NEDO-33201
Section 3
From Revision 2 to Revision 3 Change List

Formatting & editorial changes have been made to improve consistency and readability. These changes include changing fonts in tables, removing excess spacing, correcting punctuation, & spelling, and correcting grammar. Acronyms have been spelled out where appropriate.

Item	Location	Description of Change
1.	S3.1	Added note regarding event tree, and accident class categorization changes addressed in Section 22.
2.	S3.4.7	Corrected typos in title (impacts TOC)
3.	S3.4.8	Corrected typo in title (impacts TOC)
4.	S3.2.1	Added "ICS" under "RPV Overpressure Protection" for consistency with the event tree models.
5.	S3.2.1	Clarify definition of core damage to address F&O in ASME PRA Standard self-assessment.
6.	S3.2.1	Added feedwater injection, and CRD make-up under "Core Cooling" for consistency with the event tree models.
7.	S3.2.2	Added "phenomena" as one of issues considered in the level 2 analyses. The clarification was added in response to an observation from a self-assessment.
8.	S3.2.3	Edited statement regarding validation of success criteria using MAAP to reflect actual scope.
9.	S3.2.6	Deleted statement regarding sensitivity on mission time in Section 11. A sensitivity was not performed for mission time. However, the event trees include accident sequences involving Class II scenarios which occur after 24 hours.
10.	T3.2-1	Updated the designator column for loss of preferred power to address specific breakdown of initiators.
11.	T3.2-5	Updated the "Initiators Included" column for loss of preferred power to address specific breakdown of initiator.
12.	T3.2-5	Updated the "Initiators Included" column for ATWS loss of preferred power to address specific breakdown of initiator.
13.	T3.2-5	Updated the "Initiators Included" column for IORV to address specific breakdown of initiators.
14.	T3.2-5	Updated the "Initiators Included" column for ATWS loss of feedwater to address specific breakdown of initiators.
15.	T3.2-5	Updated the "Initiators Included" column for ATWS inadvertent open relief valve to address specific breakdown of initiators.
16.	T3.2-5	Updated the "Initiators Included" column for ATWS loss of coolant accident to delete medium LOCA.
17.	T3.2-5	Updated the "Transfer Out" column to show the actual gate

NEDO-33201
Section 3
From Revision 2 to Revision 3 Change List

Formatting & editorial changes have been made to improve consistency and readability. These changes include changing fonts in tables, removing excess spacing, correcting punctuation, & spelling, and correcting grammar. Acronyms have been spelled out where appropriate.

Item	Location	Description of Change
		name used in the fault tree for the following event trees: a. T-GEN b. T-FDW c. T-LOPP d. T-SW e. SL-L f. BOC-FDWA g. BOC-FDWB h. BOC-RWCU
18.	T3.3-1	Deleted extraneous event trees and added appropriate event tree references for each node, updated top gate names, corrected numerous typos, and deleted row for event tree heading "PB"
19.	S3.3.2.2	Replaced "APRM" with "SRNM"
20.	S3.3.2.3	Replaced "APRM" with "SRNM"
21.	S3.3.2.3	Added assumption "RWCU/SDC System Isolation is not included in the SLC model." The probability of failure to isolate RWCU/SDC during an ATWS is a relatively small contributor to other SLC failures such as check valve or common cause of squib valve failures.
22.	S3.3.2.2	Deleted statement for "Dependencies" – replaced with "none". Statement is not adequate or necessary since already state that failure results in core damage
23.	S3.3.3.3	Swapped the order of the last two paragraphs to be consistent with the rest of Section 3
24.	S3.3.4.1	The list of gate names in this section was updated for consistency with the event tree models.
25.	S3.3.4.2	Inserted missing paragraph marker between "Dependencies" and "Assumptions
26.	S3.3.4.5	This section has been deleted since the node is not used in the event trees
27.	S3.3.4.6	Deleted assumption since description is not correct. FDW is available with suction from CST. The change to the discussion is needed for consistency with the event tree models.

