

REACTOR OVERSIGHT PROCESS INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION PANEL
MEETING - PARKING LOT / FOLLOW-UP ISSUES

Date & Time:

Wednesday, November 1, 2000, 1:00 pm - 5:00 pm

Thursday, November 2, 2000, 8:00 am - 4:30 pm

Location:

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

11545 Rockville Pike

Room T-8A1

Rockville, MD

1. Should the panel evaluate the status of issues identified in the Commission's Staff Requirements Memorandums dated March 28, 2000 and May 17, 2000?
2. Should the panel evaluate the status of recommendations identified by the Pilot Program Evaluation Panel in their final report?
3. A complete list of future meetings associated with the Reactor Oversight Process should be provided to the panel.
4. Should the panel independently evaluate and draw their own conclusions on the raw data collected by the staff in their assessment of the reactor oversight process, as opposed just evaluating the staff's conclusions reached from their assessment of the data?
5. The panel should be provided with a copy of the "cross-cutting" issues report when it is issued.
6. Is there a clear and consistent process for addressing discrepant performance indicators? Should the self-assessment process look into this?
7. For the ROP performance metric OP1.b, the staff should consider a discriminator by performance indicator and clarify that change reports should be limited to errors.
8. The October 16, 2000 memorandum on the Reactor Oversight Process Self-Assessment is not in plain English, but should be.
9. Is there the need for a metric when performance isn't actually degraded but the measure is tripped - a "false positive"?
10. Do we need a broader definition of "unintended consequences"?
11. What is the process for getting issues onto the "frequently asked questions" list? How does the general public get information on past questions and answers?
12. Should the performance indicator thresholds be evaluated for "false positives" and "false negatives"?

13. Is consideration of licensee cost in providing information to the NRC factored into the overall burden reduction issue?
14. Are there elements of the reactor oversight process that may have unnecessarily increased burden on licensees?
15. How will the NRC assure consistency from Region to Region in reporting data for the self-assessment metrics?
16. Are there measures on how well inspectors are following the procedures and what information is available on this?
17. How were unusual events and emergencies factored into developed of the self-assessment metrics?
18. Should a metric be developed for number of findings per inspection hour?
19. How does the self-assessment process evaluate the handoff of plants from the MC 0350 process to the reactor oversight process?
20. The panel would like to hear feedback from a group of Senior Reactor Analysts.