

**APPENDIX N - REGION IV OPERATING TEST SCENARIO REVIEW MATRIX**

Scen Set	1 ES	2 TS	3 Crit	4 IC	5 Pred	6 TL	7 L/C	8 Eff	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation (See below for instructions)
1									E	Indicate in Event 2 what conclusions the SRO should draw from his TS review;(Declares Inop.) Event 3 ( <b>not credited</b> )does not seem to require any operator actions, so it cannot be credited as a malfunction;
2									E	There are only 6 malfunctions rather than the 7 claimed on ES-301-4; Recirc. line rupture should probably be counted as Major malfunction rather than Component failure; <b>OK</b>
3									E	There are only 6 malfunctions rather than the 7 claimed on ES-301-4; <b>OK</b>

**Instructions for Completing Matrix**

This form is not contained in or required by NUREG-1021. Utilities are not required or encouraged to use it. The purpose of this form is to enhance regional consistency in reviewing operating test scenario sets. Additional information on these areas may be found in Examination Good Practices Appendix D. Check or mark any item(s) requiring comment and explain the issue in the space provided.

1. ES: ES-301 checklists 4, 5, & 6 satisfied.
2. TS: Set includes SRO TS actions for each SRO, with required actions explicitly detailed.
3. Crit: Each manipulation or evolution has explicit success criteria documented in Form ES-D-2.
4. IC: Out of service equipment and other initial conditions reasonably consistent between scenarios and not predictive of scenario events and actions.
5. Pred: Scenario sequence and other factors avoid predictability issues.
6. TL: Time line constructed, including event and process triggered conditions, such that scenario can run without routine examiner cuing.
7. L/C: Length and complexity for each scenario in the set is reasonable for the crew mix being examined, such that all applicants have reasonably similar exposure and events are needed for evaluation purposes.
8. Eff: Sequence of events is reasonably efficient for examination purposes, especially with respect to long delays or interactions.
9. Based on the reviewer's judgment, is the scenario set as written (U)nacceptable (requiring repair or replacement), in need of (E)ditorial enhancement, or (S)atisfactory?
10. Provide a brief description of problem in the explanation column