

Facility: Cooper		Exam Date:												
Admin	JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes						4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation	
				I/C Focus	Cues	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Overlap	Perf. Std.	Key	Minutia			Job Link
	A1	Determined DG fuel oil G2.1.23	2 (as written, almost 1)				N						E	How are the gauges read in the field? Are they in feet and inches or just inches? The JPM should be completed up to Attachment 4 step 1.1.8. The applicant should have the entire procedure. Appears to be a simple math problem without a lot of operational significance. Will need to add runtime to the cue to use the chart.  Borderline direct lookup and really easy
	A2	Perform DW unident leak rate checks G2.1.18	2										E	Since the leak rate is 0.40625 the range should be 0.40 to 0.41. This will change the delta leak rate range to 0.30 to 0.31.  Not a SF6 JPM. The only challenge (not plug and chug) is the time.
	A3	Electrical Print reading 2.2.25	2										E	The standard could be wrong because the fuse looks like it is on the A side of RPS. The fuse is really obvious. Change to one of the sensor fuses so they have to identify which signal is being impacted. Also I can't find the alarm window on the drawing. Very easy jpm.  Seems like cueing to bulletize the two items in the key in the stem.
	A4	Calc Liquid release curie content 2.4.39	2 (very close to a 1)										E	Not a SF6 JPM. Borderline direct lookup and really easy.
	A5	Review Surv. For Sec. Cont Valve 2.1.20	3										S	
	A6	Determine action for out of spec chemistry 2.1.34	2										E	Do we have to tell them what Volume 2 procedure they are in? Could they be reviewing sample data from daily logs and then enter the procedure? This would add procedure selection to the JPM.  Seems like cueing from stem to procedure. Wouldn't CRS have to figure out procedure use on his own?

A7	Determine PMT for FHR valve 2.2.21	2										E	<p>Why is it necessary to tell the applicant the type of valve? Shouldn't they be able to look the valve up? Bonnet gasket replacement isn't listed under the butterfly valve MOV table as a maintenance option. They should be able to figure the type of valve on their own.</p> <p>Is it a classroom or sim JPM? Examiner directions state to put sim in run. I don't really need anything but the valve name and then find it in the table and all the choices in Att 2 are the answer. How is this not direct lookup?</p>
A8	Emergency exposure reqmta:2.3.4	3										E	<p>I'd like to add information on staffing the centers to make the applicant decide who the current emergency director is and make that part of the task standard. I didn't see in procedure 5.7.12 that listed anyone else as being available to approve the dose besides the emergency director. If the only person that can approve dose in a general emergency is the emergency director than I would like to remove that from the task standard and remove it as a critical task.</p> <p>Is it a classroom or sim JPM? Examiner directions state to put sim in run-cut/paste error.</p>
A9	Determine PAR: 2.4.44	3										S	
													<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Admin JPMS don't really use a SF determination but if you use that then you should put a system number and also assign a second set of Kas for the topic in addition to the generic KA..</li> <li>I recommend using an S designator in front of the SRO admin JPMs (ie SA5 vs A5)</li> </ol> <p>Alt path JPMs are minimal with 4. Should always strive to be above the minimum (such as 5)</p>
Simulator/In-Plant JPMs	1 Safety Function and K/A												
S1	1	2										E	<p>Appears to be a one -step alternate path JPM. There shouldn't be too many of these. Would like to add in the task standard that tripping the A recirc pump would also constitute JPM failure. The schedule has this run as a solo JPM. This JPM should be set up with a pre-brief room due to the number of precautions.</p> <p>Look at last time this one was done on an exam.</p>



**Instructions for Completing This Table:**

Check or mark any item(s) requiring a comment and explain the issue in the space provided using the guide below.

