

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Tabletop Exercise of Interim Staff Guidance
(ISG)-06, Draft Rev. 2, "Licensing Process"

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: Thursday, June 14, 2018

Work Order No.: NRC-3769

Pages 1-136

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 234-4433

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

TABLETOP EXERCISE OF INTERIM STAFF GUIDANCE
(ISG)-06, DRAFT REV. 2, "LICENSING PROCESS"

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

JUNE 14, 2018

+ + + + +

The meeting convened in Room 1C03/1C05 of
Three White Flint North, 11601 Landsdown Street,
Rockville, Maryland, at 8:00 a.m., Joe Golla
presiding.

INDUSTRY MEMBERS PRESENT

- JANA BERGMAN, Curtis-Wright
- MARK BURZYNSKI, NewClear Day, Inc.
- STEVE DRAGOVICH, Exelon
- PAREEZ GOLUB, Excel
- JERUD HANSON, NEI
- DAVE HARRELL, MPR Associates
- RAYMOND HERB, Southern Nuclear
- DAVID HOOTEN, Imperia Engineering Partners
- FRANK NOVAK, GE Hitachi
- WARREN ODESS-GILLETT, NEI
- JOHN SCHRAGE, Entergy

1 NRC STAFF PRESENT

2 JOSEPH GOLLA, NRR

3 ROSSNYEV ALVARADO, NRR

4 AARON ARMSTRONG, NRO

5 SHELDON CLARK, OGC*

6 SAMIR DARBALI, NRR

7 JOHN HUGHEY, NRR

8 RICHARD STATTEL, NRR

9 BOOMA VENKATARAMAN, NRR

10 MICHAEL WATERS, NRR

11 DEANNA ZHANG, NRO*

12

13 *Present via telephone

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Welcome and Introductions 3

Alternate Review Process SER Inspection Items . . 7

Appropriate license commitments in consideration
of early license amendment issuance 51

Break 81

Vendor Oversight Plan 83

Summary, Action Items, Stakeholder Feedback . . 125

Adjourn 136

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(7:58 a.m.)

MR. GOLLA: Okay, folks, good morning. This is Joe Golla speaking, Project Manager for the ISG-06. This is the second day of our tabletop exercise. Why don't we just quickly go around the room again and also on the phone just to announce name and association. We don't need to pass this, just shout.

MS. VENKATARAMAN: Just shout?

MR. GOLLA: Okay, all right.

MS. VENKATARAMAN: Okay. My name is Booma Venkataraman. I am Acting Chief in the Division of Operator and Reactor Licensing. Here I am helping as Project Manager.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Hello. My name is Aaron Armstrong and I work in NRO in the Vendor Inspection Branch and I got involved in this when 35.710 was issued.

MR. DARBALI: Samir Darbali, Instrumentation and Controls Branch, Technical Reviewer.

MR. HERB: Ray Herb, Southern Nuclear.

MR. NOVAK: Frank Novak, GE Hitachi.

MR. HARRELL: Dave Harrell, MPR and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Associates.

2 MS. GOLUB: Pareez Golub, Excel Services.

3 MR. ODESS-GILLERT: Warren Odess-Gillert,
4 NEI.

5 MR. BURZYNSKI: Mark Burzynski, Rolls-
6 Royce.

7 MR. DRAGOVICH: Steve Dragovich, Exelon.

8 MS. ALVARADO: Rossnyev Alvarado. I am
9 the Branch Chief for I&C Branch.

10 MR. HANSON: Jerud Hanson, NEI.

11 MR. HOOTEN: Dave Hooten, Imperia
12 Engineering Partners.

13 MS. BERGMAN: Jana Bergman, Curtis-Wright.

14 MR. STATTEL: Hi, I'm Richard Stattel, NRC
15 I&C Branch.

16 MR. GOLLA: Okay. And how about the
17 people on the phone, would you like to announce your
18 name and affiliation? Do we have anyone on the phone?

19 MS. ZHANG: Deanna Zhang, NRC in the
20 Office of New Reactors, I&C.

21 MR. GOLLA: Okay, Deanna. Okay, so first
22 on the agenda this morning we've got -- The topic is
23 vendor inspection, and I will turn it over to whomever
24 on the staff is prepared to speak to that.

25 MR. DARBALI: Thank you, Joe, I want to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 apologize, I lost my voice so I'll do the best I can
2 today. This is Samir Darbali. So the first topic is
3 the Vendor Oversight Plan and I will turn it over to
4 Pareez to describe the sample LAR text that you
5 provided.

6 MS. GOLUB: Thank you, Samir. All right,
7 so I am actually going to ask Ray and Steve to speak
8 to this a little bit. As you know in ISG-06 one of
9 the prerequisites is to provide a summary of the
10 licensee's vendor oversight plan.

11 And so what we wanted to provide to you
12 guys was what we thought that summary would look like,
13 what would be submitted in the LAR so what was
14 submitted was actual LAR language.

15 And I guess, Ray or Steve, did you guys
16 want to say anything more or did you just want to open
17 it up for the staff to provide feedback. I leave that
18 up to you guys.

19 MR. HERB: I can just start out by saying
20 that this is something that was added in the revision
21 to ISG-06. It's always been under the responsibility
22 of the licensees, but it's been something that we
23 haven't really done that well in the past.

24 And so we welcome the opportunity to step
25 up our vendor oversight process. It is key to an

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 efficient and effective and correct design, so it's
2 part of what we committed to do underneath of our new
3 standard design process and the digital process as
4 well.

5 So this is just a sample or this is --
6 This is a different thing.

7 MS. GOLUB: Oh, wait. This is a different
8 --

9 MR. HERB: Summary of vendor oversight
10 planning activities. Yes, so this is just, was
11 written to --

12 (Simultaneous speaking.)

13 MR. HERB: Yes, at a high level to
14 indicate the requirements of C.2.2.1. And so if we
15 have any -- Steve, do you have anything you want to
16 say?

17 MR. DRAGOVICH: Just to say that at Exelon
18 we would propose to --

19 MR. GOLLA: Closer.

20 MR. DRAGOVICH: Oh, it's not on, okay. At
21 Exelon we would propose to have both process and
22 technical oversight during each of the visits. This
23 kind of outlines what we are going to have in our
24 standard, you know, digital engineering guide so we're
25 trying to follow industry standard.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And, of course, we would be project
2 specific so we would have to at the beginning of a
3 project determine, you know, what the strategic vendor
4 oversight timeframe would be and then who the
5 stakeholders would be to attend those oversight
6 visits. So it's kind of a case-by-case project-
7 specific basis.

8 MR. DARBALI: So thank you for that
9 description. I kind of made a mistake in the
10 beginning and we are in the wrong section. So we'll
11 keep that in mind when we come back to the vendor
12 inspection plan, but actually the first item is the
13 sample inspection items.

14 And we'll do the turnover just because we
15 have Booma here in the room. So what we'll do is
16 we'll come back to --

17 MR. HERB: Okay.

18 MR. DARBALI: -- the vendor oversight
19 program.

20 MR. HERB: Yes, forget everything I said.

21 MR. DARBALI: No, no it's on the record.

22 (Laughter.)

23 MR. DARBALI: Okay. So we got on the
24 screen the sample recommended inspection items, and
25 these were provided by the staff. The idea is -- And

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we typically, we've done these in the past, we did it
2 for Diablo, we did it for Oconee, where we -- And we
3 have the guidance now in the SRP that kind of tells us
4 this is a good idea, the region likes to have this.

5 We draft these items and we kind of get
6 the regions involved as we do our license amendment
7 request review and this just kind of guides them on
8 activities to perform after the license amendment is
9 issued.

10 In the past with the tier process these
11 activities just focus on site activities, so site
12 acceptance testing, operations, installations, startup
13 testing.

14 With the alternate review process we have
15 added some sample activities that would apply to those
16 implementation and test activities that would occur at
17 the vendor.

18 It is true that, yes, those activities do
19 tie back to the vendor oversight plan. Those
20 activities used to be reviewed, audited, by the staff.
21 We will get a chance to do that and the licensee will
22 take the oversight role, even though you actually
23 always had that oversight role as part of your
24 contract with a vendor.

25 So the list of items, let's see, we

1 separated them between what we considered to be
2 alternate review process-specific and then I think
3 it's on Page 4 that we have those specific, those that
4 wouldn't apply to either process at this site.

5 The ones that came from, that are site
6 inspection items actually came from the Diablo Canyon
7 Safety Evaluation Report. We just changed the
8 language where it said the platform, we just, it would
9 say Tricon, we just changed it to the platform where
10 it said Diablo Canyon on it.

11 PG&E we just changed it to the licensee.
12 And maybe we changed some of the language to make it
13 more generic, but those should be the same. So I will
14 turn it over to the industry if you have questions on
15 those alternate review process items.

16 MS. GOLUB: All right, so we provided a
17 version of this with our questions list.

18 MR. DARBALI: Yes.

19 MS. GOLUB: I don't know if that would be
20 helpful to put up. We can speak to them, that's not
21 a problem.

22 MR. DARBALI: So --

23 MR. STATTEL: Yes, let me add a few words.

24 MR. DARBALI: Yes.

25 MR. STATTEL: Hi, this is Rich Stattel

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 again. So I just wanted to cover the origin of these
2 inspection items.

3 So with the Oconee review you have to
4 understand we were following our branch technical
5 position standard review plan guidance and we
6 encountered several guidance criteria that we weren't
7 able to accomplish for whatever reasons, the
8 procedures for the plant had not been written.

9 There were several associated with the
10 cybersecurity evaluation, because this preceded the
11 development of ESSO guidance and so we troubled with
12 how to deal with them.

13 Originally they were proposed to be
14 conditions. We proposed to include them as conditions
15 of the issuance of the license amendment, and that
16 would push back to us, we weren't allowed to do that.

17 So our only alternative was to make them
18 recommend it, right, so that it's, in other words,
19 fulfillment of these actions was not, did not have any
20 bearing on the safety conclusions in our license
21 amendment.

22 So they were recommended for inspection,
23 for inspection only, because that's essentially after
24 the license amendment was issued. That's our
25 opportunity to basically follow up with them.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Most of them are confirmatory in nature,
2 right, and that's why we were able to basically reduce
3 them to recommended items. If the inspectors chose
4 not to inspect these items that was okay, right, and
5 not 100 percent of them were actually inspected at the
6 level at the recommendation.

