American Nuclear Society

nuclear safety design process for modular helium-cooled reactor plants

an American National Standard

REAFFIRMED

November 1, 2016

ANSI/ANS-53.1-2011; R2016

This standard has been reviewed and reaffirmed with the recognition that it may reference other standards and documents that may have been superseded or withdrawn. The requirements of this document will be met by using the version of the standards and documents referenced herein. It is the responsibility of the user to review each of the references and to determine whether the use of the original references or more recent versions is appropriate for the facility. Variations from the standards and documents referenced in this standard should be evaluated and documented.
This standard does not necessarily reflect recent industry initiatives for risk informed decision-making or a graded approach to quality assurance. Users should consider the use of these industry initiatives in the application of this standard.

published by the
American Nuclear Society
555 North Kensington Avenue
La Grange Park, Illinois 60526 USA

ANSI/ANS-53.1-2011

ANSI/ANS-53.1-2011

American National Standard
Nuclear Safety Design Process
for Modular Helium-Cooled Reactor Plants

Secretariat
American Nuclear Society

Prepared by the
American Nuclear Society
Standards Committee
Working Group ANS-53.1

Published by the
American Nuclear Society
555 North Kensington Avenue
La Grange Park, Illinois 60526 USA

Approved December 21, 2011
by the
American National Standards Institute, Inc.

American National Standard

Designation of this document as an American National Standard attests that the principles of openness and due process have been followed in the approval procedure and that a consensus of those directly and materially affected by the standard has been achieved.

This standard was developed under the procedures of the Standards Committee of the American Nuclear Society; these procedures are accredited by the American National Standards Institute, Inc., as meeting the criteria for American National Standards. The consensus committee that approved the standard was balanced to ensure that competent, concerned, and varied interests have had an opportunity to participate.

An American National Standard is intended to aid industry, consumers, governmental agencies, and general interest groups. Its use is entirely voluntary. The existence of an American National Standard, in and of itself, does not preclude anyone from manufacturing, marketing, purchasing, or using products, processes, or procedures not conforming to the standard.

By publication of this standard, the American Nuclear Society does not insure anyone utilizing the standard against liability allegedly arising from or after its use. The content of this standard reflects acceptable practice at the time of its approval and publication. Changes, if any, occurring through developments in the state of the art, may be considered at the time that the standard is subjected to periodic review. It may be reaffirmed, revised, or withdrawn at any time in accordance with established procedures. Users of this standard are cautioned to determine the validity of copies in their possession and to establish that they are of the latest issue.

The American Nuclear Society accepts no responsibility for interpretations of this standard made by any individual or by any ad hoc group of individuals. Responses to inquiries about requirements, recommendations, and/or permissive statements (i.e., "shall," "should," and "may," respectively) should be sent to the Standards Department at Society Headquarters. Action will be taken to provide appropriate response in accordance with established procedures that ensure consensus.

Comments on this standard are encouraged and should be sent to Society Headquarters.

Published by

American Nuclear Society
555 North Kensington Avenue
La Grange Park, Illinois 60526 USA

Copyright © 2011 by American Nuclear Society. All rights reserved.

Any part of this standard may be quoted. Credit lines should read "Extracted from American National Standard ANSI/ANS-53.1-2011 with permission of the publisher, the American Nuclear Society." Reproduction prohibited under copyright convention unless written permission is granted by the American Nuclear Society.

Printed in the United States of America

Inquiry Requests

The American Nuclear Society (ANS) Standards Committee will provide responses to inquiries about requirements, recommendations, and/or permissive statements (i.e., "shall," "should," and "may," respectively) in American National Standards that are developed and approved by ANS. Responses to inquiries will be provided according to the Policy Manual for the ANS Standards Committee. Nonrelevant inquiries or those concerning unrelated subjects will be returned with appropriate explanation. ANS does not develop case interpretations of requirements in a standard that are applicable to a specific design, operation, facility, or other unique situation, and therefore is not intended for generic application.

Responses to inquiries on standards are published in ANS's magazine, *Nuclear News*, and are available publicly on the ANS Web site or by contacting the ANS standards administrator.

Inquiry Format

Inquiry requests must include the following:

(1) the name, company name if applicable, mailing address, and telephone number of the inquirer;

(2) reference to the applicable standard edition, section, paragraph, figure, and/or table;

(3) the purposes of the inquiry;

(4) the inquiry stated in a clear concise manner;

(5) a proposed reply, if the inquirer is in a position to offer one.

Inquiries should be addressed to

American Nuclear Society
ATTN: Standards Administrator
555 N. Kensington Avenue
La Grange Park, IL 60526

or standards@ans.org

Foreword

(This Foreword is not a part of American National Standard "Nuclear Safety Design Process for Modular Helium-Cooled Reactor Plants," ANSI/ANS-53.1-2011.)

The purpose of this standard is to provide nuclear safety criteria applicable to the design of modular helium-cooled reactor (MHR) nuclear power plants (hereinafter referred to as "plants"). To achieve this purpose, this standard provides a process that can be used to

- develop MHR top-level nuclear regulatory safety criteria;
- identify safety functions, top-level design criteria, licensing-basis events, design-basis accidents, and methods for performing safety analyses;
- determine safety classification of systems, structures, and components (SSCs);
- identify safety-related SSC special treatment requirements and defense-in-depth (DID) provisions;
- demonstrate the adequacy of DID by applying a risk-informed approach.

This standard does not address plant security design requirements or criteria. MHR security design requirements, including design-basis threats, are design elements that may be brought into the plant design process to address licensing requirements of the national nuclear regulator. In general, both deterministic and risk-based approaches may be considered in the plant security design process. It is anticipated that MHR passive safety features and inherent safety characteristics together with the use of the risk-informed nuclear safety process herein will effectively support plant security design.

This risk-informed process standard represents a new design approach for professional communities familiar with traditional, deterministic light water reactor (LWR) design processes. These include plant architect/engineers, nuclear licensing, and risk assessment professionals. This process presents an opportunity to extend traditional use of probabilistic risk assessment as applied to LWRs to MHRs and to incorporate risk insights early in the design process. Two examples are (a) modeling long-duration nonequilibrium plant conditions and (b) extensive quantification of event frequency and consequence, including uncertainty. Nuclear professional communities should develop other complementary risk-informed, performance-based consensus processes that continue to address the challenges presented with this standard.

In addition to designers, regulators, and the risk community, this standard provides a tool for plant operators who use design processes to maintain licensed plant designs. Some uses of this standard, such as SSC classification, apply beyond initial plant design, procurement, and construction into operations. Use of this standard for SSC classification also allows plant owner/operators to specify special treatments over the life of the plant for procurement, application, testing, and maintenance commensurate with risk. This standard documents an established process that nuclear design organizations can use to develop nuclear safety designs. It is anticipated that sponsors and communities of MHR-based designs will develop further specific designs with dependent standards that integrate these risk-informed characteristics. In any event, the fundamental objective of this standard is to provide clear design process guidance subordinate to the MHR's fundamental design technology. Because the traditional LWR design community is unfamiliar with MHR technology, it is expected that this standard will present the first non-LWR design process challenge.

Consider the question of secondary containment in LWRs. For high-temperature gas-cooled reactors (HTGRs), fundamentally different approaches to retention of radionuclides lead to differences in the design of the reactor building.

To specify "containment" directly, as commonly used and interpreted for LWRs, would supersede the design development process of this standard. Therefore, that is not done. The design process provided in this standard is adequate alone to assure that the containment of radionuclide safety functions is accomplished. For that reason, this standard does not specify discrete design applications that those familiar with other reactor types, like LWRs, might expect. Rather, only the fundamental attributes that distinguish an MHR are provided. Those are the minimum set of design characteristics, agreed upon by this working group, which must be met for the use of this standard.

This standard could reference documents or other standards that have been superseded or withdrawn when the standard is applied. In that case, references in the section(s) include statements that provide guidance on their use. The format of the standard provides a table at the end of each body of text that summarizes and provides succinct actionable content required. The "Summary of Requirements" tables at the end of each body of text provide that body of text's explicit requirements. Users should evaluate the requirements with the tables at the end of each body of text. In the event of a compliance question with the standard's requirements, evaluation should include the explicit body of text in the standard. The tables should be used to evaluate compliance, in the event of a question of compliance with the standard's requirements.