1. Check each JPM for appropriate administrative topic requirements (COO, EC, Rad, and EP) or safety function requirements and corresponding K/A. Mark in column 1. (ES-301, D.3 and D.4)
2. Determine the level of difficulty (LOD) using an established 1–5 rating scale. Levels 1 and 5 represent an inappropriate (low or high) discriminatory level for the license that is being tested. Mark in column 2 (Appendix D, C.1.f)
3. In column 3, “Attributes,” check the appropriate box when an attribute is **not met**:
  - The initial conditions and/or initiating cue is clear to ensure the operator understands the task and how to begin. (Appendix C, B.4)
  - The JPM contains appropriate cues that clearly indicate when they should be provided to the examinee. Cues are objective and not leading. (Appendix C, D.1)
  - All critical steps (elements) are properly identified.
  - The scope of the task is not too narrow (N) or too broad (B).
  - Excessive overlap does not occur with other parts of the operating test or written examination. (ES-301, D.1.a, and ES-301, D.2.a)
  - The task performance standard clearly describes the expected outcome (i.e., end state). Each performance step identifies a standard for successful completion of the step.
  - A valid marked up key was provided (e.g., graph interpretation, initialed steps for handouts).
4. For column 4, “Job Content,” check the appropriate box if the job content flaw **does not meet** the following elements:
  - Topics are linked to the job content (e.g., not a disguised task, task required in real job).
  - The JPM has meaningful performance requirements that will provide a legitimate basis for evaluating the applicant’s understanding and ability to safely operate the plant. (ES-301, D.2.c)
5. Based on the reviewer’s judgment, is the JPM as written (U)nacceptable (requiring repair or replacement), in need of (E)nhancement, or (S)atisfactory? Mark the answer in column 5.
6. In column 6, provide a brief description of any (U)nacceptable or (E)nhancement rating from column 5.

Save initial review comments and detail subsequent comment resolution so that each exam-bound JPM is marked by a (S)atisfactory resolution on this form.

Facility: Cooper Nuclear Station			General comments on scenarios						Exam Date: Sept xx, 2018
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Event	Realism/Cred.	Required Actions	Verifiable actions	LOD	TS	CTs	Scen. Overlap	U/E/S	Explanation
									<p><b>General Comments for all scenarios</b></p> <p>CT's are minimal (2) number for 3 of 4 scenarios. Should always strive to be above the minimum (ie 3 is good because if one is challenged or not achieved, the scenario still meets the minimum standards).</p> <p>For parameters to record for grading purposes, we will need to work thru the required parameters to capture for scenarios for grading during validation week.</p> <p>Highlight procedures in Gray when first used and for transitions.</p> <p>Measurable Performance indicators for CT table should have the actual switches manipulated for success of the CT. Example, Group 5 fails to isolate RCIC in scenario 4, so you must manually close the inbd and outbd isolation valves for RCIC (the RCIC-MO-15 and RCIC-MO-16 valves).</p>

Facility: Cooper		Scenario: 1						Exam Date:	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Event	Realism/Cred.	Required Actions	Verifiable actions	LOD	TS	CTs	Scen. Overlap	U/E/S	Explanation
1				1-2				S	<p>This is better as a JPM. This could be difficult for examiners to monitor while the other operator is providing a peer check.</p> <p>This would be a candidate for elimination based on the bean count for the scenario set.</p> <p>Not much too this event. No parameter control, only attribute to grade is control board ops and it is 4 HMI buttons.</p>
2		X		3				E	<p>Which rods are they going to manipulate? How many rods pulls does Cooper recommend before we move on to the next event? I prefer to see a list in the scenario guide.</p> <p>Not all required actions in the guide. How many rods and which ones are pulled to get to 25% open on bypass valves? These actions must be in the D-2 guide, not just the rx plan for the startup. How long does it take to get there before next event?</p>
3				2				E	<p>Which alarm card has priority? This is the one the ATC should pull first, and this should be in the guide. If they are all same priority then the guide is okay. Which guide provides directions to 2.1.5? That should be clear in the guide as well. Also, which card has the actions for bypassing the channel (if any). Are all actions in 2.1.5?</p>
4				3	✓			E	<p>What is the position of 26-07 at the start of the event? Will the rod drift all the way in on its own? I want to make sure the ATC has enough time to diagnose and get direction from the CRS for the switch manipulation since this isn't an immediate action. TS event</p> <p>Not sure I understand your explanation of the TS call. Seems to me that if you can drive the rod in, then it is trippable, therefore it is operable. This would make condition A the only applicable LCO entry, not C.</p>
5				3	✓ **			S	TRM event