NEDO-33201
Section 3
From Revision 2 to Revision 3 Change List

Formatting & editorial changes have been made to improve consistency and readability. These changes include changing fonts in tables, removing excess spacing, correcting punctuation, & spelling, and correcting grammar. Acronyms have been spelled out where appropriate.

Item	Location	Description of Change
28.	S3.3.4.7	Added new top event "UF-TOPATWS" for consistency with the event tree models. It addresses restart of flow after feedwater runback.
29.	S3.3.4.7	Inserted missing paragraph marker between "Dependencies" and "Assumptions
30.	S3.3.4.7	Deleted assumption since description is not correct. FDW is available with suction from CST. The change to the discussion is needed for consistency with the event tree models.
31.	S3.3.4.7	Added assumption stating that operator action for feedwater pump restart is necessary after feedwater runback (CF) under top UF-TOPATWS.
32.	S3.3.4.9	The success criteria were updated to match the PRA model.
33.	S3.3.4.9	The discussion on dependencies has been updated for consistency with the model.
34.	S3.3.4.11	For clarity, added details on ability to remove heat by LPCI.
35.	S3.3.4.11	The discussion on dependencies has been updated to provide additional detail.
36.	S3.3.4.12	Updated for clarity the function of FPS as an injection source.
37.	S3.3.4.13	Updated the assumption for clarity of text.
38.	S3.3.4.14	Removed the assumption in the first paragraph and moved to copied it under "assumptions".
39.	S3.3.4.15	For clarity, updated discussion to describe the acronyms used and corrected typos. In addition, the discussion on dependencies has been updated.
40.	S3.3.5.1	For clarity, added details in the discussion for pressure suppression.
41.	S3.3.5.1	Deleted details discussion of vacuum breakers since the PRA had to assume a simplified design for revision 2 of NEDO-33201.
42.	S3.3.5.2	Removed the information for the isolation valve since the model assumes a passive valve. In addition, indicated that ADS blowdown would also challenge the vacuum breakers.
43.	S3.3.5.3	For clarity, added details discussing instances where PCCS

NEDO-33201
Section 3
From Revision 2 to Revision 3 Change List

Formatting & editorial changes have been made to improve consistency and readability. These changes include changing fonts in tables, removing excess spacing, correcting punctuation, & spelling, and correcting grammar. Acronyms have been spelled out where appropriate.

Item	Location	Description of Change
		is used. In addition, the discussion on dependencies has been updated to indicate to provide makeup to the pools for long term DHR.
44.	S3.3.5.4	For clarity, updated the dependency section to indicate that an equalizing line is needed to complete recirculation path for GDCS.
45.	S3.3.5.5	Deleted discussion on timing since it does not add value. In addition, the discussion on dependencies has been updated to identify both lines.
46.	S3.3.5.6	For clarity, added statement discussing the role of FPS for makeup to the pools.
47.	S3.3.5.7	For clarity, the discussion on dependencies has been updated to identify the need for an external makeup source (FPS) if the containment vent is open.
48.	S3.2.2	Added new paragraph to address ASME Gap Assessment comment on treatment of accident conditions
49.	S3.4.1.1	Added clarification for long term makeup of ICS/PCCS pools.
50.	S3.4.1.1	Merged 7th and 8th paragraph after deleting the first sentence in the 8th paragraph. This was done for clarity since the sentence removed added no value.
51.	S3.4.1.2.2	Added statement discussing FPS injection at higher containment pressure. In addition, discussed the need for DHR (PCCS or SPC) when GDCS is the only source available for makeup.
52.	S3.4.1.2.2	Added a statement discussing the recovery that is used for sequence T-GEN004
53.	S3.4.1.2.2	Added statement indicating that RWCU/SDC is considered unavailable when the equalizing lines are opened. In addition, added a statement discussing the need for an active external source when containment is vented.
54.	S3.4.1.2.4	Update the event tree discussion on transfers to IORV instead of small LOCA. Updated the event tree figures. The PRA model was correct, but the discussion and figures needed to be updated.
55.	S3.4.2.1	Changed the discussion to clarify how the event tree is

NEDO-33201
Section 3
From Revision 2 to Revision 3 Change List

Formatting & editorial changes have been made to improve consistency and readability. These changes include changing fonts in tables, removing excess spacing, correcting punctuation, & spelling, and correcting grammar. Acronyms have been spelled out where appropriate.