This standard was initiated in 1971 and released as N213, January 1974 Draft, "Nuclear Safety Criteria for the Design of Stationary Gas Cooled Reactor Plants," for comment. Waning interest in gas reactors left that early deterministic standard incomplete. Two LWR counterparts, ANSI N18.2-1973, "Nuclear Safety Criteria for the Design of Stationary Pressurized Water Reactor Plants" (redesignated ANS-51.1), and ANSI/ANS-52.1-1978, "Nuclear Safety Criteria for the Design of Stationary Boiling Water Reactor Plants," were completed and approved. Revisions of both these standards were approved in 1983 adding a form of risk-based classification; however, all these documents remained essentially deterministic compilations of the state-of-the-art design from that era.

The American Nuclear Society Gas-Cooled Reactor Design and Operation Subcommittee, ANS-28, was inaugurated in November 2003 and tasked with developing ANS-53.1. The working group was quickly formed and began development on this standard in 2004. Use of this standard does not supersede the responsibility to review and apply the top-level safety criteria (TLSC) of the authorities in the country where the user plans to license, build, and operate MHR(s). The users of this standard are responsible to review and apply the TLSC set by the authorities in whichever country the user plans to license, build, and operate MHR(s). This standard may also be used to support the preparation of an MHR safety analysis report for the purpose of MHR licensing. When used for MHR licensing, the standard does not provide the only basis for establishing the MHR safety and design criteria. The designer also assesses the applicability of the existing body of technical licensing requirements and guidance for nuclear plant licensing in the particular country of application. In this regard, the designer determines the applicability, partial applicability, or nonapplicability of these licensing requirements. The designer may also use this standard and other supporting standards to determine what additional MHR licensing technical requirements are required for important technical design and safety aspects that are not addressed by the existing body of technical licensing requirements and guidance.

In light of the 2011 disaster in Japan at Fukushima Daiichi Units 1 through 4, the ANS-28 Subcommittee stresses that those events have been considered for

this standard as well as they are known at this time. Furthermore, while those issues are being developed, as a process standard, we do not anticipate that the process that this standard identifies will be changed at all. This standard does not exclude the use of any additional guidance or requirements to supplement that information.

The ANS-53.1 Working Group consisted of the entire ANS-28 Subcommittee of the American Nuclear Society. Members of ANS-28 who participated directly in the development of this standard are as follows:

J. K. August** (Chair, 2007–2011; Vice Chair, 2003–2007), *CORE, Inc.*
M. A. LaBar (Chair, 2003–2007), *General Atomics*
R. L. Bratton (Secretary), *Idaho National Laboratory*

J. M. Bolin, *General Atomics*
S. A. Caspersson, *Westinghouse Electric Company, LLC*
M. T. Coyle, *Exelon Nuclear*
J. C. Cunliffe, *Bechtel Systems & Infrastructure, Inc.*
K. N. Fleming, *Technology Insights*
J. P. Gaertner,** *Electric Power Research Institute*
L. J. Lommers,** *AREVA NP, Inc.*
P. P. Lowry, *Pacific Northwest National Laboratory*
Y. Makihara, *International Atomic Energy Agency*
P. M. Mills, *Idaho National Laboratory*
C. L. Reid, *Bechtel National, Inc.*
S. D. Rubin,** *U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission*
F. Shahrokhi,** *AREVA NP, Inc.*
K. R. Schultz, *General Atomics*
D. J. Spellman,** *Oak Ridge National Laboratory*
E. G. Wallace,** *Pebble Bed Modular Reactors (Pty), Ltd.*
Ben Holtzman, *ANS*, *Graduate Department, University of Illinois*

**Primary contributors participating since August 2004, which is the full project duration.

Other contributors included the following:

S. J. Ball, *Oak Ridge National Laboratory*
R. Black, *U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Nuclear Energy*
M. V. Frank, *Safety Factor Associates, Inc.*
N. P. Kadambi, *U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission*
N. Tricot, *International Atomic Energy Agency*