									Not sure I this is good enough for the second TS call. It really needs to be from the TS, not the TRM because if not, then you are minimizing risk for the scenario (TRM is minimal risk vs TS) and we want to incorporate as much risk as possible to meet the nureg. It also allows better/equivalent grading on the TS calls across scenarios.
6				3		✓		S	<p>What is the timing on reaching a secondary containment parameter reaching a max safe? Need to make sure this is possible during the scenario.</p> <p>For CT2, can you exceed the BIIT curve if you don't try SLC? How long does it take to exceed the BIIT curve?</p> <p>For CT1, the HSD weight boron aspect needs to be clear, 26% I think is the number, but is it from the SLC tank or how is this measured or determined? This is part of the CT meas perf indicator (needed in the table also).</p>
7				2				S	What is limit on SPC-if they don't get other valve open by what time, they exceed the SP max temp of what?
8				2				E	Missed SLC pump A malfunction-it counts as malf after EOP and also another event.
									<p>This doesn't seem like a 90 minute scenario. It seems too straightforward to have a 90 minute validation time.</p> <p>Potential spare.</p>







**Instructions for Completing This Table:**

Use this table for each scenario for evaluation.

- 2 Check this box if the events are not related (e.g., seismic event followed by a pipe rupture) **OR** if the events do not obey the laws of physics and thermodynamics.
- 3, 4 In columns 3 and 4, check the box if there is **no** verifiable or required action, as applicable. Examples of required actions are as follows: (ES-301, D.5f)
  - opening, closing, and throttling valves
  - starting and stopping equipment
  - raising and lowering level, flow, and pressure
  - making decisions and giving directions
  - acknowledging or verifying key alarms and automatic actions (Uncomplicated events that require no operator action beyond this should **not** be included on the operating test unless they are necessary to set the stage for subsequent events. (Appendix D, B.3).)
- 5 Check this box if the level of difficulty is **not** appropriate.
- 6 Check this box if the event has a TS.
- 7 Check this box if the event has a critical task (CT). If the same CT covers more than one event, check the event where the CT started **only**.
- 8 Check this box if the event overlaps with another event on any of the last two NRC examinations. (Appendix D, C.1.f)
- 9 Based on the reviewer's judgment, is the event as written (U)nacceptable (requiring repair or replacement), in need of (E)nhancement, or (S)atisfactory? Mark the answer in column 9.
- 10 Record any explanations of the events here.

In the shaded boxes, sum the number of check marks in each column.

- In column 1, sum the number of events.
- In columns 2–4, record the total number of check marks for each column.
- In column 5, based on the reviewer's judgement, place a checkmark only if the scenario's LOD is not appropriate.
- In column 6, TS are required to be  $\geq 2$  for each scenario. (ES-301, D.5.d)
- In column 7, preidentified CTs should be  $\geq 2$  for each scenario. (Appendix D; ES-301, D.5.d; ES-301-4)
- In column 8, record the number of events not used on the two previous NRC initial licensing exams. A scenario is considered unsatisfactory if there is  $< 2$  new events. (ES-301, D.5.b; Appendix D, C.1.f)
- In column 9, record whether the scenario as written (U)nacceptable, in need of (E)nhancement, or (S)atisfactory from column 11 of the simulator scenario table.

Facility:		Exam Date:								
Scenario	1 Event Totals	2 Events Unsat.	3 TS Total	4 TS Unsat.	5 CT Total	6 CT Unsat.	7 % Unsat. Scenario Elements	8 U/E/S	11 Explanation	
1	8						0	S		
2	8						0	S		
3	8						0	S		
4	8						0	S		
	8						0	S		

**Instructions for Completing This Table:**

Check or mark any item(s) requiring comment and explain the issue in the space provided.

1, 3, 5 For each simulator scenario, enter the **total** number of events (column 1), TS entries/actions (column 3), and CTs (column 5).

This number should match the respective scenario from the event-based scenario tables (the sum from columns 1, 6, and 7, respectively).