7 Okay, so that was kind of the origin of
8 them. With Ocone the inspectors basically when they
9 prepared their inspection plan they used them pretty
10 extensively.

11 They contacted Samir and I and the
12 reviewers and we participated and we were members of
13 the inspection team. So we were able to provide, you
14 know, what did we mean by that, you know, answering
15 those types of questions.

16 There were several of those items that the
17 licensee for one reason or another was not able to
18 fulfill and we encountered that during the
19 inspections.

20 We wrote those into the inspection reports
21 and we basically provided them, basically we approved
22 not meeting those items, okay. Some of them had to do
23 with testing methods, the testability of the system
24 that they installed.

25 It was things that we really had just not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 anticipated during the license review. Now it's
2 interesting because that has come up over and over
3 again since that time, so it's been like ten years
4 since that started.

5 One of the things we have noticed is
6 common among these upgrades is that the licensees will
7 specify the system, the vendors will design the
8 system.

9 We think we have a pretty good
10 understanding of how the system works and we think we
11 know how the operators are going to operate, but we
12 don't write the procedures for operating it or update
13 the OIs until the very end.

14 We don't update the emergency procedures
15 until the very end. We don't update the key control
16 logs and those types of things. Those are typically
17 last minute activities.

18 And at Oconee during the inspection they
19 had written a procedure and they were validating the
20 procedures in their simulator, so they were basically
21 -- They had the system simulated and they were having
22 the operating crews go through the procedures for
23 operating the system and it kind of goes to our HFE
24 discussion yesterday.

25 So even though they really didn't change

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 any of their HFE they kind of did because the way they
2 operate the system did change and it was impacted by
3 the system modification.

4 In the case of Oconee they had installed
5 a diverse actuation system, which did not exist in the
6 past, and some of their emergency response procedures
7 failed to work because the diverse actuation -- They
8 hadn't anticipated that the diverse actuation system
9 would prevent the operator from being able to operate
10 certain equipment.

11 And it wasn't a big deal. I mean they had
12 to revise the procedures and overcome that, but it's
13 things that we had not anticipated during their
14 license review.

15 And that's where I think a lot of these
16 inspection items actually do have a lot of value. So
17 we were able to work through that and approve all of
18 that and that's all documented in the Oconee
19 inspections.

20 Diablo Canyon never made it to that point
21 because they chose not to install the system. And we
22 don't always do the inspections, so for Hope Creek,
23 for example, there was no follow-up inspection.

24 Okay, so now what we are seeing here is
25 basically we took that as a starting point, what are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the recommended inspection items for Diablo, I realize
2 Samir just mentioned, but we also looked at this and
3 I had identified several -- So basically I was kind of
4 putting a lens on and looking at the Diablo Canyon
5 application as if we had issued this license amendment
6 prior to implementation of the design and prior to
7 installation, right, or testing.

8 So we added some additional activities
9 that we thought, well, we're not going to be able to
10 complete these review activities that are in the
11 review plan, therefore, I am anticipating we would
12 have to include these as recommended inspection items,
13 right.

14 So that's essentially what we have in
15 front of us here. I did read through your comments
16 and a lot of them are very good comments and we have
17 actually noticed this ourselves, there is some
18 repetition, right, and that's kind of an outcropping
19 of the way we perform our evaluations.

20 So these are, you know, we don't write
21 these evaluations sequentially, right, we perform
22 different activities and we parse them out. So we
23 will have one reviewer assigned to perform the SDO
24 evaluation, another reviewer perform D3, you know, so
25 we basically parse them out by section.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And as you know there is a lot of overlap,
2 particularly when you get into the IEEE 603 and 7432
3 sections. They have criteria that covers all aspects
4 of the design.

5 So, therefore, you know, these are being
6 generated as we perform our evaluation and that's why
7 you see the overlap and the repetition. We have
8 actually recognized this in more recent reviews and we
9 have actually done the same thing as what you are
10 recommending here.

11 So, you know, I have notes here. You
12 know, I agree with pretty much all of your
13 recommendations and these are things that, you know,
14 these are subjective and we understand that, and we
15 can choose not to cover them, right.

16 So, in other words, the SRP, it's
17 basically an all things and all people type guidance
18 document and it covers all aspects, all phases of
19 development processes.

20 So it is intended to be comprehensive in
21 that manner and, you know, being diligent and trying
22 to be organized evaluators we tried as best as we can
23 to follow all of that guidance.

24 So when we encounter something that we are
25 unable to review for whatever the reason is typically

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that gets, it's -- Think of it as like a parking lot
2 board, right, so we put that out in the parking lot
3 and then when we have finished our evaluations we look
4 through that board and see which ones of these we want
5 to retain as inspection items and, again, just
6 recommended inspection.

7 And some of them we just that's not
8 important, you know, it doesn't matter that much, and
9 we leave them off. So we are not really holding
10 ourselves to 100 percent of the criteria within the
11 Standard Review Plan.

12 So these are, I don't want to use the word
13 negotiable, but they are very subjective and it is up
14 to the evaluator, so the evaluator decides what
15 recommendations to make to the inspectors.

16 And Samir mentioned, we did have very
17 positive feedback from the inspectors from both Region
18 II and Region IV and they help us, right, they
19 actually have gotten involved with our licensing
20 evaluations and they come along with us.

21 We invite them and they typically will
22 come with us when we perform our audits. So --

23 MS. GOLUB: Oh, so they are involved
24 early.

25 MR. STATTEL: Yes. Yes, absolutely.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Shiattin Makor was involved with the Diablo Canyon
2 audits. She was present at every one of those audits
3 and she would be the one, you know, hadn't Diablo
4 Canyon gone through with installation, she would have
5 been the one performing and leading those inspections,
6 right. And the same was true at Ocone, right.

7 So the inspectors really like them
8 because, you know, they are not familiar with the
9 system, they don't know the system as well as the
10 evaluators do, so they like having us on the team and
11 they like basically us to explain those
12 recommendations to them.

13 So they actually had provided us feedback
14 to update the Standard Review Plan, which we did, and
15 we actually have guidance within our Standard Review
16 Plan, Chapter 7, it's basically telling us to include
17 these recommended items, but it is still very
18 subjective.

19 MS. GOLUB: The inspection items. You
20 know, as I told you yesterday, you know, Steve had
21 actually compiled them all, we read them all.

22 Now so you said that you concurred with
23 the comments that we made. I would like to talk about
24 the first comment if we could because that's the one
25 for us is a sticky one.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. DARBALI: Yes.

2 MS. GOLUB: And I want to make sure that
3 we are all on the same page.

4 MR. DARBALI: So I want to say where the
5 alternate review process items came from.

6 MS. GOLUB: Mm-hmm.

7 MR. DARBALI: So we didn't, because we
8 didn't have a LAR in front of us, I took Inspection
9 Procedure 35.710, which is the one Aaron worked on,
10 which is specific to NRO-type new reactor reviews, but
11 because they cover some of the development activities
12 that we typically review or audit I felt it was
13 appropriate to identify those generically as some of
14 the activities an inspection can cover. So that would
15 be Items 1 through 6.

16 And then Item 7 is for secure development
17 and operational environment. The 7a and 7b are, it's
18 language that was described in the LAR an SDOE example
19 as activities that would be performed.

20 So I figured those would be some good
21 activities to inspect and those are related to the
22 vulnerability assessment. And 7c and 7d are the
23 implementation and testing of regulatory precision
24 from Reg Guide 1152.

25 So I felt that being those the late stage

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 life cycle activities those would be good activities
2 to inspect. So with that, yes, we can go to your
3 first overall comment and --

4 MR. STATTEL: And 8 through 20, the
5 remaining ones were derived from the Diablo Canyon
6 application.

7 MR. DARBALI: Right.

8 MS. GOLUB: So I think the comments that
9 we provided on 8 through 20, you know, for your
10 consideration we can certainly go through those today
11 --

12 MR. STATTEL: Right.

13 MS. GOLUB: -- but that I think what
14 struck us when we looked at this was the way these
15 inspection items were phrased, verify licensee and
16 vendor activities related to application design, so
17 based on the vendor oversight plan, based on at least
18 how we saw the framework of the alternative review
19 process, we thought that that activity would be a
20 licensee activity to do those audits, inspections,
21 oversight of their vendor, and that the staff would be
22 inspecting how well the licensee performed their
23 oversight activities relative to what they had put
24 into their license amendment.

25 So whatever their licensing obligation was

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in the LAR and then, you know, reflected in the SER
2 license amendment, that that is where, you know, the
3 staff would be.

4 So when we read this we almost felt like
5 it was saying, okay, that's not the framework, in
6 fact, you know, the NRC is going to be performing the
7 inspections they performed previously and the licensee
8 would also be doing vendor oversight.

9 You know, so the efficiencies we thought
10 we were gaining maybe we were not.

11 MR. DARBALI: Right. And so we're talking
12 about vendor oversight, and we'll get to that later,
13 but, yes, both topics apply.

14 I think from the very beginning when we
15 were considering an early approval we were saying,
16 well, the purpose of the vendor oversight plan is for
17 the staff to have reasonable activities that those
18 activities that the staff would have reviewed before
19 a license amendment is issued that we will have
20 reasonable assurance that they would be performed.

21 So the licensee is describing in their
22 oversight plan how they make sure those are covered.
23 That doesn't -- But we always said, and we included
24 the vendor inspection team from the very beginning
25 because we were saying, yes, we are getting that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 information that you will do these activities,
2 however, we will still, and especially for these very
3 early plants we still want to inspect how the vendor
4 is doing those activities and make sure that those
5 implementation activities are performed and it is
6 within the purview of the NRC and the vendor
7 inspection team to perform those activities.

8 So I would like to turn that over to Aaron
9 to provide some background on that.

10 MR. ARMSTRONG: Yes. What happened was we
11 were aware of a thing called ISG-06 in NRO, but that's
12 NRR, we were busy doing our own things.

13 So what happened was during an inspection
14 we started looking at software, because we do have the
15 commercial grade dedication of design and analysis
16 software.

17 So after doing an inspection on that for
18 Enercon we identified that some design things were not
19 turned over to the licensee TVA for an evaluation of
20 flooding, and that was an inspection that was
21 requested from the licensing staff.

22 So that kind of got the ball rolling. We
23 came up with what, really the birth of this came out
24 of the review that we performed for NRO where there
25 were a lot of hours burned up and we wanted to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 streamline it.