The ANS-28 Subcommittee acknowledges support from the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) through Richard Black [DOE (NE-3)] and Donald Spellman [Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL)]. Without their help, this 6-year effort would have been significantly more difficult to complete. Other contributors include AREVA NP, Inc., who contributed to the development of the MHR uncertainty consequences curves; General Atomics, who provided historical modular high-temperature gas reactor/HTGR licensing interpretations; and Pebble Bed Modular Reactors (Pty), Ltd., who provided the extensive basis behind its current license application, especially licensing application of DID principles. We are also indebted to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission for introducing risk-informed guidance, existing regulatory interpretations, and extensive unacknowledged staff review assistance. Finally, all contributor companies and their employees who so generously donated their time include CORE, Inc.; AREVA NP, Inc.; Westinghouse; UT-Battelle/ORNL; Battelle Energy Alliance and Oak Ridge contractors to DOE; the Electric Power Research Institute; Bechtel; Exelon Nuclear; and General Atomics.

The Nuclear Facility Standards Committee (NFSC) had the following membership at the time of its approval of this standard:

C. A. Mazzola (Chair), *Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.*
R. M. Ruby (Vice Chair), *Constellation Energy*

J. A. August, *CORE, Inc.*
W. H. Bell, *South Carolina Electric & Gas Company*
J. R. Brault, *Shaw MOX Project*
C. K. Brown, *Southern Nuclear Operating Company*
K. R. Bryson, *Individual*
C. E. Carpenter, *U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission*
D. R. Eggett, *Automated Engineering Services Corporation*
R. W. Englehart, *Individual*
P. K. Guha, *U.S. Department of Energy*
P. S. Hastings, *Duke Energy Company (NuStart Liaison)*
R. A. Hill, *ERIN Engineering and Research, Inc.*
N. P. Kadambi, *Individual*
M. A. Linn, *Oak Ridge National Laboratory*
E. M. Lloyd, *Exitech Corporation*
S. A. Lott, *Los Alamos National Laboratory*
R. H. McFetridge, *Westinghouse Electric Company, LLC*
T. K. Meneely, *Westinghouse Electric Company, LLC*
C. H. Moseley, *ASME NQA Liaison*
D. G. Newton, *AREVA NP*
W. B. Reuland, *Individual*
J. C. Saldarini, *Bechtel Power Corporation*
D. J. Spellman, *Oak Ridge National Laboratory*
S. L. Stamm, *Shaw Nuclear Services*
J. D. Stevenson, *Individual*
J. A. Wehrenberg, *Southern Company Services*
M. J. Wright, *Entergy Operations, Inc.*
L. M. Zull, *Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board*

NFSC Liaison:

G. Hutcherson, *Institute of Nuclear Power Operations*
J. Riley, *Nuclear Energy Institute*

Contents

Section		Page
1	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose	1
1.2	Scope	1
1.3	Applicability	2
1.4	Design process	2
1.5	Safety process description	3
2	Acronyms and definitions	5
2.1	List of acronyms	5
2.2	Definitions	6
3	Develop safety design criteria	14
3.1	Introduction to safety criteria development	14
3.2	Establish event categories and F-C curve	15
3.2.1	TLSC selection guidance	16
3.2.2	F-C curve and event region guidance	17
3.2.3	Cumulative risk	20
3.2.4	DID requirement	20
3.3	Establish safety functions	22
3.3.1	SSC categorization	22
3.3.2	MHR safety functions	24
3.4	Establish TLDC	29
3.4.1	Control radionuclides in fuel particles	29
3.4.2	Remove core heat	30
3.4.3	Control heat generation	31
3.4.4	Control chemical attack	31
3.4.5	Maintain core geometry	32
3.4.6	Maintain reactor building geometry	33
4	Perform and apply PRA	33
4.1	Establish PRA requirements	34
4.2	Perform PRA	37
4.3	Apply the PRA	39
4.3.1	Develop LBEs	39
4.3.2	Identify event families	40
4.3.3	Select LBEs in AOO region	41
4.3.4	Select LBEs in DBE region	41
4.3.5	Select LBEs in BDBE region	41
4.3.6	Plot LBEs on F-C curve	41
4.4	Evaluate cumulative risk	43
5	Determine DBA and classify SSCs	43
5.1	Overview	43
5.2	Identify SSC LBE accident roles	44
5.3	Classify SSCs	45
5.3.1	Safety classification for DBE mitigation	46
5.3.2	Safety classification for high-consequence BDBE prevention	48
5.3.3	Safety classification considerations	49
5.4	Determine DBAs	50
5.5	Confirm TLDC	53
5.6	Specify special treatment requirements	53

