

June 3, 2015

MEMORANDUM TO: Michael Layton, Director
Division of Security Policy
Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response

FROM: Dr. Ralph Way, Senior Technical Advisor **/RA/**
Division of Security Policy
Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MAY 26, 2015, PUBLIC MEETING ON THE
SELF-ASSESSMENT AND THE FUTURE OF THE
FORCE-ON-FORCE AND BASELINE SECURITY INSPECTION
PROGRAMS

The following is a summary of the Category 3 Public meeting held on May 26, 2015. The meeting was chaired by Dr. Ralph Way, Senior Technical Advisor for Security, U.S Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response.

Dr. Way opened the meeting and introduced himself; Mr. Dana Caron, Senior Physical Security Inspector Region I; and Mr. Daniel Cardenas, Team Lead Security Performance Evaluation Branch. Dr. Way directed the meeting participants' attention to a panel of technical staff and introduced them to the audience. The technical staff represented a portion of the staff who participated in the Force-on-Force (FOF) Working Group that had been assembled to respond to the Staff Requirements Memorandum (SRM) SRM-SECY-14-0088. The NRC technical staffs in attendance were Adam Gendleman, Juan Peralta, Merritt Baker, and Rupert Rockhill.

Dr. Way noted that the meeting would be recorded.

Dr. Way went over the agenda and stated the objective of the meeting was to provide an overview and insight into the progress made by the FOF working group which would be highlighted in three presentations, an overview of the working group, Significance Determination Process (SDP) for Unattended Openings (UAO), and Compensatory Measures. Dr. Way then began his briefing.

Dr. Way presented a background on the NRC's FOF programs, and the methodology for the FOF lessons learned review. Dr. Way described the first iteration of the FOF program was the regulatory effectiveness review (1982-1991), which looked at vital areas, identification of safety/safeguards interface Issues, and assessed the licensee's contingency response

CONTACT: Ralph Way, NSIR/DSO
(301) 287-3766

capabilities of licensees and generic issues. The focus of the regulatory effectiveness review program was the effectiveness of NRC's regulations. The regulatory effectiveness review program was sunset and replaced by the Operational Security Response Evaluations (OSRE) (1991-2000). In 1991, the NRC first shared a design basis threat (DBT) with power reactor licensees in order to facilitate the development of licensee protective strategies. These strategies were assessed through the OSRE program. After 9/11, the security response evaluations were suspended to allow licensees and the NRC to respond to the increased threat environment. The NRC issued orders to licensees for interim compensatory measures in response to 9/11. The NRC conducted a series of expanded tabletop drills to look at licensee, local, State and Federal response activities. Based on the information from the expanded tabletop drills, the staff recommended to the Commission that the NRC conduct expanded pilot FOF exercises. The experience from the expanded tabletops and FOF drills were reported back to the Commission and the NRC used these insights to develop the FOF program. Based on the expanded threat post-9/11, the NRC implemented a transitional program to develop the FOF program. These activities lead to the development of the current FOF program, which has been in place since 2004.

Dr. Way transitioned to the COMGEA/COMWCO-14-0001 issued February 11, 2014, which stated that the staff should conduct a lessons-learned review of the NRC's FOF inspection program to evaluate whether any adjustments are necessary to ensure efforts in this area are accomplishing intended objectives effectively and whether NRC's and licensees' efforts are focused on the most important issues to ensure security and safety at the sites.

Dr. Way discussed how the methodology the staff used to respond was divided into two phases. Phase focused on data collection and analysis, literature review, benchmarking, best practices, and how the staff would solicit and consider stakeholder feedback. Phase two focused on, analyzing phase one data, developing options and recommendations and delivering the final review results (SECY-14-0088, dated 8/21/2014).

Dr. Way explained the NRC Commission's response in SRM-SECY-14-0088, wherein the Commission approved the staff's recommendation to establish an NRC working group to determine how to better integrate knowledge of adversary training methodologies and actual attacks with the tactics, techniques, and procedures used by the NRC composite adversary force.

The Commission disapproved the staff's recommendation to restore the Multiple Integrated Laser Engagement System to its original condition and directed the staff to use the existing change management process to fully evaluate the pros and cons of this change to determine if it would result in an overall enhancement to force-on-force exercises.

The Commission directed the staff to account for the realistic ability for specific opening configurations to be exploited when evaluating inspection findings and assessing licensee corrective actions. The Commission directed the staff to evaluate the NRC requirements for unattended openings through the same NRC working group that is being established to evaluate adversary tactics, techniques, and procedures.