2 So in the evolution of the developing this
3 we took all the Reg Guides, the IEEE standards that
4 were endorsed, 2.7, the guidance for dedication of
5 design and analysis software, and we rolled it up and
6 together to come up with kind of a hit list of things
7 inspectors should be aware of in the life cycle for
8 quality assurance for software that they should be
9 asking or looking at.

10 I think that's why it says "verify,"
11 because it was really written for an inspector at a
12 vendor inspection plant or doing some kind of
13 licensing inspection for software.

14 So I'm sorry it caught you guys off guard
15 that it said "verify" but I wrote it in intention for
16 the inspectors to utilize it as an inspection guidance
17 activity.

18 Now it just so happens that all of the
19 IEEE guidance and NQA-1 2.7 and the design and
20 analysis dedication and they are all interconnected,
21 so when I issued that that's how we got involved in
22 this.

23 So I think as a vendor group you are aware
24 that most all licensees have to meet 10 C.F.R. Part
25 50, Appendix B, that's a requirement of the license.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Also, Part 21 is also applicable.

2 And I know that you contractually passed
3 that down to your vendors and you do have NUPIC
4 observations or audits that you do.

5 MS. GOLUB: Yes, that's right.

6 MR. ARMSTRONG: We do oversee the NUPIC
7 observations as well, as you have seen our site. So
8 where we are kind of is when Mike Waters's group
9 contacted me, you know, we take the stance that we
10 would do what they requested as part of the licensing.

11 It is not our intention to go out and
12 routinely inspect every vendor that you have but if
13 there is things that we need to look at, you know, we
14 do have the right to go out to look and we will look
15 according to Mike's group.

16 So that's kind of where we were coming
17 from. I just wanted to clarify that how it came
18 about. So I guess if there are any questions --

19 MS. GOLUB: Yes, so I was --

20 MR. STATTEL: Actually, I want to say a
21 couple words. If you have an impression that somehow
22 in the past we were vendor oversight instead of the
23 licensee performing that activity I want to dispel
24 that right now.

25 We don't do that, right. Where this comes

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 from is we were thinking about the audits, okay. And,
2 you know, we've had a lot discussion over this,
3 because we did read your comment and we are definitely
4 taking it to heart.

5 Now we looked back at some of the audit
6 reports from the audits we have performed and what is
7 apparent to us is that we won't have the opportunity
8 perform those audit activities in an alternate review
9 process because a lot of those audit activities are
10 really dependent on having applications implemented,
11 design implemented, and that's not going to be the
12 case here.

13 So I really -- We have done audits in the
14 early stage and they are not really productive. So in
15 Diablo Canyon we went out at the early stage with ALS
16 down to Scottsdale and we tried to perform an audit
17 and essentially when you start pulling requirements
18 threads they don't go anywhere because they have an
19 implemented design. There is nothing to verify.

20 So we are trying to think of ways, well,
21 how can we perform that activity that we would
22 traditionally perform during an audit, you know, what
23 would be the alternative here, because we do still
24 have that guidance to do those, you know, basically do
25 those confirmation activities.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So I think we are talking past each other
2 a little bit here. We are not implying that we are
3 going to go perform the vendor oversight instead of
4 the licensee. You still have that responsibility.
5 That's in Appendix B, Responsibility.

6 We're really just confirming, and, again,
7 this would be, I think this is recommended inspection,
8 right, or -- Yes, this is recommended inspection. So,
9 again, it's at the discretion of the evaluator of what
10 recommendations he makes.

11 And now those recommendations in this case
12 are kind of going over to Aaron's group and they would
13 be putting those inspection plans together.

14 MR. ARMSTRONG: Well we would be working
15 with NRR to put the plans together because we are more
16 quality assurance and oversight of QA programs. I
17 mean as you aware that your NUPIC audits is really to
18 keep people on your ASLs for Appendix B supplies or
19 maybe even dedication activities that the licensees --
20 I guess I would ask a question, a NUPIC audit is
21 really geared for a QA program to be put on an ASL.

22 I guess I would impose the question, is
23 that going to be, is the audit the way it is now
24 sufficient for the licensing activities that you plan
25 to have an oversight?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. GOLUB: No, it is not.

2 MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

3 MS. GOLUB: And fundamentally a NUPIC
4 audit occurs every three years, it's not project
5 specific.

6 MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

7 MS. GOLUB: The vendor oversight plan is
8 project specific.

9 MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay, all right, great.

10 MS. GOLUB: So it's going to be in the LAR
11 for only this project.

12 MR. ARMSTRONG: Yes, okay.

13 MS. GOLUB: So NUPIC would have nothing to
14 do with it. Now I know one thing that the licensees
15 have talked about, because I have heard Ray and Steve
16 talk about this, is that, of course, they would pull
17 those NUPIC audits, you know, when they are preparing
18 to go in and do their audit, their inspections of
19 their vendors, they are going to look at all of that
20 material and they are going to, you know, see what
21 they looked at, what the deficiencies were, and take
22 that into account when they go in.

23 So I don't want to say that they are going
24 to be ignored, but that's not at all what this is
25 about. This is very project specific.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay, thank you.

2 MS. GOLUB: Yes.

3 MR. ARMSTRONG: That's awesome, thank you.

4 MS. GOLUB: Yes, no worries. So I do have
5 a question for you, and maybe this is just my
6 fundamental misunderstanding of how the agency
7 operates, but I guess in our minds we thought after
8 the SER was issued, the license amendment was issued,
9 that it fell over into the regional inspection space,
10 and so the regional inspectors would be coming in to
11 the licensees facility and doing their inspection.

12 So they would be looking at these items
13 and saying, okay, licensee, how well did you perform
14 these activities, how well did you do this oversight.
15 You committed to something, you know, you committed to
16 this in your LAR.

17 Maybe you guys took a look at the actual
18 vendor oversight plan, there's just a summary in the
19 LAR, you know, as part of your review activities, how
20 well did you perform to what you committed to?

21 And in our minds because that is done at
22 the licensees' facilities, you know, either in their
23 corporate or the site, that that was a regional
24 inspection activity and we viewed the vendor
25 oversight, the vendor quality branch, activities as

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 being done on an as-needed basis, when requested
2 basis, but not necessarily project specific, and I am
3 only talking operating plants, okay, I want to leave
4 the new plant world out of this, but that those
5 activities were done at the vendor's facilities on an
6 as-needed, non-project-specific quality process basis.

7 That was our impression. Does anybody
8 disagree with that impression? Warren?

9 MR. HERB: No, that was it.

10 MS. GOLUB: Or want to supplement it?

11 MR. ODESS-GILLERT: I would like to
12 supplement it if I can because if the regional
13 inspector finds gaps in the vendor oversight process
14 and says, well, you know, well I don't see in your
15 documentation where you verified that you verified the
16 implementation activities, okay, you don't have any
17 documentation, then somehow the licensee would have to
18 address that gap and maybe the region inspector will
19 say, you know what, maybe I'll deploy my vendor QA
20 branch to look at that gap in addition to maybe the
21 licensing being responsible for filling that gap at
22 the same time.

23 So I could see that, but the premise is
24 that the starting point for the recommended inspection
25 items would be the efficacy of the vendor oversight.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. GOLUB: done by the licensee?

2 MR. STATTEL: Right. I mean if we can
3 talk about, you know, were they an appropriate
4 location for the audit or inspection activities,
5 typically we do the audits at the vendor facilities
6 because that's where all the documentation is, that's
7 where we can speak to the people who are doing the
8 development activities.

9 It's very, actually I think pretty much
10 all of the time that the licensee is with us on those
11 audits. So they are performing their oversight, you
12 know, as we are performing our audit, in parallel.

13 Now in Oconee I will mention, Oconee
14 performed some vendor oversight activities that we
15 were not present for, right, they did that
16 independently.

17 They audited and they spent time at the
18 vendor facilities, they prepared an audit report. We
19 did credit that audit report in our safety evaluation.
20 So, you know, this kind of, I think this is a little
21 bit what you are saying, so if the licensee is
22 performing those oversight activities there would be
23 documentation associated with those oversight
24 activities and it's quite possible that our inspection
25 might be a review of the reports for that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 It doesn't necessarily have to be at the
2 vendor facilities but sometimes that is a more
3 convenient place to perform those activities.

4 MS. GOLUB: Okay. So I don't want to get
5 too caught up on the where, I guess it was more is my
6 description of your agency's activities, was that
7 accurate?

8 MR. DARBALI: Well I will let Aaron talk
9 about it, but he said that their inspections are not
10 project specific, I'll let you talk about that, but
11 when you described the region inspection of the vendor
12 oversight activity that is true, so you might have a
13 case where after a license amendment is issued you
14 have a regional or site inspector looking at the
15 licensee's vendor oversight planning implementation
16 activities and you also have a vendor inspection on
17 the vendor because they are different things. So I'll
18 let --

19 (Simultaneous speaking.)

20 MR. ODESS-GILLERT: Well that was just a
21 different position I think because from our point of
22 view, you know, the role of the vendor, I'm sorry, the
23 role of the licensee is going to dramatically change
24 as a result, that this is industry's position and this
25 is what they are going to put in their industry

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 guidance is that the role of vendor oversight is going
2 to be significantly augmented as part of supporting
3 the alternate review process.

4 MR. STATTEL: I would hope not. I would
5 hope you are performing your oversight activity, I
6 mean you've always had that responsibility, the
7 licensees have always had that responsibility.

8 MR. ODESS-GILLERT: But in reality, Rich,
9 even if you look at the Diablo Canyon work the audits
10 that the licensee performed were not nearly the same
11 level of audit as the NRC.

12 And what we are proposing is that the
13 licensee would be informed by the audits and reports
14 and plans that the NRC has done in the past, put that
15 in industry guidance as the role of the licensee to
16 conduct the same level of inspection on the vendor as
17 it has been done in the past by the NRC staff.

18 And that's why we are proposing that if
19 that is the case and we can show you the industry
20 guidance that tells the licensees to do that that the
21 role of inspection, or the focus of inspection would
22 then turn from the vendor to the licensee, did you
23 conduct your oversight to the extent that we would
24 have done it in the old process, and if you find that
25 the results are inadequate then additional inspection

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 would be required plus the licensee would address why
2 the licensee did not meet the expectations of the NRC
3 inspection staff in their inspection of the vendor.

