interim storage, for such
waste as is covered, as regards its long-term fate, beyond
that storage stage, by the Act of 1991. Turning to path-
ways now in prospect, relying on the deployment of new
installations (now planned, or in construction),
these will benefit from advances in treatment tech-
niques and processes, conducive to lower waste pro-
duction. Finally, as regards legacy waste (mainly waste
produced earlier than the 1990s, and stored on site at
the installations), and waste from decommissioning
operations at installations to be shut down, retrieval
and conditioning operations will be addressed by a
specific development effort.

As final installations are in place only for VLLW and
LILW-SL waste, considerable resources are being deployed by producers to minimize the quantities of
waste, in an effort directed at the ILW-LL and HLW-
LL waste categories. This has resulted, in particular, in
improved processes, to achieve lower waste produc-
tion, and in the deployment of treatment and charac-
terization methods, with the aim of downgrading waste,
initially classified as of the ILW-LL type, to LILW-SL
waste. Thus, for the older, legacy waste mentioned ear-
lier, which is often taken to be of the ILW-LL type, due
to inadequate knowledge, characterization by way of current methods, more accurate than the older ones
as they are, allows certain items to be directed straight
to operational industrial disposal facilities. At the same

Waste from basic nuclear installations at CEA’s Saclay
Center, placed in 60-liter stainless-steel drums, after
compaction. These drums will subsequently be
encased in mortar inside packages, which may be put
into concrete overpacks, for acceptance by ANDRA.
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What stands between waste and the environment?

Raw, solid or liquid radioactive waste undergoes, after characterization (determination of its chemical and radiological makeup, and of its physical–chemical properties), conditioning, a term covering all the operations consisting in bringing this waste (or spent fuel assemblies) to a form suitable for its transport, storage, and disposal (see Box D). The aim is to put radioactive waste into a solid, physically and chemically stable form, and ensure effective, lasting confinement of the radionuclides it contains.

For that purpose, two complementary operations are carried out. As a rule, waste is immobilized by a material – whether by encapsulation or homogeneous incorporation (liquid or powdered waste, sludges), or encasing (solid waste) – within a matrix, the nature of, and performance specification for which depend on waste type (cement for sludges, evaporation concentrates; bitumen for encapsulation of sludges or evaporation concentrates from liquid effluent treatment; or a vitreous matrix, intimately binding the nuclides to the glass network, for fission product or minor actinide solutions). This matrix contributes to the confinement function. The waste thus conditioned is placed in an impervious container (cylindrical or rectangular), consisting in one or more canisters. The whole – container and content – is termed a package. Equally, waste may be compacted and mechanically immobilized within a canister, the whole forming a package.

When in the state they come in as supplied by industrial production, they are known as primary packages, the primary container being the cement or metal container into which the conditioned waste is ultimately placed, to allow handling. The container may act as initial confinement barrier, allotment of functions between matrix and container being determined according to the nature of the waste involved. Thus, the whole obtained by the grouping together, within one container, of a number of primary
the initial waste, for which the residual activity level becomes sufficiently low to allow downgrading, or, at any rate, whose radioactivity will have quite significantly come down. Investigations carried out in this area have resulted in efficient processes, making it possible to avoid use of aqueous solutions (caustic soda...), yielding as they do considerable volumes of saline effluents. These processes include gels, foams, surfactant solutions, as well as decontamination by means of lasers or supercritical fluids. Gels, amenable to drying and vacuuming, ultimately only yield a low-volume, solid residue (flakes). Surfactant-based foams act on a volume to be decontaminated that is typically ten times larger than that of the solution initially used.

Use of surfactant solutions, allowing for instance treatment of surfaces covered with contaminated greasy coatings, was successfully employed in the cleanup of the APM (Atelier pilote de Marcoule: Marcoule Pilot Workshop) facility. Coupled use of surfactants in an acid medium and mechanical agitation enabled stripping of the superficial layer of TBP (the extractant in the Purex process) coating the tanks in that facility, allowing their effective decontamination. Laser decontamination processes, or processes of supercritical fluid extraction, in turn, yield no effluent. The former process allows ablation, by means of a laser pulse, of the contaminated surface, while the latter makes use of the peculiar solvent properties of CO2 in the supercritical phase (at moderate pressure and temperature) to dissolve the surface contaminant, then recover it through decompression of the fluid in gaseous phase. While these two processes show promise, they do however still require development work before they reach qualification scale.

The first three of these methods, on the other hand, have reached a stage of development such as to make industrial applications possible. Formulations of wholly mineral gels, which may be vacuumed, have been developed, allowing subsequent safe disposal of the solid residue (flakes), after encapsulation if required, with no risk of physical–chemical alteration of this residue from the effects of radiolysis or temperature. Recent

ILW-LL packages may ensure confinement of the radioactivity of this type of waste. If a long-term storage stage is found to be necessary, beyond the stage of industrial storage on the premises of the producers, primary waste packages must be amenable to retrieval, as and when required: durable primary containers must then be available, in such conditions, for all types of waste.

In such a case, for spent fuel assemblies which might at some time be earmarked for such long-term storage, or even for disposal, it is not feasible to demonstrate, on a timescale of centuries, the integrity of the cladding holding the fuel, forming the initial confinement barrier during the in-reactor use stage. Securing these assemblies in individual, imperious cartridges is thus being considered, this stainless-steel cartridge being compatible with the various possible future management stages: treatment, return to storage, or disposal. Placing these cartridges inside imperious containers ensures a second confinement barrier, as is the case for high-level waste packages.

In storage or disposal conditions, the waste packages will be subjected to a variety of aggressive agents, both internal and external. First, radionuclide radioactive decay persists inside the package (self-irradiation process). Emission of radiation is concomitant with heat generation. For example, in confinement glasses holding high-activity (high-level) waste, the main sources of irradiation originate in the alpha decay processes from minor actinides, beta decay from fission products, and gamma transitions. Alpha decay, characterized by production of a recoil nucleus, and emission of a particle, which, at the end of its path, yields a helium atom, causes the major part of atom displacements. In particular, recoil nuclei, shedding considerable energy as they do over a short distance, result in atom displacement cascades, thus breaking large numbers of chemical bonds. This is thus the main cause of potential long-term damage. In such conditions, matrices must exhibit thermal stability, and irradiation-damage resistance.

