

1 DRAFT SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

2  
3 TOPICAL REPORT ANP-10301P, REVISION 0,

4  
5 “STATISTICAL UNIVERSAL POWER RECONSTRUCTION WITH FIXED MARGIN

6  
7 TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS” FOR LICENSING APPLICATIONS

8  
9 AREVA NP, INC.

10  
11 PROJECT NO. 728

12  
13  
14 1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

15  
16 By letter dated September 15, 2009, AREVA NP Inc. (AREVA) submitted Topical Report (TR)  
17 ANP-10301P, Revision 0, “Statistical Universal Power Reconstruction with Fixed Margin  
18 Technical Specifications” (Reference 1), to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for  
19 review and approval. The objective of the TR is to allow the implementation of an online relative  
20 power distribution reconstruction and margin calculation system applicable to pressurized water  
21 reactors (PWRs). This system computes a reconstructed power distribution that is the best  
22 estimate of all available information in terms of relevant measurement, design specifications,  
23 and operating states, together with estimates of their uncertainties. This new methodology  
24 allows meeting the Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCO) parameter limits that assure that  
25 fuel integrity is maintained during Condition I (Normal Operation) and Condition II (Incidents of  
26 Moderate Frequency) events by limiting local power peaking. This is achieved through direct  
27 continuous online core power distribution monitoring, as opposed to the current methodology  
28 based on indirectly limiting the power distribution by limiting the LCO parameters (i.e., rod  
29 insertion, axial power shaping rod, axial imbalance, and quadrant power tilt)

30  
31 The “Statistical Universal Power Reconstruction with Fixed Margin Technical Specifications”  
32 (SUPR-FMTS) methodology supersedes the previously NRC approved methodology “Fixed  
33 Margin Technical Specifications” (FMTS) (Reference 2), and expands its applicability from  
34 Babcock & Wilcox PWRs to other operating PWRs, provided the conditions and limitations of  
35 the Safety Evaluation (SE) are met.

36  
37 2.0 REGULATORY EVALUATION

38 Section 50.34 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) requires that licensees  
39 (or vendors) provide safety analysis reports to the NRC detailing the performance of structures,  
40 systems, and components provided for the prevention or mitigation of potential accidents.  
41 AREVA is seeking review and approval of ANP-10301P, Revision 0, “Statistical Universal Power  
42 Reconstruction with Fixed Margin Technical Specifications” (SUPR-FMTS), so that  
43 implementation of this new methodology will enhance the safety of operating PWRs by  
44 improving the estimate of the margin of the LCO limits for Condition I and Condition II events.

ENCLOSURE

1 3.0 TECHNICAL EVALUATION

2 The SUPR-FMTS methodology for on-line monitoring of the core power distribution builds on  
3 the previously approved FMFS methodology (References 2 and 3). FMFS monitors the LCOs  
4 for operation by computing a peaking margin as the figure of merit. The estimate of the margin  
5 is constructed from on-line core simulator calculations of the relative power density (RPD) at all  
6 core nodes, and Fixed In-Core (FIC) detector measurements at limited nodal positions. The  
7 uncertainty in this margin estimate is dependent on global considerations such as symmetry and  
8 quadrant tilt, and pre-calculated limits based on conservative assumptions that take into account  
9 design tolerances and the entire possible range of operation. These pre-calculated limits are  
10 applied in the form of a penalty factor, that consists of statistically and non-statistically quantified  
11 components, to the estimate of the nodal relative power density.

12  
13 The SUPR-FMFS methodology shifts some of the estimation of the nodal RPDs and their  
14 uncertainty from the global considerations, used in FMFS for estimating nodal RPDs and the  
15 pre-calculated penalty factors, to more local estimates and dynamic evaluation of some sub-  
16 factors that contribute to the total penalty factor. This approach brings local measurement  
17 information to all nodes, and, thereby, allows some relaxation of the conservative assumptions  
18 used with FMFS.

19  
20 Furthermore, SUPR-FMFS extends the applicability of FMFS to cores with Traveling In-Core  
21 Probe (TIP) detector systems that take core measurements roughly monthly, as opposed to  
22 being limited, as was FMFS, to FIC systems that make core measurements typically in one to  
23 six minute intervals. This extension is achieved by introducing a RPD Check methodology that  
24 uses the measurements from the ex-core flux detectors and the fuel assembly exit  
25 thermocouples that are measured on a frequent basis.