4 MR. STATTEL: Okay. I would point out
5 that vendor oversight goes way beyond just performing
6 inspections and performing audits. So, for example,
7 one of the vendor oversight activities that I have
8 seen at both Diablo Canyon and Oconee and other plants
9 is it's typical for a licensee to send a QA inspector
10 to witness and participate in the factory test
11 activities and they will typically verify results and
12 they are there basically the entire time, right.

13 It's not just a spot check audit, they are
14 verifying it. Also, vendor documents, they are
15 typically sent to the licensee, the licensee reviews
16 them, you now, performs detailed reviews of those.

17 We don't do that. We don't do those
18 activities. We look at the reports that are generated
19 by the licensee, we verify that the licensee is
20 performing those appropriate activities.

21 But, you know, we're not duplicating that,
22 we're not going behind and, you know, we don't have
23 the resources to do those kind of things. So, yes, I
24 guess I kind of see what you are saying maybe
25 documentation wise, but I would certainly expect, you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 know, maybe not equivalent but some level of the
2 licensee performing those types, those same activities
3 that we would do during those audits.

4 I mean our audits are typically one week,
5 right. So we'll go one week, we'll perform an audit,
6 you know, and usually it's only three or four days of
7 that week, and that's it, that's the extent of it.

8 We write a report. Basically there are
9 spot checks. We are not going any kind of 100 percent
10 review of anything. We might review three or four
11 requirements out of thousands typically.

12 You know, we have interviews with the
13 people performing the activities because we find that
14 useful in understanding the processes so that we can
15 write our, you know, evaluations accurately, but they
16 are really not that extensive.

17 Those audits are really not that extensive
18 efforts. You know, we're not talking thousands of
19 hours of commitment, nowhere near what I would expect
20 an actual licensee to, the level of effort the
21 licensee would expend to perform oversight because the
22 licensees should be involved basically throughout the
23 development.

24 MS. GOLUB: Yes. But I just wanted to say
25 that I guess what Warren described that was not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 intended to be the extent of the vendor oversight, I
2 mean licensees. They are involved in all the stages
3 of the process.

4 But Warren's description, we're really
5 looking for a response on Warren's description of how
6 we view who is doing what because I feel like we have
7 a fundamental misunderstanding and I am hoping we do
8 not.

9 But if you could speak to what Warren said
10 that would be very helpful.

11 MR. STATTEL: All right.

12 MS. GOLUB: Please, go ahead.

13 MR. ODESS-GILLERT: Before you speak to
14 what I said maybe I could just confirm what Rich said
15 and that when I said "augmented" it would be the type
16 of audit that the NRC staff has done for LAR reviews
17 for digital I&C has not normally been something that
18 the licensee did, because the licensee knew that the
19 NRC was going to do it, right.

20 MR. STATTEL: Okay.

21 MR. ODESS-GILLERT: So now that the
22 licensing is expecting, is not expecting the NRC to do
23 it, it's not going to be part of the normal process,
24 but that's the augmented activities of vendor
25 oversight in addition to what they have done in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 past for making sure we meet QA requirements and
2 meeting technical requirements.

3 MR. STATTEL: And it really shouldn't be
4 unique to digital I&C. I mean vendor oversight is
5 something that's a lot broader than digital I&C.

6 MR. ODESS-GILLERT: Right.

7 MR. STATTEL: And digital I&C is not
8 special. There are many cases and many examples where
9 vendors, basically by proxy the vendors are performing
10 development activities for whatever that may be,
11 design, development. I&C is not unique in that area.

12 (Simultaneous speaking.)

13 MR. WATERS: I have a question as well.

14 MR. DARBALI: I want Aaron to talk about
15 your role as far as, you know, getting all the project
16 specific.

17 MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay. There is the
18 inspection staff at the regions, or residents, and
19 then there is the inventor inspection branch.

20 Now the difference is the resident
21 inspectors look at everything at the licensee. The
22 licensee will cut a purchase order and invoke the Part
23 21 and Appendix B.

24 When that purchase order is accepted by an
25 Appendix B holder, you've an audit, you've verified

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 their program, that's where my job would start. So if
2 you have a technical specification that you issued we
3 would evaluate your purchase order, and I am going to
4 say "you" is licensee, licensees purchase order
5 downstream.

6 That would include sub-suppliers, your
7 supplier and their sub-suppliers as well if they are
8 procuring materials or doing anything. So that's
9 probably the line between the two.

10 There are exceptions. Licensees do have
11 labs where they do dedication, and, as you are aware,
12 there was an Allen Bradley issue with the dedication
13 of a relay.

14 I am a vendor person. We own dedication
15 pretty much, all the reg guidance for dedication as
16 the vendor group, I was actually at the plant looking
17 at the relay.

18 So to say that I would never be in a plant
19 is not correct because we would send whoever has the
20 expertise to wherever they needed to go and to
21 evaluate the issue.

22 So that's kind of how we are set up to
23 regulate, or how we do our oversight now is downstream
24 from the purchase order for vendors, but there are
25 other opportunities where we would be involved at the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 licensee.

2 MS. GOLUB: Okay, so that's good.

3 MR. ARMSTRONG: So does that answer your
4 question?

5 MS. GOLUB: That clears up one
6 misconception, yes. But I guess, so when you say a
7 purchase order to a vendor, so like the purchasing of
8 relays or those kind of components, but are you saying
9 that for all -- I'm trying to differentiate between
10 like a purchasing --

11 MR. ARMSTRONG: An RPS, purchasing an RPS?

12 MS. GOLUB: Yes. Right, purchasing an RPS
13 or that kind of a platform versus a component type of.

14 MR. ARMSTRONG: Right.

15 MS. GOLUB: But so I mean --

16 MR. ARMSTRONG: If it meets -- All right,
17 50.2 has a definition of safety-related. A basic
18 component is a subset of that. So if you are
19 purchasing a basic component and as it is defined as
20 a basic component I think in Part 21 with the four or
21 five subparts, if you are procuring that, and it could
22 be a service, I think it was NUREG 0302 that actually
23 has services and software being identified as a basic
24 component.

25 So if you are procuring it under those

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 definitions you would have to invoke Part 21 in
2 Appendix B and then I would be responsible from that
3 purchase order down.

4 MS. GOLUB: Okay. So but for an
5 organization like let's say, you know, Westinghouse or
6 GE, I mean you are, I would assume, doing periodic
7 inspections of their --

8 MR. ARMSTRONG: Right now we are in a very
9 lengthy review of Westinghouse and our inspection
10 reports are publicly available and you can see where
11 Greg Galletti has been going to Westinghouse and
12 looking at the MPS system and the architecture of the
13 control equipment there and it has been routine.

14 I think he does two or three a year on the
15 oversight in the development of that program. My
16 branch chief thinks that that's a very useful way to
17 do things. You know, I'm not going to say it is or
18 isn't, I mean that's still something that I think we
19 need to discuss.

20 But I mean if there if value added and it
21 does the job then maybe it should be an alternative
22 that would be looked at. So I don't I guess -- Does
23 that make sense? Are you clear -- Am I clear?

24 MS. GOLUB: Mike, were you about to ask a
25 question?

1 MR. WATERS: This is Mike. The first
2 point is you have a September timeframe for a workshop
3 and, obviously, we need to talk more about the
4 programmatically the inspection from licensing to
5 vendor to region.

6 And I applaud the idea of industry having,
7 you know, a higher focus on its oversight process. One
8 issue I have is I don't, we haven't seen that process,
9 I mean will that be shared with us.

10 And I still believe as Rich had described
11 and Aaron described I think part of verifying that
12 would be at the vendor site pulling those few threads
13 to verify the vendor is doing it correctly and, in
14 fact, the licensee is correctly overseeing it as well
15 as well as any regional inspections.

16 Another question I am trying to
17 understand, because we view that our footprint is
18 significantly shrinking here. We're not doing the
19 paper review of a lot of details here, all their
20 implementation details, all the -- We're not -- It's
21 significantly -- The footprint of doing that paper
22 review, do that, plus a few audits that Rich
23 mentioned, that paper is significantly shrinking what
24 we traditionally do with audit during licensing.

25 You know, you wouldn't get a license till

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 an audit was satisfied, we may do now vendor
2 inspection items. I am just trying to understand is
3 that a misunderstanding or is there a concern with
4 that. That's just what we are trying to understand
5 here.

6 MS. GOLUB: Okay, so I'll -- Should I keep
7 going? So I'll just, I'll be very blunt about what
8 our concern is. So we are, of course, you know, we
9 went through this entire process because we are trying
10 to find deficiencies, we're trying to find -- Safety
11 is, of course, the number one focus, but after safety
12 there is, you know, we're hoping for cost savings,
13 efficiencies, frankly, we're trying to keep the
14 operating fleet operating.

15 That's, you know, the highest purpose
16 here. From that perspective we are really concerned
17 that now our vendors, like we're stepping up, right,
18 the industry, the licensees, they are stepping up to
19 take a closer look at the vendors, do much better
20 audits, inspections, all of that, and our thought had
21 been that we would be stepping up to do that and,
22 therefore, the NRC could step back in that role from
23 doing as much of that and would instead be making sure
24 the licensees are doing adequate inspection of their
25 vendors.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 think we did two vendor audits at the early stages and
2 two vendor audits, and, again, two because two
3 different vendors, in the late stages.

4 There wasn't a lot of value in those early
5 audits. The way the alternate review process is set
6 up that's where we would be doing our audits, if we do
7 the audits.

8 We wouldn't be doing audits at the
9 implementation and I think the late audits were during
10 the fact. So those were the audits where we got a lot
11 of value. But as of recently we had to come back for
12 a second audit because the very first audits didn't
13 get a lot of value.

14 So there is a possibility that in the
15 alternate review process if an audit is performed the
16 scope is a lot less because there is not a lot to see.

17 MR. STATTEL: Actually, I anticipate -- We
18 have kind of talked about this in the last couple of
19 weeks amongst ourselves, I actually don't think we
20 would perform well during the license review. So I
21 believe we would be stepping back in that manner and
22 I think the inspections would be, you know, it
23 wouldn't be performing the same activities that we
24 have in the past performed during audit.

25 Now with that said I believe the audits,

1 the activities we performed at audits were very
2 instructive for both sides. It's not like we went,
3 we were wasting our time, we go on these audits, we
4 never find anything wrong and there's no value, right.