Stored waste packages will also be subjected to the effects of water (leaching). Container canisters may exhibit a degree of resistance to corrosion processes (the overpacks contemplated for glasses may thus delay by some 4,000 years the arrival of water), and the confinement matrices must be proven to exhibit high chemical stability.

Between the containers and the ultimate barrier provided, in a radioactive waste deep disposal facility, by the geological environment itself, there may further be interposed, apart, possibly, from an overpack, other barriers, so-called engineered barriers, for backfill and sealing purposes. While these would be pointless as backfill in clay formations, they would have the capability, in other environments (granite), of further retarding any flow of radionuclides to the geosphere, notwithstanding degradation of the previously mentioned barriers.
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development work has made it possible to go from the laboratory scale to that of industrial production: indeed, an operating license has recently been granted. Moreover, spray application processes may be used with this type of gel. The latter are also covered by patents, jointly taken out by Areva–Cogema, and a number of licenses have been agreed to. Use of these processes results in a quite significant gain in terms of absorbed dose for operators, compared with traditional swabbing processes, using rags soaked with a decontaminant solution, e.g. cerium-based (see Figure 2). Indeed, they involve spraying the gel onto the walls requiring decontamination, letting it act and leaving it to dry, then vacuuming it while brushing the surface, if an optimized decontamination factor is sought, as evidenced by operational feedback.

This vacuumable gel technique has just been successfully used for decontamination of a cell of the ISAI installation at Marcoule. The gel was applied over all stainless steels walls, its formulation not allowing, as yet, effective use on painted surfaces. Initial assessment is positive, since the decontamination factor was found to be greater than 10, allowing the cell’s ambient radioactivity to be brought down sufficiently for operators to begin decommissioning work. This technique is highly attractive on the export side, for major cleanup and decommissioning sites, where these gels have already undergone preliminary testing.

Foam decontamination, in turn, offers the advantage that it may be used for complicated geometries, such as the inside of a fission product storage tank, while ensuring a gain by a factor 10 as between total volume subjected to decontamination, and final volume of foam settling back, after a few hours, into the form of a liquid solution. Such tanks are, as a matter of fact, fitted with internal structures, mainly comprising coolant water circuits (warranted by the heat released by the fission products stored). This technique is being targeted by full-scale formulation and qualification investigations. Pilots do in fact allow testing (in inactive configuration) foam filling and draining for a 20-m³ tank, or filling a compressed-air line network by means of a foam train, displaced along the entire length of the network. This qualification work may require feedback with regard to formulation, relating, for example, to the mechanical properties required for the foam.

A second form of waste treatment, concentrating radioactivity into a restricted volume, consists in incinerating, where applicable, its organic fraction. Three process families have been developed. The first two (conventional incineration in the Iris pilot, at Marcoule, and supercritical-water incineration, by the so-called hydrothermal oxidation [HTO process]) have reached the industrial development stage. The third process, a coupled incineration–vitrification process (in particular through use of a plasma torch), is described in Safe conditioning obtained through constantly improved processes, p. 44.

The Iris pilot has allowed full-scale development of organic waste incineration (overwhelmingly, solid waste to date). The initial pyrolysis step is carried out at moderate temperature (around 500 °C), allowing extraction of combustion gases, chlorinated gases in particular, in conditions of controlled materials corrosion, followed by treatment of these gases by afterburning, dust filtration and scrubbing. The second step consists in incineration of the pitch residue thus obtained. This process, adapted for nuclear materials, is operational at CEA’s Valduc Center, for contaminated organic waste. Support for this application, of an industrial character, has allowed broadening the range of waste treated: thus, pure PVC waste may now be treated, this being particularly chlorine-rich.

As for HTO incineration, this is used for partly organic, partly aqueous, contaminated organic effluents. This technique allows complete oxidation of organic matter into CO₂ and H₂O, mineral matter thus being present, at the outcome of the process, in the form of an aqueous solution. For this purpose, the process employs water in the supercritical phase, at about 250 bars and 500 °C. A double-walled tubular reactor was developed, to minimize corrosion effects when the mineral fraction is chlorine-rich, for instance. This process was developed successfully to a throughput of 100 g/h, and is to be used in the Delos installation of the Atalante facility, at Marcoule, to incinerate effluents from CEA research activities, with a throughput of 1 kg/h.

Retrieval of legacy waste...

One major development, in terms of waste management, concerns operations of legacy waste retrieval and conditioning, scheduled by Areva and CEA through to 2035 at La Hague, Marcoule, and other CEA sites.

... at Areva–La Hague...

At the La Hague site, plans are in hand to proceed with retrieval and vitrification conditioning of so-called UMo fission product solutions (uranium–molybdenum solutions, yielded by treatment of UNGG fuel), currently in storage. Owing to their high molybdenum content, these cannot be vitrified using current facili-
ties, and R&D investigations have allowed deployment of a suitable process, consisting in fabricating the glass involved, or rather a vitroceramic matrix, in a cold crucible. Projected production is 800 standard vitrified waste containers. Vitrification of UMo solutions should be initiated after 2010.

Further retrieval and conditioning operations concerning stored legacy waste, predominantly produced in the 1970s and 1980s, are also planned for the coming years. Area is considering making use of its recent installations (put on stream between 1990 and 2002) to carry out its treatment and conditioning. The main operations concern sludges stored at the STE2 facility (retrieved from 2005), and waste stored in the HAO (Haute Activité oxyde: High-Level Oxide) silo, silos 115 and 130, and at the SOC (Stockage organisé des coques: Organized Hull Disposal) site. Retrieval at the HAO silo and silo 130 is scheduled from 2010. The company is planning to carry out compaction conditioning, at the Hull Compaction Workshop (ACC: Atelier de compactage des coques; see Industrial solutions for long-lived, high- and intermediate-level waste, p. 36), of a major part of the waste being stored in silos, mostly of the ILW-LL type. Graphite sleeves, due to be taken out of storage at that point, are of the LLW-LL type, and should ultimately be conditioned in concrete packages. There is also a certain amount of operational waste, at first blush suited for surface disposal. Areva is further planning to effect retrieval and conditioning of various waste categories (resins, powdered graphite, etc.), stored in the settling tanks of the UP2-400 plant, along with treatment and conditioning of used solvents from that same plant.