The Commission supported the staff's commitment to actions not requiring Commission approval, and directed the staff to continue working with industry to review and reduce the number of extensive simulations used in developing and executing FOF scenarios by

identifying, validating, and benchmarking mechanisms, such as the use of simulation software, to evaluate potential vulnerabilities that may be inappropriate for performance testing during an NRC conducted FOF exercise; review and update the physical protection significance determination process; issue a generic communication to licensees to clarify the NRC's expectations regarding the implementation of compensatory measures; and enhance guidance, training, and inspection program documents in the effort to improve the realism and effectiveness of FOF exercises. The Commission directed that the staff provide information paper to the Commission, annually, providing the status of these actions.

Dr. Way described the formation and objectives of the FOF Tactics, Techniques and Procedures (TTP) Working Group as directed by the Commission in SRM-SECY-14-0088 and the current status of the working group. The working group has been established and has approved its charter. The charter is currently with the Steering Committee (composed of Deputy Office Directors and Deputy Regional Administrators) for final approval. The Working Group has met four times and has received briefings on selected topics.

Dr. Way discussed challenges faced by the working group and how the working group has a number of issues to review in a relatively short timeframe and has been tasked with multiple communications to the Commission over the next 14 months in addition to maintaining frequent, timely, and effective communications with external stakeholders while ensuring a balanced and realistic inspection program that effectively focuses both NRC and licensee resources.

Dr. Way explained the next steps, highlighting meetings with federal partners, continued analyses, issuance of a Regulatory Issue Summary (RIS) on compensatory measures, conducting a Category II meeting with Industry, and continued interactions with stakeholders.

Dr. Way concluded his briefing by informing the audience that his presentation would be made available on the NRC public site.

Dr. Way then introduced Dana Caron to facilitate the next presentation on the SDP for UAOs.

Mr. Caron described how the working group has drafted options for the revision to the significance determination process for unattended openings. The NRC headquarters and regional staff have reviewed and commented on the proposed revisions, which have been forwarded to the working group for review and concurrence. The working group will finalize its recommendation on the unattended opening SDP and forward to the steering committee.

Dr. Way then introduced Daniel Cardenas to facilitate the next presentation on Compensatory Measures Guidance.

Mr. Cardenas explained the purpose of one aspect of the working group that focused on a response to question 9 of SRMCOMGEA/COMWCO-14-0001 and how the staff identified that licensees may be applying immediate compensatory measures in cases where such measures are not required.

Mr. Cardenas described how in accordance with the SRM-SECY014-0088, NRC staff will issue a RIS to clarify the NRC's expectations regarding the implementation of compensatory measures. Mr. Cardenas explained how the RIS will identify applicable regulatory requirements for compensatory measures, which include:

- Conducting a site specific analysis to determine the specific function of security systems, equipment, components, and processes,
- Identifying criteria and measures for the implementation of compensatory measures for protective strategy deficiencies and degraded or inoperable security systems, equipment, components, or processes;
- Identifying specific time frames of the implementation of compensatory measures necessary to ensure that the capability to detect, assess, interdict, and neutralize threats to the facility are maintained at all times; and
- confirming that compensatory measures provide an equivalent level of protection.

Dr. Way informed the audience this concluded the three briefings and subsequent to a short break would offer the opportunity for the audience to ask questions.

The facilitator then adjourned the meeting for a 15 minute break.

The facilitator reconvened the meeting after 15 minutes and asked everyone to return to their seats so we could resume the meeting and turned the floor over to Dr. Way.

Dr. Way asked if there were any questions from the audience.

Mr. Dick Spear asked if a schedule of working group activities would be provided for review going forward.

Dr. Way responded that currently there is not a complete project timeline/plan.

Mr. Dick Spear asked if the UAO product could be shared.

Mr. Caron responded that the staff have spoken with Mr. Kline, NEI and once aligned internally will meet with NEI to discuss.

Mr. Dick Spear asked when the RIS on compensatory measures be shared.

Mr. Cardenas responded that once there is internal alignment on the product it would be shared with NEI.

Dr. Way asked if there were any additional questions.

The facilitator asked if anyone on the conference call in had any questions and described the process for asking a question.

M. Layton

-5-

There were no questions from conference call participants.

Dr. Way offered if there were no additional questions and/or comments the meeting would be adjourned. There were no additional questions or comments and the meeting was adjourned.

Enclosures:

1. Public Meeting Slides
2. Attendee List

M. Layton

-5-

There were no questions from conference call participants.

Dr. Way offered if there were no additional questions and/or comments the meeting would be adjourned. There were no additional questions or comments and the meeting was adjourned.

Enclosures:

1. Public Meeting Slides
2. Attendee List

ADAMS PKG. ML15154B084

OFFICE	NSIR/DSO	NSIR/DSO
NAME	R. Way	M. Layton
DATE	6/2/15	6/3/15

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY