

# Nuclear Regulatory Commission

## Office of New Reactors

### NRO Office Instruction

---

Office Instruction: **NRO-REG-100**

Office Instruction Title: **Acceptance Review Process for Design Certification and Combined License Applications**

Revision Number:

Effective Date: **September 26, 2007**

Primary Contact: **Stephen S. Koenick, NRO/DNRL**

Responsible Organization: **NRO/DNRL**

**Summary of Changes:** This initial issuance of NRO-REG-100, "Acceptance Review Process for Design Certification and Combined License Applications," provides guidance for the staff to determine the completeness and technical sufficiency of a design certification or combined license application during the acceptance review process. Updates and revisions will be made based on experience with this initial version.

Training: Email; division and branch presentations as requested

ADAMS Package Accession No.: ML072250552

Concurrences			
Primary Office Owner	Office of New Reactors		
Primary Contact	Stephen Koenick		9/18/07
Responsible Branch Chief	William Reckley		9/19/07
Responsible Manager	DNRL	Patrick Madden	9/24/07
Acceptance Review Task Force Lead	DE	Laura Dudes	9/23/07
OGC		Sara Brock (NLO)	9/19/07
ODNRO	Deputy Director	GHolahan	9/26/07

OFFICIAL RECORD

Page Left Intentionally Blank

# NRO Office Instruction NRO-REG-100

## Acceptance Review Process for Design Certification and Combined License Applications

---

### 1. **PURPOSE**

The purpose of NRO-REG-100, "Acceptance Review Process for Design Certification and Combined License Applications," is to provide guidance to the staff who conduct acceptance reviews for design certification (DC) and combined license (COL) applications submitted under Title 10, Part 52, "Licenses, Certifications, and Approvals for Nuclear Power Plants," of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR Part 52).

### 2. **GENERAL REQUIREMENTS**

The regulations in 10 CFR Part 2 prescribe the requirements for determining the acceptability of an application. In accordance with 10 CFR 2.101(a) or Section 2.815, a COL or a DC application will be assigned a docket number after the tendered application has been evaluated for completeness. These sections provide that the NRC may determine, at its discretion, the acceptability for docketing of an application based on the technical sufficiency of the application as well as the completeness of the application. In addition, Section 2.101(a)(5) allows for a COL application to be submitted in two parts. One part shall be accompanied by the information required by 52.80(b). The other part shall include the information required by 52.79 and 52.80(a). Whichever part is filed first shall also include the information required by 10 CFR 50.33, 52.79(a)(1), and 10 CFR 50.37. One part may precede or follow other parts by no longer than 6 months. Each part of the tendered application will receive an acceptance review and will be docketed, if found complete and technically sufficient.

The determination of acceptability for docketing is generally made within a period of thirty (30) days. In Staff Requirements Memorandum for COMDEK-07-0001/COMJSM-07-0001 - Report of the Combined License Review Task Force, dated June 22, 2007, the Commission directed the staff to determine acceptability of COL applications on the basis of the technical sufficiency as well as its completeness within a period of sixty (60) days. This office instruction provides the guidance and criteria to be used in this expanded review. This expanded acceptance review will also be used to confirm planning assumptions (i.e., resources and schedule associated with the application review).

The staff conducts a completeness review to ensure that the applicant has submitted all of the information required by the applicable regulations in Part 52.<sup>1</sup> The staff will utilize Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.206, "Combined License Applications for Nuclear Power Plants (LWR Edition)," NUREG-0800, "Standard Review Plan for the Review of Safety Analysis

---

<sup>1</sup>The required information varies by type of licensing process: Subpart B, "Standard Design Certifications," and Subpart C, "Combined Licenses."

Reports for Nuclear Power Plants,” and NUREG-1555, “Standard Review Plans for Environmental Reviews for Nuclear Power Plants,” in performing its completeness review. RG 1.206 provides a COL application review checklist for the staff to follow in determining the completeness of the application. Staff should note, previously certified design information is not within the scope of a COLA acceptance review.

