NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Commission Meeting with World Association

of Nuclear Operators

Docket Number: (not applicable)

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: Thursday, May 16, 2002

Work Order No.: NRC-n/a Pages 1-55

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

COMMISSION MEETING WITH

WORLD ASSOCIATION OF NUCLEAR OPERATORS

+ + + + +

THURSDAY,

MAY 16, 2002

+ + + + +

ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

+ + + + +

The Commission met in the Commissioner's Conference Room, One White Flint North, 11555
Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, at 9:30 a.m.,
Richard A. Meserve, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

RICHARD A. MESERVE, Chairman

GRETA J. DICUS, Commissioner

NILS J. DIAZ, Commissioner

EDWARD McGAFFIGAN, JR., Commissioner

JEFFREY S. MERRIFIELD, Commissioner

ALSO PRESENT:

ZACK T. PATE, Chairman, WANO

(This transcript produced from electronic caption media and audio and video media provided by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.)

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 (9:34 a.m.)

2.2

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: The Commission meets this morning to discuss the status in programs and activities of the World Association of Nuclear Operators, WANO.

As most of you are aware, WANO was formally established in 1989 as a nonprofit, non-governmental organization representing the owners and operators of nuclear powerplants worldwide. Created in the wake of the 1986 Chernobyl accident in the former Soviet Union, WANO reflects the will of the international nuclear industry to ensure that such an accident will never happen again, to enhance nuclear safety and the reliability of nuclear powerplants, and to provide a forum for the exchange of information and for fostering communication among the world's nuclear plant operators.

Thirteen years after its founding, WANO today represents approximately 440 nuclear plant operators in 32 countries and has achieved, through the collective efforts of its members, truly impressive gains in nuclear powerplant performance.

Speaking for WANO this morning is its distinguished Chairman, Dr. Zack T. Pate. Dr. Pate is

certainly no stranger to the Commission, to the NRC staff, or to the U.S. nuclear industry. For many years associated with the U.S. Institute for Nuclear Power Operations, Dr. Pate's reputation and career have been virtually synonymous with the enhancement of nuclear safety both here in the U.S. and abroad.

He has been a tireless and demanding advocate of excellence in the U.S. nuclear industry, a strong supporter of industry self-regulation as a complement to NRC regulatory programs and activities, and an articulate spokesman for the concept that the primary responsibility for safety rests on the industry itself.

His influence on the course of the U.S. nuclear industry can be readily seen in the steadily improving performance of the industry over the last two decades in increasing -- that's both within the industry and in the public -- that nuclear power is a viable option in the nation's energy future.

It is but a short leap in concept from improving nuclear safety in the U.S. to improving nuclear safety worldwide, when the world nuclear industry recognized the need for effective industry leadership in an organization to reflect its interests. You had a readily available model in Dr.

2.2

Pate and INPO, both of whom played key roles in WANO's 1 2 creation. Dr. Pate has been the longest serving 3 4 chairman in WANO's history. He has occupied this 5 position for almost half of the organization's 6 existence. 7 Dr. Pate, my colleagues on the Commission and I welcome you once again to the NRC. 8 We are 9 honored by your presence here today. We look forward 10 to your presentation this morning with great interest 11 and with regret that you will be retiring from WANO 12 later this year. 13 The Commission sincerely appreciates the 14 time and energy you have invested throughout the years 15 in nuclear safety, extends to you our best wishes as 16 you pursue your personal goals, and recognizes that 17 through your leadership of WANO you have given that organization the firm foundation necessary to continue 18 19 to perform its role into the future. 20 So thank you very much for joining us. 21 Commissioner Merrifield? 22 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Mr. Chairman, I 23 don't have any prepared remarks, and I do want to 24 associate myself with the kind words you've given.

There's a couple of things I'd like to add, as I was

reflecting on what you were saying.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

The first thing is, obviously, Zack Pate is the instrumental person in getting INPO to where it in the United States is today here and the relationship we have with them. As all of us have been at the various INPO CEO awards efforts in the past years, one of the things we are always reminded of is INPO's commitment to excellence.

And given the record that Zack Pate has shown at INPO and at WANO, I think that word "excellence" very much demonstrates the attitude that he has brought and represents in this industry. While we are regulators, certainly we can be appreciative of the fact that there is no one within industry itself that can take a more leading role in the commitment to that war than Zack Pate.

Before I came to the Commission, and as I was trying to learn more to get ready for the role that I had, many of the people who I spoke to spoke of how I need to get to know Zack Pate better, and that this is a person who really was one that knew what was going on.

I regret that I didn't get to know Zack as well as potentially I could have, but nonetheless clearly the relationship between the organization that

1 currently represents the and one that he represented previously are good, strong, and helpful. 2 So as I said, it's a bittersweet issue 3 4 today. Reflecting on all the work you've done is very sweet; reflecting on the fact that you're leaving is 5 somewhat bitter because of the commitment that you've 6 7 made. Looking at the issues of WANO, which will 8 9 be my last comment, I think it's very positive that 10 WANO now incorporates all of the countries out there, 11 and certainly your successor is going to have a 12 further commitment to try to work with those who are 13 not as strong and try to bring them into that level of 14 excellence that I know has always been your mandate. 15 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. COMMISSIONER DIAZ: I don't know that I 16 17 could add much more. Could I have the next 30 minutes 18 or so? 19 (Laughter.) 20 I just want to say that it is our 21 privilege to have you with us. We know very well what 2.2 you have done, and you have been an asset to this country. And we're very pleased that you have taken 23 24 your career for so long, and don't fade away too

quickly.

COMMISSIONER DICUS: Yes. I just want to add my congratulations and thanks for the length of service that you have had, first to our country, and then to the industry. And I think anyone who could successfully work with Admiral Rickover is to be congratulated from things I've heard. But we're very pleased to have you with us today, and I think the entire Commission wishes you the very best in the future. And thank you for coming. Pate, you may CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Dr. proceed. DR. PATE: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, thank you for your very kind and warm welcome and kind remarks about -- very kind remarks about my career. It's a pleasure for me to brief this distinguished Commission. I especially appreciate the opportunity to give you an update on the World Association of Nuclear Operators. I'm going to talk through that using these slides that were furnished in advance as a basis of my comments, and give you plenty of time for questions and comments and some dialogue. The U.S. NRC is held in high regard in many countries, and regulators in many,

countries look first to see what the U.S. NRC has done

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

or wait until the U.S. NRC takes a decision before setting their own course. And, therefore, as I think you all know, this Commission has a profound effect on the state and health of the nuclear enterprise, not just in the United States but internationally, worldwide.