Most of this waste will be conditioned by 2020, and the final operations should come to an end around 2030. Some of these operations will require prior agreement from the French Nuclear Safety Authority (Autorité de sûreté nucléaire). Cleanup operations at shutdown workshops of UP2-400 should largely be in hand by 2020.

**... at Marcoule...**

Cleanup operations at the Marcoule site will carry through. Part of the waste may be directed to surface disposal sites, provided agreements are forthcoming from ANDRA. For other waste (HLW and ILW-LL), the aim is to bring it all into two storage facilities, that at AVM (Atelier de vitrification de Marcoule: Marcoule Vitrification Workshop), for storage in wells, for vitrified HLW waste packages, and at the modular storage hall specifically built for these operations, EIP (Entreposage intermédiaire polyvalent: Multipurpose Interim Storage), put in service in 2000, for ILW-LL waste.

The strategy for magnesium structural waste (cladding from spent fuel of the UNGG type) is to condition it in stainless steel drums. Retrieval operations for such waste, stored in 17 trenches at the site, have not been initiated as yet. Drums of bitumen produced by the Liquid Effluent Treatment Station (STEL: Station de traitement des effluents liquides) have been stored, since the unit started up in 1996, for some 90%, in concrete bunkers adjoining it and in semi-subterranean trenches in the site’s Northern area, from which they have been gradually retrieved from 2000 on. As of 31 December 2004, 4,184 packages containing drums taken from the trenches in the Northern area were in storage at EIP.

By 2020, nearly half of the retrieval and conditioning operations for legacy waste stored at the Marcoule site will have been completed, along with most of the installation shutdown and decommissioning operations (with the major exception of support workshops used for the treatment and conditioning of legacy waste not yet conditioned by that time).

**... and at other CEA sites**

CEA has launched a major program for the retrieval of legacy waste disposed before the 1990s. Some of that waste has been kept at R&D installations, other items are stored in dedicated installations in CEA centers. The packages resulting from this program will be directed for disposal at the Aube Center, or stored at CEA installations.

This mainly involves solid waste, as a rule kept in drums, stored in wells, vaults or trenches at the various sites, and solid waste stored in the 5 trenches of basic nuclear installation (INB) 56 at Cadarache, in a variety of forms (loose in vinyl bags, metal drums, concrete overpacks); current schedule is for retrieval of this waste to be completed by 2008, with site rehabilitation achieved by 2009. Other solid waste, stored in hangars at INB 56, already conditioned and/or requiring reconditioning, is to be subjected to radiological measurements for the purposes of suitability sorting for the LILW-SL and ILW-LL pathways. Such operations are dependent on the coming on stream of the Radioactive Waste Conditioning and Storage (CEDRA: Conditionnement et entreposage des déchets radioactifs) installation, currently being built, clearance of all packages being spread over 6 years, from the unit’s startup date. It should be noted that, while retrieval of legacy solid waste does require specific tools or installations, the waste resulting from these specific treatments, for its part, may be taken in by conventional pathways.
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What is radioactive waste?

According to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), radioactive waste may be defined as “any material for which no use is foreseen and that contains radionuclides at concentrations greater than the values deemed admissible by the competent authority in materials suitable for use not subject to control.” French law in turn introduces a further distinction, valid for nuclear waste as for any other waste, between waste and final, or “ultimate,” waste (déchet ultime). Article L. 541-1 of the French Environmental Code thus specifies that “may be deemed as waste any residue from a process of production, transformation or use, any substance, material, product, or, more generally, any movable property left derelict or that its owner intends to leave derelict,” further defining as ultimate “waste, be it the outcome of waste treatment or not, that is not amenable to further treatment under prevailing technological and economic conditions, in particular by extraction of the recoverable, usable part, or mitigation of its polluting or hazardous character.”

Internationally, experts from IAEA and the Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA) – an OECD organization – as those in the European Commission find that long-lived waste produced in countries operating a nuclear power program is stored securely nowadays, whilst acknowledging a final solution is required, for the long-term management of such waste. They consider burial in deep geological structures appears, presently, to be the safest way to achieve final disposal of this type of waste.

What constitutes radioactive waste? What are the volumes currently involved?

Radioactive waste is classified into a number of categories, according to its level of radioactivity, and the radioactive period, or half-life, of the radionuclides it contains. It is termed long-lived waste when that period is greater than 30 years, short-lived waste otherwise. The French classification system involves the following categories:

- short-lived waste (LLW); this contains very small amounts of radionuclides, of the order of 10–100 Bq/g (becquerels per gram), which precludes considering it as conventional waste;
- short-lived low and intermediate level waste (ILW-LL); radioactivity levels for such waste lie as a rule in a range from a few hundred to one million Bq/g, of which less than 10,000 Bq/g is from long-lived radionuclides. Its radioactivity becomes comparable to natural radioactivity in less than three hundred years. Production of such waste stands at some 15,000 m³ per year in France;
- long-lived low-level waste (LLW-LL); this category includes radium-bearing waste from the extraction of rare earths from radioactive ores, and graphite waste from first-generation reactors;
- long-lived intermediate-level waste (ILW-LL), this being highly disparate, whether in terms of origin or nature, with an overall stock standing, in France, at 45,000 m³ at the end of 2004. This mainly comes from spent fuel assemblies (cladding hulls and end-caps), or from operation and maintenance of installations; this includes, in particular, waste conditioned during spent fuel reprocessing operations (as from 2002, this type of waste is compacted, amounting to some 200 m³ annually), technological waste from the operation or routine maintenance of production or fuel-processing plants, from nuclear reactors or from research centers (some 230 m³ annually), along with sludges from effluent treatment (less than 100 m³ annually). Most such waste generates little heat, however some waste of this type is liable to release gases;
- high-level waste (HLW), containing fission products and minor actinides partitioned during spent fuel reprocessing (see Box 8), and incorporated at high temperature into a glass matrix. Some 120 m³ of “nuclear glass” is thus cast every year. This type of waste bears the major part of radioactivity (over 95%), consequently it is the seat of considerable heat release, this remaining significant on a scale of several centuries. Overall, radioactive waste conditioned in France amounts to less than 1 kg per year, per capita. That kilogram consists, for over 90%, of LLW-LL type waste, bearing but 5% of total radioactivity; 9% of ILW-LL waste, less than 1% HLW, and virtually no LLW-LL waste.

