

Draft Safety Guide

DS507 “Seismic Hazards in Site Evaluation for Nuclear Installations”, Step 12 Version from February 2020

COMMENTS BY REVIEWER					RESOLUTION			
Reviewer: Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) (with comments of GRS) Country/Organization: Germany					Pages: 2 Date: 30.03.2020			
Relevanz	Comment No.	Para/Line No.	Proposed new text	Reason	Accepted	Accepted, but modified as follows	Rejected	Reason for modification/rejection
1	1.	Page 8 Fig.1 “Flow chart for the seismic hazard assessment process for nuclear installations”.	OUTPUT FOR ENGINEERING USES (Sections 40 8): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uniform hazard response spectra (at control point) - Earthquake time histories - Other ground motion parameters 	Following the review of the publishing committee, Fig. 1 has been changed presumably for editorial aspects. The new figure is adequate. However for consistency please change reference to Section 8, since Section 10 is about application of management system.	X			
1	2.	Page 8 Fig.1 “Flow chart for the seismic hazard assessment process for nu-	EARTHQUAKE CONCOMITANT EVENTS (Sections 8): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fires - Floods (e.g. tsunamis, dam failures) (<u>Sections 8</u>) 	Section 8 does not concern fires. Thus we suggest to replace the reference on Section 8. On the other hand side fires are no topic of this Safety Guide in general. If possible the addition of a meaningful reference to another IAEA	X	Modified both “Associated geological and geotechnical hazards” and “Earthquake concomitant events” according to the contents.		

Relevanz: 1 – Essentials 2 – Clarification 3 – Wording/Editorial

COMMENTS BY REVIEWER					RESOLUTION			
Reviewer: Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) (with comments of GRS) Country/Organization: Germany					Pages: 2 Date: 30.03.2020			
Relevanz	Comment No.	Para/Line No.	Proposed new text	Reason	Accepted	Accepted, but modified as follows	Rejected	Reason for modification/rejection
		clear installations”.		Standard would be appropriate here.				

Relevanz: 1 – Essentials 2 – Clarification 3 – Wording/Editorial

COMMENTS BY REVIEWER				RESOLUTION			
Reviewer: Page 1 of 1 Country/Organization: ISRAEL / NLSO, IAEC 12/4/2020				Date:			
Comment No.	Para/Line No.	Proposed new text	Reason	Accepted	Accepted, but modified as follows	Rejected	Reason for modification/rejection
1	Parag. 1.8	This paragraph addresses, understandably, use of graded approach for nuclear installations, other than NPP's, having lesser potential associated radiological consequences. We would like to address the last sentence of this paragraph: <i>For sites at which nuclear installations of different types are collocated, particular consideration should be given to using a graded approach.</i> We suggest to clarify this last sentence (footnote can be used): To point out that in cases of collocation of nuclear installations with lesser potential radiological consequences, with a NPP, the design should prevent accident scenarios at the "smaller" nuclear installation which can result in "collateral" damage to the NPP with potential to significant radiological consequences.	Clarity		In order to avoid misleading to describe that in this particular case the graded approach is recommended more than in other cases, the last sentence is deleted. The graded approach is described in "Section 9 EVALUATION OF SEISMIC HAZARDS FOR NUCLEAR INSTALLATIONS OTHER THAN NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS" and the sentence has no correspondence with the Section.		

Relevanz: 1 – Essentials 2 – Clarification 3 – Wording/Editorial