If I could have my first slide. This slide shows WANO's mission. It's straightforward. It's safety-focused. The words are different, but it's actually quite similar to INPO's mission. And WANO, like INPO, focuses strongly on its mission.

Next slide. This slide shows four regional centers in Atlanta, Paris, Moscow, and Tokyo, and our coordinating center in London. And it is literally that, a coordinating center. We are elevating the role of the center in London, and I'll talk more about that later.

The regional centers are the focal points for WANO's activities and programs, and the regional concept which was part of WANO's creation or formation has proven invaluable to WANO in the always difficult challenge of transcending cultural and language barriers.

Can I have the next slide? This is just a brief WANO chronology to show you, in part, the

2.2

history of the chairmanship. Chernobyl, of course, as Chairman Meserve mentioned, was a catalyst for WANO just as Three Mile Island had been the catalyst for INPO.

About a year -- a little bit more than a year after Chernobyl, in a planning meeting in Paris, we managed to get 29 countries -- top executives from 29 countries, and virtually all of the executives committed to the need to form an international nuclear safety organization. And that was followed by an inaugural meeting in Moscow. Lord Walter Marshall became our first Chairman. At the time, he was Chairman of CEGB, a utility that served virtually all of the United Kingdom. And he was a distinguished first leader.

Four years later, Remy Carle, who at the time was the number two executive at EDF, became our Chairman and provided continuing fine leadership for the organization.

And then, four years later I became the Chairman at a general meeting in Prague. I was still CEO of INPO at the time, but I retired from INPO 10 months later to enable me to focus on WANO.

Now I'll be succeeded at a Governing Board meeting in Kiev, Ukraine, in just a couple of months.

2.2

I'll be succeeded by a gentleman from Kansai Electric, a top executive at Kansai Electric, named Hajimu Maeda. And I think -- I have great confidence that we've made a really great choice for my successor.

To give you a sense of my own interest and involvement, I have attended 44 of the 45 WANO Governing Board meetings over the past 12 years, missing one because of illness.

Could I have the next slide? Just to briefly look at WANO's structure, the General Assembly, which is a membership, elects the president of WANO, an honorary position, and we just this past March elected Pierre Carlier, who recently retired, again, as the number two man at EDF, as WANO's new president.

The Governing Board includes three members from each regional center, and the Governing Board, of course, elects the Chairman. And then each of the regional centers has its own Governing Board.

Next slide, please. WANO programs, although the names are different, are quite similar to INPO's, except there is no formal accreditation or training in WANO. There's, of course, a lot of interest on -- focus on training, but no formal accreditation program like the Commission is

accustomed to seeing from INPO.

2.2

Next slide, please. I thought I'd take a minute now and go through the membership of each region. This slide shows the members of the Atlanta center, and I hasten to add that India and Pakistan are also members of the Tokyo center. And one might ask why Romania and Slovenia are in the Atlanta center.

So Romania, as you undoubtedly know, has built a plant using Canadian technology. And so they wanted to be close in their alliance to Canada, who is a member of the Atlanta center. And Slovenia, the only member of the former Soviet Union that operates other than a Russian-designed plant, has a turnkey Westinghouse plant. So they chose to be members of the Atlanta center.

Next slide? The Moscow center is unique in that all of its members operate Russian-designed plants. Finland, of course, operates a Russian-designed plant and a European-designed plant. And on this slide Poland has no nuclear plant but has ambitions and is very interested in and contributes and follows WANO's work.

And Iran on this slide is a new member as of this past March, based on the fact that they are

building the Bushear Nuclear Plant -- another Russian design.

Next slide, please. The Paris center -China is a member of the Paris center, because of the
French technology at Dai Bai, and, of course, China is
also a member of the Tokyo center. Brazil is a member
of both the Atlanta center and the Paris center, with
a Westinghouse- and a Siemens-designed plant.

Next slide? This is the Tokyo center membership, and it's basically all Asian countries that operate nuclear powerplants are members of this center.

Next slide, please. This is a peer review history, just showing the cumulative number of peer reviews done at WANO member plants. There are 440 units around the world but about 200 stations. And, of course, the peer reviews are done at a station, not a unit. So you could say that 187 of the 200 have been completed, but some of these are repeats. So that's not quite the full picture.

Initially, peer reviews, or evaluations as we call them at INPO, were not a WANO program. But in 1992 and '93, we did two pilots in each region and managed to do those to a standard and to a level of success that the members that had the pilots reported

2.2

them very favorably to the membership at our biennial general meetings. And slowly we've been able to get WANO members to endorse and support the peer review program.

It is, of course, voluntary. And you can see from this slide that there is a clear growing acceptance of the WANO peer review program. The peer reviews, as Chairman Meserve alluded to a few minutes ago, is modeled closely after the INPO evaluation program.

The next slide shows some peer review goals. When we finally got peer reviews established as a program in about 1995, we set a goal of finishing half the plants around the world by 2000. We actually completed 62 percent by 2000.

And then we've set a goal to finish all of the plants around the world by 2005, and we currently have either completed or have scheduled 93 percent of the plants around the world, and we have three years to go. So I'm confident my successors will carry on and meet this goal.

Next slide, please. This slide is just intended to show the growing participation. This is primarily training seminars. And, again, these are often modeled after the very successful seminar

2.2

program that INPO has for prospective plant managers, 1 2 engineering managers, maintenance managers, superintendents, radiation 3 operations protection 4 managers, and so on. So we've started a similar series 5 seminars in WANO, and you can see that there's been a 6 7 three-fold increase in participation over the last six 8 years. 9 And logical question about these 10 seminars is: are they being endorsed and supported in 11 all regions? This next slide shows the regional 12 participation, and the red block is the 1996 level of 13 participation in each region, and then the darker 14 block is the current or last year participation in 15 each region, and you can, again, see the growth. 16 But important to me and important to my 17 colleagues on this slide is the regional participation is more or less proportional to the size of the region 18 19 or to the number of nuclear powerplants in the region. 20 So the slide does show that we have good, broad 21 participation across all regions. 22 You can see the Moscow center got off to 23 a slow start on that slide, but it has come up nicely.

examples of participation. Again, as Chairman Meserve

The next slide shows some additional

24

mentioned, 32 countries, they currently are all members. They've been -- the countries that operate nuclear powerplants have been members of WANO throughout. And at a recent biennial general meeting in Seoul, Korea, just this past March, we had all 32 countries represented by more than 300 delegates. Actually, closer to 350.