2, 4, 6 For each simulator scenario, evaluate each event, TS, and CT as (S)atisfactory, (E)nhance, or (U)nsatisfactory based on the following criteria:

- a. Events. Each event is described on a Form ES-D-2, including all switch manipulations, pertinent alarms, and verifiable actions. Event actions are balanced between at-the-controls and balance-of-plant applicants during the scenario. All event-related attributes on Form ES-301-4 are met. Enter the total number of unsatisfactory events in column 2.
- b. TS. A scenario includes at least two TS entries/actions across at least two different events. TS entries and actions are detailed on Form ES-D-2. Enter the total number of unsatisfactory TS entries/actions in column 4. (ES-301, D.5d)
- c. CT. Check that a scenario includes at least two preidentified CTs. This criterion is a target quantitative attribute, not an absolute minimum requirement. Check that each CT is explicitly bounded on Form ES-D-2 with measurable performance standards (see Appendix D). Enter the total number of unsatisfactory CTs in column 6.

7 In column 7, calculate the percentage of unsatisfactory scenario elements:  $\left(\frac{2 + 4 + 6}{1 + 3 + 5}\right) 100\%$

8 If the value in column 7 is > 20%, mark the scenario as (U)nsatisfactory in column 8. If column 7 is ≤ 20%, annotate with (E)nhancement or (S)atisfactory.

9 In column 9, explain each unsatisfactory event, TS, and CT. Editorial comments can also be added here.

Save initial review comments and detail subsequent comment resolution so that each exam-bound scenario is marked by a (S)atisfactory resolution on this form.

Site name:		Exam Date:				
OPERATING TEST TOTALS						
	Total	Total Unsat.	Total Edits	Total Sat.	% Unsat.	Explanation
Admin. JPMs	9	2	3	4		
Sim./In-Plant JPMs	11	0	1	10		
Scenarios	4	0	4	0		
<b>Op. Test Totals:</b>	24	2	8	14	8	Satisfactory submittal.

#### Instructions for Completing This Table:

Update data for this table from quality reviews and totals in the previous tables and then calculate the percentage of total items that are unsatisfactory and give an explanation in the space provided.

- Enter the total number of items submitted for the operating test in the "Total" column. For example, if nine administrative JPMs were submitted, enter "9" in the "Total" items column for administrative JPMs. For scenarios, enter the total number of simulator scenarios.
- Enter the total number of (U)nsatisfactory JPMs and scenarios from the two JPMs column 5 and simulator scenarios column 8 in the previous tables. Provide an explanation in the space provided.
- Enter totals for (E)nhancements needed and (S)atisfactory JPMs and scenarios from the previous tables. This task is for tracking only.
- Total each column and enter the amounts in the "Op. Test Totals" row.
- Calculate the percentage of the operating test that is (U)nsatisfactory ( $\text{Op. Test Total Unsat.} / \text{Op. Test Total}$ ) and place this value in the bolded "% Unsat." cell.  
  
Refer to ES-501, E.3.a, to rate the overall operating test as follows:
  - satisfactory, if the "Op. Test Total" "% Unsat." is  $\leq 20\%$
  - unsatisfactory, if "Op. Test Total" "% Unsat." is  $> 20\%$
- Update this table and the tables above with post-exam changes if the "as-administered" operating test required content changes, including the following:
  - The JPM performance standards were incorrect.
  - The administrative JPM tasks/keys were incorrect.
  - CTs were incorrect in the scenarios (not including postscenario critical tasks defined in Appendix D).
  - The EOP strategy was incorrect in a scenario(s).
  - TS entries/actions were determined to be incorrect in a scenario(s).

Final is below

Facility: Cooper		Exam Date:												
Admin	JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
				I/C Focus	Cues	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Overlap	Perf. Std.	Key	Minutia	Job Link		
	A1	Determined DG fuel oil G2.1.23	2										S	All comments resolved.
	A2	Perform DW unident leak rate checks G2.1.18	2										S	All comments resolved.
	A3	Electrical Print reading 2.2.25	2										S	All comments resolved.
	A4	Calc Liquid release curie content 2.4.39	2										S	All comments resolved.
	SA5	Review Surv. For Sec. Cont Valve 2.1.20	3										S	
	SA6	Determine action for out of spec chemistry 2.1.34	2										S	All comments resolved.
	SA7	Determine PMT for FHR valve 2.2.21	2										S	All comments resolved.
	SA8	Emergency exposure reqmta:2.3.4	3										S	All comments resolved.
	SA9	Determine PAR: 2.4.44	3										S	
Simulator/In-Plant		1												



**Instructions for Completing This Table:**

Check or mark any item(s) requiring a comment and explain the issue in the space provided using the guide below.

