

Report to NISA on "Response to Data Misentry Made by Kyusyu Electric Power Co., Inc., Regarding Seismic Safety Assessment for Reactor Building and Auxiliary Reactor Building of Unit 3, Genkai Nuclear Power Station" (Summary)

1. Introduction

In accord with Data Misentry Made by Kyusyu Electric Power Co., Inc. regarding Seismic Safety Assessment of Unit 3, Genkai Nuclear Power Station, the instruction from Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency (NISA) of Ministry of Economy instructed as below:

Nuclear operator who contracted out analysis work to same company contracted by Kyusyu Electric power Co. Inc has to check whether there are any mistakes.

Nuclear operator who contracted out analysis work to different company contracted by Kyusyu Electric power Co. Inc has to review evaluation system to make sure there is no data misentry.

We contracted out analysis work regarding "Regulatory Guide for Reviewing Seismic Design of Nuclear Power Reactor Facilities" to different company contracted by Kyusyu Electric power Co. Inc. Therefore, we reported review result of our evaluation system to make sure there is no data misentry.

Instruction: Response to Data Misentry Made by Kyusyu Electric Power Co., Inc., Regarding Seismic Safety Assessment for Reactor Building and Auxiliary Reactor Building of Unit 3, Genkai Nuclear Power Station (Instruction)
July 22, 2011 NISA #1

2. Results of reviewing our evaluation system

We submitted the following reports (including interim reports) regarding results of seismic safety assessment;

- Units 1 to 6 at Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station (interim report),
- Units1 to 4 at Fukushima Daini Nuclear Power Station (interim report), and
- Units1 and 5 to 7 at Kashiwazaki Kariwa Nuclear Power Station.

As quality assurance activity for the analyses concerning seismic safety assessments above, we conduct the analysis examination for each analysis and confirm the following items based on the internal "manual regarding the verification of the analyses for permits";

- a. the procedures for the analyses are established and observed,
- b. evidence documents for inputs are created,

- c. substantially reviewed by a person other than the original analyzer, and
- d. if the analyses are new, the design review (design evaluation and verification) is made.

In addition, to make sure the quality assurance activity by manufacturers who conduct analyses, based on the internal “manual for auditing the third party”, we audit manufacturers and check the implementation status of the quality assurance activity including analysis work and the validity.

Based on this Instruction, to review our evaluation system to make sure there is no data misentry, we checked the analysis records based on the “manual regarding the verification of the analyses for permits” and the records (after 2008) of auditing construction companies and others based on the “manual for auditing the third party”.

As a result, we confirmed that regarding the seismic response analyses in each report, we properly conducted the analyses and audits of construction companies and others and that we adequately implemented the quality assurance activity concerning analysis work.

3. Conclusion

As a result of our review of our evaluation system based on this Instruction, we conclude that regarding analysis work on seismic safety evaluation the proper and adequate quality assurance activity is implemented therefore there is no problem in our evaluation system. We will continuously make sure to implement the quality assurance activity and endeavor to further develop the quality assurance activity for the analysis work by trying to collect information on noncompliant events.

END