What of the waste of tomorrow?

From 1991, ANDRA compiled, on a yearly basis, a geographical inventory of waste present on French territory. In 2001, ANDRA was asked by government to augment this “National Inventory,” with the threefold aim of characterizing extant stocks (state of conditioning, processing traceability), predicting future waste production trends to 2020, and informing the public (see An inventory projecting into the future). ANDRA published this reference National Inventory at the end of 2004. To meet requirements for research in compliance with the directions set out in the French Act of 30 December 1991 (see Radioactive waste management research: an ongoing process of advances), ANDRA, in collaboration with waste producers, has drawn up a Dimensioning Inventory Model (MID: Modèle d’inventaire de dimensionnement), for the purposes of arriving at estimates of the volume of waste packages to be taken on board in research along direction 2 (disposal). This model, including as it does predictions as to overall radioactive waste arisings from the current reactor fleet, over their entire lifespan, seeks to group waste types into families, homogeneous in terms of characteristics, and to formulate the most plausible hypotheses, with respect to conditioning modes, to derive the volumes to be taken on board for the purposes of the investigation. Finally, MID sets out to provide detailed stocktaking, intended to cover waste in the broadest possible fashion. MID (not to be confused with the National Inventory, which has the remit to provide a detailed account of actual waste currently present on French territory) thus makes it possible to bring down the variety of package families to a limited number of representative objects, and to specify the requisite margins of error, to ensure the design and assessment of disposal safety will be as robust as feasible, with respect to possible future variations in data.

To ensure consistency between investigations carried out in accordance with direction 2 and those along direction 3 (conditioning and long-term storage), CEA adopted MID as input data. MID subsumes waste packages into standard package types, then computes the number and volume of HLW and ILW-LL packages, according to a number of scenarios, all based on the assumption that current nuclear power plants will be operated for 40 years, their output plateauing at 400 TWh per year. Table 1 shows the numbers and volumes for each standard package type, for the scenario assuming a continuation of current strategy, with respect to spent fuel reprocessing: reprocessing of 79,200 UOX fuel assemblies and storage of 5,400 MOX
Table 2.
Amounts (number, and volume) of waste packages, as predicted in France for 40 years’ operation of the current fleet of reactors, according to ANDRA’s investigations covered by the Act of 30 December 1991.

The orange area highlights those categories targeted by Long-term management modes, as currently operated, or planned, in France, by the Dimensioning Inventory Model (MID).

* renamed Areva NC in 2006

---

**What forms does it come in?**

Five types of generic packages (also found in MID) may be considered:

- **cementitious waste packages**: ILW-LL waste packages employing hydraulic-binder based materials as a conditioning matrix, or as an immobilizing grout, or yet as a container constituent;
- **bituminized sludge packages**: LLW and ILW-LL waste packages, in which bitumen is used as confinement matrix for low- and intermediate-level residues from treatment of a variety of liquid effluents (fuel processing, research centers, etc.);
- **standard compacted waste packages (CSD-C: colis standard de déchets compac- tés)**: ILW-LL packages obtained through compaction conditioning of structural waste from fuel assemblies, and technological waste from the La Hague workshops;
- **standard vitrified waste packages (CSD-V: colis standard de déchets vitrifiés)**: HLW packages, obtained mainly through vitrification of highly active solutions from spent fuel reprocessing;
- **spent fuel packages**: packages consisting in nuclear fuel assemblies discharged from reactors; these are not considered to be waste in France. The only long-lived waste packages to be generated in any significant amounts by current electricity production (see Box B) are vitrified waste packages and standard compacted waste packages, the other types of packages having, for the most part, already been produced, and bearing but a small part of total radioactivity.

**What is happening to this waste at present? What is to be done in the long term?**

The goal of long-term radioactive waste management is to protect humankind and its environment from the effects of the materials comprised in this waste, most importantly from radiological hazards. Any release or dissemination of radioactive materials must thus be precluded, through the lasting isolation of such waste from the environment. This management is guided by the following principles: to produce as little waste as practicable; limit its hazardous character as far as feasible; take into account the specific characters of each category of waste; and opt for measures that will minimize the burden (monitoring, maintenance) for future generations.

As for all nuclear activities subject to control by the French Nuclear Safety Authority (Autorité de sûreté nucléaire), fundamental safety regulations (RFSs: règles fondamentales de sûreté) have been drawn up with respect to radioactive waste management: sorting, volume reduction, package confinement potential, manufacturing method, radionuclide concentration. RFS III-2f, in particular, specifies the conditions to be met for the design of, and demonstration of safety for an underground repository, and thus provides a basic guide for disposal investigations. Industrial solutions (see Industrial solutions for all low-level waste) are currently available for nigh on 85% (by volume) of waste, i.e. VLLW and LLW-LL waste. A solution for LLW-LL waste is the subject of ongoing investigation by ANDRA, at the behest of waste producers. ILW-LL and HLW waste, containing radionuclides having very long half-lives [in some cases, greater than several hundred thousand years] are currently held in storage installations coming under the control of the Nuclear Safety Authority. What is to become of this waste in the long term, beyond this storage phase, is what the Act of 30 December 1991 addresses (see Table 2).

