



U.S.NRC

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Protecting People and the Environment

Assessment and Enforcement Program Development Workshop

November 28, 2007



Workshop Objectives

- Converge on programmatic relationships as displayed in flowchart
- Introduce draft enforcement examples
- Introduce approach to CAP effectiveness reviews



Workshop Series Accomplishments

- Positive interactions with stakeholders on inspection, assessment, and enforcement program inter-relationships.
- General agreement on the significance of 08/30 examples.
- Agreement on the outputs of the construction response table.
- Agreement on the inputs of the construction response table (except for cross-cutting issues).



Future Workshop Topics

- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discuss enforcement examples• Introduce definitions of identification credit• Introduce minor threshold/examples | December 18, 2007 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Follow-up discussion on CAP review• Criteria/ timing/documentation• Discuss minor/threshold/examples | January 31, 2008 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• CAM inputs/ thresholds/outputs• Length of time inputs in CAM | Early March 2008 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Substantive cross-cutting issues• Cross-cutting aspects, themes, and areas | Late March 2008 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Treatment of licensee-identified issues• Allegations interface | Late April 2008 |



Changes to Flowchart

- Initial screening
- Traditional enforcement evaluation
- Relationship to ITAAC acceptance criteria
- Limited amount of ITAAC Findings
- Common evaluation of enforcement applicability
- Notice of ITAAC Non-Conformance
- Isolated/ programmatic/ QA breakdown



Enforcement Examples

- Existing Supplement 2 of Enforcement Policy
- Results of extent of condition review included in examples
- Inaccurate/ incomplete ITAAC notification letter
- Escalated enforcement focused on QA and CAP deficiencies/ breakdowns



Effectiveness Reviews

- Two PI&R inspections will be conducted:
 - One programmatic review when a licensee is ready
 - Second for implementation when there is sufficient construction activity
- Once effective implementation has been demonstrated PI&R inspections will revert to a normal schedule
- Resident and other inspections will also be considered in formulating a decision



Decision Process

- Effectiveness of the CAP will be discussed at first bi-annual assessment meeting and every meeting thereafter until a decision is made
- A positive decision requires both an adequate program be in place and demonstration of adequate implementation



Decision Process (cont'd)

- There can have been no significant issues identified from any inspection
- The decision results (positive, negative, or insufficient information) will be documented in a bi-annual assessment letter



Determination Criteria

- Licensee has established an adequate program
- Licensee has demonstrated effectiveness in identifying and documenting problems (no substantial violations for failure to identify and document adverse conditions)
- Licensee has demonstrated effectiveness in correcting problems and preventing recurrence (no substantial violations for failure to take corrective action and prevent recurrence)



CAP Degradation

- Sufficient degradation may result in the NRC reverting to issuing NOVs for all violations
- Significance of identified issues will be considered
- Any SLII violation issued against the CAP will be considered sufficient indication to revert to NOVs



CAP Degradation (cont'd)

- Decision to revert to NOVs will be documented in an assessment letter (bi-annual or quarterly)
- Following licensee corrective actions the effectiveness review process will be repeated



Conclusions and Recommendations

- Workshop Summary
- Next steps
- Public Meeting Schedule:
 - December 18, 2007
 - January 31, 2008
 - Early March 2008