We were quite proud of that because, as we all know, air travel has gotten more difficult since 9/11, and yet members came out to Seoul, Korea, in the same numbers that had been planned before 9/11 when we had to postpone that conference.

If I could look at the next slide, I'm going to now quickly show five performance indicators, and I know the Commission is very accustomed to looking at these. This first one is a very important one -- unplanned capability loss factor. But before I show these, let me report to you that all plants around the world report data on several performance indicators into a central database.

What I will show is the trends basically over WANO's lifetime, or the trends over the period from 1990 when we got data from about 350 units in 1990, and as you'll see on a later slide we had data from 428 units, essentially all that are operating in

2.2

1 2001. So the trend in unplanned capability loss 2 factor is quite favorable. The next one -- and I'll go through these 3 4 quickly -- collective radiation exposure, a good, favorable trend. Again, this is worldwide with about 5 400 units in 2001. 6 7 The next one, industrial safety, using the same measure that you are accustomed to seeing in the 8 9 U.S. 10 Unit capability factor, the last of the 11 five. 12 We found in WANO, just as we found years 13 earlier in the U.S., is that sharing performance 14 indicator data among the members is just simply highly 15 People take a great interest in this motivational. 16 data. They want to know how they're doing compared to 17 They want to know what quartile they're in. others. And if they see they're in the lower quartile or even 18 19 the lower half in a particular category, they really work to get to the higher quartiles. 20 21 And they not only work, but they reach out 2.2 to other plants in the database who are doing well in 23 that area and find best practices on their own. 24 WANO doesn't have to do a thing except manage the

database and provide the opportunity for them to share

that and see the need for their own improvement.

So this has been a very powerful program without a huge resource commitment by WANO, but sometimes I am sure by a huge resource commitment by the plant. This shows about a nine percent gain in unit capability factor around the world, which is well over 40 units, and an additional 41,000 megawatt units in additional installed generated capacity.

This next slide is an index of the performance indicators. It's a weighted amalgamation, the same basic approach that INPO uses with some of the indicators having more weight than others. The number of units is actually shown on this slide, and this is typical -- from 373 in 1990 to 428 last year.

But the important thing I ask you to notice on this slide is the improved performance of the lowest quartile, and that's a worldwide trend, you know, from 42-1/2 to 78.9 last year. And hopefully in this current year we'll reach the eighties and achieve a doubling of the points indicator index for the lowest quartile in this important measure. And I know we're all very interested in seeing the plants that are in the lower quartile move up.

The last slide -- like all organizations, WANO has its challenges. I'll just give you a moment

2.2

to read these. My successor and the WANO organization will do their best to meet these challenges, I am confident.

I said earlier that I would say something about the role of the coordinating center. The new Chairman will, of course, operate from Japan, just as I have operated from the U.S. -- Atlanta.

And we realized in WANO that we needed to strengthen the coordinating center during my chairmanship, and we've done that by elevating the position of the director of the coordinating center to managing director of WANO.

And the person who will take that position this fall is a gentleman named Sigbal Byrd who recently ran the accreditation program, and before that the evaluation programs at INPO. And before that, earlier in his career, he ran the Braidwood nuclear powerplant -- when it was doing quite well, I might add -- and I think it's doing quite well today.

So I think we have a very capable man who will support the Chairman in the new London coordinating center, and he will have a -- you know, some greater ability to support and challenge the regions and lead them forward. So that's an additional challenge that I'll leave to my successors.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

Can I go back to the opening slide now?

That, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, completes my remarks, and I more than welcome any questions you have.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Well, thank you very

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Well, thank you very much, Dr. Pate. We very much welcome, as I indicated, the chance to interact with you as well as to hear your presentation.

I just returned from a meeting -- a review meeting for the Convention on Nuclear Safety, in which I had the opportunity to respond to questions from other countries about the U.S. nuclear program. And I was rather struck, and a little bit surprised, at the extent of the questioning I received about performance indicators and U.S. usage of performance indicators as one of the components of our activities for oversight of reactors.

The very clear impression I have was some suspicion by other regulators as to the possible manipulation of performance indicators. And I know that you have provided us not only the information today, but you had earlier sent me some information about the improvements.

I am curious about whether you have, then, concerns in that area on -- you've, again, emphasized

2.2

this morning the performance indicators, how you assure the validity of the information that is reported to you.

DR. certainly PATE: Wе have had discussions about the that performance worry indicators could be misinterpreted or could be misreported. And even, you know, totally unintentionally some of them are complicated. And so it would be easy to report data that's not precisely accurate.

But by checking plant against plant, and continuously analyzing the data to see that it makes sense and that it's consistent, I think we've achieved a level of confidence that the performance indicators are pretty darn accurate. And we also have the sense that the members, you know, have a high sense of integrity about it, and that is checked during peer reviews from time to time.

And we haven't, frankly, run across any cases that I know of where there's been -- where we can see that data has been manipulated or reported that -- we found errors, but we haven't seen examples where it appeared to us that the data had been intentionally misreported. So within a small bracket of error, I think the data that's being reported is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1 pretty solid.

2.2

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: We have similar confidence in the data that's reported to us by our licensees, as I recounted at that meeting.

We have been approached by the executive branch about resuming our nuclear safety dialogue with India. And, of course, WANO has had the opportunity to interact with India and the Indian nuclear program over a period that we have not been interacting with that country on nuclear issues.

I wonder if you had any suggestions for us as to areas in which that cooperation might be most useful.