For all of these waste types, the French Nuclear Safety Authority is drawing up a National Radioactive Waste Management Plan, specifying, for each type, a management pathway.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MID standard package types</th>
<th>Symbols</th>
<th>Producers</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Volume (m³)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vitrified waste packages</td>
<td>C0 — C2</td>
<td>Cogema*</td>
<td>HLW</td>
<td>42,470</td>
<td>7,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activated metal waste packages</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>EDF</td>
<td>ILW-LL</td>
<td>2,540</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bituminized sludge packages</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>CEA, Cogema*</td>
<td>ILW-LL</td>
<td>105,010</td>
<td>36,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemented technological waste packages</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>CEA, Cogema*</td>
<td>ILW-LL</td>
<td>32,940</td>
<td>27,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemented hull and end-cap packages</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Cogema*</td>
<td>ILW-LL</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>2,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compacted structural and technological waste packages</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Cogema*</td>
<td>ILW-LL</td>
<td>39,900</td>
<td>7,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containerized loose structural and technological waste packages</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Cogema*</td>
<td>ILW-LL</td>
<td>10,810</td>
<td>4,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>192,740</td>
<td>78,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>235,210</td>
<td>85,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*renamed Areva NC in 2006

---

Table 1.
Amounts (number, and volume) of waste packages, as predicted in France for 40 years’ operation of the current fleet of reactors, according to ANDRA’s Dimensioning Inventory Model (MID).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-lived Half-life &lt; 30 years for the main elements</th>
<th>Long-lived Half-life &gt; 30 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very-low-level waste (VLLW)</td>
<td>Morvilliers dedicated disposal facility (open since 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-level waste (LLW)</td>
<td>Aube Center (open since 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate-level waste (ILW)</td>
<td>Dedicated disposal facility under investigation for radium-bearing waste (volume: 100,000 m³) and graphite waste (volume: 14,000 m³)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level waste (HLW)</td>
<td>MID volume estimate: 78,000 m³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.
Long-term management modes, as currently operated, or planned, in France, by radioactive waste category. The orange area highlights those categories targeted by investigations covered by the Act of 30 December 1991.

---

1 According to the Dimensioning Inventory Model (MID)
Most high-level (high-activity) radioactive waste (HLW) originates in France, in the irradiation, inside nuclear power reactors, of fuel made up from enriched uranium oxide (UOX) pellets, or also, in part, from mixed uranium and plutonium oxide (MOX). Some 1,200 tonnes of spent fuel is discharged annually from the fleet of 58 pressurized-water reactors (PWRs) operated by EDF, supplying over 400 TWh per year, i.e. more than three quarters of French national power consumption.

The fuel’s composition alters, during its irradiation inside the reactor, thereby necessitating management safety measures requiring major industrial resources – of some 10^17 Bq per tonne of initial uranium (tU) (see Figure 1). The uranium found in spent fuel exhibits a makeup that is obviously different from that of the initial fuel. The greater the irradiation, the higher the consumption of fissile nuclei, and consequently the greater the extent by which the uranium will have been depleted of the fissile isotope 235 U. Irradiation conditions usually prevailing in reactors in the French fleet, with an average fuel residence time inside the reactor of some 4 years, for a burnup rate close to 50 GWd/tU, result in bringing down final 235 U content to a value quite close to that of natural uranium (less than 1%), entailing an energy potential very close to the latter’s. Indeed, even though this uranium remains slightly richer in the fissile isotope than natural uranium, for which 235 U content stands at 0.7%, the presence should also be noted, in smaller, though significant, amounts, of other isotopes having adverse effects in neutronic or radiological terms (237 Np, 238 U), that had not figured in the initial fuel (see Table 1).

The plutonium present in spent fuel is yielded by successive neutron capture and decay processes. Part of the Pu is disintegrated through fission: thus about one third of the energy generated is yielded by “in situ” recycling” of this element. These processes further bring about the formation of heavy nuclides, involving, whether directly themselves, or through their daughter products, long radioactive halflives. These are the elements of the actinide family, this including, essentially, plutonium from 239 Pu to 241 Pu, the odd-numbered isotopes generated in part undergoing fission themselves during irradiation), but equally neptunium (Np), americium (Am), and curium (Cm), known as minor actinides (MAAs), owing to the

Table 1. Major actinide inventory for spent UOX and MOX fuel after 3 years’ cooling, for a variety of enrichment and burnup rates. Burnup rate and quantity are expressed per tonne of initial uranium (tU) for UOX, per tonne of initial heavy metal (tthm) for MOX.
lesser abundance of these elements, compared with that of U and Pu, the latter being termed major actinides. Activation processes affecting nuclei of non-radioactive elements mainly involve structural materials, i.e. the materials of the tubes, grids, plates and end-fittings that ensure the mechanical strength of nuclear fuel. These materials lead, in particular, to formation of carbon-14 (\(^{14}\text{C}\)), with a half-life of 5,730 years, in amounts that are however very low, much less than one gram per tonne of initial uranium (g/tiU) in usual conditions.

It is the products yielded by fission of the initial uranium 235, but equally of the Pu generated (isotopes 239 and 241), known as fission products (FPs), that are the essential source of the radioactivity of spent fuel, shortly after discharge. Over 300 radionuclides – two thirds of which however will be dissipated through radioactive decay in a few years, after irradiation – have been identified. These radionuclides are distributed over some 40 elements in the periodic table, from germanium (\(^{72}\text{Ge}\)) to dysprosium (\(^{66}\text{Dy}\)), with a presence of tritium from fission, i.e. from the fission into three fragments (tertiary fission) of \(^{235}\text{U}\). They are thus characterized by great diversity: diverse radioactive properties, involving as they do some highly radioactive nuclides having very short lifespans, and conversely others having radioactive half-lives counted in millions of years; and diverse chemical properties, as is apparent from the analysis, for the “reference” fuels used in PWRs in the French fleet, of the breakdown of FPs generated, by families in the periodic table [see Table 2]. These FPs, along with the actinides generated, are, for the most part, present in the form of oxides included in the initial uranium oxide, which remains by far the majority constituent. Among some notable exceptions may be noted iodine (I), present in the form of cesium iodide, rare gases, such as krypton (Kr) and xenon (Xe), or certain noble metals, including ruthenium (Ru), rhodium (Rh), and palladium (Pd), which may form metallic inclusions within the oxide matrix.

Pu is recycled nowadays in the form of MOX fuel, used in part of the fleet (some 20 reactors currently). Residual U may in turn be re-enriched (and recycled as a substitute for mined uranium). Recycling intensity depends on market prices for natural uranium, the recent upturn in which should result in raising the current recycling rate (about one third being recycled at present).