Item	Location	Description of Change
		modeled after ADS failure.
56.	S3.4.2.2.1	Minor clarification and rewording on scenario.
57.	S3.4.2.2.2	Added statement discussing FPS injection at higher containment pressure. In addition, discussed the need for DHR (PCCS or SPC) when GDCS is the only source available for makeup.
58.	S3.4.2.2.2	Changed the discussion to clarify how event tree is modeled and how the failures lead to core damage while venting. In addition, discussed the need for DHR (PCCS or SPC) when GDCS is the only source available for makeup.
59.	S.3.4.2.2.2	Added a statement discussing the recovery that is used for sequence T-FDW003
60.	S3.4.2.2.2	Added statement indicating that RWCU/SDC is considered unavailable when the equalizing lines are opened. In addition, added a statement discussing the need for an active external source when containment is vented.
61.	S3.4.2.2.5	In the discussion for event tree transfer, replaced transfer to "SL-S event tree" with "IORV event tree" to match the PRA model. Updated the event tree figures. The PRA model was correct, but the discussion and figures needed to be updated.
62.	S3.4.3.1	Deleted the information dealing with recovery of loss of offsite power since the information is not correct.
63.	S3.4.3.1.1	Deleted paragraph about LOPP recovery since it is not credited in the models.
64.	S3.4.3.2.1	For clarity, updated discussion regarding CRD. In addition, corrected wording associated with low pressure injection.
65.	S3.4.3.2.2	Added statement discussing FPS injection at higher containment pressure. In addition, discussed the need for DHR (PCCS or SPC) when GDCS is the only source available for makeup.
66.	S.3.4.3.2.2	Added a statement discussing the recovery that is used for sequence T-LOPP003
67.	S.3.4.3.2.2	Added statement indicating that RWCU/SDC is considered

NEDO-33201
Section 3
From Revision 2 to Revision 3 Change List

Formatting & editorial changes have been made to improve consistency and readability. These changes include changing fonts in tables, removing excess spacing, correcting punctuation, & spelling, and correcting grammar. Acronyms have been spelled out where appropriate.

Item	Location	Description of Change
		unavailable when the equalizing lines are opened. In addition, added a statement discussing the need for an active external source when containment is vented.
68.	S3.4.3.2.2	Changed the discussion to clarify how event tree is modeled and how the failures lead to core damage while venting.
69.	S3.4.3.2.5	In the discussion for event tree transfer, replaced transfer to "SL-S event tree" with "IORV event tree" to match the PRA model. Updated the event tree figures. The PRA model was correct, but the discussion and figures needed to be updated.
70.	S3.4.4.2.1	Updated discussion to clarify how event tree is modeled if FPS is not available during loss of service water scenarios.
71.	S3.4.4.2.2	Added statement discussing FPS injection at higher containment pressure. In addition, discussed the need for DHR (PCCS or SPC) when GDCS is the only source available for makeup.
72.	S3.4.4.2.2	Changed the discussion to clarify how event tree is modeled and how the failures lead to core damage while venting.
73.	S.3.4.4.2.2	Deleted statement regarding CRD availability and stated that high pressure injection is not available. CRD is assumed to fail due to loss of equipment cooling.
74.	S3.4.4.2.2	Added discussion on the need to vent containment due to loss of all DHR, and discussed impact on long term GDCS when the recirculation loop is broken.
75.	S3.4.4.2.3	Added CRD pump trip due to loss of equipment cooling.
76.	S3.4.4.2.4	Replaced the word "break" with "SRVs". This sequence involves loss of service water and does not involve a pipe break.
77.	S3.4.4.2.5	In the discussion for event tree transfer, replaced transfer to "SL-S event tree" with "IORV event tree" to match the PRA model. Updated the event tree figures. The PRA model was correct, but the discussion and figures needed to be updated.
78.	S3.4.5.2.1	For clarity, added discussion to provide details and clarify

NEDO-33201
Section 3
From Revision 2 to Revision 3 Change List

Formatting & editorial changes have been made to improve consistency and readability. These changes include changing fonts in tables, removing excess spacing, correcting punctuation, & spelling, and correcting grammar. Acronyms have been spelled out where appropriate.