DR. PATE: The Director General of the Nuclear Power Corporation of India, Limited, Dr. Chaturvedi, is a member of the WANO Governing Board, and he currently chairs the WANO Tokyo center board. He has been a delightful person to have on the WANO Governing Board, and seems to have to me -- and seems to represent from NPCIL a sense of openness and a desire to have a first-class nuclear program in the high levels of safety in India.

So I think, Mr. Chairman, the only comment I could make is to say that I sense in India, through its Chairman and through other people that we've

1	interacted with in peer reviews, a real desire for
2	openness and a real desire for improvement. So it
3	occurs to me that it's just simply encouraging that
4	you would reach out to India.
5	CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Again, I'm going to put
6	you on the spot on another country. We have reports
7	from time to time about the prospects for extension of
8	the lives of the first generation reactors in Russia.
9	And this has been an area of great interest throughout
10	the Western world, of course, in dealing with the
11	concerns about that those reactors.
12	Do you have any perspectives on those
13	the situation as a result of your WANO activities that
14	you could share with us?
15	DR. PATE: You're asking some good, tough
16	questions.
17	(Laughter.)
18	That's fair.
19	CHAIRMAN MESERVE: We realize this may be
20	our last chance in this role to be able to drag
21	information I mean, I don't mean to put you in an
22	awkward position. I realize that your interactions
23	with these countries are confidential, and I
24	DR. PATE: I think I
25	CHAIRMAN MESERVE: whatever insights

you can provide us would be useful.

2.2

DR. PATE: I think, first of all, I would say that our Russian colleagues have worked very hard since the Chernobyl accident to improve the safety of their nuclear power program and the safety of their plants. Working with them has been an absolute delight to me. I have a number of friends in Moscow throughout the nuclear program in Russia, and I have just the highest regard for them.

I might add to that that my sense from many plant visits and reviewing many peer reviews -peer review reports is that their pressurized water reactors are pretty rugged plants with a lot of margin, a lot of thermal margin. And so I think that's probably the limit of my real knowledge.

You know, we see real improvement in Russia in their safety and in their culture. We see a real dedication to improvement, and the pressurized water plants appear to me to be a rugged plant with a lot of margin.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: I won't ask you about the RBM case. Let me -- this is -- you obviously know the U.S. program very well and have a perspective as a result of your WANO experiences to have some insight on our own program.

24 1 And I didn't want to have this opportunity 2 interact with you go past without asking you whether you have any suggestions for the NRC as a 3 4 result of your experiences with WANO. 5 DR. PATE: The really honest answer to that question is, once I retired from INPO, I focused 6 on other countries. And I haven't, frankly, followed 7 the U.S. NRC's work nearly as closely as I did when I 8 9 was at INPO. Of course, I read continuously, and I 10 think I have a generally good sense of what the U.S. 11 NRC is doing. 12 My sense is that their new regime that's 13 been put in place in recent years is 14 improvement over the previous approaches. 15 simply don't have enough insight to give you 16 suggestion for improvement, and I think if I did it 17 would likely be off -- probably off base, off target. 18 So I pass on that. 19 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Okay. 20 DR. PATE: And that's just a genuine, you 21

know, reality. It's not dodging the issue. don't know enough or have enough insight, especially compared to the people around this table, to think that I could give you a meaningful suggestion. simply say that it appears to me to be a huge

2.2

23

24

1	improvement over what I saw a decade ago.
2	CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Thank you very much.
3	Commissioner Dicus?
4	COMMISSIONER DICUS: Thank you.
5	On slide 17, where you have the collective
6	radiation exposure and the impressive numbers going
7	down over a decade, and as you and I both know it's a
8	product of two things improvement in exposure
9	control plus the number of people who are monitored.
10	I kind of want to hear from you that this
11	decline in collective radiation exposure is not so
12	much because their fear of people being monitored, but
13	because it does represent, in your view, a true
14	improvement in radiation safety.
15	DR. PATE: You know, frankly, I hadn't
16	really seriously thought about that. But my immediate
17	reaction is that in most countries the number of
18	people hasn't changed much. You know, whereas in the
19	U.S., I think there's been a concerted effort to
20	reduce staff, I don't see much change in most member
21	countries. So, you know, my sense is it's a pretty
	direct measure of reduced exposure.
22	
22	COMMISSIONER DICUS: Are our U.S.
	COMMISSIONER DICUS: Are our U.S. utilities very active in WANO?

we basically married WANO and INPO and put them in the same building with a lot of common services, with a full recognition that INPO was in place, and U.S. utilities were used to INPO evaluations and had fully endorsed and supported accreditation, and so on.

And so we didn't seek to change that, but what we did seek to do is give the U.S. credit in WANO for participation in INPO programs. So the U.S. is a bit of an anomaly in the sense that its participation in WANO is through INPO. The Atlanta center, of course, is in the same building.

Now, having said that, about one out of four U.S. evaluations are now WANO peer reviews. And that means a little bit different approach, not much, and it means that several people from the international community are on the team to gain the benefit of seeing what's happening in U.S. plants and to gain experience that can be applied back in their center.

So the U.S. utilities see WANO peer reviews from time to time, about every third or fourth evaluation. I think it's now settling down to be every third, because that meets WANO's goal -- one of WANO's goals. And the U.S. utilities often get documents now that are WANO documents in lieu of an

2.2

INPO document. But INPO also monitors that document, and, if it wants to add something to it, it does that.

The U.S. is not entirely unique in this regard because EDF has its own internal peer review system that's managed from headquarters, and within the WANO community they take credit for the peer reviews done internally by EDF. The German utilities do quite a similar thing. So the U.S. is not the only country that in a way has its own peer review program.

And to address that, when WANO set its long-term peer review goal, it set the goal of -- that every WANO member should have a peer review with external direction at least every three years, and a WANO peer review at least every six.

Now, many WANO members opt to have the WANO peer review every three years -- for example, British Energy -- but the U.S. has a WANO peer review every six years and an INPO evaluation every two. So that goal accommodated the INPO programs, and it accommodates programs like EDF has. But it still gets the WANO peer review done periodically in each member country.

COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay. Thank you.

