

Facility: South Texas Project			Exam Date: 10/22/2018										
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		
	A1	2.1.20	2									S	Bank JPM from 2015 NRC exam
No Changes													
	A2	2.1.25	2									S	Modified bank from 2009 NRC exam
No Changes													
	A3	2.2.13	3									S	Bank JPM from 2013 NRC exam
The following comments were incorporated after the validation: 1. Provided TPNS numbers for SFP Skimmer Pump Valves and SFP Skimmer Pump Handswitch if student asks for them. See CUE added on JPM steps for handswitch and valves.													
	A4	2.3.7	1									E S	Bank JPM, exam unknown I believe this to be LOD 1, little discriminatory value. Although there is one area of the survey that shows a High Contamination Area, I see no reason why it is plausible that something other than the Contamination Area would be selected for dress out. Additionally, since the question involves moving fuel, it is obvious that the work will take place above the pool where all areas are <0.1 mr/hr
JPM A4 was enhanced from a JPM that was used on the LOT 18 Audit exam. It has not been used on an NRC exam. The enhancements were made to reflect the possibility that it may be considered an LOD 1. At STP we have made modifications to the Fuel Handling Building (FHB) to start moving spent fuel to fuel canisters designed for onsite fuel storage. If fuel was being moved to these fuel canisters then the other areas of the FHB identified in the RWP and survey map would be used including the High Contaminated area. The RWP covers and includes all fuel movement in the FHB including Region 1 to Region 2. However, the RWP does not indicate what Region 1 to Region 2 means. Only a trained fuel handler would know that Region 1 and Region 2 are only associated with the spent fuel pool. With the information given an untrained worker could possibly believe that moving fuel from Region 1 to Region 2 could include the areas of the FHB with higher dose rates and higher contamination levels identified on the survey map. Therefore we believe that this JPM is at least an LOD 2. We currently have it listed as an LOD 3.													
The following comments were incorporated after the validation: 1. Page 6 of JPM – Accepted JPM as LOD 2 and made change.													
	A5	2.1.37	2									E S	Bank JPM from 2015 NRC exam (last 2) Answer key shows an error associated with actual SDM, but no error associated with Inoperable or available rod worth. If there is no error associated with the input, there can be no error associated with the output.
JPM A5 was on the LOT 20 Exam and would be considered as being on the last 2 NRC exams. This JPM was developed using Unit 1 Cycle 19 data and was updated to use Unit 1 Cycle 21 data. No other changes were made. The KEY shows the error and reason for the recorded Inoperable Rod Worth (1 rod used in calculation instead of 2) and how the error affects Available Rod Worth and then the calculated SDM. We will review this again during the Validation Week and make sure it is OK.													
The following comments were incorporated after the validation: 1. Page 4 & 8 of Student HO1 – On Student Handout for OPSP10-ZG-0005 changed check marks to N/A on steps 5.5.4.2, 5.5.4.3 & 5.8.6.2. 2. Page 6 of JPM – Added administrative NOTE to use a binder for Student Handouts if available. 3. Page 7 of JPM – Updated Examiner NOTE for JPM Step 6 to follow up with TS 3.1.1.1 if Student documented as UNACCEPTABLE but didn't list TS.													

A6	2.1.25	2										S	Modified bank, exam unknown
<p>The following comments were incorporated after the validation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Page 24 of Student HO – On the chart show the GCBs closed for Unit 1 and Unit 2 Page 25 of Student HO – On the chart show closed the breakers for the 4160 KV bus supply breakers to the 480 V LC. Page 32 of Student HO – Delete the Unit Supervisor signature on this page. 													
A7	2.2.13	2										S	Bank JPM, exam unknown This question would be better if instead of having the breaker being listed closed instead of open, it was left off of the clearance, and part of the JPM would be to identify that it was missing.
<p>JPM A7 was on the LOT 10 Exam. We will make this enhancement to the JPM.</p>													
<p>The following comments were incorporated after the validation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Page 4 & 9 of JPM – Changed Initiating Cue to remove note about double valve protection and added to bolded note for student to review ECO in its entirety and if errors found document all errors. Page 6 of JPM – Added administrative NOTE to use a binder for Student Handouts if available. Page 1 of Student HO1 and Key – Changed check mark for Hazardous System from Yes to No. 													
A8	2.3.4	2										S	Bank JPM from 2011 exam
No Changes													
A9	2.4.41	3										S	Modified bank from 2015 exam
<p>The following comments were incorporated after the validation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Page 6 of JPM – Added administrative NOTE to use a binder for Student Handouts if available. 													