26  
27 To these ends, SUPR-FMFS exploits the statistical estimation method referred to as Kriging  
28 (Reference 4). In this method, the core simulator computed RPDs at each spatial core node are  
29 corrected to the information from measured values at instrumented assemblies, such as FICs or  
30 TIPs. This is achieved by computing the best unbiased linear estimator of an unmeasured core  
31 node by using a stochastic model of the spatial variance of all the core nodes, and by  
32 minimizing the variance of the prediction error, subject to the constraint that the expectation of  
33 the difference between the measure and computed RPDs is zero. In this computation, with  
34 each node there is associated a three-dimensional "domain of influence" consisting of  
35 neighboring measured and unmeasured core nodes, wherein the spatial covariance function  
36 between the nodes in a domain of influence is specified as Gaussian.

37  
38 Since the dynamically computed Kriging prediction is based on flux measurements and flux core  
39 simulator calculations, this prediction does not take into account core design tolerances and  
40 operating conditions of the reactor system. The effect on peaking of these uncertainties is taken  
41 into account through penalty factors. These are divided into two sets: a set of plant-specific  
42 factors established off-line before plant operation, that can be roughly divided into tolerances  
43 and system operating uncertainties that include instrument failure fraction; and a set of  
44 dynamically computed factors, that account for the change in pin peaking and the Kriging  
45 variance over the operating cycle.

46  
47 For cores with TIP measurement systems the time between measurements is sufficiently long to  
48 introduce some changes in the core composition and other factors. To assure that the on-line  
49 core simulator estimates between TIP measurements capture the effects of these changes,

1 SUPR-FMTS applies an RPD Check methodology. Should any deviation be beyond that  
2 expected, an additional penalty is computed and applied. This methodology uses the real-time  
3 fuel assembly exit thermocouple and excore flux detector data that is available at each reactor.  
4 The check is performed by computing an expected response from the Kriging-estimated RPDs  
5 and reactor conditions, in the form of computed assembly exit thermocouple temperatures and  
6 excore flux detector responses. These are compared to the on-line measurements. If the test  
7 fails, the Kriging-process variance is adjusted with penalty factors computed from the  
8 thermocouple and excore detector estimate-to-measurement comparisons, and the margin is  
9 recomputed. This RPD Check methodology serves to control the margin estimate between TIP  
10 measurements.

#### 11 4.0 LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS

12 To implement SUPR-FMTS, at a plant, for on-line LCO core monitoring based on peaking  
13 margin as a figure of merit, a License Amendment Request (LAR) must be submitted to the  
14 NRC for review and approval. The LAR must identify and justify the adequacy of the approved  
15 systems in place at the plant that will contribute the measured data and the computed data for  
16 the implementation of the SUPR-FMTS methodology.

17 If the NRC's criteria or regulations change so that its conclusions about the acceptability of the  
18 assumptions made during this review are invalidated, the organization referencing the report  
19 (Reference 5) will be expected to revise and resubmit its respective documentation, or submit  
20 justification for the continued effective applicability of these methodologies without revision of  
21 the respective documentation.

#### 22 5.0 CONCLUSION

23 Based on the foregoing considerations, the NRC staff concludes that the use of SUPR-FMTS by  
24 AREVA as described in ANP-10301P, Revision 0, "Statistical Universal Power Reconstruction  
25 with Fixed Margin Technical Specifications," is acceptable for licensing calculations and may be  
26 used to perform on-line relative power distribution reconstruction for PWRs and provide input to  
27 a LCO power peaking margin calculation provided the limitations and conditions in Section 4.0  
28 of this SE are met.

#### 29 6.0 REFERENCES

- 30 1. Letter from Ronnie L. Gardner (AREVA NP Inc.) to U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
31 Document Control Desk, Request for Review and Approval of ANP-10301P, "Statistical  
32 Universal Power Reconstruction with Fixed Margin Technical Specifications,"  
33 September 15, 2009 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System  
34 (ADAMS) Accession No. ML092610436).
- 35 2. R. A. Kochendarfer, C.T. Rombough, A. Y. Cheng, "Fixed Margin Technical  
36 Specifications," BAW-10158P-A, Babcock & Wilcox, Lynchburg, Virginia, August 1988.
- 37 3. Nuclear Applications Software Package," BAW-10123, Babcox & Wilcox, Lynchburg,  
38 Virginia, February, 1978.
- 39 4. Brian D. Ripley, *Spatial Statistics*, John Wiley & Sons (1981).

1 5. ANP-10301P, Revision 0, "Statistical Universal Power Reconstruction with Fixed Margin  
2 Technical Specifications", September 2009 (ADAMS Accession Nos. ML092610437 and  
3 ML092610438 (Non-Publicly Available/Publicly Available)).  
4

5 Principal Contributor: Y. Orechwa  
6

7 Date: July 2, 2013