

# **Accident Sequence Precursor (ASP) Peer Review Criteria and Procedures**

**Office of RES  
Division of Risk Analysis and Applications  
Operating Experience Risk Analysis Branch**

**Nilesh Chokshi, Branch Chief  
Michael Cheok, Assistant Branch Chief  
Gary DeMoss, ASP Program**

# ASP Peer Review Criteria and Procedures

## Meeting Objective

To discuss ways to achieve efficiencies in the transmittal and review of ASP analyses.

## Desired Outcome

Provide on a risk-informed transmittal and review criteria and processes for ASP analyses. Request comments from industry and staff on the proposal.

## Relevant Objectives of the ASP Review Process

- Maintain high level of confidence that all “significant” precursors ( $CCDP \geq 10^{-3}$ ) and precursors ( $CCDP \geq 10^{-6}$ ) are systematically identified, evaluated and documented so that insights can be factored into other Agency processes.
- Focus resources for risk significant analyses and reduce effort on less risk significant analyses
- Provide stakeholders a chance to comment on relevant analyses
- Reduce the time to issue final analysis of precursors of low risk significance.

## Implementing efficiencies can reduce unnecessary burden on:

- NRR/Projects - issuing letter requesting comments and closeout
- Regions; NRR - reviews of analyses in which no differences in SDP results were noted.
- RES:
  - Package preparation when SDP is well documented.
  - Coordination with NRR/DLPM on issuing packages
- Licensee:
  - Eliminate licensee reviews for conditions in which licensee’s comments were already provided during the SDP process
  - Eliminate licensee reviews for initiating events in which licensee analysis results were documented in the LER

## Description of ASP Review Procedures

Criteria	Procedure
<b>A. Formal peer review required</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RES/OERAB completes internal ASP program reviews</li> <li>• OERAB Branch Chief sends memo requesting review from staff and transmittal to licensee</li> <li>• NRR/DLPM transmits letter to licensee</li> <li>• NRR/Regions and licensee reviews analysis, and provides comments as appropriate .</li> <li>• RES/OERAB responds to comments and revises final analysis</li> <li>• RES/DRAA Division Director sends transmittal memo containing final results</li> <li>• NRR/DLPM transmits letter to licensee</li> <li>• Package in ADAMS made public</li> <li>• Final analysis to ASP database update (via RES web page) (future)</li> <li>• Results to annual SECY paper, ITP, and Performance &amp; Accountability Report</li> </ul>
<b>B. Final transmittal required</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RES/OERAB completes internal ASP program reviews</li> <li>• RES/DRAA Division Director sends transmittal memo containing final results</li> <li>• NRR/DLPM transmits letter to licensee</li> <li>• Package in ADAMS made public</li> <li>• Final analysis to ASP database update (via RES web page) (future)</li> <li>• Results to annual SECY paper, ITP, and Performance &amp; Accountability Report</li> </ul>

## Proposed Reviews by ASP Report Types

ASP Package	Current	Proposed
CCDP or $\Delta$ CCDP $> 10^{-4}$	<i>Formal Review</i>	<i>Formal Review</i>
ASP results vs. SDP color (CCDP or $\Delta$ CCDP in $10^{-5}$ range)		
ASP = SDP	Final Transmittal	Final Transmittal or Accept SDP**
ASP < SDP	<i>Formal Review</i>	Final Transmittal* (Staff Review)
ASP > SDP	<i>Formal Review</i>	<i>Formal Review</i>
ASP has windowed conditions	<i>Formal Review</i>	<i>Formal Review</i>
ASP results vs. SDP color (CCDP or $\Delta$ CCDP $< 1 \times 10^{-5}$ )		
ASP = SDP	Final Transmittal	Final Transmittal or Accept SDP**
ASP < SDP	<i>Formal Review</i>	Final Transmittal* (Staff Review)
ASP > SDP	<i>Formal Review</i>	<i>Final Transmittal</i>
ASP has windowed conditions	<i>Formal Review</i>	<i>Final Transmittal</i>
No SDP—ASP results vs. LER PRA results (CCDP or $\Delta$ CCDP in $1 \times 10^{-5}$ range)		
ASP = LER	Final Transmittal	Final Transmittal*
ASP < LER	<i>Formal Review</i>	Final Transmittal*
ASP > LER	<i>Formal Review</i>	<i>Formal Review</i>
none provided by licensee	<i>Formal Review</i>	<i>Formal Review</i>
No SDP—ASP results vs. LER PRA results (CCDP or $\Delta$ CCDP $< 1 \times 10^{-5}$ )		
ASP = LER	Final Transmittal	Final Transmittal*
ASP < LER	<i>Formal Review</i>	Final Transmittal*
ASP > LER	<i>Formal Review</i>	Final Transmittal
none provided by licensee	<i>Formal Review</i>	Final Transmittal

\* Accepting the SDP will be more common as RASP is implemented, and documentation standards are improved.

\* Potential for no package transmittal to the licensee.

**NOTE:** > or < means significantly greater than or significantly less than