The staff also conducts a technical sufficiency review to ensure that the application contains sufficient technical information in scope and depth for the staff to begin its detailed technical review and complete it within a predictable timeframe. The Standard Review Plans (SRPs) provide guidance to the technical staff on performing their safety reviews of applications to construct and operate nuclear power plants and applications to approve standard designs and sites for nuclear power plants.

In consideration of magnitude of prospective COLAs the NRC may receive, the staff has developed a design-centered-review approach (DCRA).<sup>2</sup> With the DCRA, staff decisions made on the “reference COL” would apply to all “subsequent COLs”. Therefore, during performance of an acceptance review of a subsequent COLA, the staff is expected to verify the degree of standardization to the reference COL but focus its review on site-specific, application specific issues.

In addition, the Commission’s Final Policy Statement on the Use of Probabilistic Risk Assessment Methods in Nuclear Regulatory Activities (FR, Vol. 60, p. 42622, August 16, 1995) states, “The use of PRA technology should be increased in all regulatory matters to the extent supported by the state-of-the-art in PRA methods and data and in a manner that complements the NRC’s deterministic approach and supports the NRC’s traditional defense-in-depth philosophy.” To the extent available, application of risk-insights to the acceptance review will occur during the technical sufficiency review and will allow for risk insights to be factored into determining the scope of technical review during the acceptance review period.

NRO has prepared pre-baseline review schedules for each application based on design centers as captured within the Enterprise Project Management (EPM). These pre-baseline schedules contain estimated staff-hours to conduct the review based on the anticipated scope of review (e.g., for a COL application (COLA) referencing a DC, the review hours are adjusted down to a minimal review effort for areas incorporated by reference to the DC. Similarly, a subsequent COL is expected to need less staff-hours than the reference COL). These schedules are utilized for all planning assumptions. The acceptance review provides the opportunity to identify potential changes to the schedule and hours based on insights gained from the review of the applications. At the completion of the acceptance review, a baseline review schedule with adjusted staff-hours is developed for the review of the application.

NRC inspectors from the Quality and Vendor Branches (CQVB/CQVP) may conduct an audit of the preparation of the application to support the acceptance review in accordance with NRC Inspection Manual Chapter (IMC) 2502, “Construction Inspection Program: Pre-Combined License (Pre-COL) Phase.” The results of this audit may

---

<sup>2</sup>Additional information on DCRA is provided in SECY-06-0019, dated January 31, 2006.

inform the acceptance review. This audit will typically be conducted within 30-60 days before the application is scheduled to be submitted to the NRC. Through implementation of IMC 2502, Project Managers (PMs) and technical staff may participate in the audit to assess the content of the application within their purview. Observations of the review of the completed portions of the application against RG 1.206 will be compiled from the audit and provided to individuals performing the acceptance review of the application. Issues from these observations will be documented in the audit report. In addition, staff will also consider auditing the applicants PRA at this time to support the use of risk-insights during the acceptance review.

### **3. SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS**

#### **3.1 Responsibilities**

##### **3.1.1 Project Management**

###### **Projects**

The Lead PM in the design-specific project branch within the Division of New Reactor Licensing (DNRL)

- Coordinates activities associated with NRO-REG-100.
- Performs administrative activities associated with the acceptance review.
- Reviews assigned sections to evaluate the completeness and technical sufficiency of the application.
- Performs interactions with stakeholders in accordance with the COL Communication Plan.
- Manages acceptance review activities via the EPM.
- Compiles inputs from all technical branches.
- Refers technical staff to QAVB audit report, if available.
- Refers technical staff to risk-insights, if available.
- Briefs management on results and recommends acceptability of application for docketing to Division management (NRO and NSIR).
- Supports the technical staff by reviewing the application for completeness.

The DNRL Projects Branch Chief

- Evaluates the overall application acceptability based upon the results of the PM's and technical staff's review for completeness and technical sufficiency.
- Briefs senior management on the status of the review.
- Issues results of review, Federal Register Notice/Letter to applicant. For docketed applications, this includes an application-specific schedule.

