Draft Federal Register Notice

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Draft Regulatory Guide and associated Standard Review Plan; Issuance, Availability, Workshop

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has issued for public comment a regulatory guide (and its associated Standard Review Plan) in its Regulatory Guide Series. This series has been developed to describe and make available to the public such information as methods acceptable to the NRC staff for implementing specific parts of the NRC's regulations, techniques used by the staff in evaluating specific problems or postulated accidents, and data needed by the staff in its review of applications for permits and licenses.

The specific documents available for comment are draft regulatory guide DG 1122, "An Approach for Determining the Technical Adequacy of Probabilistic Risk Assessment Results for Risk-Informed Activities," and its companion Standard Review Plan (SRP), Chapter 19.1

The purpose of the regulatory guide is to (1) provide guidance to licensees for an acceptable approach to demonstrate with appropriate documentation that those parts of the probabilistic risk assessment (PRA) used in a regulatory application are of sufficient quality to support the analysis, (2) provide guidance on determining the technical adequacy of the PRA results (via e.g., consensus PRA standards), and (3) provide the NRC position on consensus PRA standards and industry PRA program documents.

The purpose of the SRP Chapter 19.1is to provide guidance to the staff on how to determine that the PRA providing the results being used in the decision is technically adequate.

It is the NRC's intent to update this RG, at a minimum, when a new or revised PRA standard or industry program is published. If a new standard or program is published, an additional appendix will be added containing the staff position. If a current standard or program is revised which would impact the staff position, the appropriate appendix would be revised.

The NRC intends to conduct a workshop on September 19, 2002, at the Doubletree Inn Executive Meeting Center, 1750 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, (301) 468-1100, to discuss and explain the material contained in DG 1122 and SRP Chapter 19.1, and to answer questions and receive comments and feedback on the proposed documents. The purpose of the workshop is to facilitate the comment process. In the workshop, the staff will describe each document and its basis and solicit comment and feedback on their completeness, correctness, and usefulness. Since these documents cover a wide range of technical areas, many topics will be discussed. Listed below are particular topics (not limited to) on which discussion and feedback are sought at the workshop:

(1) Is the relationship of this regulatory guide to other regulatory guides (e.g., RG 1.174, RG 1.177) and how this regulatory guide is to be used to support risk-informed applications clear? If more discussion is needed, what level of detail is needed?

(2) Is the associated SRP the appropriate place for the staff review guidance, or should the guidance be included in the application specific SRPs?

(3) Is the level of detail in the guidance in regard to demonstrating the technical adequacy of the PRA to support a regulatory application contained in the proposed regulatory guide clear and sufficient, or is more detailed guidance necessary? What level of detail is needed?

(4) Is the level of detail in the guidance in regard to the scope, level of detail and technical adequacy of the PRA contained in the proposed regulatory guide clear and sufficient, or is more detailed guidance necessary? What level of detail is needed?

(5) Is the level of detail in the guidance in regard to staff regulatory position on consensus PRA standards and industry PRA programs contained in the proposed regulatory guide clear and sufficient, or is more detailed guidance necessary? What level of detail is needed?

(6) Is the level of detail in the guidance in regard to documentation and submittal contained in the proposed regulatory guide clear and sufficient, or is more detailed guidance necessary? What level of detail is needed?

(7) Is the staff position in the appendices of the proposed regulatory guide clear, or is more discussion necessary? What level of detail is needed?

(8) In Appendix A, is the discussion provided on the "issue" helpful or necessary in providing the bases for the staff position? If not, should this column be removed, or is more discussion needed and what would be the appropriate level of detail?

(9) In Appendix A, the staff has provided "Clarification" to the definition regarding "dominant," "significant," and "important." Clarification of these terms is provided because in places, these terms are used interchangeably (to have the same meaning) and in other places, they may be used to convey different meanings. In the context of a PRA, these terms generally are indicating that the entity under question is a major factor to the outcome under consideration. In this general sense, these terms can be used interchangeably (e.g., an important sequence, a significant sequence, a dominant sequence). However, if these terms are used to distinguish whether a requirement is imposed, a common and specific understanding (i.e., quantitative) of these terms is needed. Is this the appropriate quantitative definition? If not, what quantitative definition is appropriate?

(10) In Appendix B, the staff review of NEI-00-02 and its supplemental guidance, is based on the perspective that this document is primarily historical in that almost all the licensee's PRAs have been peer reviewed using NEI-00-02, Rev A3. Consequently, the staff endorsement does not address future use of this document. Where the staff has objection to this document, the resolution would be addressed via a licensee's self assessment. Is this approach appropriate; that is, should the staff extend its review so that industry would have the staff position regarding this process for future use?

In order to gain experience and more detailed insights into the use of the approach proposed in DG-1122 and the associated draft SRP section, during the public comment period the NRC desires to conduct a review of one or more pilot applications (e.g., Risk-Informed Technical Specifications Initiative 4b, "Configuration Risk Management for Completion Times") using this approach. The experience and insights gained from the practical application of the approach proposed in DG-1122 and the associated draft SRP section will support the staff's risk-informed regulatory initiatives, consistent with the NRC's policy statement on PRA. The lessons learned from the pilot application(s) will be documented and reflected in the final RG. Since this pilot application(s) will assist the NRC in developing a RG, the Chief Financial Officer will waive the review fees in accordance with 10 CFR 170.11(b)(1). By granting this waiver for the pilot application(s), the NRC continues its longstanding policy of granting fee exemptions for the review of license applications accepted for review as a pilot application(s).

The NRC staff is soliciting comments on these proposed documents. Comments may be accompanied by relevant information or supporting data. Written comments may be submitted to the Rules and Directives Branch, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Copies of comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD. Comments will be most helpful if received by **November 10, 2002.**

You may also provide comments via the NRC's interactive rulemaking web site through the NRC home page (http://www.nrc.gov). This site provides the ability to upload comments as files (any format) if your web browser supports that function. For information about the interactive rulemaking web site, contact Ms. Carol Gallagher, (301) 415-5905; email CAG@NRC.GOV. For information about the draft guide and the related standard review plan chapter, contact Ms. M.T. Drouin at (301)415-6675; email MXD@NRC.GOV.

Although a time limit is given for comments on this draft guide, comments and suggestions in connection with items for inclusion in guides currently being developed or improvements in all published guides are encouraged at any time.

Electronic copies of this draft RG are available on the NRC's web site <www.nrc.gov> in the Reference Library under Regulatory Guides. Electronic copies are also available in NRC's Public Electronic Reading Room at the same web site; DG-1122 is under ADAMS Accession Number_____. Regulatory guides are available for inspection at the NRC's Public Document Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD; the PDR's mailing address is USNRC PDR, Washington, DC 20555; telephone (301)415-4737 or (800)397-4205; fax (301)415-3548; email PDR@NRC.GOV. Requests for single copies of draft or final guides (which may be reproduced) or for placement on an automatic distribution list for single copies of future draft guides in specific divisions should be made in writing to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Reproduction and Distribution Services Section; or by email to DISTRIBUTION@NRC.GOV; or by fax to (301)415-2289. Telephone requests cannot be accommodated. Regulatory guides are not copyrighted, and Commission approval is not required to reproduce them.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this _____ day of _____ 2002.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

_____

Scott F. Newberry, Director

Division of Risk Analysis and Applications

Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research