Such U and Pu recycling is the foundation for the reprocessing strategy currently implemented in France, for the major part of spent fuel (some two thirds currently). For the 500 kg or so of U initially contained in every fuel element, and after partitioning of 475 kg of residual U and about 5 kg Pu, this “ultimate waste” amounts to less than 20 kg of FPs, and less than 500 grams MAs. This waste management pathway (otherwise known as the closed cycle), consisting as it does in reprocessing spent fuel now, to partition recoverable materials and ultimate waste, differs from strategies whereby spent fuel is conserved as-is, whether this be due to a wait-and-see policy (pending a decision on a long-term management model), or to a so-called open cycle policy, whereby spent fuel is considered to be waste, and designated for conditioning into containers, and disposal as-is.

In the nuclear power cycle, as it is implemented in France, waste is subdivided into two categories, according to its origin. Waste directly obtained from spent fuel is further subdivided into minor actinides and fission products, on the one hand, and structural waste, comprising hulls (segments of the cladding tubes that had held the fuel for PWRs) and end-caps (fittings forming the end-pieces of the fuel assemblies for these same PWRs), on the other hand. The process used for spent fuel reprocessing, to extract U and Pu, also generates technological waste (operational waste, such as spare parts, protective gloves...) and liquid effluents.
Raw, solid or liquid radioactive waste undergoes, after characterization (determination of its chemical and radiological makeup, and of its physical–chemical properties), conditioning, a term covering all the operations consisting in bringing this waste (or spent fuel assemblies) to a form suitable for its transport, storage, and disposal (see Box D). The aim is to put radioactive waste into a solid, physically and chemically stable form, and ensure effective, lasting confinement of the radionuclides it contains. For that purpose, two complementary operations are carried out. As a rule, waste is immobilized by a material – whether by encapsulation or homogeneous incorporation (liquid or powdered waste, sludges), or encasing (solid waste) – within a matrix, the nature of, and performance specification for which depend on waste type (cement for sludges, evaporation concentrates and incineration ashes; bitumen for encapsulation of sludges or evaporation concentrates from liquid effluent treatment; or a vitreous matrix, intimately binding the nuclides to the glass network, for fission product or minor actinide solutions). This matrix contributes to the confinement function. The waste thus conditioned is placed in an impervious container (cylindrical or rectangular), consisting in one or more canisters. The whole – container and content – is termed a package. Equally, waste may be compacted and mechanically immobilized within a canister, the whole forming a package.

When in the state they come in as supplied by industrial production, they are known as primary packages, the primary container being the cement or metal container into which the conditioned waste is ultimately placed, to allow handling. The container may act as initial confinement barrier, allotment of functions between matrix and container being determined according to the nature of the waste involved. Thus, the whole obtained by the grouping together, within one container, of a number of primary....
ILW-LL packages may ensure confinement of the radioactivity of this type of waste. If a long-term storage stage is found to be necessary, beyond the stage of industrial storage on the premises of the producers, primary waste packages must be amenable to retrieval, as and when required: durable primary containers must then be available, in such conditions, for all types of waste. In such a case, for spent fuel assemblies which might at some time be earmarked for such long-term storage, or even for disposal, it is not feasible to demonstrate, on a timescale of centuries, the integrity of the cladding holding the fuel, forming the initial confinement barrier during the in-reactor use stage. Securing these assemblies in individual, impervious cartridges is thus being considered, this stainless-steel cartridge being compatible with the various possible future management stages: treatment, return to storage, or disposal. Placing these cartridges inside impervious containers ensures a second confinement barrier, as is the case for high-level waste packages. In storage or disposal conditions, the waste packages will be subjected to a variety of aggressive agents, both internal and external. First, radionuclide radioactive decay persists inside the package (self-irradiation process). Emission of radiation is concomitant with heat generation. For example, in confinement glasses holding high-activity (high-level) waste, the main sources of irradiation originate in the alpha decay processes from minor actinides, beta decay from fission products, and gamma transitions. Alpha decay, characterized by production of a recoil nucleus, and emission of a particle, which, at the end of its path, yields a helium atom, causes the major part of atom displacements. In particular, recoil nuclei, shedding considerable energy as they do over a short distance, result in atom displacement cascades, thus breaking large numbers of chemical bonds. This is thus the main cause of potential long-term damage. In such conditions, matrices must exhibit thermal stability, and irradiation-damage resistance. Stored waste packages will also be subjected to the effects of water (leaching). Container canisters may exhibit a degree of resistance to corrosion processes (the overpacks contemplated for glasses may thus delay by some 4,000 years the arrival of water), and the confinement matrices must be proven to exhibit high chemical stability.

Between the containers and the ultimate barrier provided, in a radioactive waste deep disposal facility, by the geological environment itself, there may further be interposed, apart, possibly, from an overpack, other barriers, so-called engineered barriers, for backfill and sealing purposes. While these would be pointless as backfill in clay formations, they would have the capability, in other environments (granite), of further retarding any flow of radionuclides to the geosphere, notwithstanding degradation of the previously mentioned barriers.
The object of nuclear waste storage and disposal is to ensure the long-term confinement of radioactivity, in other words to contain radionuclides within a definite space, segregated from humankind and the environment, as long as required, so that the possible return to the biosphere of minute amounts of radionuclides can have no unacceptable health or environmental impact.

According to the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management, signed on 5 September 1997, "storage" means "the holding of spent fuel or of radioactive waste in a facility that provides for its containment, with the intention of retrieval."

This is thus, by definition, an interim stage, amounting to a delaying, or wait-and-see solution, even though this may be for a very long time (from a few decades to several hundred years), whereas disposal may be final.

Used from the outset of the nuclear power age, industrial storage keeps spent fuel awaiting reprocessing, and conditioned high-level waste (HLW), or long-lived intermediate-level waste (ILW-LL) in conditions of safety, pending a long-term management mode for such waste. Retrieval of stored packages is anticipated, after a period of limited duration (i.e. after a matter of years, or tens of years).

Long-term storage (LTS) may be contemplated, in particular, in the event of the deferred deployment of a disposal facility, or of reactors to carry out recycling–transmutation, or simply to turn to advantage the natural decay of radioactivity (and hence the falling off of heat release from high-level waste), before putting the waste into geological disposal. By "long term" is meant a timespan of up to 300 years. Long-term storage may take place in a surface or subsurface facility. In the former case, the site may be protected, for instance, by a reinforced-concrete structure. In the latter case, it will be located at a depth of some tens of meters, and protected by a natural environment (for instance, if buried in a hillside) and its host rock.