###### **Environmental**

The Environmental PM in the Environmental Projects Branch (RAP1/RAP2) within the Division of Site and Environmental Reviews (DSER)

- Coordinates activities associated with NRO-REG-100 related to the environmental review for a COLA.

- Supports the Lead PM in performing administrative activities associated with the acceptance review.
- Reviews Environmental Report to evaluate the completeness and technical sufficiency of the application.
- Compiles environmental inputs from assigned technical branches.
- Provides results of environmental report acceptance review to Lead PM
- Supports management briefings of acceptance review results.

#### The DSER Projects Branch Chief

- Evaluates the environmental report acceptability based upon the results of the PM's and technical staff's review for completeness and technical sufficiency.
- Supports management briefings of acceptance review results.

### **Planning and Scheduling**

#### The Planning and Scheduling Branch (NPLS) PM

- Prior to receipt of application, develops/loads EPM with pre-baseline review schedule.
- Inputs changes into EPM pre-baseline review schedule to determine effect of acceptance review on baseline review schedule.
- Coordinates with projects branch and appropriate technical branches in reviewing potential changes from the pre-baseline schedule.
- Briefs management on potential changes from the pre-baseline schedule to the baseline review schedule.
- Finalizes the baseline review schedule following management review and approval.
- Captures dependencies among concurrent review activities (e.g., review of a DC application in parallel with the review of a COLA) within the baseline review schedules.

#### 3.1.2 **Technical Branch**

##### The Technical Staff - NRO and other offices as assigned

[Technical assistance from contractors may be used to perform the acceptance review as long as the prescribed acceptance review schedule can be maintained.]

- Before beginning their acceptance review, becomes familiar with the anticipated scope of review (e.g., design-specific finality matrices for certified designs, applicable sections of RG 1.206) and the EPM pre-baseline review schedule and estimated staff-hours.
- Reviews assigned sections to evaluate the completeness and technical sufficiency of the application.
- Obtains input and support from outside entities (e.g., FEMA, DHS, Corp of Engineers, EPA, USGS, etc.) to support the completeness and technical sufficiency review of applicable sections and for development of baseline review schedule.
- Identifies changes from the pre-baseline review schedule and estimates hours to be factored into the baseline review schedule.

- Identifies any known dependencies among concurrent review efforts (e.g., review of a DC application in parallel with the review of a COLA).
- Communicates results of acceptance review and proposed changes to the pre-baseline review schedule and estimated staff-hours with branch chief.
- The Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA) Licensing, Operations Support and Maintenance Branch (SPLA/B) will review the application and provide the risk-significant structures, systems, and components (SSCs) to the technical staff through projects early within the acceptance review, such that this information can inform the outcome of the acceptance review.
- CQVB/CQVP will provide audit insights, as applicable.
- Consistent with EPM, does not begin detailed technical review until after a docket number is assigned the application.

#### The Technical Branch Chief

- Reviews and evaluates the significance of technical issues and the results of the staff's acceptance reviews.
- Communicates potential issues, when identified, early in the acceptance review.
- Communicates proposed changes to the pre-baseline review schedule and estimated staff-hours on a timely basis.
- Forwards acceptance review results via memorandum (Attachment A) to both Projects and NPLS.
- Supports management briefings of acceptance review results.

#### 3.1.3 **NRO/NSIR Management**

- Receives briefing on results of acceptance review.
- Provides consultation for not accepting the application.

#### 3.2 **Acceptance Review**

The purpose of the acceptance review is to determine if the application is sufficient to permit docketing. As noted above, the 60-day acceptance review evaluates the completeness and technical sufficiency of each application prior to conducting a more detailed technical review of the application. The acceptance review will also be used to confirm or revise planning assumptions and dependencies among concurrent reviews.

The acceptance review includes three steps: (1) administrative processing, (2) the completeness and technical sufficiency review, and (3) the compilation of acceptance review inputs from the technical branches and the decision of whether to docket an application. An example acceptance review schedule containing these three steps is shown in Attachment B.