Simulator/In-Plant JPMs	1 Safety Function and K/A													
S1	2	2											S	Bank JPM from 2013 exam
<p>The following comments were incorporated after the validation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Page 3 of JPM – Enhanced administrative note to acknowledge all ICS alarms and clear all unacknowledged ICS alarms prior to starting the JPM. Page 4 of JPM – Added to the Task Standard to Trip RCP 1C within 5 minutes of receiving ICS alarm. Page 10 of JPM – Changed estimated completion time to 10 minutes. 														
S2	3	2											S	Bank JPM from 2013 exam
<p>The following comments were incorporated after the validation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Page 10 of JPM – Changed estimated completion time to 10 minutes. 														
S3	6	2			X								E S	Step 6, how does the applicant know the sequencer is functional? The cue states, "IF a plant operator ..." indicating that there should be another way to determine the sequencer is non-functional. Change the task standard to include placing Addendum 3 equipment in PTL, and make step 7 critical.
<p>JPM S3 is a new JPM. JPM step 6 has a NOTE telling the examiner that the BSMP light for Sequencer B 'LOSS CONT PWR' being illuminated is indication that the sequencer is not functional. The CUE was inserted in case the student sends an operator to the sequencer to check its status. The operator would report back that the sequencer supply breakers are tripped open. (This is how the failure was setup in the simulator.) We agree that JPM step 7 should be a critical step and we made the requested change.</p>														
<p>The following comments were incorporated after the validation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Page 7 of JPM – On JPM Step 7 removed note about step being NON-CRITICAL and added note that RHR Pump and SFP Pump were already in PTL. Page 8 of JPM – Added examiner note that the Emergency Start Pushbutton will have to be depressed to start the DG. 														
S4	5	2			X								E S	Bank JPM 2009 exam Step 11 is not critical. While I understand what the note states about the step being critical, the note in step 10 states that system flow will already be greater than 560 gpm, so in effect, step 11 is N/A. We will need to work out during validation week how to lower flow in the event someone does simply N/A that step.
<p>JPM S4 was on the LOT 17 Exam. JPM step 11 (procedure step 5.3.11) requires that flow be adjusted between 548.8 and 571.2 gpm. Nominally 560 gpm. We have enhanced the NOTE in JPM step 10 to clarify that flow will be out of range high when the pump is started. JPM step 11 (procedure step 5.3.11) must be performed and NOT N/Ad.</p>														
<p>The following comments were incorporated after the validation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Page 3 of JPM – Added administrative note to put up a screen between CP001 and CP002. Page 7 of JPM – Added CUE and Examiner note that SI/CS Pump Room fan started after starting CS Pump 1A. Page 10 of JPM – Changed estimated completion time to 10 minutes. 														
S5	4P	2											S	Modified bank, exam unknown
<p>The following comments were incorporated after the validation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Page 3 of JPM – Added administrative note to put up a screen between CP001 and CP002. Page 6 of JPM – Added CUE and Examiner note that ESF DG will NOT be paralleled to offsite power. 														