And, again, recognizing the confidentiality that you have, but are there any key points or issues that you

2.2

1	have noticed across the countries that exist between
2	the regulator and the industry that would be of
3	particular use to us?
4	DR. PATE: Explain that a little bit more.
5	COMMISSIONER DICUS: Well, for example,
6	obviously, in the countries there are different levels
7	of regulation, there are different regulators that
8	have more or less resources. But clearly, in the
9	countries, there's a regulator I am assuming, in
LO	most of them and the industry. Are there key
L1	points that you have noticed that seem to be common
L2	denominators in the countries? And I know I'm
L3	catching cold on another
L4	DR. PATE: That's okay. Well
L5	COMMISSIONER DICUS: And there may not be.
L6	I'm
L7	DR. PATE: I think, as you already know,
L8	there are regulators in some countries that don't have
L9	enough independence or authority, and see that from
20	time to time. So that's the you know, that's the
21	challenge, if you will, that is evident from time to
22	time, without, of course, naming those countries.
23	(Laughter.)
24	COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay. Thank you.
25	CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Commissioner Diaz?

1 Thank COMMISSIONER DIAZ: you, Mr. 2 Chairman. I notice in your mission 3 Pate, 4 statement that it's WANO's mission to maximize the safety and reliability of the operation of nuclear 5 Of course, we at the NRC are always 6 powerplants. 7 trying to maintain or, I will say, maximize the safety always. 8 9 Of course, I have for years said that 10 there has to be -- and there surely is -- a strong 11 correlation between safety and reliability, that those 12 plants that are most reliable probably have a very 13 good safety record, and vice versa. 14 So I think that putting this together is 15 a very good thing. With this tremendous amount of 16 experience that I hope we're not going to lose, that 17 you're going to still be on the sidelines, on the issue of safety and reliability, is there any one 18 19 particular issue that presently exists that has a 20 relationship between these two components that you 21 believe could be, you know, improved? And let me tell 2.2 you why. If you look at these figures -- and I made 23

the comment in a briefing not very long ago that there

is no doubt a significant improvement in all of them,

24

1	but their approach in in asymptotic behavior
2	DR. PATE: Yes.
3	COMMISSIONER DIAZ: and that's because
4	of the you know, the systems learn, the error, you
5	know, gets better, expertise gets more into play,
6	people are more concerned of there's all of these
7	factors, both in equipment and things that are have
8	created this very good resource that, you know,
9	reflect very clearly in safety.
10	And, of course, it's very difficult to get
11	out of asymptotic behavior. You have to have a
12	significant change. You can go back if you're not
13	careful, but to bring it down but I wonder, when
14	you look at all of these factors, is there anything
15	out there that comes out in your attention that could
16	significantly be considered as an area that further
17	improvement could be made?
18	DR. PATE: Is there any one particular
19	area that could lead to further improvement in safety
20	and reliability?
21	COMMISSIONER DIAZ: Right. That's not a
22	tough question, is it?
23	(Laughter.)
24	DR. PATE: No, but it bears some thought.
25	(Laughter.)

It's difficult to point to any one particular area that would lead to a small step along this asymptote. I gave a speech at our tenth anniversary biennial general meeting in Victoria, British Columbia, called Message from the Top, and focused on the vital importance of the right message about safety from the top of the organization. And somewhere in the speech I added, including from the regulator.

So perhaps our most important challenge collectively in this area where we, you know, are in an asymptotic behavior -- for example, for unit capability factor or capacity factor -- and we probably are approaching an asymptotic behavior for unplanned plant closures, is to keep that strong focus on safety at all levels, so the pressures of staying on that asymptote and not having that drop down that you mentioned or that wrinkle or having that, you know, economic loss don't pull away the paramount importance of safety in the minds of operators, engineers, managers, at all levels, and so on.

So, to me, one of the most important factors to stay on this asymptote rather than to -- and continue the improvement rather than to backslide is to get that message from the top, and by that I

mean the CEO and the chief nuclear officer and the regulator and the -- everyone who has a hand in this equation, including WANO. So the people who run these plants understand day in and day out that their paramount mission is safe operation of that plant.

I perceive that as one of our greatest challenges going forward. I think we are handling it well, but we must continue to handle that well.

COMMISSIONER DIAZ: Because I think that I -- I believe that what -- you know, which is -- of course, I personally like to have this asymptotic behavior. But what it's going to do is -- and maybe, you know, this is a good question.

By being in this asymptotic behavior in practically every single one of these -- in all regions, there's really now the need or the pressure to perform at those levels, and to avoid, you know, getting the event that will get you out and create, you know, the capability loss or the increased, you know, radiation exposure, or, you know, any of the multiple performance indicators.

I believe that what could happen is that we're going to have to drive the understanding of what it means to be working at those levels, and at the same time there's going to be a pressure to go to a

higher level of performance, which is the only way that, of course, you're going to change the curve in itself.

And that higher level of performance, of course, is probably possible now by all of the learning that has taken place. In other words, it is probable that only a deep knowledge of the system's behaviors and some of the human factors that are involved can maintain that curve going the way it is, or even if it's going to be improved. And that requires another level of excellence, using some of your most favorite words. Does that make sense to you?

DR. PATE: Yes, I think I understand fully what you are driving to. That the human factors side of that equation is always a great challenge. As you talked and as I thought about this question, I thought about an experience of just a few years back that our Chair with the Commission visited the nuclear powerplant in Armenia. In fact, the Moscow center had a Governing Board meeting in Armenia. They move the Governing Board meetings around the membership.

And I went out and attended the Governing Board meeting, and then visited the plant and spent actually quite a bit of time with the plant manager,

station manager, a man named Asashan. And it happened to be his birthday while we were there.

We all know that plant started up after having been closed from an earthquake for many years and one of two units restarted. And we learned quickly in Armenia that this small country is highly dependent on that plant, and any time that one unit is closed they're in brownouts.

So I went there with an inherent worry that the operators and management would be under tremendous pressure, and they would have a mentality to operate the plant at all cost. You know, it would be under just enormous pressure to keep it running.

Well, they are, and they were. But the people in the plant, it seemed to me, realized that the success of that plant was so important to this small country, and in a country so, you know, proud and so proud of its independence.

And they were such heroes in the community for running that plant and getting it restarted and having electricity that it struck me and my colleagues that they had reached a higher level. I mean, they were determined to understand every system. They were determined to meet the human performance challenge and to communicate and to wait and see and to stop and

2.2

think before they acted.