Whichever management strategy is chosen, it will be imperative to protect the biosphere from the residual ultimate waste. The nature of the radioelements the latter contains means a solution is required that has the ability to ensure their confinement over several tens of thousand years, and even longer. On such timescales, social stability is a major uncertainty that has to be taken on board. Which is why disposal in deep geological strata (typically, 500 m down) is seen as a reference solution, insofar as it inherently makes for deployment of a more passive technical solution, with the ability to stand, with no increased risk, an absence of surveillance, thus mitigating a possible loss of memory on the part of society.

The geological environment of such a disposal facility thus forms a further, essential barrier, which does not exist in the storage case. A disposal facility may be designed to be reversible over a given period. The concept of reversibility means the design must guarantee the ability, for a variety of reasons, to access the packages, or even to take them out of the facility, over a certain timespan, or to opt for the final closure of the disposal facility. Such reversibility may be envisaged as a succession of stages, each affording a decreasing level of reversibility. To simplify, each stage consists in carrying out one further technical operation bringing the facility closer to final closure, making retrieval more difficult than at the previous stage, according to well-specified criteria.
Transmutation is the transformation of one nucleus into another, through a reaction induced by particles with which it is bombarded. As applied to the treatment of nuclear waste, this consists in using that type of reaction to transform long-lived radioactive isotopes into isotopes having a markedly shorter life, or even into stable isotopes, in order to reduce the long-term radiotoxic inventory. In theory, the projectiles used may be photons, protons, or neutrons. In the first case, the aim is to obtain, by bremsstrahlung, through bombardment of a target by a beam of electrons, provided by an accelerator, photons able to bring about reactions of the (\(\gamma, xn\)) type. Under the effects of the incoming gamma radiation, x neutrons are expelled from the nucleus. When applied to substances that are too rich in neutrons, and hence unstable, such as certain fission products (strontium 90, cesium 137...), such reactions yield, as a rule, stable substances. However, owing to the very low efficiency achieved, and the very high electron current intensity required, this path is not deemed to be viable.

In the second case, the proton–nucleus interaction induces a complex reaction, known as spallation, resulting in fragmentation of the nucleus, and the release of a number of particles, including high-energy neutrons. Transmutation by way of direct interaction between protons is uneconomic, since this would involve, in order to overcome the Coulomb barrier, very-high-energy protons (1–2 GeV), requiring a generating energy greater than had been obtained from the process that resulted in producing the waste. On the other hand, indirect transmutation, using very-high-energy neutrons (of which around 30 may be yielded, depending on target nature and incoming proton energy), makes it possible to achieve very significantly improved performance. This is the path forming the basis for the design of so-called hybrid reactors, coupling a subcritical core and a high-intensity proton accelerator (see Box F, What is an ADS?).

The third particle that may be used is thus the neutron. Owing to its lack of electric charge, this is by far the particle best suited to meet the desired criteria. It is "naturally" available in large quantities inside nuclear reactors, where it is used to trigger fission reactions, thus yielding energy, while constantly inducing, concurrently, transmutations, most of them unsought. The best recycling path for waste would thus be to reinject it in the very installation, more or less, that had produced it...

When a neutron collides with a nucleus, it may bounce off the nucleus, or penetrate it. In the latter case, the nucleus, by absorbing the neutron, gains excess energy, which it then releases in various ways:

- by expelling particles (a neutron, e.g.), while possibly releasing radiation;
- by solely emitting radiation; this is known as a capture reaction, since the neutron remains captive inside the nucleus;
- by breaking up into two nuclei, of more or less equal size, while releasing concurrently two or three neutrons; this is known as a fission reaction, in which considerable amounts of energy are released. Transmutation of a radionuclide may be achieved either through neutron capture or by fission. Minor actinides, as elements having large nuclei (heavy nuclei), may undergo both fission and capture reactions. By fission, they transform into radionuclides that, in a majority of cases, are short-lived, or even into stable nuclei. The nuclei yielded by fission (known as fission products), being smaller, are only the seat of capture reactions, undergoing, on average, 4 radioactive decays, with a half-life not longer than a few years, as a rule, before they reach a stable form. Through capture, the same heavy nuclei transform into other radionuclides, often long-lived, which transform in turn through natural decay, but equally through capture and fission.

---

(1) From the German for “braking radiation.” High-energy photon radiation, yielded by accelerated (or decelerated) particles (electrons) following a circular path, at the same time emitting braking photons tangentially, those with the highest energies being emitted preferentially along the electron beam axis.

(2) A force of repulsion, which resists the drawing together of same-sign electric charges.
The probability, for a neutron, of causing a capture or a fission reaction is evaluated on the basis, respectively, of its capture cross-section and fission cross-section. Such cross-sections depend on the nature of the nucleus (they vary considerably from one nucleus to the next, and, even more markedly, from one isotope to the next for the same nucleus) and neutron energy.

For a neutron having an energy lower than 1 eV (in the range of slow, or thermal, neutrons), the capture cross-section prevails; capture is about 100 times more probable than fission. This remains the case for energies in the 1 eV–1 MeV range (i.e., that of epithermal neutrons, where captures or fissions occur at definite energy levels). Beyond 1 MeV (fast neutron range), fissions become more probable than captures.

Two reactor pathways may be considered, according to the neutron energy range for which the majority of fission reactions occur: thermal-neutron reactors, and fast-neutron reactors. The thermal neutron pathway is the technology used by France for its power generation equipment, with close to 60 pressurized-water reactors. In a thermal-neutron reactor, neutrons yielded by fission are slowed down (moderated) through collisions against light nuclei, making up materials known as moderators. Due to the moderator (common water, in the case of pressurized-water reactors), neutron velocity falls off, down to a few kilometers per second, a value at which neutrons find themselves in thermal equilibrium with the ambient environment. Since fission cross-sections for 235U and 239Pu, for fission induced by thermal neutrons, are very large, a concentration of a few per cent of these fissile nuclei is sufficient to sustain the cascade of fissions. The flux, in a thermal-neutron reactor, is of the order of 1018 neutrons per square meter, per second.