S6	8	2										S	Bank JPM from 2015 NRC exam (last 2)
<p>The following comments were incorporated after the validation:</p> <p>1. Page 5 of JPM – Added Examiner note that in accordance with the procedure valve stroke times should be recorded in hundredths of a second.</p>													
S7	1	2										E S	Bank JPM, exam unknown It is not apparent to me that the initiating cue states that control rods will not be moved in and out 8 steps first, as the initiating cue is silent (step 3). There should be an examiner cue to inform the applicant, if asked that control rods will not be moved in and out 8 steps first Cue listed in step 14 is cueing a critical step. Remove the cue from the JPM. The applicant should know to complete the procedure once done with exercising rods.
<p>JPM S7 was on the LOT 18 Exam. It has been modified to take out the alternate path. The Initiating Cue in the JPM was clarified to inform the student that control rods will NOT be moved in and out 8 steps prior to moving them in and out 10 steps. Removed Examiner Cue in JPM step 14 when the student places rod control back to AUTO or MANUAL.</p>													
<p>The following comments were incorporated after the validation:</p> <p>1. Page 3 of JPM – Added administrative note to adjust RCS temperature so that Tavg/Tref difference is about 1.7°F to 1.8°F. 2. Page 10 of JPM – Enhanced Examiner note that control rods should be placed in MANUAL because Tavg/Tref difference is > 1.5°F.</p>													
S8	7	2										S	Bank JPM, exam unknown
No Changes													
P1	4S												
No Changes													
P2	9												
No Changes													
P3	1												
<p>The following comments were incorporated after the validation:</p> <p>1. Page 5 & 6 of JPM – Enhanced examiner note that the MG Set room where the motors are actually located require DOUBLE ear protection. Moved note from Page 6 to beginning of JPM on Page 5. 2. Page 5 of JPM – Added Examiner CUE that MG Set #1 has been walked down and is ready for a start. 3. Page 5 of JPM – Added Examiner CUE for Directional Overcurrent A & C relays and Ground relay not actuated (no red flags) OR AS YOU SEE IT. 4. Page 7 of JPM – Enhanced Examiner CUE for Condition of MG Set #2. The condition is on the Initiating Cue. 5. Page 8 of JPM – Enhanced Examiner note that control room alarm is expected to clear after starting the MG Set. For this JPM the alarm clears but comes back in. 6. Page 8 of JPM – In the STANDARD column, corrected a procedure step number from 5.8 to 6.8. 7. Page 10 of JPM – Enhanced Examiner CUE about the Directional Overcurrent Relays. For each relay, if asked, indicate that the two red flags are showing and the ground relay is AS YOU SEE IT.</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: South Texas Project			Scenario: 1				Exam Date: October 22, 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	

General Comments: Please highlight (and/or shade) the Critical Tasks in the D2, along with the critical task statement and bounding criteria.

All Critical Tasks are bolded within the D2 and are also listed on a separate page included with the D2.

1							2015/3		Withdraw control rods to raise reactor power to 1% - 3%
2					✓				Power Range Channel NI 42 Fails High
3									Condensate Pump #12 Trip
4					✓				Loss of Starting Air ESF DG #12 - TS 3.8.1.1.b & d
5									Continuous Control Rod Withdrawal Malfunction.
6						✓			ATWS – Reactor fails to trip
7						✓	2015/4		Main Steam Line Break in Containment on SG 1B
8									Failure of Train B Essential Chiller to start

The following comments were incorporated after the validation:

- Page 5 – Examiner note that operator will pull control rods about 5 steps to get a startup rate of about 0.2 to 0.3 DPM.
- Page 6 – Added Annunciator Window number for the annunciator alarms.
- Page 6 – Add BOP with RO on steps for immediate actions for NI failure.
- Page 7 – Change to BOP performing steps at CP-011.
- Page 20 – Added comment for Event 7 to trigger event when crew re-enters EO00.
- Page 20 – Add examiner note that one CS Pump will be placed in PTL as per CIP of EO00.
- Page 21 – Changed AF-FV-7524 from ‘OCIV’ to ‘AFW Reg Valve.’
- Page 26 & 34 – Added communication with Chem Tech about sampling all SGs for activity.
- Page 30 – Added note about 30 second time delay when starting Ess. Chiller.
- Page 32 – Updated CT-17 condition to included ‘OR prior to receiving a RED path indication on Integrity, Subcooling or Containment.’
- Page 37 – Change Boric Acid Controller Pot setting to 5.48.
- Page 40 – Change RCS Boron to 2002 ppm on Turnover Sheet.
- Page 40 – Added to Turnover Sheet to raise power to 1% to 3% by using Control Rods.