6 Perform deterministic safety analyses 54
6.1 Purpose of deterministic safety analyses 54
6.2 Safety analysis criteria 54
6.2.1 Deterministic safety analysis criteria 54
6.2.2 Deterministic analysis supporting criteria 55
6.3 Basic elements of MHR safety analyses 56
6.3.1 Initial conditions 56
6.3.2 System response 57
6.3.3 Radionuclide source term 57
6.3.4 Radionuclide transport within and outside the HPB 58
6.3.5 Consequence/dose assessment 58
6.3.6 Supporting analyses 58
6.4 MHR characteristics important to deterministic safety analyses 59
6.4.1 Particle fuel characteristics and safety analyses 59
6.4.2 Core structure characteristics and safety analyses 60
6.4.3 Negative temperature reactivity characteristics and safety analyses 60
6.4.4 Helium primary coolant characteristics and safety analyses 60
6.4.5 Thermal inertia characteristics and safety analyses 61
6.4.6 Passive decay heat removal characteristics and safety analyses 61
6.5 Deterministic safety analysis categories and analysis requirements 62
6.5.1 Normal operation and AOOs 62
6.5.2 Reactivity events 62
6.5.3 Depressurization events 63
6.5.4 Loss-of-forced-cooling events 64
6.5.5 Chemical attack events 65
6.5.6 Nonreactor events in plants 66
6.6 Treatment of uncertainties in MHR deterministic safety analyses 68
6.6.1 Level of conservatism 69
6.6.2 Major deterministic safety analysis uncertainties 69
6.6.3 Reduction of deterministic safety analysis uncertainties 70
6.6.4 Addressing uncertainties in deterministic safety analyses 70
6.7 Qualification of deterministic safety analysis methods 73
6.7.1 Identification of required model capabilities 73
6.7.2 Method evaluation and qualification 73

7 Evaluate DID 74
7.1 Overview 74
7.2 Plant capability DID 77
7.3 Programmatic DID 79
7.4 Risk-informed evaluation of DID 80
7.5 Implementation of DID process 81

8 Special treatments 84
8.1 Background 84
8.1.1 Purpose 84
8.1.2 Safety functions 85
8.1.3 Basis 86
8.1.4 Capability and reliability 87
8.1.5 Selection flowchart 88
8.2 Classify safety-related SSCs 90
8.2.1 Identify safety categories 91
8.2.2 Classify SSC safety functions 94

8.2.3 Classify SSC subassemblies 96
8.2.4 Identify critical characteristics 97
8.3 Specify special treatments 98
8.3.1 Scope 98
8.3.2 Requirements 100
8.3.3 Partition: SSCs and functions 103
8.3.4 Critical characteristics 105
8.3.5 Specify special treatments 106
8.3.6 Dedicate SSCs 107
8.3.7 Quality versus reliability 111
8.3.8 Historical differences 113
8.3.9 Defense-in-depth 114
8.3.10 Other industry use 115
8.4 Conclusion 115

9 References 116

Tables

Table 1 Required MHR safety design elements 14
Table 2 Summary of requirements for F-C curve 15
Table 3 Summary of requirements for TLSC selection 16
Table 4 Summary of requirements for F-C curve and event region 18
Table 5 Summary of requirements for BDBEs 19
Table 6 Summary of requirements for cumulative risk determination 20
Table 7 Summary of requirements for DID 21
Table 8 Summary of requirements for establishing MHR safety functions 22
Table 9 Summary of requirements for SSC categorization 24
Table 10 Summary of requirements for control of radionuclides in fuel particles 25
Table 11 Summary of requirements for removal of core heat 26
Table 12 Summary of requirements for control of heat generation 26
Table 13 Summary of requirements for control of chemical attack 27
Table 14 Summary of requirements for maintaining core geometry 28
Table 15 Summary of requirements for maintaining reactor building geometry 28
Table 16 Summary of requirements for control of radionuclides in fuel particles 29
Table 17 Summary of requirements for removal of core heat 30
Table 18 Summary of requirements for control of heat generation 31
Table 19 Summary of requirements for control of chemical attack 32
Table 20 Summary of requirements for maintaining core geometry 32
Table 21 Summary of requirements for maintaining reactor building geometry 33
Table 22 Summary of requirements for establishing the PRA 35
Table 23 Summary of requirements for performing PRA 38
Table 24 Summary of requirements for applying the PRA 42
Table 25 Summary of requirements for evaluating cumulative risk 43
Table 26 Summary of requirements for identifying SSC LBE accident roles 45
Table 27 Evaluation of SSCs for core heat removal capability on DBEs 47
Table 28 Evaluation of SSCs for core heat generation control on DBEs 48
Table 29 Summary of requirements for classifying SSCs 49
Table 30 Selection of deterministic DBAs for a set of MHR DBEs 51

