

NRR-DMPSPeM Resource

From: Archambo, Neil G <Neil.Archambo@duke-energy.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 18, 2017 9:37 AM
To: FREGONESE, Victor; Rahn, David
Cc: Curtis, David; Jung, Ian; Waters, Michael; Drake, Jason; Morton, Wendell; GEIER, Stephen; REMER, Jason; HANSON, Jerud
Subject: [External_Sender] RE: Agenda and Support Docs for 5/25 RIS Tabletop

It would certainly be useful to get the revised so I can make any necessary changes to the example qualitative assessment. If the timing doesn't work out where I can get the revised RIS, we can work through the necessary qualitative example changes during the tabletop. I would envision making real-time changes to the qualitative assessment during the tabletop. Ideally, by the end of the meeting we will have reached consensus and all have a firm understanding of what an acceptable qualitative assessment looks like – that's the primary goal.

I really want this tabletop to be interactive with good candid discussion. As I told Dave Rahn yesterday, I'm very thick-skinned – you're not going to hurt my feelings with candid comments. I realize we all share the same goal – to get useable guidance on the street. I developed the qualitative assessment through the eyes of a DI&C design engineer. We need to identify areas where the qualitative assessment misses the mark and determine if the RIS needs further clarification in these areas.

I look forward to this tabletop exercise and believe it will prove very beneficial.

Neil

From: FREGONESE, Victor [<mailto:vxvf@nei.org>]
Sent: Thursday, May 18, 2017 9:16 AM
To: Rahn, David
Cc: Archambo, Neil G; Curtis, David; Jung, Ian; Waters, Michael; Drake, Jason; Morton, Wendell; GEIER, Stephen; REMER, Jason; HANSON, Jerud
Subject: Re: Agenda and Support Docs for 5/25 RIS Tabletop

Jason, I took a look at the proposed agenda. I believe that the first thing industry needs to understand is what the differences are from the previous RIS we reviewed and commented on, and the one that be issued in the next few days. I also would think that there are technical points that need to be discussed further from our last round of comments, depending on how these were addressed in the new version. I suspect this will take a good bit of time. The tabletop exercises will only be useful if we are aligned on the scope and extent of conditions that are in the revised document. Neil please add your commentary on this if possible.

On May 18, 2017, at 8:48 AM, Rahn, David <David.Rahn@nrc.gov> wrote:

Hi Neil:

I believe that we are primarily interested in seeing how the safety-related example (EDG digital voltage regulator) works to identify design attributes, quality measures, and operating experience that could be used for arguments that satisfy the 50.59 criteria—primarily 50.59(C)(2)(i),(ii),(v), and (vi).

For the non-safety related example (Open Phase detection system), even if it is not put into the format we have in the RIS, it would be good to use your previous write-up to discuss the pros and cons of using the available design attributes and quality measures (e.g., critical digital

review, FMEA, EMI/RFI testing, software quality measures, etc. but limited operating experience) to see how well an argument can be put together that satisfies the criteria.

Thanks,
Dave

From: Archambo, Neil G [<mailto:Neil.Archambo@duke-energy.com>]

Sent: Thursday, May 18, 2017 8:33 AM

To: Drake, Jason <Jason.Drake@nrc.gov>; Rahn, David <David.Rahn@nrc.gov>; Morton, Wendell <Wendell.Morton@nrc.gov>; GEIER, Stephen <seg@nei.org>; FREGONESE, Victor <vxf@nei.org>; REMER, Jason <sjr@nei.org>; HANSON, Jerud <jeh@nei.org>

Cc: Curtis, David <David.Curtis@nrc.gov>; Jung, Ian <Ian.Jung@nrc.gov>; Waters, Michael <Michael.Waters@nrc.gov>

Subject: [External_Sender] RE: Agenda and Support Docs for 5/25 RIS Tabletop
Jason,

I've just about completed the qualitative assessment for one tabletop example. It may be difficult to fully develop a second example prior to the meeting. Additionally, I'd like to review the revised RIS prior to completing the first example qualitative assessment. I'm shooting for completion of this example by the end of the weekend or very early next week.

The qualitative assessment I'm working on is a safety related example (EDG voltage regulator). I will attempt to develop a qualitative assessment for a non-safety example prior to the meeting next week if time permits. If I do not get the second example fully developed prior to the meeting, perhaps we could develop it (or finish developing it) as a group during the meeting. That may prove beneficial as well. Thoughts?

Neil

From: Drake, Jason [<mailto:Jason.Drake@nrc.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, May 18, 2017 8:18 AM

To: Rahn, David; Morton, Wendell; GEIER, Stephen; FREGONESE, Victor; Archambo, Neil G; REMER, Jason; HANSON, Jerud

Cc: Curtis, David; Jung, Ian; Waters, Michael

Subject: Agenda and Support Docs for 5/25 RIS Tabletop

Importance: High

All,

Just 24 hours removed from the ACRS briefing and we need to get going on our next actions. I have a rough agenda in PMNS for the 5/25 tabletop meeting (link below). Let's try to get some resolution to the agenda today and shoot for no later than Tuesday next week to load the presentation materials into ADAMS. Call or email me with any questions.

<https://adamswebsearch2.nrc.gov/webSearch2/view?AccessionNumber=ML17135A393>

Thanks for the support!

Jason Drake

Project Manager

Licensing Processes Branch (PLPB)

Division of Policy and Rulemaking

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Phone: (301) 415-8378

Location: 012-H20

Email: jason.drake@nrc.gov

This electronic message transmission contains information from the Nuclear Energy Institute, Inc. The information is intended solely for the use of the addressee and its use by any other person is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient, you have received this communication in error, and any review, use, disclosure, copying or distribution of the contents of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone or by electronic mail and permanently delete the original message. IRS Circular 230 disclosure: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS and other taxing authorities, we inform you that any tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties that may be imposed on any taxpayer or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

Hearing Identifier: NRR_DMPS
Email Number: 194

Mail Envelope Properties (48CDF0E40BAC134B896462F436986B88BCA3054F)

Subject: [External_Sender] RE: Agenda and Support Docs for 5/25 RIS Tabletop
Sent Date: 5/18/2017 9:37:19 AM
Received Date: 5/18/2017 9:37:28 AM
From: Archambo, Neil G

Created By: Neil.Archambo@duke-energy.com

Recipients:

"Curtis, David" <David.Curtis@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Jung, Ian" <Ian.Jung@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Waters, Michael" <Michael.Waters@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Drake, Jason" <Jason.Drake@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Morton, Wendell" <Wendell.Morton@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"GEIER, Stephen" <seg@nei.org>
Tracking Status: None
"REMER, Jason" <sjr@nei.org>
Tracking Status: None
"HANSON, Jerud" <jeh@nei.org>
Tracking Status: None
"FREGONESE, Victor" <vxf@nei.org>
Tracking Status: None
"Rahn, David" <David.Rahn@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: IMCLTEXCP61.nam.ent.duke-energy.com

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6837	5/18/2017 9:37:28 AM

Options

Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received: