

June 7, 2002

MEMORANDUM TO: Mark A. Satorius, Chief  
Performance Assessment Section  
Inspection Program Branch  
Division of inspection Program Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: John W. Thompson, Senior Reactor Operations Engineer */RA/*  
Inspection Program Branch  
Division of Inspection Program Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY ON THE MITIGATING  
SYSTEM PERFORMANCE INDEX PILOT HELD ON  
May 23, 2002

On May 23, 2002, a public meeting was held in OWFN, room 7B4, to discuss developing success criteria necessary to support the Mitigating System Performance Index (MSPI) pilot. An attendance list, draft success criteria, and future meeting schedule are included in the attachment list below.

The all-day meeting consisted of a brief historical review of the development of the MSPI pilot, addressing industry open implementation issues, as well as what changes may be necessary to the revised oversight process upon full implementation of the MSPI. Meeting participants agreed that table top scenarios would be conducted prior to and during the MSPI pilot that would evaluate the methodology and significance outcome of the MSPI and to compare those results with an evaluation to the significance determination process.

At the conclusion of the meeting, staff agreed in principle to go to full implementation of the MSPI upon a successful completion of the MSPI pilot, if the success criteria was met and any identified inconsistencies from the table top assessments and analysis of pilot data revealed no significant unintended consequences that could not be resolved.

The next public MSPI meeting is scheduled for June 13, 2002, in OWFN, 07B4.

Attachments:

1. Attendance List
2. Draft Success Criteria
3. Schedule of MSPI Future Meetings and Milestones

June 7, 2002

MEMORANDUM TO: Mark A. Satorius, Chief  
Performance Assessment Section  
Inspection Program Branch  
Division of inspection Program Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: John W. Thompson, Senior Reactor Operations Engineer */RA/*  
Inspection Program Branch  
Division of Inspection Program Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY ON THE MITIGATING  
SYSTEM PERFORMANCE INDEX PILOT HELD ON  
May 23, 2002

On May 23, 2002, a public meeting was held in OWFN, room 7B4, to discuss developing success criteria necessary to support the Mitigating System Performance Index (MSPI) pilot. An attendance list, draft success criteria, and future meeting schedule are included in the attachment list below.

The all-day meeting consisted of a brief historical review of the development of the MSPI pilot, addressing industry open implementation issues, as well as what changes may be necessary to the revised oversight process upon full implementation of the MSPI. Meeting participants agreed that table top scenarios would be conducted prior to and during the MSPI pilot that would evaluate the methodology and significance outcome of the MSPI and to compare those results with an evaluation to the significance determination process.

At the conclusion of the meeting, staff agreed in principle to go to full implementation of the MSPI upon a successful completion of the MSPI pilot, if the success criteria was met and any identified inconsistencies from the table top assessments and analysis of pilot data revealed no significant unintended consequences that could not be resolved.

The next public MSPI meeting is scheduled for June 13, 2002, in OWFN, 07B4.

Attachments:

1. Attendance List
2. Draft Success Criteria
3. Schedule of MSPI Future Meetings and Milestones

**DISTRIBUTION:**

NRC File Center IIPB r/f

Accession #ML021570027

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without enclosures "E" = Copy with enclosures "N" = No copy

<b>OFC:</b>	DIPM/IIPB				
<b>NAME:</b>	JWThompson				
<b>DATE:</b>	06/07/02				

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

**ATTENDANCE LIST****INDUSTRY/STAFF MSPI PILOT PUBLIC MEETING**

May 23, 2002

	<b><u>NAME</u></b>	<b><u>AFFILIATION</u></b>
1)	Serita Sanders	NRC
2)	Steve Floyd	NEI
3)	Thomas C. Houghton	NEI
4)	Petteri Tiippana	NRC
5)	Robin Ritzman	PSEG
6)	Greg Gibson	SCE
7)	Ken Heffner	Progress
8)	Stan Ketelsen	PS&G
9)	Hossein Hamzehee	NRC
10)	John Thompson	NRC
11)	Wade Warren	Southern Nuclear
12)	Duane Kanitz	APS
13)	Dale Ambler	Exelon
14)	Deann Raleigh	Scientech
15)	Patrick Baranowsky	NRC
16)	W.E. Moorhoek	STP NOC
17)	Don Olson	Dominion
18)	Susan Ferrell	TVA
19)	Mark Ring	NRC
20)	Deann Raleigh	LIS, Scientech
21)	David Hembree	INPO
22)	Glenn Meyer	NRC
23)	Mike Parker	NRC
24)	Max Schneider	NRC
25)	Kery Landis	NRC
26)	Randy Musser	NRC
27)	Bennett Brady	NRC
28)	Ray Larson	NRC
29)	Rick Rasmussen	NRC
30)	Dan Marks	Palo Verde
31)	Laura Dudes	NRC
32)	Gene Dorman	Entergy
33)	Greg Krueger	Exelon
34)	William Dean	NRC