Administrative processing includes receiving, staging, and noticing the application. The Lead PM as supported by the Environmental PM performs a Sensitive Unclassified Non-Safeguards Information (SUNSI) review in accordance with the interim guidance provided on the internal web

<http://www.internal.nrc.gov/ois/divisions/irsd/sunsi/index.html>. Questions on SUNSI reviews are directed to [NRO\\_Inforeview@nrc.gov](mailto:NRO_Inforeview@nrc.gov). As applicable, the Lead PM reviews

the applicant's request to withhold proprietary information from public disclosure<sup>3</sup> in accordance with NRR Office Instruction, LIC-204, "Handling Requests to Withhold Proprietary Information from Public Disclosure." The tendered application should be made publicly available following the SUNSI review, with the proprietary review to be completed as soon as practicable - this may be following the conclusion of the acceptance review. Administrative templates are located within ADAMS folder NRO/NRO-DNRL/Templates.

The completeness and technical sufficiency reviews will be conducted in parallel with the administrative processing step and can begin within a day or two of NRC's receipt of the application. As discussed in Sections 3.2.1 through 3.2.3, the technical staff should conduct their acceptance reviews using the acceptance review guides in Attachments C and D. Once the technical staff completes the technical sufficiency review, the Technical Branch Chiefs document their reviews by memoranda. Attachment A contains a template memorandum that should be used by the Technical Branch Chiefs to transmit their acceptance review results to the Lead and NPLS PMs.

The Lead PM compiles all of the inputs from the technical branches, develops a report summarizing the outcome of the acceptance review and recommends whether the application is acceptable for docketing. Note: the environmental PM compiles the inputs related to the environmental report review and transmits the information to the Lead and NPLS PMs. The Lead PM informs the DNRL Project Branch Chief of the results. Concurrently, the NPLS PM will evaluate the list of information contained in the report to evaluate impacts to the baseline review schedule. Sections 3.3 and 3.4 provide more details on these parts of the acceptance review.

Early and frequent communication is essential for meeting the Agency's objective for openness with all stakeholders. Throughout the acceptance review, the Lead PM follows the COL Communication Plan.

### 3.2.1 **Completeness and Technical Sufficiency Review**

An application will be considered acceptable for docketing if it provides the information required by regulation, and the information is technically sufficient so that the staff can begin the detailed technical review of the application in accordance with regulations, SRPs, and other applicable guidance and complete its review within a predictable timeframe. An application deemed "acceptable for docketing" does not imply that there will be no need for requests for additional information (RAIs) or further detailed technical information to be provided by the applicant. The assigned technical staff should use the "Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Guide - For a Combined License Application (COLA) Referencing a Certified Design" (Attachment C) to perform and document their reviews. This guide focuses on the anticipated COLA referencing a DC. Attachment C will be supplemented, as necessary to address an acceptance review of a DC application, DC amendment application, or a custom COLA. The assigned technical reviewers for the Environmental Report should use the "Environmental Report

---

<sup>3</sup>For a design certification rulemaking, all primary sources (e.g., the design control document) must be publicly available.

Acceptance Review Guide - For a Combined License Application (COLA)" (Attachment D). There is no associated environment report review for a DC application.

The next several paragraphs are related to the technical safety review.

The completeness portion of the acceptance review verifies the application contains all of the information required by the applicable regulations. The completeness review is conducted by the PM and technical staff by evaluating the information in the application against the checklist provided in Section C.IV.1, "Combined License Application Acceptance Review Checklist," of RG 1.206 and the SRP. For a COLA referencing a DC, the applicant is also required to address all COL information items and departures from the certified design. Although an applicant is not required to conform to the guidance provided in RG 1.206 and the SRP, the checklist will facilitate both the preparation of an application by the applicant and the timely review of the application by the NRC staff. While the checklist is intended to cover all current regulations pertaining to an application, the application must address any omissions or new regulations in effect after the guide was issued.