Table 31 Summary of requirements to determine DBAs 52
Table 32 Summary of requirements for confirming TLDC 53
Table 33 Summary of requirements for specifying special treatment requirements 53
Table 34 Summary of requirements for safety analysis criteria 56
Table 35 Summary of requirements for deterministic safety analysis elements 58
Table 36 Summary of requirements for safety analysis regarding MHR characteristics 61
Table 37 Summary of safety analysis requirements for MHR accident categories 66
Table 38 Summary of requirements for safety analysis uncertainties .. 72
Table 39 Summary of requirements for safety analysis method qualification 74
Table 40 Elements of plant capability DID 78
Table 41 Summary of requirements for plant capability DID 79
Table 42 Elements of programmatic DID 79
Table 43 Summary of requirements for programmatic DID 80
Table 44 Elements of risk-informed evaluation DID 80
Table 45 Summary of requirements for risk-informed evaluation DID .. 81
Table 46 MHR/DID underlying principles 82
Table 47 Criteria for application of MHR DID principles 82
Table 48 Summary of requirements for implementation of DID process 83
Table 49 Summary of requirements for the purpose of special treatments 85
Table 50 Summary of requirements for safety functions 85
Table 51 Summary of requirements for treatment basis 86
Table 52 Safety-related NSRWST SSCs 87
Table 53 Summary of requirements for capability and reliability 88
Table 54 Summary of requirements for selection flowchart 90
Table 55 Summary of requirements for classifying safety-related SSCs 90
Table 56 Summary of requirements for identifying safety categories ... 91
Table 57 Summary of requirements for safety-related 93
Table 58 Summary of requirements for NSR 93
Table 59 Summary of requirements for NSRWST 94
Table 60 Summary of requirements for NSRWST basis 94
Table 61 Summary of requirements for classifying SSC safety functions 95
Table 62 Summary of requirements for classifying SSC subassemblies 97
Table 63 Summary of requirements for critical characteristics 98
Table 64 Summary of requirements for special treatment scope 100
Table 65 Summary of special treatment requirements 102
Table 66 Summary of requirements for partition: systems, SSCs, and functions 105
Table 67 Summary of requirements for critical characteristics 106
Table 68 Summary of requirements for specifying special treatment requirements 107
Table 69 Summary of requirements for reviewing fit, form, and function 108
Table 70 Summary of requirements for determining SSC special treatment strategies 109

Table 71 Summary of requirements for identifying special treatments 110
Table 72 Summary of requirements for dedication 111
Table 73 Summary of requirements for quality versus reliability 112
Table 74 Summary of requirements for historical management 114
Table 75 Summary of requirements for DID 115
Table 76 Summary of requirements for special treatment conclusion .. 115

Figures

Figure 1 Engineering safety design relationship 3
Figure 2 MHR safety design process overview 4
Figure 3 Illustrative F-C curve based on TLRC 17
Figure 4 MHR safety functions 23
Figure 5 Reliability and capability SSC roles preventing and mitigating LBEs 45
Figure 6 F-C curve showing DBA regions 51
Figure 7 MHR DID elements 75
Figure 8 Logic for implementing evaluation of DID 76
Figure 9 Barriers to radionuclide transport included in plant capability DID 77
Figure 10 Elements of safety design incorporated into plant capability DID 78
Figure 11 SSC special treatment selection processes 89