5 Well they are valuable. That's why we
6 continue to perform them. They identify problems,
7 they identify shortcomings, they increase awareness of
8 the vendor personnel.

9 It helps -- In the past -- One of the main
10 benefits of the audit for us when we perform it during
11 a license evaluation is being able to sit down and
12 talk with the actual people who are performing the
13 development.

14 It helps us immensely to understand what
15 it is we are approving and it gives us a lot of
16 confidence in when we write our safety conclusions.
17 You know, we have a whole lot of confidence in those
18 safety conclusions.

19 We are not just, yes, what the vendor
20 said, we're not just taking someone's word for it. We
21 actually do understand these processes and we
22 understand these systems pretty well.

23 So I don't think -- You know, I think we
24 are backing off on that and we're going to have to
25 figure out how to fill that gap, right, without -- I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 don't think audits are the answer, right.

2 I am just trying to project this for you,
3 audits are optional. We don't always perform audits
4 during license reviews and if we don't get to
5 implementation and design and testing there is very
6 limited value in performing those audits.

7 So I think what you said is correct. I
8 think we are backing off on what our role would be in
9 an alternate process, so it seems to me like we are in
10 agreement on this.

11 I'm not sure if the words are right in the
12 documentation. And if someone on the staff disagrees
13 with anything I said please speak up.

14 MR. DARBALI: I would say that what the
15 vendor oversight plan -- The licensee always performs
16 vendor oversight, but because the staff reviews those
17 implementation and testing activities we don't need to
18 see your vendor oversight plans because we are not
19 going to be looking at those activities.

20 That's where the plan comes from. The
21 plan gives us reasonable assurance that what we can't
22 see will be performed, but that doesn't mean that we
23 don't need to inspect it or that we don't have the
24 option to inspect it.

25 The ISG itself relies on that plan for the

1 alternate review process but it doesn't change our
2 inspection activities, it doesn't change the way we
3 treat commitments or conditions, it just changes how
4 and when we give you that license amendment.

5 It doesn't affect all the other oversight
6 activities that the NRC has the purview of. So we
7 don't control that of which is outside licensing. We
8 can inform it but we can't -- I mean we can, the ISG
9 can't say we won't do that because that's outside of
10 what an ISG can do, and we can verbally even tell you
11 we are not going to do it, but that's within the
12 purview of the inspection oversight activities.

13 So in a sense, and, right, we're trying to
14 get to an agreement and that is the purpose of the
15 tabletop and we'll have that September workshop, but
16 there is a lot more going on outside of the digital
17 licensing process.

18 MS. GOLUB: Yes, and the reason we are
19 going down this path is not to have the whole workshop
20 here, you know, today.

21 MR. DARBALI: Right.

22 MS. GOLUB: That's not at all the purpose.
23 But, you know, I think yesterday when we went over one
24 of the outcomes for this meeting was we want to make
25 sure that when we come in September that on our side

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we have a good sense of what to expect, you know, what
2 your position is, it kind of helps us be better
3 prepared.

4 So all of these questions are really
5 towards making sure we understand how the agency
6 conducts its business so that we can be better
7 prepared. So just to be clear that's where this is
8 coming from.

9 But I guess I think I heard Rich say --
10 Did somebody --

11 MR. DRAGOVICH: I just was going to add
12 something.

13 MS. GOLUB: You go ahead.

14 MR. DRAGOVICH: I was just going to say,
15 and we're not suggesting either that we want to
16 guarantee that there wouldn't be inspections, I think
17 we're just saying that we want the licensee to have
18 the first crack at doing the inspection and then if
19 there is any gaps then we would expect that either we
20 would be challenged to go back and get more
21 information or there would be a potential inspection.

22 MR. DARBALI: Right.

23 MR. DRAGOVICH: But any time we do
24 something at the vendor it's a lot more costly. We
25 have the type of vendor resources that could have an

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 impact to schedule so it would be a lot easier for the
2 licensee to have that auditor inspection, you know,
3 our house and try to go through what we were supposed
4 to address and then identify any gaps.

5 MR. STATTEL: I would also point out that
6 I think there is an opportunity for improvement here
7 because frankly the licensees are a lot better
8 equipped to provide this oversight than we are.

9 So as an example during one audit that I
10 participated we did a sampling, we sampled like 2
11 percent of like condition reports or issue reports,
12 and we found, you know, we found a list of problems,
13 right.

14 So let's say we found, you know, five
15 issues where procedures weren't followed or there was
16 a problem and a typical response we would get from a
17 licensee is, okay, we fixed those five problems.

18 Now given the fact that we only sampled 2
19 percent of the condition reports it obviously leaves
20 us open-ended here because we are thinking well what
21 is the true extent of that condition.

22 So we will typically write a RAI please
23 perform a extent of condition and please tell us what
24 actions you are putting in place programmatically to
25 prevent these types of errors from occurring, right.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 That's just an example.

2 And honestly, you know, we're just doing
3 this really small sampling. I think, and correct me
4 if I am wrong, but I know at the plant that I work at
5 there was a vendor oversight group that had like seven
6 or eight people in that group, you know, here, you
7 know, we had one week and it's one or two people,
8 staff members, who are not familiar with the processes
9 of the licensee, so I think honestly it's -- These
10 same activities that we have performing I think that
11 the licensee should be a lot better equipped to
12 perform those and perform them more efficiently.

13 MR. DARBALI: And I would like to stop the
14 conversation. We do have from 10:00 to 11:00 the
15 vendor oversight plan, so I imagine that we are going
16 to continue this.

17 MS. VENKATARAMAN: Samir, may I add a
18 comment?

19 MR. DARBALI: Oh, go ahead.

20 MS. VENKATARAMAN: I just thought I would
21 piggyback on what he said yesterday and because the
22 alternate review processes count in licensing space I
23 think we had the conversation and probably the ISG-06
24 talks about the vendor oversight could potentially
25 become a license condition, so there is that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And that also goes to what Rich said that,
2 you know, the licensee is more equipped and, you know,
3 so that's something to keep in mind. That's the
4 alternate review process.

5 The conventional process is a longer
6 process so you probably didn't have anything, but I
7 think this is something that ISG-06 alludes to so I
8 just thought I would bring that here.

9 MR. WATERS: Yes, and I agree, too, and,
10 again, I mean to summarize I personally applaud the
11 idea of what was explained is a transition.

12 We don't want to go and inspect at a
13 vendor site or a regional site if an inspection is not
14 warranted. We want to completely trust the licensee
15 to do that job under Appendix B and we believe they
16 are doing that, but part of the inspections confirm
17 that, but it seems like we are in a state of
18 transition.

19 From a license standpoint we are looking
20 at this oversight plan, but we have not seen the
21 detailed execution, all your plans you would do as a
22 licensee, and that's not our previous prior licensing,
23 so maybe down the road, you're right, we'll just be at
24 the site and granted the licensee is correctly doing
25 the oversight, but we're not there yet.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I think we need to work this out more
2 internally. I do want to mention one thing, Rich
3 asked if he was wrong. He is not wrong.

4 I do want to say during licensing, am I
5 completely clear there will not be any licensing
6 audits at all? Yesterday we talked about electronic
7 audits as well, the electronic portal, maybe they are
8 an option, so I don't want to completely preclude that
9 right now unless we need to.

10 MR. DARBALI: Okay, so we'll come back to
11 this conversation in 25 or one hour.

12 MS. GOLUB: I guess the only thing I want
13 to say is that, you know, we had made a comment on the
14 word "verify" and how that beginning part was phrased.

15 MR. ARMSTRONG: It was written for an
16 inspector and it was --

17 MS. GOLUB: Yes, and so is it just
18 possible to get a little feedback on our proposed
19 wording?

20 MR. ARMSTRONG: I would have to leave it
21 up to -- I'm not going to change an inspection
22 procedure because I am an NRO and we are using this
23 inspection procedure.

24 I would leave that up to Rich and Samir
25 and his group how they wanted to connect the two or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 use the guidance in the inspection procedure. So --

2 MS. GOLUB: Okay. So maybe this could be
3 a topic for our inspection workshop because that part
4 I think would be important for us to understand.

5 MR. STATTEL: I had actually taken some
6 notes and I agree with some of your wording on their
7 comments. Yes, so I wrote down "review documentation
8 related to the licensee oversight activity."

9 So I think we can work with you on this.
10 I think we can come up with some acceptable middle-of-
11 the-ground here.

12 MS. GOLUB: Okay. Very good, thank you.

13 MR. DARBALI: Okay. So the next topic is
14 the Sample Commitments. We've got John Hughey here in
15 the room, we've got Booma Venkataraman from DORL, and
16 Aaron Armstrong from the Vendor Inspection Branch.

17 Do we have any other folks on the phone
18 who just chimed in? Sheldon, are you on the phone?

19 MR. CLARK: Yes.

20 MR. DARBALI: Hi, Sheldon. Can you
21 introduce yourself?

22 MR. CLARK: Yes. My name is Sheldon
23 Clark. I am with the NRC Office of the General
24 Counsel.

25 MR. DARBALI: Thank you. And do we have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Bob Weisman on the phone?

2 (No audible response.)

3 MR. DARBALI: I think Bob is going to be
4 calling in later. So we provided also a list of
5 sample regulatory commitments. This is typically
6 something that the licensee would provide, and we took
7 the list that Diablo Canyon provided.

8 If you look at the Diablo Canyon safety
9 evaluation there is a section at the end that points
10 to the letters where the commitments came from but it
11 doesn't list them because the safety evaluation didn't
12 rely on them.

13 So Rich pulled those commitments and we
14 changed the language, where it said Tricon we put
15 platform, where it said PG&E we put licensee, and we
16 kind of tried to make them more generic.

17 MS. GOLUB: Oh, but these are the actual
18 formal regulatory commitments from the Diablo Canyon
19 LAR? I don't think I realized that.

20 MR. STATTEL: Yes, they are. So just a
21 couple notes on those, so for Diablo's Canyon case so
22 we performed our evaluation being aware of what these
23 commitments were so they were part of the application,
24 right.

25 We did not reference them, we did not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 evaluate the commitments. When I went back and looked
2 at them to prepare for this exercise I actually noted
3 that many of those commitments were actually fulfilled
4 by the time we had issued the license amendment.

5 So that was kind of interesting, I really
6 wasn't aware of that. But, again, we don't rely on
7 those commitments, we don't anchor our safety
8 conclusions on those commitments at all, we don't
9 reference them.

