

**AGENDA**  
**PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS THE U.S. NUCLEAR**  
**REGULATORY COMMISSION (NRC) EFFORT TO REVIEW ITS**  
**POSITION AND REGULATIONS ON COMMON CAUSE FAILURE**

**Category 3 Meeting**  
**April 26, 2016**

**PURPOSE:** Exchange information about challenges in addressing common cause failure (CCF) in digital instrumentation and control systems, for license amendment requests, new construction, and changes without prior NRC approval. Gather information on possible solutions to identified technical issues and possible methods for modifying the current NRC policy and regulations on CCF and information to support development of a technical basis for any potential modifications.

- 8:30 - 8:45 a.m. Welcome, introduction, and safety procedures (NRC Staff/All)
- 8:45 – 9:00 a.m. Review of results of the March 21, 2016 meeting (NRC)
- 9:00 – 9:15 a.m. Discuss possible methods to update the criteria to determine which systems are within the scope of CCF policy (NRC)
- 9:15 – 10:15 a.m. General discussion of how best to scope which systems are to be included (ALL)
- Should this be based on safety significance?
  - Is there a method for grading what systems need to be included and if so should this include what kind of analysis is needed?
  - Can risk insights or safety significance be used?
- 10:15 – 10:30 a.m. Morning Break
- 10:30 – 10:45 a.m. Discuss possible methods for using bounding analysis, or other analysis methods for determining if CCF failure will meet acceptance criteria (NRC)
- 10:45 – 12:00 p.m. General discussion of how best to define analysis associated with CCF failure (All)
- Should the analysis be best estimate?
  - Is the current acceptance criteria appropriate? If not, how should it be modified
  - Can other analysis be used, bounding analysis, previous design basis analysis, PRA acceptance criteria analysis?
- 12:00 pm – 12:15 p.m. General discussion of design attributes and their effect on CCF (NRC)
- 12:15 – 1:00 p.m. General discussion of what design attributes are sufficient to eliminate consideration of CCF or to reach a finding that further analysis is not required (ALL)
- Are the “simplicity” and “internal diversity” appropriate design attributes for this purpose?

- Are there other attributes that can be demonstrated to provide the same level of assurance?
- Should the attributes be defined in policy/rule or guidance? Or should there be a more general criteria for design attributes?

1:00 – 2:00 p.m.

Lunch

2:00 – 2:45 p.m.

General Discussion continued

2:45 – 3:45 p.m.

Open discussions and questions and answers (All)

3:45 – 4:00 p.m.

Next steps, actions, recap, and adjourn