



Document ID	Version	Status	Reg no	Page
-	0.1	Preliminary		1 (1)
Author			Date	
Olle Olsson, Allan Hedin, Johan Andersson, Saida Engström			2012-06-01	

SKB factual check of NEA review of SKB:s post closure safety case

SKB has been invited by SSM to perform a factual check of SKB:s post closure safety case.

Draft copies of the documents have been provided to SKB for reading at the SSM premises during a period of 6 hours. The short time available has not allowed a detailed check of the comprehensive information provided in the NEA review report.

SKB has identified the following factual errors or statement that might need clarification.

Page 24 §1, 3.6.2 §2, page 90 §1; The review report states that “SKB specify the final practical deposition hole rejection criteria prior to beginning of any underground excavation work”. “Final” rejection criteria cannot be defined at an early stage during the development of the repository. It is essential that knowledge gained on geological and hydrological conditions during construction of the repository can put to use.

Page 30 §1; Delete “SSM” from the statement “, e.g. under a joint protocol with SSM and KTH, amongst others”.

Page 42 §3, “RFM049” should be “RFM045”.

Page 43 §1; “The predicted conditions at repository level ... findings from magnetic surveys.” SKB finds it appropriate to add seismic surveys.

Page 47 §3 “SKB-3” should be changed to “KBS-3” on two instances.

Page 70 4.3.3 §1; “The pitting coefficient assumed in the safety case is 25 ... ”
The estimation in SR-Site of localised corrosion is not using a pitting coefficient, even if such interpretation of experimental data is discussed. The most realistic understanding of pitting during the period when oxygen is present, based on available experimental data, is that it will have the appearance of uneven general corrosion. Thus the estimate of corrosion from oxygen remaining in the repository in SR-Site is a corrosion depth of less than 500 µm, including an unevenness around the average corrosion depth on the order of ±50 µm, the latter based on the observations made by /Litke et al. 1992, Brennenstuhl et al. 2002/, see further p. 115 of SKB TR-10-46.

Page 75 penultimate §; “bur-up” should be changed to “burn-up”.

Page 103 §1 last sentence; Regarding the IRT’s comment that it would have been of interest to expose a calculation case with a pessimistic realisation of the DFN-model, SKB notes that all individual realisations of the DFN-model are evaluated in the corrosion calculations as illustrated in Figure 5-7 of TR-10-66.