1. Check each JPM for appropriate administrative topic requirements (COO, EC, Rad, and EP) or safety function requirements and corresponding K/A. Mark in column 1. (ES-301, D.3 and D.4)
2. Determine the level of difficulty (LOD) using an established 1–5 rating scale. Levels 1 and 5 represent an inappropriate (low or high) discriminatory level for the license that is being tested. Mark in column 2 (Appendix D, C.1.f)
3. In column 3, “Attributes,” check the appropriate box when an attribute is **not met**:
  - The initial conditions and/or initiating cue is clear to ensure the operator understands the task and how to begin. (Appendix C, B.4)
  - The JPM contains appropriate cues that clearly indicate when they should be provided to the examinee. Cues are objective and not leading. (Appendix C, D.1)
  - All critical steps (elements) are properly identified.
  - The scope of the task is not too narrow (N) or too broad (B).
  - Excessive overlap does not occur with other parts of the operating test or written examination. (ES-301, D.1.a, and ES-301, D.2.a)
  - The task performance standard clearly describes the expected outcome (i.e., end state). Each performance step identifies a standard for successful completion of the step.
  - A valid marked up key was provided (e.g., graph interpretation, initialed steps for handouts).
4. For column 4, “Job Content,” check the appropriate box if the job content flaw **does not meet** the following elements:
  - Topics are linked to the job content (e.g., not a disguised task, task required in real job).
  - The JPM has meaningful performance requirements that will provide a legitimate basis for evaluating the applicant’s understanding and ability to safely operate the plant. (ES-301, D.2.c)
5. Based on the reviewer’s judgment, is the JPM as written (U)nacceptable (requiring repair or replacement), in need of (E)nhancement, or (S)atisfactory? Mark the answer in column 5.
6. In column 6, provide a brief description of any (U)nacceptable or (E)nhancement rating from column 5.

Save initial review comments and detail subsequent comment resolution so that each exam-bound JPM is marked by a (S)atisfactory resolution on this form.











**Instructions for Completing This Table:**

Use this table for each scenario for evaluation.

- 2 Check this box if the events are not related (e.g., seismic event followed by a pipe rupture) **OR** if the events do not obey the laws of physics and thermodynamics.
- 3, 4 In columns 3 and 4, check the box if there is **no** verifiable or required action, as applicable. Examples of required actions are as follows: (ES-301, D.5f)
- opening, closing, and throttling valves
  - starting and stopping equipment
  - raising and lowering level, flow, and pressure
  - making decisions and giving directions
  - acknowledging or verifying key alarms and automatic actions (Uncomplicated events that require no operator action beyond this should **not** be included on the operating test unless they are necessary to set the stage for subsequent events. (Appendix D, B.3).)
- 5 Check this box if the level of difficulty is **not** appropriate.
- 6 Check this box if the event has a TS.
- 7 Check this box if the event has a critical task (CT). If the same CT covers more than one event, check the event where the CT started **only**.
- 8 Check this box if the event overlaps with another event on any of the last two NRC examinations. (Appendix D, C.1.f)
- 9 Based on the reviewer's judgment, is the event as written (U)nacceptable (requiring repair or replacement), in need of (E)nhancement, or (S)atisfactory? Mark the answer in column 9.
- 10 Record any explanations of the events here.

In the shaded boxes, sum the number of check marks in each column.

- In column 1, sum the number of events.
- In columns 2–4, record the total number of check marks for each column.
- In column 5, based on the reviewer's judgement, place a checkmark only if the scenario's LOD is not appropriate.
- In column 6, TS are required to be  $\geq 2$  for each scenario. (ES-301, D.5.d)
- In column 7, preidentified CTs should be  $\geq 2$  for each scenario. (Appendix D; ES-301, D.5.d; ES-301-4)
- In column 8, record the number of events not used on the two previous NRC initial licensing exams. A scenario is considered unsatisfactory if there is  $< 2$  new events. (ES-301, D.5.b; Appendix D, C.1.f)
- In column 9, record whether the scenario as written (U)nacceptable, in need of (E)nhancement, or (S)atisfactory from column 11 of the simulator scenario table.