In a fast-neutron reactor, such as Phénix, neutrons yielded by fission immediately induce, without first being slowed down, further fissions. There is no moderator in this case. Since, for this energy range, cross-sections are small, a fuel rich in fissile radionuclides must be used (up to 20% uranium 235 or plutonium 239), if the neutron multiplication factor is to be equal to 1. The flux in a fast-neutron reactor is ten times larger (of the order of 1019 neutrons per square meter, per second) than for a thermal-neutron reactor.

**Figure.**
Simplified representation of the evolution chain of americium 241 in a thermal-neutron reactor (shown in blue: radionuclides disappearing through fission). Through capture, 241Am transforms into 242mAm, this disappearing predominantly through fission, and into 242Am, which mainly decays (with a half-life of 16 hours) through beta decay into 242Cm. 242Cm transforms through alpha decay into 238Pu, and through capture into 242Cm, which itself disappears predominantly through fission. 238Pu transforms through capture into 239Pu, which disappears predominantly through fission.
A nuclear ADS (accelerator-driven system) is a hybrid system, comprising a nuclear reactor operating in subcritical mode, i.e. a reactor unable by itself to sustain a fission chain reaction, “driven” by an external source, having the ability to supply it with the required complement of neutrons. Inside the core of a nuclear reactor, indeed, it is the fission energy from heavy nuclei, such as uranium 235 or plutonium 239, that is released. Uranium 235 yields, when undergoing fission, on average 2.5 neutrons, which can in turn induce a further fission, if they collide with a uranium 235 nucleus. It may thus be seen that, once the initial fission is initiated, a chain reaction may develop, resulting, through a succession of fissions, in a rise in the neutron population. However, of the 2.5 neutrons yielded by the initial fission, some are captured, thus not giving rise to further fissions. The number of fissions generated from one initial fission is characterized by the effective multiplication factor $k_{\text{eff}}$, equal to the ratio of the number of fission neutrons generated, over the number of neutrons disappearing. It is on the value of this coefficient that the evolution of the neutron population depends: if $k_{\text{eff}}$ is markedly higher than 1, the population increases rapidly; if it is slightly higher than 1, neutron multiplication sets in, but remains under control; this is the state desired at reactor startup; if $k_{\text{eff}}$ is equal to 1, the population remains stable; this is the state for a reactor in normal operating conditions; and, if $k_{\text{eff}}$ is lower than 1, the neutron population dwindles, and becomes extinct, unless – as is the case for a hybrid system – an external source provides a neutron supply.

The source of extra neutrons is fed with protons, generated with an energy of about 100 keV, then injected into an accelerator (linear accelerator or cyclotron), which brings them to an energy of around 1 GeV, and directs them to a heavy-metal target (lead, lead–bismuth, tungsten or tantalum). When irradiated by the proton beam, this target yields, through spallation reactions, an intense, high-energy (1–20 MeV) neutron flux, one single incoming neutron having the ability to generate up to 30 neutrons. The latter then go on to interact with the fuel of the subcritical neutron multiplier medium, yielding further neutrons (fission neutrons) (see Figure).

Most hybrid system projects use as a core (of annular configuration, as a rule) fast-neutron environments, since these make it possible to achieve neutron balances most favorable to transmutation, an operation that allows waste to be “burned,” but which may equally be used to yield further fissile nuclei. Such a system may also be used for energy generation, even though part of this energy must be set aside to power the proton accelerator, a part that is all the higher, the more subcritical the system is. Such a system is safe in principle from most reactivity accidents, its multiplication factor being lower than 1, contrary to that of a reactor operated in critical mode: the chain reaction would come to a halt, if it was not sustained by this supply of external neutrons.

A major component in a hybrid reactor, the window, positioned at the end of the beam line, isolates the accelerator from the target, and makes it possible to keep the accelerator in a vacuum. Traversed as it is by the proton beam, it is a sensitive part of the system: its lifespan depends on thermal and mechanical stresses, and corrosion. Projects are mooted, however, of windowless ADSs. In the latter case, it is the confinement constraints, and those of radioactive spallation product extraction, that must be taken on board.
The characteristics of the major part of the radioactive waste generated in France are determined by those of the French nuclear power generation fleet, and of the spent fuel reprocessing plants, built in compliance with the principle of reprocessing such fuel, to partition such materials as remain recoverable for energy purposes (uranium and plutonium), and waste (fission products and minor actinides), not amenable to recycling in the current state of the art.

58 enriched-uranium pressurized-water reactors (PWRs) have been put on stream by French national utility EDF, from 1977 (Fessenheim) to 1999 (Civaux), forming a second generation of reactors, following the first generation, which mainly comprised 8 UNGG (natural uranium, graphite, gas) reactors, now all closed down, and, in the case of the older reactors, in the course of decommissioning. Some 20 of these PWRs carry out the industrial recycling of plutonium, included in MOX fuel, supplied since 1995 by the Melox plant, at Marcoule (Gard département, Southern France).

EDF is contemplating the gradual replacement of the current PWRs by third-generation reactors, belonging to the selfsame pressurized-water reactor pathway, of the EPR (European Pressurized-Water Reactor) type, designed by Areva NP (formerly Framatome–ANP), a division of the Areva Group. The very first EPR is being built in Finland, the first to be built in France being sited at Flamanville (Manche département, Western France).

The major part of spent fuel from the French fleet currently undergoes reprocessing at the UP2-800 plant, which has been operated at La Hague (Manche département), since 1994, by Areva NC (formerly Cogema,) another member of the Areva Group (the UP3 plant, put on stream in 1990–92, for its part, carries out reprocessing of fuel from other countries). The waste vitrification workshops at these plants, the outcome of development work initiated at Marcoule, give their name (R7T7) to the “nuclear” glass used for the confinement of long-lived, high-level waste.

A fourth generation of reactors could emerge from 2040 (along with new reprocessing plants), a prototype being built by 2020. These could be fast-neutron reactors (i.e. fast reactors [FRs]), either sodium-cooled (SFRs) or gas-cooled (GFRs). Following the closing down of the Superphénix reactor, in 1998, only one FR is operated in France, the Phénix reactor, due to be closed down in 2009.

(1) A reengineering of the UP2-400 plant, which, after the UP1 plant, at Marcoule, had been intended to reprocess spent fuel from the UNGG pathway.