2.2

In fact, they had this STAR program as part of their culture, the stop, think, and act, and then review what you've done, which has been around for many years and I've seen in many countries around the world.

So we came away with a sense that although there could have been, you know, a small degraded margin of safety because of the pressure, we came away with a sense that there was an enhancement of the margin of safety because of the commitment and because of the sense of purpose that these operators in Armenia had.

So I think that's an example of what you are talking through that -- to get the operators and managers of the plants to the next level where they -- rather than feel the enormous pressures that are on them today to operate these plants to stay on that asymptote, they achieve a higher sense of purpose in that level of knowledge, in that state of human performance, that takes them to the next level.

So I think that's, you know, a fascinating and important challenge for all players in this business.

COMMISSIONER DIAZ: Thank you very much.

1	That Armenian powerplant was BBVR 230. It had a
2	serious earthquake when it was operating, and had
3	it didn't have a LOCA, that's correct? Thank you,
4	sir.
5	CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Commissioner
6	McGaffigan?
7	COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Thank you, Mr.
8	Chairman. I want to apologize for being late. I
9	ended up having to drive more than 50 miles to get
10	here this morning, and it took me more than an hour
11	and a half to do it. So that's it's only 17 miles
12	from here, but I had to backtrack for a while to do
13	some soccer business, unfortunately.
14	When you all do a WANO evaluation, do you
15	use the INPO system? Do plants get rated WANO 1, 2,
16	3, 4, 5, a la INPO when you do a WANO inspection?
17	DR. PATE: Yes. That's first of all,
18	the peer reviews are voluntary in WANO.
19	COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Right. I
20	understand they're voluntary. But do you still give
21	them a score?
22	DR. PATE: And then the performance
23	assessment is voluntary. So several members now ask
24	for assessments, and it's a growing activity. And, of
25	course, I would encourage it, and I think it will

continue to grow. But only a relatively small fraction of the countries, probably about one-fourth now, ask for an assessment.

COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Okay. That answered several of my questions, because I want to -let me just -- one of the most powerful tools I ever saw INPO use, and I think it was while you were still despite all of there, your rules about was confidentiality, Com Ed had gotten to the point where they weren't listening, and you published a letter to the Com Ed board that had a profound effect on Com Ed, a profound effect for the positive. All of the watch lists that we had had hadn't really gotten their attention, but you got their attention in a unique I think it was around '98. way.

Is that a tool that WANO will ever get to, where you would -- you know, you would get so frustrated with the performance of a member utility that you would do what you did with Com Ed in '98? Is that conceivably -- that's probably not allowed currently by your rules, but it would be allowed some day perhaps.

DR. PATE: WANO's confidentiality policy retains the results of peer reviews within the WANO community. But the WANO Governing Board has to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

represent WANO and its members' overall best interests 1 2 just as I think the INPO Governing Board or the INPO Board of Directors has done in the U.S. over the 3 4 years. 5 I think it would be, you know, a rare occasion, an unusual situation, for WANO to go beyond 6 7 this confidentiality policy. But we did that on one occasion early in my chairmanship when the peer review 8 9 team found some really troublesome situations at 10 Chernobyl Unit 3. And the WANO Governing Board made the 11 12 decision to ask the member to provide a copy of a 13 summary of the report to IAEA, and the WANO Governing 14 Board also decided to inform the G-7 safety 15 representatives in the G-7 countries. 16 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: That's analogous 17 to what -- the comment in the 1998 letter that INPO sent to Com Ed in some sense. 18 19 DR. PATE: At least somewhat. 20 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Right. 21 DR. PATE: Yes. 22 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Okay. 23 DR. PATE: And, you know, one of the 24 consequences of that was Vice President Gore wrote a 25 letter to President Kuchma to encourage improvements

at Chernobyl Unit 3. So that was a difficult decision 1 2 for WANO, but it shows that the WANO Governing Board 3 is willing to, you know, step out when necessary. 4 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: This is, again, 5 probably a question that goes to our practice, and I'm trying to see how widespread it is. It probably isn't 6 7 based on the first question, but one of the things I've done since I've come here is to pay attention to 8 9 INPO and INPO ratings of the U.S. plants. 10 And a wise person from INPO told me early 11 on that what you all told people when you were at INPO 12 is to believe the worst. If you're in our good graces 13 and NRC has you in the gun sights, believe NRC. 14 you're in -- if NRC doesn't have you in the gun 15 sights, and we have you at INPO 4, believe us. 16 believe the worst of the two ratings. 17 I'm very familiar with that. DR. PATE: 18 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Do regulators in 19 other countries get access -- you know, we get access 20 to INPO reports through our resident inspectors, and 21 our program managers can see them when they visit a 2.2 plant. Do regulators in other countries get access to 23 WANO reports as a routine matter, or is it country-24 specific?

DR. PATE:

25

There's not a WANO policy on

that. The WANO policy permits the member to share the
results with the regulator, because a policy otherwise
would not be wise. And I think many, perhaps most, do
share the results with their regulator. I think, in
general, as you would expect, when the regulator asks
they are able to see the reports.
And as is the case in this country, the
regulators have respected the confidentiality of the
reports, when they have asked to see them.
COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: One of the
issues in the '90s, and it still comes up in this
country, you have these design basis issues that were
the heart of some of Millstone's problems and other
plant's problems. And I know INPO, as a result of
that, tried to put somewhat greater emphasis in their
program, at least thinking about design basis issues.
We're still at Point Beach we've got a
design issue there that
DR. PATE: I didn't understand the first
part. I'm sorry.
COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: During the '90s,
we had some real problems in this country with design
basis issues and with
DR. PATE: With design basis, okay.
COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: with design

basis issues. And we basically -- you know, many plants were shut down for significant periods of time. The classic was Millstone.

After that, as I understand it, INPO put some -- founds ways to build design basis issues into their program. You know, as a passing thought, I'll tell you we're still finding significant design basis issues. Point Beach is about to -- has gotten a preliminary red finding and is not really disputing the red finding for an old design issue.