To assist in their review, the staff is directed to Chapter 1 of the final safety analysis report (FSAR) included in the COLA which should provide useful information addressing general regulatory considerations including conformance with the SRP and Regulatory Guides, operating experience and identification of new safety features. In addition, for a COLA referencing a DC or a DC and an ESP, Chapter 1 of the FSAR identifies departures from the DC and treatment of COL information items and Chapter 2 of the FSAR identifies how site parameters fall within site characteristics. Each item will be addressed in more detail in the specific technical section(s) of the FSAR or other portions of the COLA.

For a COLA, the applicant must describe certain operational programs and their implementation. From SECY-05-0197, "Review of Operational Programs in a Combined License Application and Generic Emergency Planning Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria," as approved in the associated staff requirements memorandum (SRM) dated February 22, 2006, "'fully described' should be understood to mean that the program is clearly and sufficiently described in terms of the scope and level of detail to allow a reasonable assurance finding of acceptability. Required programs should always be described at a functional level and at an increased level of detail where implementation choices could materially and negatively affect the program effectiveness and acceptability."

The staff conducts a technical sufficiency review to verify that the application contains sufficient technical information in scope and depth for the staff to begin its detailed technical review and complete its review within a predictable timeframe. This technical sufficiency review precedes the detailed technical review and enables the technical staff to identify significant deficiencies in the application for which the staff is unable to begin its evaluation or could result in notable schedule delays. The quality of the application will determine the number of requests for additional information (RAIs). A high quality application containing sufficient technical information will assure that a reviewer can begin and complete the assigned review with a minimal number of RAIs. The technical sufficiency review does not preclude future RAIs, but instead identifies review areas that

could potentially require significant time and resources to resolve and challenge the ability for staff to reach its reasonable assurance finding.

As stated in the General Requirements section, above, with the DCRA, staff decisions made on the “reference COL” would apply to all “subsequent COLs”. Therefore, during performance of an acceptance review of a subsequent COLA, the staff is expected to verify the degree of standardization to the reference COL but focus its acceptance review on site-specific, application specific issues.

Risk insights, when available,<sup>4</sup> are applied to the acceptance review to help determine the scope of the technical sufficiency review. Staff should focus its technical sufficiency review on systems, structures, and components (SSCs) that have been identified as risk-significant. In addition, for identified technical deficiencies, technical staff should identify in consultation with SPLA/B, as necessary, whether it is risk significant (i.e., whether the technical deficiency is related to a risk-significant SSC).

A list of review areas contained within the SRP that may potentially involve more detailed technical review (e.g., involve computer code evaluation, detailed data analysis, new safety feature, or emerging operating experience) has been developed<sup>5</sup> and is in ADAMS (ML072430683). These review items should be factored into the technical sufficiency review and confirmation of planning assumptions—development of the baseline schedule and adjusted staff-hours.

An environmental acceptance review checklist has been developed and is in ADAMS (ML072250354). This list is a comprehensive set of review issues based on RG 4.2 and NUREG-1555 and is applicable to both early site permit and COL applications.

During the completeness and technical sufficiency review, technical staff should discuss identified deficiencies with the branch chief and notify projects of the significant deficiencies as they are identified. These significant deficiencies will be discussed with the applicant following the COL Communication Plan. Following completion of the acceptance review, the technical branches document their acceptance reviews using Attachments C and D, as appropriate, and transmitting them to the Lead PM using the technical branch memo (Attachment A) which documents the acceptance review.

### **3.2.2 Confirmation of Planning Assumptions**

---

<sup>4</sup>Risk-insights from an ongoing or completed DC application review should be available for a design center. For the acceptance review of a DC application or a COLA submitted concurrently with a referenced DC, SPLA/B will review the applicant's summary of its PRA and its results for identification of SSCs that have been identified as risk-significant as part of the acceptance review or under pre-application audit. The timeframe in which the risk insights are reviewed and distributed among the staff will determine the extent to which risk-insights can inform the scope of the acceptance review.

<sup>5</sup>Not all of the SRP sections are represented in the list. The list will be updated to reflect lessons learned from the initial COLA acceptance reviews.

