

March 1960

South Africa Department of Foreign Affairs, 'Purchase by the Union of a Research Reactors to be Discussed at Special Meeting of Atomic Energy Board: 16th March, 1960'

Citation:

"South Africa Department of Foreign Affairs, 'Purchase by the Union of a Research Reactors to be Discussed at Special Meeting of Atomic Energy Board: 16th March, 1960'", March 1960, Wilson Center Digital Archive, South African Foreign Affairs Archives, Atomic Research in the Union of South Africa.137.11.23.Vol 3.24.3.58-13.5.60. Obtained and contributed by Anna-Mart van Wyk, Monash South Africa. https://wilson-center-digital-archive.dvincitest.com/document/116040

Summary:

Summary of a memorandum prepared by Dr. A.J.A. Roux comparing the costs and benefits of different types of reactors.

Credits:

This document was made possible with support from Carnegie Corporation of New York (CCNY)

Original Language:

English

Contents:

Original Scan

Original Scan

Purchase by the Union of a Research Reactor: To be discussed at Special Meeting of Atomio Energy Board : 14th March, 1960.

the original plan, as approved by Cabinet, to purchase a small SMW Merlin Reactor now and possibly acquire a larger one later, or whether, in the altered circumstances prevailing, it would not be preferable to go for a larger 20mm CRR Reactor right away. The point was debated at the second meeting of the Research advisory Committee which favoured the second alternative. Dr. Roux has prepared a 22-page memorandum on the subject, which is summarised briefly in the following paragraphs.

- thermal neutron flux range of from 108 to 1014 m/cm2 set.

 The British-made Merlin 5NN open tank reactor offered thermal neutron fluxes up to 1013, and would thus be suitable for some of (but not all) the work to be done. In view, however, of its very low price (£280,000) it was decided to purchase this type and to built a second larger reactor later for the balance of the work which required a flux of 1014.

 That was in 1958.
- price to £531,000 (without fuel). At the same time a quotation was received from the United States firm of allia-Chamers for £902,000 (without fuel) for a much larger 200% closed-tank Oak Ridge Reactor (ORR), which could be started at 500 and later adapted to reach 2000 at a cost of only £118,000, that is to say a total cost of £1,022,000. We know that this type is capable of reaching

MTIAL.

because it is already doing so at Oak Ridge. It is claimed that the Merlin type could also be stepped up (at a cost of £50,000) but only to lOMW and there is some doubt as to whether the plant can in fact operate at that level; it has not been tried before. The purchase of an ORR reactor would of course obviate the necessity for a second reactor later.

- reactor, a "controlled leakage" building would be perfectly adequate at 5MW, but there is a risk albeit a slight one that at 20MW a pressure resistant steel housing might be required at an increased cost of as much as £150,000.

 Present indications seem to show that this will not be necessary.
- from the United States, as they would be if an ORR Reactor were purchased, the initial charge would be only £10,000 for 5MW operation. If obtained (bought outright) from the United Kingdom, "the capital tied up at 5MW operation will be about £240,000". Whether one could approach the United States for fuel for a British reactor is problematical.
 - 6. Thus we have the following costs:

	ORR	MERLIN.
Reactor appoint a or	£964,000	€544,000
Initial fuel to the	10,000	240,000
Miscellaneous	70,000	70,000
Conversion to higher	118,000	50,000
pomer	£1,162,000	£904,000

The difference in cost here is £258,000, but in return the ORR would provide a proven maximum rating of 20MW, while

Norlin would provide an unproven maximum rating of aly low. I should perhaps add that a third type, the LAF 5NW Reactor, is also considered but not very seriously, and it is consequently ignored in this summary.

- of an ORR type reactor. Its cost will be twice as much as was originally approved (£550,000) although funds are in fact available to meet this difference. A first reactor must be a proven overseas type, but it was the intention to build the second reactor ourselves, which would have provided valuable experience in technology which will not now be gained. Two reactors are better than one; there are difficulties in undertaking materials testing, isotope production and more fundamental research all in one reactor.
- 8. There are also questions will to be resolved such as the general technical standard and facilities of the manufacturers, operational difficulties and costs, what contract terms and conditions are available, whether a controlled leakage building is adequate etc.
- 9. Nevertheless the recommendation is that the ORR Reactor be acquired subject to satisfactory answers being provided to the unresolved questions mentioned in paragraph 8 above; that Dr. Roux and Mr. Colley (Reactor Manager) proceed overseas for further enquiry; that Dr. Roux appoint a consultant abroad; and that a letter of Intent be sent to the chosen manufacturing group.