10 They are there, the licensee prepared
11 them, they didn't talk to us about them in advance.
12 I don't even recall having a lot of discussion about
13 commitments during the Phase 0 meeting honestly.

14 I guess we could, but I do recognize that
15 several of these commitments were issues that were
16 discussed at that Phase 0 meeting so I think there was
17 kind of a connection there.

18 So they are quite a bit different than the
19 inspection items. We don't use them going forward.
20 We don't -- I don't think there is really any ties
21 between our recommended inspection items and those
22 commitments.

23 Okay, so if you think about this it could
24 have been. You know, we could have put recommended
25 inspection items and make sure they make that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 commitment but we didn't do that, you know, we didn't
2 consciously do that.

3 MS. GOLUB: So I guess is it possible, and
4 I know Joe is not here, but it would be great if we
5 could see the section of ISG-06 C.2.2.2, or C.2.2.1.

6 MR. STATTEL: C.2.2.1.

7 MR. DARBALI: Okay, I'll try --

8 (Simultaneous speaking.)

9 MS. GOLUB: Because -- Yes. So I mean the
10 purpose of asking you to provide these to us was that
11 we have this new section in the alternate review
12 process for prerequisites and one of them was for
13 licensees to propose this set of commitments.

14 So we are really looking for in this
15 guidance document what are the kinds of commitments
16 that you think meet the criteria that is in C.2.2.1.
17 That's really, you know, that's really what we were
18 looking for.

19 And I understand you took these out of
20 Diablo Canyon, so is this, I mean is -- So Diablo
21 Canyon, for whatever reason, they made these
22 commitments, and I don't know why they made these
23 commitments because I am not familiar with the process
24 --

25 MR. STATTEL: Yes, it's unfortunate that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 PG&E is not here.

2 MS. GOLUB: I know.

3 MR. STATTEL: Because I know they --

4 (Simultaneous speaking.)

5 MS. GOLUB: I agree with you, Rich. We'll
6 go back and -- We're still in touch with those folks.
7 You know, they --

8 MR. STATTEL: Honestly, we did not drive
9 any of these commitments. PG&E -- They came with the
10 license amendment.

11 MS. GOLUB: But I guess the question --
12 But the question I am asking for the purpose of the
13 tabletop exercise and understanding that, you know,
14 we're trying to write an industry guidance document
15 for especially these unique aspects of the alternate
16 review process what is the NRC's intent for that 022.
17 Yes, so I think it's Item 3, Samir.

18 MR. DARBALI: So I want to point out --

19 MS. GOLUB: Okay.

20 MR. DARBALI: -- Commitment 13 and 14 I
21 added those based on, so they are SDOE related based
22 on the Reg Guide, and Commitment 15 that just will be
23 Tricon and ASAI's, and I do realize it kind of ties it
24 to an existing commitment, but that kind of gets you
25 an idea of where I would pull, if I was license where

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I would pull I would pull a commitment from.

2 MS. GOLUB: Okay.

3 MR. STATTEL: Yes, and I also recognize
4 some of these commitments are, they get down into some
5 details, right, some design details. One has to do
6 with isolation and I do have some understanding of why
7 Diablo Canyon made those commitments.

8 So, for example, in the Diablo Canyon
9 design there were several connection points to non-
10 safety-related meters, instruments, and they were
11 really not within the scope of the modification, of
12 the vendor modification, the vendor system.

13 They were actually -- The licensee was
14 actually adding isolators in and they were basically
15 handling that separately and they hadn't completed
16 that design so they recognized that, they recognized
17 that it would have to meet certain criteria and they
18 put that down as a commitment because they had
19 fulfilled that at the time they submitted the license
20 amendment.

21 And there was some like, there were some
22 that were specific and when I read them I do
23 understand why Diablo Canyon would make that
24 commitment at the time of the license amendment
25 because they hadn't, they didn't have the information

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to put right in the license amendment, okay.

2 I think there was some other ones
3 related,, and I discussed this yesterday, power
4 supply, so they had actually some commitments that
5 were related to that as well.

6 MS. GOLUB: Thanks. So I am looking at
7 the guidance in ISG-06, so this is what licensees
8 would use to try to determine what do I need to make
9 as commitments.

10 So the Item A I understand that's related
11 to, you know, the PSAIs, and we talked about that
12 yesterday --

13 MR. STATTEL: Is this in ISG-06?

14 MS. GOLUB: It is, yes.

15 (Simultaneous speaking.)

16 MS. GOLUB: So the request we had asked
17 for you guys was if you looked at 3B, 3B under the
18 C.2.2 licensing prerequisites for the alternate review
19 process -- Joe, can you --

20 MR. ODESS-GILLERT: Joe, can you scroll
21 down to the next page, to three.

22 MS. GOLUB: Can you scroll down to 3?

23 MR. ODESS-GILLERT: Thank you. Right
24 there.

25 MS. GOLUB: Yes, right there is perfect.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Thank you.

2 But if you look at 3B we were really
3 looking for your feedback, and I heard Samir say that
4 13 and 14 sound like they met the 3B item, that they
5 were commitments from later life cycle activities
6 under a licensee's purview when he was talking about
7 SDOE later life cycle stuff.

8 But I guess we were looking for from the
9 staff for this exercise what do you think meets that
10 3B? So the reasons that Diablo did what they did
11 maybe is a little bit different because, you know,
12 they made regulatory commitments to complete
13 activities that would be within the licensing review
14 scope of a Tier 1/Tier 2 review.

15 In our case, you know, we are, the plan is
16 especially understanding some of the risks associated
17 with, you know, with saying we have a completed system
18 level design.

19 We probably would not do that. You know,
20 the licensees would make sure their system level
21 design was complete. Samir, I was just saying that
22 the purpose for this for us for this exercise was to
23 understand what the NRC would consider meets the
24 prerequisites of 3B.

25 MR. DARBALI: Oh.

1 MS. GOLUB: And, you know, I understand
2 from what you said for your SDOE ones that maybe that
3 does meet 3B because they are later life cycle
4 activities.

5 But that was kind of the framework we had
6 in mind when we made the request. It just, you know,
7 reading the words you're never quite sure what they
8 mean so we wanted to have a sense of, you know, what
9 was your perspective on that new guidance for us?

10 MR. STATTEL: Well when I read it now this
11 is certainly not comprehensive guidance on preparing
12 commitments, right. I don't know if that exists.
13 Actually, the licensees prepare them, so is there any
14 industry guidance out there for preparing --

15 MS. GOLUB: There is industry guidance,
16 yes. It's 9904 I think on doing that.

17 MR. STATTEL: I am honestly not familiar
18 with that.

19 MS. GOLUB: Yes, and so, again, this is,
20 it was more, the intent was just more around what, you
21 know, in your minds like if you had to judge are the
22 appropriate commitments included, right, if you were
23 looking at that and saying are the appropriate
24 commitments included.

25 We just wanted your perspective on what

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 would those appropriate commitments be so we have some
2 sense of whether we are hitting the mark when we
3 submit the LAR.

4 MR. STATTEL: Yes, we could probably make
5 some improvements to that. We saw the commitments as
6 a venue or a way to address those activities,
7 implementation, that basically wouldn't be in our
8 purview for the license amendment review.

9 So we just saw that as the venue. We are
10 no experts on creating commitments. We don't do that,
11 right, and we don't really evaluate them either.

12 MS. GOLUB: Okay, so that's good feedback
13 for us.

14 MR. STATTEL: So I would actually look at
15 industry for what they would --

16 MS. GOLUB: Yes, thank you. Yes, and
17 that's good feedback for us because I guess I didn't
18 understand that part about that you don't evaluate
19 them.

20 So maybe, you know, that's something for,
21 you know, a future discussion. We could take that
22 task and maybe take the next cut at this understanding
23 everything, and especially, Samir, what you put in,
24 which I think is along the lines we were thinking.

25 MR. DARBALI: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. WATERS: So I think there is multiple
2 angles here and we probably need to get back to you on
3 the exact definition and regulatory, you know,
4 legalistic regulatory connotation of "commitment," but
5 I think there is two things here.

6 You mentioned that a lot of this may be
7 artifacts of what Diablo did. You know, I think our
8 focus is, you know in the past we traditionally made
9 the licensing decision, that FAT, right, and we write
10 the paperwork on that, somebody has also done the
11 audits, there were significant amounts of regulatory
12 assurance, and we issued a license.

13 So the real question to us and to staff is
14 if we should write this amendment early what happens
15 between that point and I guess traditionally FAT,
16 because there are some things here that would still
17 happen before that.

18 You know, as a regulator I don't know what
19 the difference is between a commitment to do a process
20 or a test in future versus getting a diagram of the
21 architecture. Both are important to me in making my
22 regulatory decision.

23 The ultimate question are significant
24 commitments or actions you guys have committed to
25 talk, or if you call it a commitment or not, that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 could require inspection focus and/or a license
2 condition and/or something that is put into FSAR or
3 not at all or if it's something that you develop in
4 50.59.

5 So I think that's the real test that we,
6 you know, need to sit down and hypothetically play
7 this out. I think as Rich has also noted we are not
8 going to have guidance in ISG-06 of this and I think
9 it will be very, very application-specific as well.

10 MS. GOLUB: Yes, so typically, you know,
11 we're not looking for more guidance in ISG-06, it was
12 more a case of we don't want it to turn into bring me
13 another rock, right.

14 So if we have some idea of what that rock
15 looks like we can try our best to bring it to you the
16 first time in the LAR. But I guess hearing that, you
17 know, this is really on the licensees side, I mean the
18 licensees are going to follow their processes to the
19 best of their abilities.

20 So, you know, for the licensees to make a
21 commitment to follow their own processes or to follow
22 what they laid out in the LAR, right, if they laid out
23 a process in the LAR they are going to follow it, they
24 are going to treat it as a "commitment" to the staff.

25 The commitments typically, and, Booma, you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 can I am sure speak to this better than me, but
2 commitments are typically are activities which are not
3 something open-ended like follow your process, but
4 they are more do this by a certain date and that's why
5 the Diablo Canyon commitments are pretty specific on,
6 you know, they are going to include this in their
7 design or they are going to implement this in their
8 procedures.

9 I just -- I want to make sure that we are
10 all on the same page with the intent of 3B, because I
11 don't think the licensees are going to propose
12 something that says, you know, we are going to commit
13 to following the process we put in the LAR unless that
14 is required to be done for your review.