During the 60-day acceptance review, technical staff should compare the results of the acceptance review against the EPM pre-baseline review schedule and estimated hours.

The pre-baseline review schedule may not account for the review of:

- Alternatives to SRP acceptance criteria and Regulatory Guides,
- New safety features,
- Deviations from the DC, for a COLA referencing a DC, or
- Application-specific information in a standardized section for a subsequent COLA as compared to the reference COLA.

If changes to the pre-baseline review schedule are needed, technical staff should project the new review time in terms of changes to the staff hour estimates for the FSAR section<sup>6</sup> or environmental impact statement (EIS) issue area section in the EPM, and not the individual review area/topic. See Table 2, "Resource Plan Revisions," included in Attachments C and D. Furthermore, the revised estimates should be divided into the applicable review phases captured in the EPM (e.g., for the safety review: Phase 1 - PSER and RAIs, Phase 2 - SER with Open Items). Note that changes in estimates would not be a reason for not accepting an application, but would be considered in the development of the baseline review schedule.

The technical staff should discuss with their supervisor any resource implications associated with a change from the EPM pre-baseline review schedule. Schedule implications (e.g., whether the pre-baseline schedule will have to be adjusted - see Section 3.4, below) will be assessed by NPLS and the projects branches for the overall application once the technical branches have completed their acceptance reviews.

### 3.2.3 **Identification of Dependencies among Concurrent Reviews**

Technical staff should identify any known dependencies among concurrent reviews. An example of a dependency is as follows. If the staff has identified an issue with a DC review area, the resolution of that issue could affect the review of the COLAs that reference the DC especially if the review area is incorporated by reference to the DC. For the environmental review, these dependencies may include regional or generic implications, or other environmental assessments at the same site. These dependencies should be identified by the technical staff to assist the integrated management of the concurrent reviews, such that a slippage in the DC application review schedule will be evaluated for possible impacts to the COLA review schedule. These dependencies could potentially result in changes to planning assumptions for other COLA or DC applications.

### 3.3 **Integrating Results of Completeness and Technical Sufficiency Reviews**

The NPLS PM will revise the pre-baseline review schedule using conclusions from the technical branch's acceptance review. The NPLS PM will provide the revised schedule

---

<sup>6</sup>In most cases, the FSAR section has a corresponding SRP section, but there may be some exceptions in which assigned work does not have a direct correspondence to an SRP section.

to the Lead PM. The Lead PM will integrate the results of the acceptance reviews which are documented in the technical branch memoranda (Attachment A) and distributed electronically.

Completeness and technical sufficiency are factored into the NRC's decision of whether to docket an application. If an application is being considered as not acceptable for docketing, the projects branch should inform senior management, as soon as practical.

The possible outcomes of the completeness and technical sufficiency portion of the acceptance review are as follows:

Acceptable for Docketing - The staff has determined that the application contains sufficient information for the staff to begin its technical review; therefore, it is acceptable for docketing. The Lead PM communicates the status and results of the acceptance review using the COL Communication Plan.

Following this determination, the NPLS PM will develop the baseline review schedule and adjusted staff-hours. See Section 3.4.

Application not Acceptable for Docketing - The application is not sufficiently complete to start the detailed technical review and/or complete the review within a predictable timeframe. The significant technical deficiencies are documented in the technical branch memos. Upon interactions with the applicant during the acceptance review, the staff may determine that the applicant can address and has committed to providing the missing information within a mutually agreed timeframe by supplementing their application. During this period of time, the application is considered to be tendered but not docketed. The application will be docketed and the review commenced after the staff has reviewed the supplement and concluded that the application is now sufficiently complete to start the detailed technical review and complete the review within a predictable timeframe. A baseline review schedule can be transmitted to the applicant once the supplement has been determined to be acceptable. If the staff determines that due to the high complexity or large volume of missing information in the application, the applicant cannot provide the NRC with the necessary information, the staff can issue a letter of non-acceptance, or the applicant can choose to withdraw its application. The staff should communicate the deficiencies to the applicant in accordance with the COL Communication Plan. The applicant can choose to resubmit their application once the deficiencies are corrected. However, the NRC will conduct a new 60-day acceptance review.

