

Hardies, Robert

21

From: Stevens, Gary *RG*
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2012 8:31 AM
To: Hardies, Robert; Nove, Carol; Poehler, Jeffrey; Fairbanks, Carolyn
Cc: Rosenberg, Stacey; Csontos, Aladar; Kirk, Mark
Subject: RE: Doel 3 -Tihange 2 RPV issue - WG3 - justification file

Bob:

I will do my best to meet your request, but the likely date that I will have my comments compiled will be next Friday, 12/21. That assumes, of course, that I actually find the time to read the reports.

Gary L. Stevens
Senior Materials Engineer
NRC/RES/DE/CIB
E-mail: Gary.Stevens@nrc.gov
Office: 301-251-7569
Blackberry: (b)(6)

From: Hardies, Robert *RG*
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2012 8:27 AM
To: Nove, Carol; Poehler, Jeffrey; Stevens, Gary; Fairbanks, Carolyn
Cc: Rosenberg, Stacey; Csontos, Aladar; Kirk, Mark
Subject: FW: Doel 3 -Tihange 2 RPV issue - WG3 - justification file

We should decide on a plan of action to address the FANC requests. They would like some preliminary written feedback regarding their reports. They would like it by tomorrow, which is absolutely impossible, I think. I am willing to put a list of comments together. Please review the safety case, the conservatism report, and the reports that feed the safety case that are specific to your area of expertise, and try to answer the questions that Guy has provided below. Send your input to me and I will collate it and send a copy to each working group chair. I will send them a collection of individual comments that reflect individual review opinions and not the opinion of the NRC. If you can complete the reading by next Monday, and have your comments to me by Wednesday that would be nice.

I am not soliciting comments from Mark because he should maintain some semblance of independence.

Robert Hardies
Senior Level Advisor for Materials Engineering
Division of Engineering
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Office Phone 301 415-5802
Cell (b)(6)

From: Roussel Guy [<mailto:guy.roussel@Belv.be>]
Sent: Friday, November 30, 2012 1:34 AM
To: aweyn@vincotte.be; Bjorn.Brickstad@ssm.se; bsf@csn.es; car@csn.es; francois.balestreri@lrsn.fr; fvanderherck@vincotte.be; Stevens, Gary; igor.simonovski@ec.europa.eu; John.Highton@hse.gsi.gov.uk; Juergen.Sievers@grs.de; Kamreddine.OULIDDREN@FANC.FGOV.BE; Kjellin, Daniel; Klaus.Germerdonk@ensi.ch; laurent.streibig@asn.fr; Lutz.lindhorst@ilent.nl; Nancy.SALGADO@oecd.org; Hardies, Robert; Roussel Guy; sangmin.lee@kins.re.kr; ??? ??

E/41

Cc: WERTELAERS An; VAN WONTERGHEM Frederik; Deprez Marc; Briegleb Pierre; Barras Pierre; Marloye Daniel; Deledicque Vincent; Beatrice.TOMBUYES@FANC.FGOV.BE; Roussel Guy
Subject: Doel 3 -Tihange 2 RPV issue - WG3 - justification file

Dear WG3 member,

The safety case ('justification file') for the Doel 3-Tihange 2 RPV issue should be released by the Licensee on 30 November and posted to the FANC portal shortly after.

Some other documents related to the methodology used for demonstrating the structural integrity and to other specific input data (e.g., transients) had previously been posted to the FANC portal. I am not aware whether other reports documenting the structural integrity demonstration will be made available before end of November.

The reports released by the Licensee before December 1 are considered by Bel V and AIB-Vinçotte as the basis documentation on which the preliminary conclusions of their assessment of the demonstration of the RPV structural integrity will be based.

We would appreciate if you could spend some time by reviewing the documents posted to the FANC portal. In particular, your opinions on the following questions will be of great value to us:

- (1) Do you consider the justification file as comprehensive and complete ?
- (2) Do you consider the justification procedure as an appropriate procedure for the type and extent of the detected degradation ? Justify our answer
- (3) Is answer to question (2) is no: are there any changes that you would require to make the procedure appropriate ?
- (4) If answer to question (2) is yes: are there on some matters weaknesses for which you would require improvements ?
- (5) Did you find in the documents you have reviewed any inconsistency or lack of justification ?
- (6) Have you any other specific remarks ?

You ask you to provide your answers at your earliest convenience but, if possible, before December 12.

On the basis of your answers, we will decide whether a meeting in Brussels (possibly with representatives of the Licensee) is necessary within a short delay.

We thank you for your efforts.

Best regards,

Guy Roussel
Chairman of WG 3

Bel V
rue Walcourt 148
B-1070 Bruxelles
Belgium
www.belv.be

+32 2 52 80 357
e-mail: guy.roussel@belv.be