Item	Location	Description of Change
		how manual depressurization scenario is modeled in the event tree.
79.	S3.4.5.2.2	Added statement discussing FPS injection at higher containment pressure. In addition, discussed the need for DHR (PCCS or SPC) when GDCS is the only source available for makeup.
80.	S3.4.5.2.2	Added statement indicating that RWCU/SDC is considered unavailable when the equalizing lines are opened.
81.	S3.4.5.2.2	Changed the discussion to clarify how event tree is modeled and how the failures lead to core damage while venting.
82.	S3.4.6.1	Deleted discussion associated with RWCU since it is considered unavailable when equalizing lines are opened. Added a statement discussing the need for an active external source when containment is vented
83.	S3.4.6.2.1	Added statement discussing the use of CRD to mitigate core damage in sequence LL-S049
84.	S3.4.6.2.2	Added statement discussing FPS injection at higher containment pressure. In addition, discussed the need for DHR (PCCS or SPC) when GDCS is the only source available for makeup.
85.	S3.4.6.2.2	Changed the discussion to clarify how event tree is modeled and how the failures lead to core damage while venting.
86.	S3.4.7	Corrected typos in title for this section.
87.	S3.4.7.2.1	Added statement discussing the use of CRD to mitigate core damage in sequence LL-S-FDWA015
88.	S3.4.7.2.1	Corrected sequence names (missing dash)
89.	S3.4.7.2.2	Corrected sequence names (missing dash)
90.	S3.4.7.2.2	Added statement discussing FPS injection at higher containment pressure. In addition, discussed the need for DHR (PCCS or SPC) when GDCS is the only source available for makeup.

NEDO-33201
Section 3
From Revision 2 to Revision 3 Change List

Formatting & editorial changes have been made to improve consistency and readability. These changes include changing fonts in tables, removing excess spacing, correcting punctuation, & spelling, and correcting grammar. Acronyms have been spelled out where appropriate.

Item	Location	Description of Change
91.	S3.4.7.2.3	Corrected sequence names (missing dash)
92.	S3.4.8.2.1	Corrected sequence names (missing dash)
93.	S3.4.8.2.2	Corrected sequence names (missing dash)
94.	S3.4.8.2.3	Corrected sequence names (missing dash)
95.	S3.4.8.2.2	Added statement discussing FPS injection at higher containment pressure. In addition, discussed the need for DHR (PCCS or SPC) when GDCS is the only source available for makeup.
96.	S3.4.8.2.2	For clarity, deleted statement "due to loss of low pressure makeup"
97.	S3.4.8.2.2	Changed the discussion to clarify how event tree is modeled and how the failures lead to core damage while venting.
98.	S3.3.4.10	Added assumption regarding effectiveness of GDCS when the containment is vented or failed.
99.	S3.4.9.2.1	Replaced "or" with "and" in the description of the sequence since all injection is lost.
100.	S3.4.9.2.2	Added statement discussing FPS injection at higher containment pressure. In addition, discussed the need for DHR (PCCS or SPC) when GDCS is the only source available for makeup.
101.	S3.4.9.2.2	Added assumption stating that venting is considered unavailable if an external source (FPS) is not available for make-up.
102.	S3.4.9.2.3	Included FPS failure in the description of sequence ML-L012 to be consistent with PRA model.
103.	S3.4.10.2.1	Added clarification (detail) in the description of sequences SL-S016, and SL-S017 to match event tree.
104.	S3.4.10.2.2	Added statement discussing FPS injection at higher containment pressure. In addition, discussed the need for DHR (PCCS or SPC) when GDCS is the only source

NEDO-33201
Section 3
From Revision 2 to Revision 3 Change List

Formatting & editorial changes have been made to improve consistency and readability. These changes include changing fonts in tables, removing excess spacing, correcting punctuation, & spelling, and correcting grammar. Acronyms have been spelled out where appropriate.