Have you all in WANO thought about design basis issues and making them part of your evaluations in some way? It's not your primary focus. Your focus is operations. But some of these things that we found occasionally were quite significant. D.C. Cook was another example.

DR. PATE: The performance objectives and criteria that are used as a basis for peer reviews — it's a document that gives guidance in each particular functional area and on a range of other broad areas. The ones used by INPO and WANO are closely matched and constantly compared.

So if performance objectives and criteria have guidelines that lead you into design basis issues at INPO, then I think most of that would be

2.2

transferred to the PO&C -- performance objectives and criterias -- for WANO. Having said that, WANO is at a stage of relative infancy in its peer reviews, and I would say that there's only a minimal look at design basis, and that there should be more in the future.

COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Final question I'm going to have -- one of the things I'm proud of we did as a Commission during the last few years that I think improved safety is that we passed a rule -- 5065(a)(4) -- which basically asked licensees to keep a track of their misconfiguration when they're doing online maintenance.

The concern was that with more and more online maintenance happening so that outages could be shorter, that some licensees weren't necessarily using the best tools available to keep track of their risk configuration.

And the licensees who had the tools were

-- I visited Point Beach at one point, and they had a
nice risk monitor, and they told me that at times when
they were planning some maintenance they would find
these resonances where they'd say they were doing X,
and they'd be doing Y, and if they did them at the
same time it was a problem. And it wasn't intuitively
obvious, but once they understood why the risk monitor

2.2

was was shouting at them, they understood it, and
then they obviously amended their maintenance program.
That practice is now obviously the
baseline in America. Have other countries similarly
thought more about whether by a regulation or just by
a peer evaluation, thought more about how to how to
keep their risk configurations under control when
as they do more and more online maintenance and try to
make outages shorter and shorter?
DR. PATE: At least in part by using kind
of a real-time
COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Risk tools.
DR. PATE: GSA.
COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Right.
DR. PATE: That technology is spreading,
and it's I think, you know, in wider use around the
world. But I think that the U.S. is ahead of most
countries on that. You know, there may be some that
are right up there in Western Europe, but it's a good
technology that we should continue to encourage.
COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Part of my
reason for asking the question is to have this
dialogue on the record. Thank you, sir.
CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Commissioner
Merrifield?

1 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Thank you, Mr. 2 Chairman. I'll start, first, with a clarification. 3 4 Commissioner McGaffigan asked a question about the activities you had at INPO relative to Com Ed in terms 5 of sending a letter. And you mentioned to him the 6 7 issues that you had relative to Chernobyl and the Ukraine, and how you were dealing with that at WANO. 8 9 Just for clarification of the record, 10 there wasn't -- are we usually that as an example? 11 Was it or was it not your intention to put those on the same significance level? 12 13 DR. PATE: No. There was no intent to in 14 any way correlate significance. 15 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Okay. 16 DR. PATE: I think as you -- you know, 17 maybe to further clarify that, rather than just leave it as a stark answer, I think as all the Commissioners 18 19 would remember, that we wrestled with Com Ed for a long time trying to get the program to go this way. 20 21 And it seemed to at least many of us that 2.2 it kind of went -- I know your predecessor chairman 23 said at one time they -- I forget -- "the blanket 24 won't cover the whole bed" as a characterization back 25 several years ago.

1 So there wasn't any abrupt change. 2 just pushed harder to try and resolve a long-term kind of troublesome situation that had worried a number of 3 us for some time. 4 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: 5 Issues of the Ukraine were -- given the activities of --6 7 DR. PATE: Totally different situation. COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: -- technologies 8 9 it was more significant in that respect. 10 DR. PATE: Well, yes, totally different 11 situation. 12 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Okay. I just 13 wanted to clarify that. 14 One of the things that I have observed 15 lately -- and it's hard to see where it's going to go; 16 you can't always project into the future. But many 17 countries out there right now are talking about creation of smaller or modular reactor projects that 18 19 would fulfill a variety of purposes -- providing power 20 for remote areas or providing power for desalinization 21 for several countries that are in great need for that. 22 So that would include not just the Pebble 23 Bed project down in South Africa, but the discussions 24 the Russians have had about floating reactors, efforts 25 that China, Korea, Japan, and others have had with

smaller -- thinking about smaller reactors that they 1 2 might be able to sell to some countries. 3 In parallel with that, there are countries 4 out there right now which currently do not have 5 nuclear programs, but that are considering them, Vietnam being I think an example of that. 6 7 DR. PATE: That are considering what? COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: 8 Considering 9 entering into a nuclear program, but that currently do 10 not have them. Vietnam is one example of that. 11 My question of this: to what degree is 12 WANO looking proactively down the road to reach out to 13 countries that might have an interest in having a 14 nuclear power option in their country which -- that 15 don't have it now, to ensure that if they choose that 16 as a national priority that they are prepared for what 17 comes with it, from a safety impact and other things 18 that we collectively are concerned about. 19 DR. PATE: Well, yes, the answer to that 20 is quite straightforward in the sense that WANO 21 traditionally waits until a potential member has a underway, and 22 project that member applies for 23 membership hopefully well in advance of completion of 24 the project.

So WANO has not in any way tried to

influence the question of whether a country built a plan or what choice they made. Iran became a member in March. Iran is building Bushear. WANO had no influence whatsoever on whether Iran built that plant or what technology they chose, but simply took the position, the posture, the policy, that if a country built a nuclear powerplant and plans to operate it for commercial or for, you know, public use, meaning not a weapons plant, then WANO wants to help them operate that plant safely, so we encourage them to become a member.

But that, so far, has been a limit of WANO's involvement with potential -- with countries that potentially want to add a nuclear program.

COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: One of the reasons I raise that is given the nature of the dropin modular projects, and being -- having smaller reactors, that could certainly increase or make wider availability to countries that may not have the capabilities, where we would traditionally think of operating these.