**DRAFT SUCCESS CRITERIA - MSPI PILOT**  
**MSPI Planning Committee Meeting**  
**May 23, 2002**

Statement of Purpose

Upon successful completion of the following success criteria, with a determination that the MSPI pilot is a valid and appropriate means of measuring risk for the monitored systems, then the MSPI will suffice as the measure of assessment and not the significance determination process for failures of the active components monitored by the MSPI. It is expected that the MSPI will not give an indication that overall industry performance has changed, but will provide a simplified method to monitor the risk impact of changes in performance of the monitored systems.

Draft Success Criteria

- 1) Overall assessment of the MSPI will satisfy the ROP objective of:
  - a) Maintain Safety: MSPI capable of discerning significant departures from expected performance that warrant additional attention.
  - b) Enhancing Public Confidence: MSPI is at least as understandable as the current indicator.
  - c) Improving the Efficiency and Effectiveness of NRC Processes: Less NRC time is spent on single demand failure SDPs and fault exposure data issues.
  - d) Reducing Unnecessary Regulatory Burden: The overall resources needed to satisfy the new indicator are less than the old indicator considering for example, the balance of additional reporting elements with the elimination of duplicate records for MR, PRA, and RP data, and less time on single demand failure SDP evaluation.
- 2) For highly reliable components that also have risk significance, the occurrence of a single failure of such a component should rarely exceed the green/white MSPI, as measured from the baseline value.
- 3) Instances where the MSPI is statistically or technically invalid are rare. (I.e., the false positive/false negative indication should be acceptable.)
- 4) Instances where the results from the MSPI calculational methodology are not consistent with the SPAR-3 models are rare.
- 5) There will be no significant technical problems that can't be resolved before full MSPI implementation.
- 6) The MSPI pilot plant participants can: (1) identify and compile the risk significant functions for the monitored systems in a readily inspectable format, and (2) compile a set of predetermined success criteria for the risk significant functions.
- 7) The active components in the monitored system are suitable for monitoring by the MSPI and are a manageable number of components under the MSPI.

- 8) By the end of the pilot, MSPI data can be accurately reported and quality checked.
- 9) By the end of the pilot, guidelines are sufficiently detailed to minimize FAQs and NRC feedback forms.
- 10) FAQs and NRC feedback forms do not reveal any non-resolvable issue(s).
- 11) Data inconsistencies between the maintenance rule and the MSPI can be reconciled in order to eliminate or significantly reduce separate reporting.

#### Pre-Full Implementation Issue

- 1) If the Success Criteria 2 through 4 are met, (i.e., the identified instances are rare), then the ROP should be revised to provide a decision process and a rational basis that justify use of the MSPI results in lieu of the SDP. The basis should include addressing the inconsistency between the SPAR-3 model or licensee plant-specific PRA, and the calculational methodology used by the MSPI and why it is adequate to use the MSPI result.
- 2) The MSPI guidance should be evaluated for consistency and coherence with the Maintenance Rule inspection and SDP guidance.

**MITIGATING SYSTEMS PERFORMANCE INDICATOR PILOT PROGRAM  
TIME LINE OF PLANNED ACTIVITIES**

**MONTH OF June, 2002****Program/Technical Lead**

June 12	ROP Public Meeting	John Thompson
June 13	MSPI Committee Public Meeting	John Thompson

**MONTH OF JULY, 2002**

No July ROP public meeting

July 23-25	Tentative Date of MSPI Public Workshop (Place T.D.)	John Thompson/NEI
------------	--	-------------------

**MONTH OF AUGUST, 2002**

August 1	Start of MSPI	N/A
----------	---------------	-----

**MONTH OF SEPTEMBER, 2002**

September 1	Start of MSPI data collection	N/A
-------------	-------------------------------	-----

**MONTH OF NOVEMBER, 2002**

November	Brief ACRS subcommittee on pilot progress	NRR/RES
----------	---	---------

**MONTH OF FEBRUARY, 2003**

February 28	End of data collection period. Start of data analysis	
-------------	---	--

**MONTH OF MARCH, 2003**

March	Brief ACRS Subcommittee on pilot progress	N/A
-------	---	-----

**MONTH OF JULY, 2003**

July	End of Pilot. RIS to communicate pilot results to public	N/A
------	--	-----