Item	Location	Description of Change
		available for makeup.
105.	S3.4.10.2.2	Added statement indicating that RWCU/SDC is considered unavailable when the equalizing lines are opened.
106.	S3.4.10.2.2 #2	Added clarification to assumption of core damage for sequences where all decay heat removal including containment venting fail.
107.	S3.4.10.2.2	Changed the discussion to clarify how event tree is modeled and how the failures lead to core damage while venting.
108.	S3.4.10.2.4	For clarity, updated the description of sequence SL-S064.
109.	S3.4.11.1	Deleted statement regarding the suppression pool level, since it is not consistent with the event tree.
110.	S3.4.11.2.1	Added clarification (detail) in the description of sequences SL-L021, and SL-L022 to match event tree.
111.	S3.4.11.2.2	Added statement discussing FPS injection at higher containment pressure. In addition, discussed the need for DHR (PCCS or SPC) when GDCS is the only source available for makeup.
112.	S3.4.11.2.2 #2	Added clarification to assumption of core damage for sequences where all decay heat removal including containment venting fail.
113.	S3.4.11.2.2	Changed the discussion to clarify how event tree is modeled and how the failures lead to core damage while venting.
114.	S3.4.12.2	Added assumption stating that failure of RPS concurrent with RVR is considered highly unlikely and it is not shown in the event tree.
115.	S3.4.12.2.2	Added statement discussing FPS injection at higher containment pressure. In addition, discussed the need for DHR (PCCS or SPC) when GDCS is the only source available for makeup.
116.	S3.4.12.2.3	Corrected the description for this sequence to state that RPV rupture and steam pressure suppression failure is assumed to

NEDO-33201
Section 3
From Revision 2 to Revision 3 Change List

Formatting & editorial changes have been made to improve consistency and readability. These changes include changing fonts in tables, removing excess spacing, correcting punctuation, & spelling, and correcting grammar. Acronyms have been spelled out where appropriate.

Item	Location	Description of Change
		results in core damage with containment bypass. This makes the description consistent with the event tree.
117.	S3.4.13.1	Corrected the name of the event tree node to be consistent with PRA model.
118.	S3.4.13.2.1	Added statement discussing FPS injection at higher containment pressure. In addition, discussed the need for DHR (PCCS or SPC) when GDCS is the only source available for makeup.
119.	S3.4.13.2.1 #2	Added clarification to assumption of core damage for sequences where all decay heat removal including containment venting fail.
120.	S3.4.13.2.1	Remove the word “other” since it is not appropriate for context.
121.	S3.4.5.2.2 #2	Added clarification to assumption of core damage for sequences where all decay heat removal including containment venting fail.
122.	S3.4.13.2.1	Added, for consistency with other sections, a statement regarding unavailability of RWCU when level drops below Level 3
123.	S3.4.13.2.1	Changed the discussion to clarify how event tree is modeled and how the failures lead to core damage while venting.
124.	S3.4.14.1	Updated the name of the top event node to be consistent with section 3.3.4. In addition, provided additional detail (isolation) in the description of the sequence.
125.	S3.4.14.2.1	Added clarification regarding feedwater line isolation for sequences BOC-FDWA020 and BOC-FDWA027.
126.	S3.4.14.2.1	Added clarification stating that GDCS failure in sequences BOC-FDWA020 and BOC-FDWA027 leads to core damage.
127.	S3.4.14.2.2	For clarity, discussed the need for DHR (PCCS or SPC) when GDCS is the only source available for makeup.

NEDO-33201
Section 3
From Revision 2 to Revision 3 Change List

Formatting & editorial changes have been made to improve consistency and readability. These changes include changing fonts in tables, removing excess spacing, correcting punctuation, & spelling, and correcting grammar. Acronyms have been spelled out where appropriate.

