

Sunil Weerakkody

Chief, PRA Operations and Human Factors Branch
Division of Risk Assessment
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
January 8th, 2014

MEETING OBJECTIVE

- Receive alternatives\feedback to methods documented in RASP Handbook Vol. 1 Section 8 and Section 9:
 - Use of CCDP metric to assess risk significance of licensee performing deficiencies that lead to events during normal power operations
 - Minimum Human Error Probability (HEP) value of 1E-06 for Joint HEPs

Objectives of RASP Handbook

- *“The first objective of the Risk Assessment of Operational Events Handbook (sometimes known as RASP Handbook// or —handbook is to document methods and guidance that NRC staff should use to achieve more consistent results when performing risk assessments of operational events and licensee performance issues.”*
- *“The second objective is to provide analysts and standardized plant analysis risk (SPAR) model developers with additional guidance to ensure that the SPAR models used in the risk analysis of operational events represent the as-built, as-operated plant to the extent needed to support the analyses.”*
- *“This Handbook represents best practices based on feedback and experience from the analyses of over 600 precursors of events dating back to 1969 in the Accident Sequence Precursor (ASP) Program and numerous Significance Determination Process (SDP) Phase 3 analyses (since 2000).”*

External Stakeholder Participation

IMC 308, Att. 3 Section G: External Stakeholder Participation in SDP Development and Changes

“The ROP was developed with substantial involvement from both internal and external stakeholders, notably increasing openness and acceptance of the ROP. In addition, the ROP is an integrated set of tools and processes in which changes to one component will likely affect other components. Because of these factors, changes to the SDP must be carefully considered and in some cases it may be beneficial to engage external stakeholders prior to making substantive changes to the SDP or its component tools. Such engagement is not intended to arrive at consensus, but rather to ensure that the staff has considered the possible effects which could occur from a substantive change. It is permissible to make changes which, in the judgment of the staff, do not require external stakeholder engagement.”

Desirable Attributes of Acceptable Alternatives

- **Technically Adequate**
 - (e.g., Aligns with high-level goals of Risk-Informed ROP, Makes a meaningful distinction between risk-significant vs. non risk-significant events/conditions)
- **Meets Principles of Good Regulation**
 - (e.g., efficient, independent, open, clear, reliable)
- **Meets ROP Objectives**
 - (e.g., predictable, understandable, risk-informed)
- **Compatible with Other ROP Assessment Tools**
 - (e.g., No double counting in the overall performance assessment process)