Facility:		Exam Date:								
Scenario	1 Event Totals	2 Events Unsat.	3 TS Total	4 TS Unsat.	5 CT Total	6 CT Unsat.	7 % Unsat. Scenario Elements	8 U/E/S	11 Explanation	
1	8						0	S		
2	8						0	S		
3	8						0	S		
4	8						0	S		
	8						0	S		

**Instructions for Completing This Table:**

Check or mark any item(s) requiring comment and explain the issue in the space provided.

1, 3, 5 For each simulator scenario, enter the **total** number of events (column 1), TS entries/actions (column 3), and CTs (column 5).

This number should match the respective scenario from the event-based scenario tables (the sum from columns 1, 6, and 7, respectively).

2, 4, 6 For each simulator scenario, evaluate each event, TS, and CT as (S)atisfactory, (E)nhance, or (U)nsatisfactory based on the following criteria:

- a. Events. Each event is described on a Form ES-D-2, including all switch manipulations, pertinent alarms, and verifiable actions. Event actions are balanced between at-the-controls and balance-of-plant applicants during the scenario. All event-related attributes on Form ES-301-4 are met. Enter the total number of unsatisfactory events in column 2.
- b. TS. A scenario includes at least two TS entries/actions across at least two different events. TS entries and actions are detailed on Form ES-D-2. Enter the total number of unsatisfactory TS entries/actions in column 4. (ES-301, D.5d)
- c. CT. Check that a scenario includes at least two preidentified CTs. This criterion is a target quantitative attribute, not an absolute minimum requirement. Check that each CT is explicitly bounded on Form ES-D-2 with measurable performance standards (see Appendix D). Enter the total number of unsatisfactory CTs in column 6.

7 In column 7, calculate the percentage of unsatisfactory scenario elements:  $\left(\frac{2 + 4 + 6}{1 + 3 + 5}\right) 100\%$

8 If the value in column 7 is > 20%, mark the scenario as (U)nsatisfactory in column 8. If column 7 is ≤ 20%, annotate with (E)nhancement or (S)atisfactory.

9 In column 9, explain each unsatisfactory event, TS, and CT. Editorial comments can also be added here.

Save initial review comments and detail subsequent comment resolution so that each exam-bound scenario is marked by a (S)atisfactory resolution on this form.

<b>Site name:</b>				<b>Exam Date:</b>		
<b>OPERATING TEST TOTALS</b>						
	Total	Total Unsat.	Total Edits	Total Sat.	% Unsat.	Explanation
Admin. JPMs	9	0	0	9		
Sim./In-Plant JPMs	11	0	0	10		
Scenarios	4	0	0	4		
<b>Op. Test Totals:</b>	24	0	8	14	0	

**Instructions for Completing This Table:**

Update data for this table from quality reviews and totals in the previous tables and then calculate the percentage of total items that are unsatisfactory and give an explanation in the space provided.

1. Enter the total number of items submitted for the operating test in the "Total" column. For example, if nine administrative JPMs were submitted, enter "9" in the "Total" items column for administrative JPMs. For scenarios, enter the total number of simulator scenarios.
2. Enter the total number of (U)nsatisfactory JPMs and scenarios from the two JPMs column 5 and simulator scenarios column 8 in the previous tables. Provide an explanation in the space provided.
3. Enter totals for (E)nhancements needed and (S)atisfactory JPMs and scenarios from the previous tables. This task is for tracking only.
4. Total each column and enter the amounts in the "Op. Test Totals" row.
5. Calculate the percentage of the operating test that is (U)nsatisfactory (Op. Test Total Unsat.)/(Op. Test Total) and place this value in the bolded "% Unsat." cell.  
  
Refer to ES-501, E.3.a, to rate the overall operating test as follows:
  - satisfactory, if the "Op. Test Total" "% Unsat." is ≤ 20%
  - unsatisfactory, if "Op. Test Total" "% Unsat." is > 20%
6. Update this table and the tables above with post-exam changes if the "as-administered" operating test required content changes, including the following:
  - The JPM performance standards were incorrect.
  - The administrative JPM tasks/keys were incorrect.
  - CTs were incorrect in the scenarios (not including postscenario critical tasks defined in Appendix D).
  - The EOP strategy was incorrect in a scenario(s).
  - TS entries/actions were determined to be incorrect in a scenario(s).