

TITLE : DS 417 Meteorological and Hydrological Hazards in Site Evaluation for Nuclear Installations – Draft 01.02 29/04/2010

COMMENTS BY REVIEWER				RESOLUTION			
Reviewer: F. Féron		Page					
Country/Organization: France/ASN		Date: 3 June 2010					
Com ment No.	Para/Line No.	Proposed new text	Reason	Accepted	Accepted, but modified as follows	Rejecte d	Reason for modification/rejecti on
1.	6.2 and Annex 1		Annex 1 is only one example of one country. Is it appropriate to keep it into the guide?		<p>This comment was answered in the stage of MS comment. Yes, it is consider desirable and convenient to present detailed guidance through a coherent and consistent practice, at least in one Member State according to the practice usually applied for NPPs design bases. The Member State was identified and it is was indicated that alternative methods can be applied. See text, as follows:</p> <p><i>“ . . .The following tables provide examples of criteria for defining the design basis parameters for a given meteorological variable as taken from the practice in one Member State (United States of America). These meteorological design basis parameters correspond to single load cases which are associated in design codes with different load combinations and different load factors for designing structures, systems and components. Alternative definitions of parameters and criteria may be used according to practice in another countries, as appropriate and within a given, consistent and integrated framework for this type of hazards.</i></p>		

COMMENTS BY REVIEWER				RESOLUTION			
Reviewer: F. Féron		Page					
Country/Organization: France/ASN		Date: 3 June 2010					
Com ment No.	Para/Line No.	Proposed new text	Reason	Accepted	Accepted, but modified as follows	Rejecte d	Reason for modification/rejecti on
2.	7.7		This paragraph is also applicable for 7.5 (a) as, for example, the “dry site” concept does not avoid having to deal with storm or heavy rainfall...	Y	<p>“7.7. For both approaches indicated in para 7. the following conditions should be met:</p> <p>(a) A warning system should be provided that is able to detect conditions indicating the potential for flooding of the site with sufficient time to complete the safe shutdown of the plant together with the implementation of emergency procedures. Special operational procedures should be specified on the basis of the real time monitoring data on the identified causes of the flooding [10];</p> <p>(b) All items important to safety (including warning systems powered by a protected off-site power supply) should be designed to withstand the flood producing conditions (e.g. wind and landslides, but excluding highly unlikely combinations) that are considered characteristic of the geographical region in which the site is located.</p>		
3.	8.5 footnote 34	Delete footnote 34	This footnote is very specific to one MS which is not named...	Y	<p>“8.5. To take account of future climatic change, an additional safety margin should be taken into consideration in the design of nuclear power plants. Periodic re-evaluation of design parameters should be performed as the uncertainties affecting the estimates of future extremes of climate are reduced or as observed trends show evidence of more extremes of climate (see Annex IV).”</p>		
4.	10.2/1	After “evaluation” add “,if graded is applied”	To be consistent with 1.12	Y	Done.		

COMMENTS BY REVIEWER				RESOLUTION			
Reviewer:		Page 1 of 1		(国内検討用)			
Country/Organization: Japan/JNES		Date: May 2010					
Comment No.	Para/Line No.	Proposed new text	Reason	Accepted	Accepted, but modified as follows 日本語コメント	Rejected	Reason for modif./rejection 備考
1	General	No more comment. We appreciate the effort of the people involved.					