

JPM#	1. Dyn (D/S)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Attributes					4. Job Content Errors		5. U/E/S	6. Explanation (See below for instructions)
			IC Focus	Cues	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Overlap	Job-Link	Minutia		
RA1		3								S	<b>GENERAL COMMENT FOR OUTLINES:</b> The 301-2 Forms are not the Sup-1 version; however, the ESF function has been identified
RA2		3								E S	TIME CRITICAL. There are no standards with associated S/U performance listed on the examiners sheet. None of the elements have been identified as critical. In the initial conditions change annunciator xxx has annunciated to annunciator xxx is illuminated. Third initial condition is one run-on sentence. See markup on student card for the fix. <a href="#">Revised JPM to include critical steps.</a>
RA3		3								E S	Why are the blue tags on the boards not critical; if not required to complete the task, then should the JPM only have the applicant identify tagging not on the control boards? This is wasted effort, since there is no affect on the grade of this JPM if the applicant does not identify the blue tags. <a href="#">Revised JPM.</a>
RA4										E S	No standards and no critical steps have been identified on the examiner's sheet. In the elements/standard column fifth row, change acceptable times from 8010 to 0810 and 8015 to 0815. Plus or minus 2 minutes seems to be a large error when the actual time is only 12 minutes. <a href="#">Change cue to have candidate calculate the Delta-T and what action should be taken based on the calculated Delta-T. Revised JPM.</a>
SA1		2							?	? S	The procedure clearly states that every employee is responsible for ensuring they are meeting the requirements for hours of work. This JPM is trivial and does not appear to be a task devoted solely to the SRO since each individual would have to perform the same analysis for their own hours. However, because the responsibility for overall manning rests with the SRO, this may be an OK JPM. <a href="#">OK as written.</a>
SA2		4								E S	Recommend not handing any of the procedures / TS to the applicant. Have them available for review on a laptop or rolling cart. Ensure cue sheet and answers are on yellow paper (not provided in draft). <a href="#">Revised.</a>
SA3		3								E S	Initiating cue: Change 5 foot to 5 feet. Ensure yellow sheets to applicant. <a href="#">Revised.</a>
SA4		3								S	TIME CRITICAL. Stability Class is on Notification Form.
SA5		2								S	Possible SUNSI material. (MAY NEED TO REDACT FROM ADAMS SUBMITTAL) TIME CRITICAL: 15 min for determination. 15 min for form. Total 30 min.

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 tests. 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.

- Determine whether the task is dynamic (D) or static (S). A dynamic task is one that involves continuous monitoring and response to varying parameters. A static task is basically a system reconfiguration or realignment.
- Determine level of difficulty (LOD) using established 1-5 rating scale. Levels 1 and 5 represent inappropriate (low or high) discriminatory level for the license being tested.

3. Check the appropriate box when an attribute weakness is identified:
  - The initiating cue is not sufficiently clear to ensure the operator understands the task and how to begin.
  - The JPM does not contain sufficient cues that are objective (not leading).
  - All critical steps (elements) have not been properly identified.
  - Scope of the task is either too narrow (N) or too broad (B).
  - Excessive overlap with other part of operating test or written examination.
4. Check the appropriate box when a job content error is identified:
  - Topics not linked to job content (e.g., disguised task, not required in real job).
  - Task is trivial and without safety significance.
5. Based on the reviewer's judgment, is the JPM as written (U)nacceptable (requiring repair or replacement), in need of (E)ditorial enhancement, or (S)atisfactory?
6. Provide a brief description of any U or E rating in the explanation column.
7. Save initial review comments as normal black text; indicate how comments were resolved using [blue text](#) so that each JPM used on the exam is reflected by a (S)atisfactory resolution on this form.

JPM#	1. Dyn (D/S)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Attributes					4. Job Content Errors		5. U/E/S	6. Explanation (See below for instructions)
			IC Focus	Cues	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over-lap	Job-Link	Minutia		
a	D	3								E S	Is there a criterion as to when the RRC pump should be stopped (ie time or power limit)? OK as written.
b	S	2								E S	There should be some plausible reason for bypassing the rod listed in the initial conditions. The queue seems a little too open ended as written. There are 2 S/U for step 5.1.13 -> there should be only one. Revised.
c	S	2								S	
d	D	2								S	
e	D	2								?? S	*****Verify this action is not performed during any scenario. Not a repeat.
f	D	2				U				U S	This JPM as written does not rise to the level of alternate path. Simply stating that welding is taking place and having the applicant state that he/she can't continue does not meet the intent of alternate path. There are no actions in the act of stopping the task. This is an alternate path as the JPM cannot be completed at the subsystem level and must be performed at the component level.
g	S	2								S	
h	S	2							?	E S	Wrong section of procedure was included in the package. Should be 5.8. This JPM seems a little trivial with only 3 action steps. Satisfactory as written and the correct procedure was placed in JPM package.
i	S	3			E					E S	Step 5.1.4a: Standard should be observes D/G Control selector in Control Room position Adjusting KW loading, KVAR, Frequency and Voltage would not affect the task of securing the EDG, so those steps should not be considered critical. Need to place somewhere in instructions to examiner that Section 5.3 should not be handed out until requested. Revised JPM
j	S	3								E S	Are there cues for 5.1.2a, b and c? Does the examiner provide these indications? Cues were added to JPM.
k	S	3								S	
											FORM ES-301-2 has listed 2 in-plants for the SRO-U... fix this so it reads 3.

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 tests. 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.

- Determine whether the task is dynamic (D) or static (S). A dynamic task is one that involves continuous monitoring and response to varying parameters. A static task is basically a system reconfiguration or realignment.

2. Determine level of difficulty (LOD) using established 1-5 rating scale. Levels 1 and 5 represent inappropriate (low or high) discriminatory level for the license being tested.
3. Check the appropriate box when an attribute weakness is identified:
  - The initiating cue is not sufficiently clear to ensure the operator understands the task and how to begin.
  - The JPM does not contain sufficient cues that are objective (not leading).
  - All critical steps (elements) have not been properly identified.
  - Scope of the task is either too narrow (N) or too broad (B).
  - Excessive overlap with other part of operating test or written examination.
4. Check the appropriate box when a job content error is identified:
  - Topics not linked to job content (e.g., disguised task, not required in real job).
  - Task is trivial and without safety significance.
5. Based on the reviewer's judgment, is the JPM as written (U)nacceptable (requiring repair or replacement), in need of (E)ditorial enhancement, or (S)atisfactory?
6. Provide a brief description of any U or E rating in the explanation column.
7. Save initial review comments as normal black text; indicate how comments were resolved using **blue text** so that each JPM used on the exam is reflected by a (S)atisfactory resolution on this form.

CG-2009-01										DRAFT OPERATING TEST COMMENTS	SCENARIOS
Scenario 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 S	<p>OVERALL: All of the pages listed as FORM-ES-D-1 after the actual D-1 are actually FORM ES-D-2.</p> <p>EVENT 3: The RO has been given credit for an instrument failure. The position is not identified as having any actions associated with this failure; therefore, the RO can't get the credit. Additionally, none of the crew may notice this, and a call from the field will queue them.</p> <p>EVENT 7: Page 11, what are the actions of PPM 3.3.1 on the bottom of the page? <a href="#">Revised scenario.</a></p>	
2									E S	Label D-2's as D-2's.	
3(B/U)									E S	Label D-2's as D-2's.	

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, rate the scenario set as (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.
11. Save initial review comments as normal black text; indicate how comments were resolved using [blue text](#) so that each JPM used on the exam is reflected by a (S)atisfactory resolution on this form.