Facility: South Texas Project			Scenario: 2				Exam Date: October 22, 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
1					✓				CRE HVAC Train C Supply Fan becomes inoperable.
2					✓				Loop 1A Cold Leg RTD T-0410B Fails Low
3									SGFPT #13 Trips and SGFP #14 fails to start. Crew will start a down power to about 80% power.
4						✓			RTD T-420B fails low causing the reactor to trip and the Main Turbine fails to auto trip.
5									LBLOCA.
6						✓			LHSI Pumps 1A & 1B fail to Auto Start
7							2015/3		Train B of Phase A fails to auto actuate with CV-MOV-0023 failed open.

The following comments were incorporated after the validation:

1. Page 5 & 30 – Added the Plant Operator will respond after 2 minutes for Event 1.
2. Page 7 – Added note that TS 3.6.2.1 and TRM 3.7.7 do not apply for this event.
3. Page 10 – Added note that TS 3.3.2.9.b does not apply for this event.
4. Page 15 – Make event 4 an Examiner Trigger.
5. Page 26 & 29 – Added note to acceptance criteria for CT-5 that the action can be accomplished while performing Addendum 5 of EO00. Note was already on Page 18.

Facility: South Texas Project			Scenario: 3				Exam Date: October 22, 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
1									Raise Reactor Power.
2					✓		2015/2		Over current trip on Charging Pump 1B
3					✓				DRPI indication for rod F8 fails (both channels).
4									RCP 1C #1 seal leakage ramped in over 3 minutes and then increases in severity after 7 minutes.
5						✓✓			SBLOCA (30 seconds after the reactor is tripped)
6									AFWP #14 fails to auto start.
7									SG 1B PORV pressure transmitter (PT-7421) fails high.

The following comments were incorporated after the validation:

- Page 12 – Make picture of actual DRPI Alarm and Power panels to use for cue.
- Page 32 – Change Event 1 communications for HD-MOV-0365 to open 25% instead of 20%

Facility: South Texas Project			Scenario: 4				Exam Date: October 22, 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
1									Perform OPC Test on Main Turbine and then continue with Plant Startup.
2					✓				PZR level channel LT-0465 fails high
3									VCT Level Transmitter LT-0112 fails high.
4									SG 1B Level Channel LT-0572 fails high.
5						✓			PZR Steam Space SBLOCA
6						✓			On the Reactor Trip and SI, a Loss of offsite power will occur with the following: Train A 4160V bus lockout, Train B Sequencer fails to actuate and ECW Pump 1C fails to auto start. The crew will manually start the ECW Pumps on Train B and C to supply cooling water to the respective ESF DGs.
7									RCFC Fans on Train B did not auto start because of Train B Sequencer and RCFC Fans on Train C fail to auto start.

The following comments were incorporated after the validation:

1. Ensure event pages all have Scenario 4 listed. Some did not.
2. Page 7 – Changed Event 2 to come in 60 seconds after main turbine is tripped in Event 1.
3. Page 15 – Use Low Power FRV, FV-7152. Low Power FRV are in service.
4. Page 22 – Added RNO step for RCP Seal Cooling. CCPs will not be running after the LOOP and SI so the RO will verify CCW flow.
5. Page 31 – Added page that has notes for CRE, EAB and FHB HVAC alignment. Operator may have to manually align some HVAC due to the LOOP on Train A and the Sequencer failure on Train B.
6. Page 34 & 35 – Lesson Plan steps and communications added for SG 1A and 1D Blackout Switches and CV-MOV-0025. Communications ONLY added for all other Phase 'A' valves powered by Train A.

Instructions for Completing This Table:

- 1 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 ≥ 2 for each scenario. (ES-301, D.5.d)
- In column 7, preidentified CTs should be ≥ 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	2	0	2	0	0	E S	Scenario marked as edit to capture any comments which may arise during validation	
2	7	0	2	0	2	0	0	E S	Scenario marked as edit to capture any comments which may arise during validation	
3	7	0	2	0	2	0	0	E S	Scenario marked as edit to capture any comments which may arise during validation	
4	7	0	2	0	2	0	0	E S	Scenario marked as edit to capture any comments which may arise during validation	

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	0	3	6		
Sim./In-Plant JPMs	11	0	3	8		
Scenarios	4	0	4	0		All scenarios marked as edit to capture any comments which may arise during validation
Op. Test Totals:	24	0	10	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.

- 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 (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%
- 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).