15 They are just going to follow their
16 process and treat it as an obligation because they
17 wrote it in their license amendment.

18 MR. HARRELL: So that makes sense, but
19 look at Number 5.

20 MS. GOLUB: Yes, so that -- Yes, so that's
21 what -- And maybe we could go through our comments,
22 too, that -- You're right, Dave, we should also sort
23 of -- Maybe you can respond to what I said and then we
24 can --

25 (Simultaneous speaking.)

1 MS. VENKATARAMAN: Yes. I just wanted to
2 have a comment. First of all, again, we have to put
3 the alternate review process in perspective. It is a
4 LAR process but it is again it's a very kind of a
5 reduced more efficient process.

6 So, therefore, it appears that the
7 licensee may put in more commitments and commitments
8 are not requirements, right. So only the licensee can
9 come up with those and they are right, you're right,
10 they are very specific.

11 They may not be open-ended but they could
12 not, they may not be very, sometimes they may say we
13 will follow our procedures or, you know, by a certain
14 date, or we will change our procedures.

15 And sometimes here we are talking that
16 they may be elevated to a license condition or an
17 implementation statement in the UFSAR, or a mandated
18 licensing, depending on how important it is to safety
19 and that we will know as the review progresses.

20 So but when you submit the application you
21 may have some commitments in place and I think, you
22 know, there are some examples that I believe, you
23 know, I think maybe, Samir, you can put to that, this
24 is my understanding based on this, like an
25 implementation of high quality software or with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 respect to the vendor oversight.

2 But they may not describe everything of it
3 but you may have something in there with knowing that
4 it may become a license condition in the future. Does
5 that make sense?

6 MS. GOLUB: It does, yes.

7 MS. VENKATARAMAN: Yes. Yes, the basic
8 process, the overall process doesn't change. Our
9 license amendment, 50.90 regulation, that doesn't
10 change, but there is just nuance because it is a very
11 crunch process.

12 MS. GOLUB: Okay. And I think that makes
13 sense. I mean it sounds to me like you don't have lie
14 a preconceived expectation, maybe aside from some of
15 the examples given, of what would meet 3B and the
16 licensee should just propose what they believe are the
17 right commitments, which we could certainly do.

18 MS. VENKATARAMAN: Yes.

19 MR. WATERS: I think a challenge here if
20 we look at part of it is commitments are not
21 conditions of a license and so we kind of start
22 backwards and we're trying to define that and in a
23 normal discussion what is a commitment, right.

24 I mean I'll author a question back to you
25 based on these slices of what are called commitments,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 forget about the title commitments and the numerical
2 -- Is there any things in here in detail that you
3 would not provide in some form of the LAR, and even an
4 architecture description or when describing your
5 plans, do you guys see something here that, hey,
6 that's, you know, we're not going to even obligate
7 ourselves to that in a LAR in some form?

8 That's the question I would have to get
9 the conversation started I guess.

10 MS. GOLUB: Yes. No, so I don't think
11 there is material here, and, you know, I am going to
12 look to my colleagues because I am not looking at all
13 of our comments, but it's not that there is items here
14 that we would say, no, we're not looking at set
15 points, forget it, that's out. It's not at all like
16 that.

17 We just wanted to make sure that if you
18 had specific expectations for 3B we understood what
19 they are and what I am taking from this discussion is
20 that you don't have something specific in mind, you
21 want the licensees to evaluate it and propose
22 regulatory commitments on a project-specific basis?

23 MR. WATERS: You're right, and all we have
24 is a limited history of what we have done for a few
25 sites and that's what Samir had pulled as --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (Simultaneous speaking.)

2 MS. GOLUB: Absolutely, so that's a
3 starting point, and that's fine. So we understand
4 it's a starting point and --

5 MR. WATERS: Obviously, again, part of
6 this will be hopefully a module in an application
7 meeting of, you know, what to expect as far as
8 content.

9 MR. DARBALI: You know, I'm thinking about
10 the acceptance review process. If we get a LAR
11 requesting to use the alternate review process and it
12 doesn't include certain commitments to do FAT testing,
13 implementation and test activities, I don't know if we
14 would reject the LAR because it doesn't have those
15 commitments because we don't need those commitments.

16 However, if we say, well, you didn't
17 commit to that but I want that to be a condition then
18 that's something we will work with our project manager
19 and for the licensee during the review process.

20 So I think it helps the NRC and the
21 licensee to be on the same page and it's very helpful
22 for the staff to understand that licensee expects to
23 do those activities and is willing to do that. It's
24 always very helpful.

25 But if we need it for our regulatory

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 evaluation then we'll make it a condition.

2 MS. GOLUB: Yes. So, okay, so, again, and
3 I think we're okay here. Okay, I am just going to say
4 that fundamentally I think we are okay here. The part
5 is that I don't want to wait until we get to the
6 acceptance review and then find out that we didn't
7 meet your, you know, we didn't meet the mark with the
8 regulatory commitments that were proposed and then,
9 you know, and then you're kind of scrambling.

10 So I thinking that from a pre-application
11 coordination meeting standpoint this is probably a
12 good topic, you know, like we're given this specific
13 application that we're going to be proposing the LAR
14 for, you know, here are the types of commitments that
15 we think meet this prerequisite.

16 I mean maybe that's a good, you know, a
17 good way to make sure that before we hit that
18 acceptance review we understand what the expectations
19 are and we can meet them.

20 MR. WATERS: Right.

21 MR. DARBALI: So even if you don't have a
22 commitment talking about those future activities I
23 would expect the LAR to say these are the things we
24 are going to be doing.

25 MS. GOLUB: Yes.

1 MR. DARBALI: So that should be there.
2 And if the LAR is silent then, assuming it gets
3 accepted for review, would write a request for
4 additional information asking what activities are you
5 going to be doing past this date or you didn't cover
6 this implementation activity.

7 So those are the things we would ask you,
8 that you provide that information. And, again, we
9 have a process for making that a condition.

10 MS. GOLUB: Absolutely. It's just, you
11 know, part of this is, of course, informing our
12 industry guidance document so we would love to be able
13 to, you know, provide some guidance so an RAI may not
14 be needed. You know what I mean? That's the purpose
15 of doing this exercise, but understanding there is
16 always a mechanism for you to get more information,
17 but I am trying to make sure we understand the
18 expectation so we can provide some appropriate
19 guidance for it.

20 MR. DARBALI: Right.

21 MR. HUGHEY: So as I listen to the
22 conversation what I hear both from fellow staff and
23 from industry is a real grappling and a struggle to
24 understand the value of regulatory commitments and to
25 me that is very encouraging.

1 I think that your comment is well taken
2 about well why would we write a regulatory commitment
3 to do something that is part of our plant process
4 already, why would we not just say in the LAR this is
5 what we're doing, this is our normal plant process,
6 this is the way we do things. I think that's exactly
7 right on.

8 And I think that, you know, of course, we
9 reference LIC-101, NRC has a checkered past with
10 regulatory commitments and that is detailed in LIC-
11 101, which is publically available.

12 And so there has been a lot of confusion
13 in the past on our side about what a regulatory
14 commitment is, how it is used, and so back several
15 years ago there was an OIG report and a big
16 undertaking, new training within the NRC to help us
17 all get on the same page.

18 So the reason I wanted to say something is
19 that I think it's good that we are struggling with,
20 hey, what's the value of having these regulatory
21 commitments, and I would suggest that we may all be
22 better off for them to not see the light of day again
23 anywhere because they really cause confusion and don't
24 have a lot of, they have no legal value, you know.

25 However, at the same time what is really

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 important is the concept of a license condition,
2 especially for this alternative review process. So
3 the limited time I was here yesterday for human
4 factors, I feel that everything we talked about in
5 that time period was applicable to the normal review
6 process not just the alternate review process.

7 All those discussions I think were
8 applicable, valuable, in our normal review process
9 now. And the human factors team as we have gotten
10 together and we thought about just the mechanics of
11 how we would make this work in a license amendment
12 review under the alternate review process we realized,
13 as we said yesterday, it's all the same technical
14 review.

15 What's different is how do we apply the
16 right licensing mechanics to make us able to give a
17 reasonable assurance review and keep the right
18 regulatory footprint on our approval of that review,
19 and that's where license conditions are going to
20 become really important.

21 And I will just -- In a limited I just
22 want to say the way we see that is that we would need
23 to have license conditions, when necessary a license
24 condition would talk about something that is going to
25 happen in the design future and would be something

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that would draw an envelope with very clear boundaries
2 and would say something like if something changes that
3 is outside of this boundary then there is no approval
4 for that, it's to be addressed.

5 I am not exactly sure how that would play
6 out, I think we have to see, and every application is
7 going to be different, every configuration is a little
8 different, but I would also say that in the case of
9 Diablo Canyon, you know, their human factors elements,
10 if it was an application similar to Diablo Canyon
11 where there is no change in human actions, there is no
12 change in operator manual actions, and that is a
13 definitive statement, that is the design, then we
14 don't need any license conditions, we are able to
15 review what the design is going to be and there is
16 nothing in the future.

17 But even in that case where that would
18 change is in the example amendment yesterday, so there
19 is the second sentence that says "If the digital I&C
20 modification adds or changes important human actions
21 then appropriate evaluations would be performed.

22 So if there is a caveat like that in the
23 LAR well then even though we can say everything you
24 told us good, we're good with that, no further review
25 is needed, if there is a caveat like that we would

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 need a license condition that has very stringent
2 envelopes.

3 And the last thing I will say about that
4 is just our policy per LIC-101 is that we would be
5 looking for -- it's a collaborative process to know
6 what the license conditions are, which means there
7 would necessarily need to be some public meetings.

8 In the course of the review of the audit
9 there would need to be public meetings between staff
10 and licensees to really determine what those are,
11 unless it was straightforward enough that it could be
12 done just with the public RAI process.

13 And so, anyway, those are just a few
14 comments I wanted to make about that. Thank you.

15 MS. GOLUB: And I appreciate what you
16 said, and very much so. So that, you know, part of
17 this exercise for these sample regulatory commitments
18 is that when we had talked about that 3B above there
19 was an understanding that some of those commitments
20 could turn into conditions.

21 And so that was one of the reasons that we
22 were interested in understanding what the NRC's view
23 of the commitments were because that would obviously
24 inform us what you are considering to be conditions.

