



**HITACHI**

**GE Hitachi Nuclear Energy**

**James F. Harrison**

GE-Hitachi Nuclear Energy Americas LLC  
Vice President, Fuel Licensing, Regulatory Affairs  
P.O. Box 780  
Wilmington, NC 28401 USA

T 910.620.1826  
james.harrison@ge.com

*7/24/2015*

*80 FR 44160*

MFN 15-083  
September 22, 2015

*4*

Via Electronic Submission  
Docket: NRC-2015-0172

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Document Control Desk  
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

**Attention:**  
Cindy Bladey  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop: OWFN-12-H08  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

RECEIVED

2015 SEP 23 PM 3:38

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
REMOVED

**Subject: Comments: Clarification of Reporting Requirements, Federal Register, Vol. 80, No. 142 (July 24, 2015), NRC-2015-0172**

GE Hitachi Nuclear Energy (GEH) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the subject draft regulatory issue summary. Specific comments are provided in Enclosure 1.

If you have any questions regarding the enclosed comments, please contact me or Tom Stoddard (910-819-6706).

Sincerely,

James F. Harrison  
Vice President, Fuel Licensing  
Regulatory Affairs  
GE-Hitachi Nuclear Energy Americas LLC

SUNSI Review Complete  
Template = ADM - 013  
E-RIDS= ADM-03  
Add= *A. Popova (Axp16)*

MFN 15-083  
Page 2 of 2

Project No. 710

Enclosure:

1. GEH Comments: Clarification of Reporting Requirements, Federal Register, Vol. 80, No. 142 (July 24, 2015), NRC-2015-0172

cc: J. Golla (NRC)  
B.R. Moore (GNF)  
J.G. Head (GEH)  
P.L. Campbell (GEH)

ENCLOSURE 1

MFN 15-083

GEH Comments: Clarification of Reporting Requirements, Federal Register, Vol. 80, No. 142 (July 24, 2015), NRC-2015-0172

Non-Proprietary Information – Class I (Public)

GEH Comments: Clarification of Reporting Requirements, Federal Register, Vol. 80, No. 142  
(July 24, 2015), NRC-2015-0172

GE-Hitachi (GEH) has reviewed the Regulatory Issue Summary (RIS) issued by number NRC-2015-0172, July 24, 2015, regarding the reporting requirements of 10 CFR 50.46 by licensees as to changes or errors identified in an approved evaluation model used for evaluating emergency core cooling system (ECCS) performance in response to a postulated loss of coolant accident. GEH appreciates the opportunity to offer a few clarifying comments and observations from the draft RIS.

- 1 In the second paragraph under “Summary of Issue/NRC Staff Position” section, by including the plant-specific inputs and design parameters, the definition of an “evaluation model” as the “calculational framework” is effectively expanded. The extension of this revision of interpretation as to the definition of input as part of the “calculational framework” is to arrive erroneously at the conclusion that each application of the computer program(s) for a plant demonstration of ECCS performance, with all its incorporated input as part of the application, coupled with the need to report changes/errors to every input term, as applied, becomes its own unique evaluation model. The definition of how this input is selected from plant to plant and the margins the licensees may elect to retain or pursue in terms of the “act of putting an evaluation model to use” (NRC staff’s plain-language definition of application), makes each one different than that which was originally approved, by definition. Approval of the plant analysis becomes de facto approval of a unique “evaluation model” as directed by that licensee. GEH does not believe that is the intent of the 1988 Rule statement of considerations.
- 2 The statement of consideration cited within the RIS stipulates the purpose of the “significance test” for changes/errors (greater than 50°F or an accumulation of changes/errors the absolute value of which sums to greater than 50°F) was to establish a standard as to the “adequacy of the evaluation model”. In that context, the assertion that changes in a numerical value inserted to a computer program necessarily constitute a change to the computer program requires further justification. The RIS should clarify those changes in input to an evaluation model that would always be considered a change to the evaluation model and those changes that would not be.

GEH believes that the points of concern articulated by the NRC staff by this draft RIS could be resolved by a forum of stakeholders at which standardization can be achieved which would meet the need of both industry as well as regulatory interests. Distinctions can be drawn as to the nature of inputs, those which properly should be reported for identified changes or discovered errors, in contrast with those which do not reflect on licensed methodology. Such a forum should be expanded to address issues raised by stakeholder comments on the reporting requirements of the proposed 10 CFR 50.46c rule. The forum and a guidance document as a resulting product would be more productive than this RIS.