June 1, 2015

MEMORANDUM TO: Anthony J. Mendiola, Chief
Licensing Processes Branch
Division of Policy and Rulemaking
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Joseph J. Holonich, Senior Project Manager ***/RA/***
Licensing Processes Branch
Division of Policy and Rulemaking
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF THE MARCH 18, 2015, CLOSED MEETING WITH WESTINGHOUSE REGARDING POTENTIAL UPDATES TO THE COMMON Q TOPICAL REPORT (TAC NO. MF5774)

On March 18, 2015, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff met with representatives from Westinghouse Electric Company (Westinghouse). This was a Phase 0 meeting to discuss potential updates to the Westinghouse Common Q topical report (TR) and Software Program Manual for Common Q Systems (SPM). Information pertaining to this meeting can be found in the meeting package at Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML15078A079.

The meeting began with short introductory remarks from the NRC staff and Westinghouse representatives. In their remarks, the Westinghouse representatives stated that the goal for the meeting was to see if the path forward identified by Westinghouse for the Common Q updates was acceptable to the NRC staff. In response the NRC staff noted that, based on the NRC staff understanding, the approach outlined for the updates would result in a separate safety evaluation (SE). This approach would lead to a SE for the updates that would be an addendum to the existing SEs for the Common Q TR and SPM.

In the meeting, Westinghouse representatives provided a presentation that covered the purpose of the meeting, background, licensing considerations, and schedule, as well as details on the proposed update. During the presentation, the NRC staff asked what version of the SE should be used when documenting its review. Westinghouse representatives responded that the most recent SEs for the Common Q TR and SPM should be used.

Additionally, the NRC staff asked about changes that had been made to the Common Q platform since the issuance of the NRC SE in 2013. The Westinghouse representatives reported that there had been changes but they were not significant enough to warrant NRC review and approval per Westinghouse's Topical Report Change Management Process.

NOTICE: Enclosure transmitted herewith contains Proprietary Information. When separated from Enclosure, this transmittal document is decontrolled.

In response, the NRC staff asked if Westinghouse had any objection to these change evaluations being provided for NRC staff information in an audit associated with the Common Q updates. The NRC staff stated that looking at these changes in an audit would allow the NRC to confirm the screening criteria used by Westinghouse to determine the significance of the changes. Westinghouse stated it had no objection.

Also, the NRC staff asked about operating plants and any impacts to them from the updates to the Common Q TR and SPM. The Westinghouse representatives responded that it recognized that the existing approved Common Q TR and SPM, in addition to the proposed addendum, need to be recognized as valid to be able to support the existing installed base, future new applications, and spares related to the Common Q Platform.

Major milestones and schedules were the final topic in the Westinghouse presentation. The overall schedule presented by Westinghouse showed the NRC staff review of the update being completed in approximately a year. The NRC staff stated that it believed it could support that schedule.

However, the NRC staff also provided a discussion on the priorities of TR reviews. It was noted that TRs are considered lower priority than licensing actions because TRs are not essential to the NRC staff doing its job. Also, the NRC staff discussed the priority form used to determine the relative priority of TRs among themselves.

In response to a Westinghouse question, the NRC staff did note that even if a TR had an established priority, the priority determinations of TRs could change. This was based on the fact that in determining the priorities of a TR, where it was in the review added additional points to the priority score. Thus, a TR that might have a lower score could increase its priority as more of the TR review milestones were completed.

An additional discussion is included in the enclosures to this meeting summary. The non-proprietary version is Enclosure 1 and the proprietary version in Enclosure 2.

The action items from the meeting were:

1) Westinghouse will construct a draft mapping.
2) The NRC staff will meet internally to gain alignment on the scope of the review.
3) A second closed Phase 0 meeting will be scheduled in April to review and discuss Action Items 1 and 2.

Project 779

Enclosures
1. As stated (Non-Proprietary)
2. As stated (Proprietary)

In response, the NRC staff asked if Westinghouse had any objection to these change evaluations being provided for NRC staff information in an audit associated with the Common Q updates. The NRC staff stated that looking at these changes in an audit would allow the NRC to confirm the screening criteria used by Westinghouse to determine the significance of the changes. Westinghouse stated it had no objection.

Also, the NRC staff asked about operating plants and any impacts to them from the updates to the Common Q TR and SPM. The Westinghouse representatives responded that it recognized that the existing approved Common Q TR and SPM, in addition to the proposed addendum, need to be recognized as valid to be able to support the existing installed base, future new applications, and spares related to the Common Q Platform.

Major milestones and schedules were the final topic in the Westinghouse presentation. The overall schedule presented by Westinghouse showed the NRC staff review of the update being completed in approximately a year. The NRC staff stated that it believed it could support that schedule.

However, the NRC staff also provided a discussion on the priorities of TR reviews. It was noted that TRs are considered lower priority than licensing actions because TRs are not essential to the NRC staff doing its job. Also, the NRC staff discussed the priority form used to determine the relative priority of TRs among themselves.

In response to a Westinghouse question, the NRC staff did note that even if a TR had an established priority, the priority determinations of TRs could change. This was based on the fact that in determining the priorities of a TR, where it was in the review added additional points to the priority score. Thus, a TR that might have a lower score could increase its priority as more of the TR review milestones were completed.

An additional discussion is included in the enclosures to this meeting summary. The non-proprietary version is Enclosure 1 and the proprietary version in Enclosure 2.

The action items from the meeting were:

1) Westinghouse will construct a draft mapping.
2) The NRC staff will meet internally to gain alignment on the scope of the review.
3) A second closed Phase 0 meeting will be scheduled in April to review and discuss Action Items 1 and 2.

Project 779

Enclosures
1. As stated (Non-Proprietary)
2. As stated (Proprietary)

ADAMS Accession Nos.: ML15086A353; (Minutes); ML15086A360 (Proprietary Enclosure); ML15054A318 (Notice); ML15078A079 (Meeting Package)

OFFICE	NRR/DPR/PLPB	NRR/DPR/PLPB	NRRDE/EICB	NRR/DPR/PLPB	NRR/DPR/PLPB
NAME	JHolonich	DHarrison	JThorp	AMendiola	JHolonich
DATE	03/30/2015	05/7/2015	04/02/2015	05/28 /2015	06/01/2015

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DISTRIBUTION FOR MEETING SUMMARY:
JThorp
TerryJackson
RStattel
NCarte
JZhao
JHolonich
RidsNroOd
RidsAcrsMailCtr
RidsNrrDpr
RidsNrrDprPlpb
RidsNrrLADHarrison
RidsOgcMailCenter
RidsNrrDeEvib
RidsResOd

External Distribution:
'Zozula, Camille T.' zozulact@westinghouse.com

ENCLOSURE TO
SUMMARY OF THE MARCH 18, 2015, CLOSED MEETING WITH WESTINGHOUSE REGARDING POTENTIAL UPDATES TO THE COMMON Q TOPICAL

As part of Westinghouse Electric Company's (WEC) Phase 0 presentation on the Common Q TR and SPM updates, [

]

[

.] The NRC staff took an action (see action #2) to have internal discussions regarding the scope of the review.

The discussion on the scope led to the following questions:

1. [

2.

The NRC staff stated that it understood the position and this approach could potentially be acceptable but needs more discussion in the follow-on Phase 0 meeting.

The following proprietary information provides more detail for the identified action items:

1. WEC will construct a draft mapping [

   ]
2. The NRC staff will meet internally to gain alignment on the scope of the review [

.]

ENCLOSURE 1