One of the things that INPO and its members do that I think is very meritorious is that when there is a member who is in difficulty, the INPO members and INPO staff try to provide assets,

including sending people from INPO to a site to help 1 2 in recovery efforts -- currently right now, 3 example, in Cooper, there are some INPO folks there. 4 Other members of INPO have sent folks to Cooper to try to help them with some of their difficulties. 5 Is there -- has there been any thought of 6 7 a WANO corollary to this? DR. PATE: I think that I could give you 8 examples of a similar thing being done in Canada, you 9 10 know, to help that member. So it -- certainly, WANO 11 recognizes the benefit and the merits of trying to 12 help a member who is experiencing difficulty. 13 that, in WANO's realm, would be a regional matter. 14 And the region would have to find someone of the same 15 language and culture who could really help. 16 So I think the reality is WANO does little 17 of that, but WANO certainly discusses and will do that 18 when it can. And I think that's a good, important 19 challenge for the future. It's a good point. 20 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: On a related 21 topic, and you mentioned it in your answer, WANO has 2.2 divided itself, to a certain extent, technologically 23 by design, by the reactor style in part. 24 I think one of the benefits of effective 25 review programs is to get a good crosspeer

fertilization, not simply within an owners group, for example, but among different styles of reactors, because not only is it an issue of the technology that you're working on, but an issue of management -- things that we don't get into at the NRC, of management styles, ways in which you manage your workers, work programs, and corrective action programs, and things of that nature.

Is there some thought of enhancing that cross-fertilization? And is that part of the vision of the London center, to try to coordinate a greater amount of that going down the road to avoid too much regionalization?

DR. PATE: Yes. That's a good question and a good point. And a very important part of the answer is that the WANO teams almost always draw on people from all regions. A good example is I was at the exit meeting for a WANO peer review at Louisa plant in Finland. It's a Russian-designed plant.

I would say there were nine people on the team from the Moscow center, mostly Russia, Potts, the Potts plant in Hungary, the Yukivani plant in the Czech Republic, Ukraine, but others. And then there were four or five from Central Europe, from EDF, I think one from Spain, and so on. There were two from

the Atlanta center and one from the Tokyo center.

So that's kind of a typical model of how WANO does a peer review, where the bulk of that team -- the nine or 10 -- are from that region culturally, and that peer review was done in Russian, but everything is translated to English, and the final report is in English.

But the people -- the nine people on the team, and probably about 12 of the 16 or so team members, could speak Russian. And, of course, you have interpreters for those who don't. But it can be done in the language that the operators speak, which is, of course, enormously helpful in the day-to-day dialogue by the team.

But the makeup of the team is truly worldwide and has people who know how EDF runs plants, and, you know, how plants are run in Spain, Hungary, Czech Republic, and the U.S.

So we try and do that, and you're exactly right. The coordinating center in London needs to encourage that, because sometimes the regions will tend to put people from only their region on the team and not have enough representation from other parts of the world who may have a little different slant on management or approaches. It could be valuable, so --

2.2

1 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: But also, 2 strikes me it goes both ways as well, not simply a function of having one of the members come to a site 3 4 and provide that peer review there, but also an effort to get people from those sites out --5 6 DR. PATE: Exactly. 7 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: -- and see how other people --8 9 DR. PATE: Exactly. And, in fact, that 10 proves to be one of the greatest benefits of a peer 11 review is to see something different and something new and often times something better and takes it home. 12 13 As I'm sure has been discussed by this 14 group before, there are three major benefits of peer 15 reviews and evaluations. And the first is the preparation the plant undertakes to get ready, 16 17 sometimes we think that's about half the benefit. then it's the peer review itself that points out 18 19 things that can be improved. And then the third is 20 the people on the team take home fresh ideas. 21 So those three things in combination, in 2.2 my view, make peer reviews a very powerful tool to 23 stimulate improvement around the world. 24 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Okay. 25 that score, I'll tell you about a peer review of my

own. I had not been a Commissioner very long here, and when -- on my first foreign trip I managed to go to Slovenia and visited the Kirshko unit that you mentioned early on.

While I was there, I had an opportunity to have a long discussion with Miraslav Duporach, and during that he quoted to me -- and I've mentioned this before in public -- quoted to me verbatim parts of Reg. Guide 1.174, and much better than I knew it at the time, frankly.

And it struck me the degree to which the NRC has had an impact on our foreign counterparts in terms of helping them with their programs, and we -- and it goes both ways now, which is a healthy thing.

Some years ago, there were a lot of concerns among licensees about the subsidy that they involved had give for us to be in those international programs. Now that Congress has given us money out of the general revenues to help pay for things of that nature -- and those are no longer imposed on our licensees -- I think some of that discussion about our international programs is ebbing.

But the question that I'm coming at from here is to try to see if you have some reflection on the involvement of the NRC in the international arena

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

with our co-regulators. And are there areas, given your wide involvement internationally, where you think it would be helpful for us to become more involved?

DR. PATE: It's difficult for me to, you know, draw on insights from WANO that would be helpful in answering that. But I go back to my opening remarks about, you know, the profound effect of this Commission on the success of the nuclear enterprise, not just in the U.S. but worldwide.

And in response to your question, I think the best suggestion that I could give, which I am confident you do anyway, is to -- as you go through your routine decisionmaking process, take full cognizance that it has enormous effect overseas. And I think the regulators overseas follow closely what happens in this regulatory agency and this Commission. And it doesn't need a lot of stimulation. It takes place anyway.

COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Well, following along on the -- on a question that the Chairman asked -- and I don't want -- my intention is not to have you answer this now, but to perhaps reflect -- sort of a takeaway to reflect on it, and if you had an opportunity to engage with us in a more individual manner later on.

2.2

But it would be helpful to get reflections on countries that it might be useful for involved us become more with, internationally where we may enhance our impact on improving safety, and how we may engage and what regulators we might need to engage with to help bring them up, because as you and you leadership at INPO and WANO have tried to lift the boat among the regulated industry, I think there's a commitment -- I mean, I sense that on -- certainly on my part, and the others here, of trying to lift the boat of our regulatory community so that we're doing the right thing as well. So I don't expect you to answer that

So I don't expect you to answer that directly, but if you had some reflections that you could provide later on, that might be helpful.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Good. Thank you, Dr. Pate, for your presentation. I think it is clear from your comments that WANO was a great success, and that the organization has established a solid foundation and the necessary credibility to sustain itself and its programs in the future. Much of that considerable accomplishment has to do with your leadership.

We thank you, Dr. Pate, for a job and a career well done.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24