Once a determination has been made about the outcome of the acceptance review, the lead PM and the DNRL Projects Branch Chief should communicate the outcome to senior management and the technical staff as soon as possible (to ensure the detailed technical review is not initiated if application is determined to be not acceptable for docketing).

### 3.4 **Adjustments to Baseline Review Schedule and Estimated Staff-hours**

The NPLS PM develops the baseline review schedule and adjusts the staff-hours based on the identified changes from the EPM pre-baseline review schedule and estimated

hours. The NPLS PM should also capture review dependencies within the baseline review schedule. The review schedule could be either:

A. Baseline Schedule - The application is sufficiently complete to begin a detailed technical review (DC or COLA) and complete it within a predictable timeframe. There are no significant departures from the DC, and there are no apparent unique technical issues. This does not preclude staff's use of RAIs (i.e., multiple rounds of RAIs are not anticipated) during the evaluation. A baseline schedule (e.g., for a COL referencing a DC, the pre-baseline schedule is typically 30 months from docketing the application) can be transmitted to the applicant.

B. Baseline Schedule Adjusted from Pre-baseline Schedule - The application is sufficiently complete to begin a detailed technical review (DC or COLA) and complete it within a predictable timeframe. There may be departures from the DC, new safety features, or alternatives to the SRP and/or RG 1.206 guidance; however, the applicant provided sufficient level of detail for the staff to begin its review. The staff has identified new methodologies in the application or supporting documentation that will require additional review time beyond the pre-baseline schedule to reach a safety finding. A schedule can be transmitted to the applicant that is adjusted to account for the complexity or uniqueness of the review.

### 3.5 Response to Applicant

During the 60-day acceptance review, the Lead PM, supported by the appropriate staff and branch chiefs, should communicate the status of the staff's review with the applicant in accordance with the COL Communication Plan.

### 3.6 Performance Measures

Completion of the acceptance review is consistent with the EPM schedule.

Completion of the acceptance review is within 75 calendar days.

## 4. REFERENCES

- A. Regulatory Guide 1.206, "Combined License Applications for Nuclear Power Plants (LWR Edition)."
- B. NUREG-0800, "Standard Review Plan for the Review of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants."
- C. NUREG-1555, "Standard Review Plans for Environmental Reviews for Nuclear Power Plants."
- D. Title 10, Part 52, of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR Part 52), "Licenses, Certifications, and Approvals for Nuclear Power Plants."
- E. Staff Requirements Memorandum - COMDEK-07-0001/COMJSM-07-0001 - Report of the Combined License Review Task Force, dated June 22, 2007.
- F. SECY-05-0197, "Review of Operational Programs in a Combined License Application and Generic Emergency Planning Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria."
- G. List of SAR Review Areas Potentially Involving More Detailed Review (ML072430683).

H. Environmental Review Acceptance Checklist for Early Site Permit and Combined License Applications (ML072250354).

Attachments:

- A. Branch Memo Documenting Acceptance Review Results
- B. Example Acceptance Review Schedule
- C. Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Guide - For a Combined License Application (COLA) Referencing a Certified Design (ML072210984)
- D. Environmental Report Acceptance Review Guide - For a Combined License Application (COLA) (ML072600270)



# **ATTACHMENT A**

[DATE]

MEMORANDUM TO: [Branch Chief Name], Chief  
 [Name of PM Branch]  
 Division of New Reactor Licensing  
 Office of New Reactors [Include if originating organization is  
 outside NRO]

FROM: [Branch Chief Name], Chief  
 [Name of Technical Branch]  
 [Name of Division]  
 [Name of Office, if outside NRO]

SUBJECT: ACCEPTANCE REVIEW RESULTS FOR THE [plant XXXX]  
 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION (TAC NO. XXXXXX)

