

SUNI Review Complete  
 Template=ADM-013  
 E-RIDS=ADM-03  
 ADD: Meraj Rahimi, Michael  
 Eudy, Dawnmathews  
 Kalathiveettil, Kyle Song,  
 Jeanne Johnston,  
 Holly Cruz, Mary Neely

**As of:** 8/20/20 8:38 AM  
**Received:** August 19, 2020  
**Status:** Pending\_Post  
**Tracking No.** 1k4-9ih4-glz8  
**Comments Due:** September 14, 2020  
**Submission Type:** API

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

Comment (3)  
 Publication Date:  
 8/14/2020  
 CITATION 85 FR 49685

**Docket:** NRC-2020-0171  
 Setpoints for Safety-Related Instrumentation

**Comment On:** NRC-2020-0171-0001  
 Setpoints for Safety-Related Instrumentation

**Document:** NRC-2020-0171-DRAFT-0004  
 Comment on FR Doc # 2020-17763

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Anonymous Anonymous

---

## General Comment

The endorsed standard (i.e., ISA 67.04.01-2018) contains a figure that is misleading (i.e., Figure 1, "Relation between setpoint parameters") which should be clarified in the RG. Typically, the accident analysis presumes a particular protective action is initiated at a particular process parameter value (i.e., the analytical limit) and takes an assumed amount of time to achieve the protective action. The accident analysis then determines the most extreme values that all the process parameters reach; these extreme values are then compared to the associated safety limits. That is, the process parameter that initiates the protective action (e.g., primary coolant temperature) generally is not the same process parameter that has an associated safety limit; that is, the safety limits (typically listed in the technical specifications) are very few, and are often not directly measurable by sensors (i.e., they are calculated). Therefore, the analytical limit and the associated safety limit are generally on two different process parameters. An explanation superior to this one should be included in the RG.