Item	Location	Description of Change
128.	S3.4.14.2.5	Deleted "feedwater" since it is not needed in description. CRD is unavailable, and the break is in the feedwater line.
129.	S3.4.15.1	Updated the name of the top event node to be consistent with section 3.3.4. In addition, provided additional detail (isolation) in the description of the sequence
130.	S3.4.15.2.1	Added clarification regarding feedwater line isolation for sequences listed in section 3.4.15.2.1.
131.	S3.4.15.2.2	Deleted "remaining 18" since only 9 sequences apply to Class 2a. It should be noted the description for remaining 9 sequences is appropriately included under Class 2b.
132.	S3.4.15.2.2	Added statement discussing FPS injection at higher containment pressure. In addition, discussed the need for DHR (PCCS or SPC) when GDCS is the only source available for makeup.
133.	S3.4.15.2.2 #1	Added clarification that LPCI and FPS are unavailable (after manual depressurization)
134.	S3.4.15.2.2 #2	Corrected statement since it was not representative for the sequences listed. GDCS is available after ADS, however core damage is assumed if unable to remove decay heat and control containment pressurization.
135.	S3.4.15.2.2	Changed the discussion to clarify how event tree is modeled and how the failures lead to core damage while venting for cases where the break is isolated.
136.	S3.4.15.2.2	Changed the discussion to clarify how event tree is modeled and how the failures lead to core damage while venting for cases where the break is not isolated.
137.	S3.4.15.2.2	Added, for consistency with other sections, a statement regarding unavailability of RWCU when level drops below Level 3 for cases where the break is isolated.
138.	S3.4.15.2.2	Added, for consistency with other sections, a statement regarding unavailability of RWCU when level drops below Level 3 for cases where the break is not isolated.

NEDO-33201
Section 3
From Revision 2 to Revision 3 Change List

Formatting & editorial changes have been made to improve consistency and readability. These changes include changing fonts in tables, removing excess spacing, correcting punctuation, & spelling, and correcting grammar. Acronyms have been spelled out where appropriate.

Item	Location	Description of Change
139.	S3.4.15.2.5	Corrected statement since it was representative for the sequences listed. The break is not isolated for these sequences. In addition, removed the statement regarding ICS failure since ICS is not credited (no random failures required) in these sequences
140.	S3.4.15.2.5	Added for clarity the word "assumed". Sequences where the vacuum breakers fail are not modeled in detail, and core damage failure is assumed due to potential impact to piping.
141.	S3.4.16.1	Added clarification regarding automatic, and manual isolation assumptions. Corrected event top name BC (replaced with I RWCU).
142.	S3.4.16.2.1	Added statement discussing FPS injection at higher containment pressure. In addition, discussed the need for DHR (PCCS or SPC) when GDCS is the only source available for makeup.
143.	S3.4.16.2.1	Changed the discussion to clarify how event tree is modeled and how the failures lead to core damage while venting.
144.	S3.4.16.2.3	Corrected description to match event tree structure – Low pressure injection is initially available
145.	S3.4.16.2.3	Corrected description– deleted sequence BOC-RWCU049 from the description since paragraph is only applicable for sequences BOC-RWCU046, and BOC-RWCU048
146.	S3.4.16.2.3	Added paragraph to describe sequence BOC-RWCU049
147.	S3.4.17.1	For clarity, added "train" to the description.
148.	S3.4.17.2.1	Added statement discussing FPS injection at higher containment pressure. In addition, discussed the need for DHR (PCCS or SPC) when GDCS is the only source available for makeup.
149.	S3.4.17.2.1	Added statement regarding assumed failure of injection for sequences where all DHR is lost (Class 2a)
150.	S3.4.17.2.1	Changed the discussion to clarify how event tree is modeled and how the failures lead to core damage while venting

Formatting & editorial changes have been made to improve consistency and readability. These changes include changing fonts in tables, removing excess spacing, correcting punctuation, & spelling, and correcting grammar. Acronyms have been spelled out where appropriate.