[Name of branch (branch acronym)] has completed its acceptance review of the [plant XXX] Combined License application (COLA) submitted by [Applicant XXX (applicant acronym)]. This review covered the following COLA FSAR Section[s] for which [branch acronym] has [primary/secondary] review responsibilities and, in addition, applicable interface documentation referenced in the FSAR:

- FSAR Section X; Section Y; Section Z; and etc.
- Referenced documentation
  - [reactor designXXX] Design Control Document (DCD) Tier 1 / 2, Revision #[XX], Section[s] X, Y, and etc.
  - Technical / Topical Reports [identifyXXX (e.g., design vendor, NEI)]

#### Completeness and Sufficiency

Based on this review, I conclude that the application contains the information required by regulations and that the submitted information is technically sufficient for [branch acronym] to commence the [plantXXX] COLA detailed technical review.

***[Alternate paragraph to be used when a COLA section(s) is not technically sufficient.***

Based on this review, I conclude that the application contains the information required by regulations. However, there are significant gaps in the submitted information that preclude the conduct of an effective and efficient technical review and, therefore, preclude the development of a specific review schedule at this time. [Branch acronym] cannot commence the [plantXXX] COLA detailed technical review without the information identified in Enclosure 1.]

The significant technical deficiencies are as follows ["No" responses to Column 4]

1.

#### Schedule

The estimated effort for the detailed technical review of the following [plantXXX] COLA SRP Section[s] by [branch acronym] is [are] generally consistent with the current pre-baseline EPM model. The resource plan that currently exists in the EPM for these sections may be retained. The SRP sections in this category are:

**[Alternate paragraph to be used when a COLA section(s) requires changes to the schedule:**

The estimated effort for the detailed technical review of the following [plantXXX] COLA SRP Section[s] by [branch acronym] varies materially from the pre-baseline model in the EPM. [provide rationale for differences] For each section, I have provided an updated resource plan for these tasks in Enclosure 2. The resource plan includes the new estimated level of effort, the resource(s) assigned, and the expected start date (or predecessor task that controls the start date e.g., application accepted milestone). Revisions to the resource plans have been submitted for the following FSAR Section reviews:

- FSAR Section X1;
- FSAR Section X2;
- ]

Review Dependencies.

[Branch acronym]'s detailed technical review of the [plantXXX] COLA is dependent upon completion of the staff's ongoing review as identified in Enclosure 2.

[Alternate paragraph: [Branch acronym]'s detailed technical review of the [plantXXX] COLA is independent of other ongoing application reviews by the staff.]

- Enclosure:    1. Table 1 of the Safety Analysis Report Review Guide  
                   2. Table 2 [Branch Name] Resource Plan Revisions for [Applicant Name] [Design Center Name] [Application Type]

CONTACT: [Branch Chief Name], [branch acronym]  
                   [BC phone number]

DISTRIBUTION:

NRO/DE RF [Lead PM] [Supporting PM] [NPLS PM] [Other Technical Branches that have primary/secondary review]

**ADAMS Accession No.:**

OFFICE			
NAME			
DATE			

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

## **ATTACHMENT B**

---

**Example Acceptance Review Schedule**

<u>Task Name</u>	<u>Duration</u>	<u>Start</u>	<u>Finish</u>
ACCEPTANCE REVIEW - RCOL, NRG ENERGY, SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT	43 days	10/01/2007	12/03/2007
Receiving, Staging and Noticing Application	1 day	10/01/2007	10/01/2007
SUNSI Review	5 days	10/02/2007	10/09/2007
Administrative Processing	6 days	10/01/2007	10/10/2007
Application Review by Technical Staff and PMs in NRO and NSIR	26 days	10/01/2007	11/06/2007
Compilation, Analysis, and Decision	25 days	10/23/2007	11/28/2007
Acceptance Review Complete	0 days	11/28/2007	11/28/2007
Federal Register Notice Published		11/28/2007	12/03/2007

**ATTACHMENT C**  
(see Accession No. ML072210984)

**ATTACHMENT D**  
(see Accession No. ML072600270)