

MAR 02 1989

WSEI NOTE NO.2

- 1 -

NOTE FOR: The File

FROM: Michael Lee, Project Officer *MPL*
WSE&I Program Element

SUBJECT: NRC/CNRA PROGRAM ARCHITECTURE REORIENTATION TELEPHONE CONFERENCE

The following is a summary of the items of discussion between NRC and the CNRA regarding the reorientation of the Program Architecture. The discussion focussed on NRC's February 23, 1989 response to the Center's February 15, 1989 query on the same subject (see attachments). Those staff in attendance were as follows:

<u>NRC:</u>	RBrowning	JLinehan	<u>CNRA:</u>	JLatz
	JBunting	MLee		WPatrick
	PAitmare	JHolonich		AWhiting
	JMoore	BBordenick		TRomine

Discussion Point #1 -- TECHNICAL COMPONENTS OF PROOF AS A PROPOSED CONCEPT

Given NRC's concerns and the Center's preferences regarding the proposed concept, the following was agreed upon. There would be separate data fields in PASS containing REOP's and a combined field containing REOP's and TCOP's that would be clearly separate and titled. The title for this latter data field, and replacing the TCOP title, will be proposed by the Center. The definitions would be modified to clarify that only REOP's must be proven.

Discussion Point #2 -- PROGRAM ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT RELATED TO LOW- AND HIGH-RISK UNCERTAINTIES

The Center expressed concerns regarding the potential for dual development of the PA process for low-risk uncertainties and high-risk uncertainties reviewed by NRC. It was agreed that no regulatory requirement topic containing either low-risk uncertainties and high-risk uncertainties reviewed by NRC would be PA mainstreamed until NRC reached a decision (10-day review) with regard to the nature of the high-risk uncertainty.

Discussion Point #3 -- CLARIFICATION OF POSTULATED UNCERTAINTY REDUCTION LANGUAGE (PURL's)

This discussion point focussed on clarifying the definition of PURL's. The notion behind the proposed concept (correspondence dated February 8, 1989) was that PURL's would be written in such a manner that would reflect what the analyst would say in order to eliminate the uncertainty. Furthermore, the preparation of a PURL itself is not intended to suggest or imply that rulemaking is the vehicle for reducing the uncertainty. Again, the notion was that the Center would write PURL's, when appropriate, and NRC would determine how to implement the fix.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ 710 8703090468

MAR 02 1989

- 2 -

The Center requested, and NRC agreed, to have an opportunity to review the definition of the PURL concept and propose, as necessary, recommendations regarding changes to the language of the concept.

Discussion Point #4 -- STEP #2 OF THE 2/15/89 FIVE-STEP APPROACH

NRC proposed changing its recommendation of February 23, 1989 regarding step #2 of the Center's February 15, 1989 five-step approach addressing uncertainty reduction. This change is in response to a recent understanding that in the analysis associated with the major milestone R8 letter report the Center was not directed to develop weighting factors. Nonetheless, the attributes developed may have application in identifying so-called "high-risk" uncertainties. Therefore, the following was proposed, and agreed to by the Center, for step #2:

"Step 2. NRC will approve weighting factors recommended by the Center for general application in preliminary rank-ordering of uncertainties. NRC may modify those factors on a case-by-case basis."

Following resolution of this discussion, two additional points were raised for consideration. The first concerned identifying and reaching closure on those additional points as they relate to Program Architecture process and content that are derived from the CNWRA "lessons learned" and NRC's comments on regulatory requirement topics E17 and E36. NRC and the CNWRA agreed to meet on March 9 and 10, 1989 in San Antonio to reach closure on those points considered to be of mutual interest in this area. NRC will identify what it considers to be the pertinent discussion points, in a letter prior to the agreed meeting date. Generally these points are thought to be as follows:

1. Specification for the Program Architecture September deliverable.
2. Establishing a requirement for technical projects to contribute to Program Architecture.
3. Establishing a process for NRC/CNWRA task interaction leading to NRC Program Architecture data base acceptance.
4. Updated Program Architecture milestone schedule.

The final discussion point concerned development of an Operations Plan for WSE&I Program Subelement which includes the performance assessment task (task no. 4). It was agreed that scoping meetings between NRC and the CNWRA should precede the drafting of any such plan. The date for the meetings is to be determined but could be expected to occur sometime this Spring.

~~Enclosures (2): As stated → same as attachment 4~~