Item	Location	Description of Change
		(class 2b).
151.	S3.4.17.2.3	Added clarification – core damage is conservatively assumed when vacuum breakers fail to perform pressure suppression
152.	S3.4.18.1	Corrected SLC actuation description. ATWS/SLC uses the SRNM ATWS permissive instead of APRM that is used for ADS inhibit.
153.	S3.4.18.1	For clarity, added assumption stating that both high pressure injection and decay heat removal is required for ATWS scenarios.
154.	S3.4.18.2.1	For clarity, added assumption stating that both high pressure injection and decay heat removal is required for ATWS scenarios. In addition, deleted statement regarding reaching the shutoff head for low pressure system when DHR is not available, since it is assumed that high pressure injection is required (power/level control).
155.	S3.4.18.2.2	Added clarification regarding need for high pressure systems during ATWS
156.	S3.4.19.1	Corrected SLC actuation description. ATWS/SLC uses the SRNM ATWS permissive instead of APRM that is used for ADS inhibit.
157.	S3.4.19.1	For clarity, added assumption stating that both high pressure injection and decay heat removal is required for ATWS scenarios
158.	S3.4.19.2.1	For clarity, added assumption stating that both high pressure injection and decay heat removal is required for ATWS scenarios. In addition, deleted statement regarding reaching the shutoff head for low pressure system when DHR is not available, since it is assumed that high pressure injection is required (power/level control).
159.	S3.4.20.1	Corrected SLC actuation description. ATWS/SLC uses the SRNM ATWS permissive instead of APRM that is used for

NEDO-33201
Section 3
From Revision 2 to Revision 3 Change List

Formatting & editorial changes have been made to improve consistency and readability. These changes include changing fonts in tables, removing excess spacing, correcting punctuation, & spelling, and correcting grammar. Acronyms have been spelled out where appropriate.

Item	Location	Description of Change
		ADS inhibit.
160.	S3.4.20.1	For clarity, added assumption stating that both high pressure injection and decay heat removal is required for ATWS scenarios
161.	S3.4.20.2.1	For clarity, added assumption stating that both high pressure injection and decay heat removal is required for ATWS scenarios. In addition, deleted statement regarding reaching the shutoff head for low pressure system when DHR is not available, since it is assumed that high pressure injection is required (power/level control).
162.	S3.4.21.1	Corrected SLC actuation description. ATWS/SLC uses the SRNM ATWS permissive instead of APRM that is used for ADS inhibit.
163.	S3.4.21.1	Added clarification addressing the impact of loss of service water on high pressure injection and decay heat removal systems.
164.	S3.4.21.1	For clarity, added assumption stating that both high pressure injection and decay heat removal is required for ATWS scenarios
165.	S3.4.21.2.4	For clarity, added statement regarding need for feedwater runback at the beginning of the ATWS scenario.
166.	S3.4.22.1	For clarity, added statement regarding the assumed unavailability of IC during IORV scenarios.
167.	S3.4.22.1	For clarity, added assumption stating that both high pressure injection and decay heat removal is required for ATWS scenarios
168.	S3.4.22.2.1	For clarity, included feedwater or CRD success in the description for the sequences listed in this section.
169.	S3.4.23.1	For clarity, added assumption stating that both high pressure injection and decay heat removal is required for ATWS scenarios
170.	F3A-1	Figure has been updated to address transfer to IORV instead

NEDO-33201
Section 3
From Revision 2 to Revision 3 Change List

Formatting & editorial changes have been made to improve consistency and readability. These changes include changing fonts in tables, removing excess spacing, correcting punctuation, & spelling, and correcting grammar. Acronyms have been spelled out where appropriate.

Item	Location	Description of Change
		of small LOCA, and any changes in accident class labeling.
171.	F3A-2	Figure has been updated to address transfer to IORV instead of small LOCA, and any changes in accident class labeling.
172.	F3A-3	Figure has been updated to address transfer to IORV instead of small LOCA, and any changes in accident class labeling.
173.	F3A-4	Figure has been updated to address transfer to IORV instead of small LOCA, and any changes in accident class labeling.
174.	F3A-10	Figure has been updated to address changes in accident class labeling.
175.	F3A-11	Figure has been updated to address changes in accident class labeling.