Draft DPP DS497 for the revision of eight closely interrelated Safety Guides supporting the Safety Requirements SSR-2/2(Rev.1) (Version 03 dated 7 July 2016)

RESOLUTION

Reviewer: Page: 1 of 2

Country/Organization: Japan Nuclear Regulation Authority

Date: 24/10							
Comment No.	Para/Line No.	Proposed new text	Reason	Accepted	Accepted, but modified as follows	Rejected	Reason for modification/rejection
1.	General Comment For 3. Justificatio n for the production of the document Amendme nt of the relevant Safety Guides are needed following areas: Bullet No.4.	To clarify "consideration of the role and involvement of Regulatory Body" in revised safety guide.	guides are supposed to be				

-		ı				
				body in the revised safety		
				guides.		
2.	General	•	We agree with the proposal for			
	Comments		revision of 8 old guides in			
	for 4.		parallel and consolidation of			
	Objective		these similar kind of operational			
	and 5.		safety guides.			
	SCOPE	•	On the other hand, from the			
			view point of user friendliness,			
			it doesn't seem necessary to			
			consolidate all operational			
			safety guides in one document			
			at the STEP 2.			
		•	Consolidation of all operational			
			safety guides could not be			
			useful for all Member States.			
			For instance, Severe Accident			
			Management Programmes for			
			NPPs, Operating Experience			
			Feedback for Nuclear			
			Installations, PSR for NPPs			
			could be beneficial document as			
			a stand-alone for MS.			
		•	Therefore, further discussion			
			should be needed regarding			
			STEP2			
	1	1				1

Document Preparation Profile (DPP) DS497 - Revision of eight closely interrelated Safety Guides as a set of publications (Version 03 dated 7 July 2016)

Note: Blue parts are those to be added in the text. Red parts are those to be deleted in the text.

	Safety (B)	MUB) (with	COMMENTS BY REVIEWER (inistry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Box comments of GRS)	uilding and Nuclear Page 1 of 1 Date: 2016-10-18	RESOLUTION				
Rele-	Country/Organization: Germany Comment Para/Line Proposed new text			Reason	Accepted	Accepted, but modi-	Rejected	Reason for modi-	
vance	No.	No.				fied as follows	,	fication/rejection	
1	1	5/ NS- G-2.3/ point 2	Requirement 10 - To adequately address configuration control with respect to redundancy, diversity, and common cause events.	Lessons learned from Fukushima					
1	2	5/ NS- G-2.3/ point 5	To provide guidance on testing after a modification. After completion of the modification tests, the correct alignment of the system and its components should be independently verified considering incident and emergency situations in the analysis of the correct alignment.	Prevent for an analysis considering only normal operation					
1	3	5/ NS- G-2.5/ point 5	Consider a list of human resources including backup needed for the action with respect to competences.	Prevent for delays/ unplanned Situa- tions due to una- vailability of per- sonal.					
1	4	5/ NS- G-2.6/ point 8	To address maintenance, surveillance and in-service inspection for severe accident management associated equipment, including permanently installed and mobile. Ensure for appropriate backup of the system unavailable due to maintenance or surveillance if necessary.	Prevent for a lack in defense-in-depth due to maintenance of safety related systems					