25 And a license condition is a, you know, a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 license condition is a serious item, right, we want to
2 make sure that we had some understanding of what that
3 looks like.

4 (Simultaneous speaking.)

5 MS. VENKATARAMAN: Can I add a comment?
6 Yes, so what we are saying is the regulatory
7 commitments are part of the licensing basis. They
8 will -- But if when you propose them, maybe in the
9 application or later, they have to be put in the
10 docket.

11 But if they are not used to make the
12 regulatory finding or the safety they will just be
13 listed in a section in the license amendment. So the
14 good thing is because you are making, you know, it
15 known to us that this is what you are doing, but just
16 like Samir said, to summarize, you don't have to,
17 later on the reviewer may find and they ask questions
18 in an RAI or it could be a public meeting and if
19 necessary they will be elevated to a license condition
20 or the other way is to make an implementation
21 statement in the USFAR, then they become obligations
22 as opposed to just not obligations, like a -- Yes,
23 that's how it is. Thank you.

24 MS. GOLUB: Thank you. Thank you for that
25 clarification. So we've had specific questions on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 these commitments do we want to go through those
2 questions?

3 MR. STATTEL: Yes, I was just going to
4 offer that up because I can't respond to any
5 individual. Some of them are little bit, you know,
6 very project-specific, but I do have an answer for
7 them.

8 MS. GOLUB: Yes, and I don't want to get
9 into some of the, you know, like the technical details
10 of that project because I know that was a very
11 specific project.

12 MR. STATTEL: I will mention though there
13 is -- I don't want to downplay the value of the
14 licensee making commitments because I think it's a
15 communication avenue and so, for example, I look at
16 Commitment Number 7, Number 7 has to do with the
17 licensee's, that they really didn't make any changes
18 to the set points in the license amendment.

19 However, they recognized that there were
20 going to be changes to calculations and they wanted us
21 to know, they wanted to communicate to us that we are
22 going to be using approved set point methodologies
23 and, you know, I mean you can read it, right.

24 So your comment was why did we need to
25 create a commitment to do work that is normal plant

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 practice, well that was really good for me to know
2 that.

3 So this didn't get elevated into a
4 condition, but it was very important for me to know
5 that the licensee was aware that even though they
6 weren't making a change to their license basis set
7 point they still had that obligation to re-perform the
8 calculations, consider the new uncertainties with the
9 new equipment, and use their approved methodology.

10 So I feel that is valuable for me to be
11 aware of that.

12 MS. GOLUB: So, Rich, if that was written
13 into the LAR would that have been sufficient or would
14 you have wanted it --

15 MR. STATTEL: Well it essentially was
16 because it was an appendix to the LAR, so it was part
17 of the LAR. Conditions sometimes, I mean different
18 licensees format it differently, but this was part of
19 the LAR.

20 MS. GOLUB: Correct. But this was a
21 formal regulatory commitment. What I am saying if the
22 licensee had written it in that sort of the
23 description of how they are going to be conducting --

24 (Simultaneous speaking.)

25 MR. STATTEL: That would be acceptable,

1 too.

2 MS. GOLUB: If that works. I just think
3 --

4 MR. STATTEL: And I think the list of
5 commitments Oconee had was a lot shorter, so Diablo
6 Canyon chose to elaborate a lot more. And, you know,
7 going to your comments, you know, you are asking well
8 why would they have to make a commitment to do this,
9 you know, why is this necessary, well, you know, the
10 plant chose to do this as a way of letting us, the
11 NRC, know that they intend to follow through with
12 this, this is what they intend to do.

13 It didn't factor -- It didn't weigh or
14 factor into their safety conclusion. We didn't
15 identify these as being required for issuing a license
16 amendment, but, again, we were aware of all of these
17 issues.

18 So, you know, I mean we can talk about
19 individual one you would like to, you know, but one
20 had to do with time response, one had to do with some
21 isolation testing, I believe it was Commitment Number
22 9, and in that case they hadn't performed all of the
23 EQ testing for the equipment at the time they prepared
24 the license amendment and they hadn't done all of
25 their Class 1E isolation testing, but they recognized

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that they were going to have to do that before they
2 installed this system.

3 So they identified that, they committed,
4 yes, we are going to follow through with that. So
5 that is why they chose to include that.

6 MR. WATERS: I guess, Rich, the question
7 is was that before or after we issued the license and
8 was that something you ultimately looked at or
9 considered in some other form of that LAR approval?

10 MR. STATTEL: Well that's a good question.
11 So in that particular case they completed that test
12 before we issued the license amendment. So that
13 commitment was fulfilled.

14 That was one of many of these commitments
15 that had been fulfilled at the time we issued the
16 license amendment. We didn't make that -- You know,
17 I think actually we probably would have held off on
18 the license amendment if that one hadn't been
19 fulfilled, but several of these they actually did
20 complete during the course of our evaluation.

21 MS. GOLUB: Yes, this is good feedback
22 though because the feedback is there for you. Diablo
23 Canyon, they made the decisions they made based on
24 their reasoning.

25 They are not here, so I am not going to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 speak for them, but it sounds, you know, that that's
2 going to be a licensee decision not a project-specific
3 basis to choose which commitments to make.

4 MR. STATTEL: Yes, I would say Diablo
5 Canyon used these commitments more liberally than what
6 --

7 (Simultaneous speaking.)

8 MS. GOLUB: Right, that's my
9 interpretation as well.

10 MR. STATTEL: But I think that's okay,
11 too.

12 MS. GOLUB: Right, absolutely, that's a
13 choice that they made and, yes, there's nothing.

14 MR. HOOTEN: But at the same time we
15 shouldn't interpret what they did as a model for
16 everyone else to follow either, right, you know,
17 that's what I am hearing you say.

18 MR. STATTEL: Well that is your decision,
19 that's your choice.

20 MR. HOOTEN: I understand.

21 MR. STATTEL: You could. I don't see any
22 problem with it because, again, they are not asking us
23 to base our conclusions off of what they are
24 committing to do and we still have -- If we see a
25 commitment that we feel basically would prevent us

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 from being able to have a safety conclusion like that
2 one, if they hadn't completed their isolation testing
3 that might have been a show stopper.

4 We might not have been able to issue their
5 license amendment. We would certainly identify that,
6 you know, we can do that, and we would do that. So
7 having it as a commitment up front because they hadn't
8 completed that activity and then closing it out during
9 the process of our evaluation I think that's perfectly
10 fine. It gets everything out in the open.

11 MS. GOLUB: Yes, that's right, and that's
12 the choice that's being made, and, yes, absolutely.
13 So I don't think from our perspective we need to go
14 through all of the questions.

15 I think we have kind of the general basis
16 for, yes, for what you guys had in mind, so I
17 appreciate that.

18 MR. STATTEL: Okay.

19 MS. GOLUB: And I am thinking that maybe
20 we could add something to our pre-application.

21 MR. DARBALI: And I am going to ask Booma
22 and industry, but I don't how long the concept of
23 commitments has existed in licensing, but --

24 MR. STATTEL: A long time.

25 MR. DARBALI: -- would imagine there would

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 be some NRC or industry guidance document on --

2 MS. GOLUB: There is. Yes, there is.

3 MR. DARBALI: Okay. So I would refer back
4 to those.

5 MS. GOLUB: Yes, absolutely. Yes, we're
6 doing that. That's no problem.

7 MR. DARBALI: Okay.

8 MR. STATTEL: I would imagine it predates
9 Three Mile Island, but my first experience with
10 dealing with commitments, license commitments, was
11 there were a lot of them after Three Mile Island for
12 implementing Reg Guide 197 requirements, things like
13 that.

14 And so in the early '80s there was a big
15 effort to -- The NRC came out and did inspections at
16 the plants to verify that the commitments have been
17 fulfilled and in a lot of cases they found that they
18 weren't.

19 So that was a big issue back in the early
20 '80s, but they may have actually just prior to Three
21 Mile Island.

22 MS. GOLUB: Well there is an industry
23 guidance document, NEI 9904 which is adopted by all of
24 the licensees and it gives very specific directions on
25 how to craft commitments and when they are necessary.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. DARBALI: Okay.

2 MS. GOLUB: So we are not looking for the
3 NRC to provide us information on that. This was only,
4 this was really just specific to the ISG. So I think
5 we got what we needed from the discussion. Thank you.

6 MR. HUGHEY: And not to belabor it, LIC-
7 105 is what is --

8 MS. GOLUB: Is the NRC's --

9 MR. HUGHEY: -- the NRC's policy on
10 regulatory commitments. LIC-105, I believe it is.
11 Yes, it is. We wanted it to be public for industry
12 when we issued it.

13 MR. WATERS: Yes, so obviously you don't
14 want to revisit or challenge the regulatory policy
15 commitments. What I would ask though is I think
16 what's more important when we get to the September
17 workshop is what content in the LAR that we call
18 commitments or just text description could be subject
19 to further inspection and/or license condition both in
20 vendor, you know, the vendor development site or site
21 installation site, I think that's part of that ongoing
22 conversation we're going to have in September.

23 MS. GOLUB: Yes, agreed.

24 MR. DARBALI: Okay. So I think we are
25 done with that topic. We are up for a break. Do we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have any questions or comments from the folks on the
2 phone?

3 (No audible response.)

4 MR. DARBALI: Okay. I want to thank
5 Sheldon and Booma and John for helping us in this
6 section, and Bob if he called in. We are going to be
7 taking a break.

8 Since Aaron is going to be helping us in
9 the vendor oversight plan portion I think we can take
10 a break of ten minutes and come back at 9:50. Okay,
11 thank you.

12 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
13 off the record at 9:40 a.m. and resumed at 9:53 a.m.)

14 MR. GOLLA: We're back. And, vendor
15 oversight plan. Are we looking at it now?

16 MR. DARBALI: So, Ray, I'm going to ask
17 you to provide that. A brief summary of the summary
18 you provided earlier today.

19 (Laughter.)

20 MR. HERB: Okay. I actually refined it a
21 little bit, based on the previous discussion. I wish
22 I had heard that before I opened my mouth earlier this
23 morning, but this section right here is the summary of
24 the vendor oversight activities and planning.

25 And as Rich and Samir have said, we're

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 getting an early issuance of the license and so we're,
2 essentially, we're promising, we're committing, we're
3 obligating ourselves to follow those things in the
4 LAR.

5 And so, we've always done vendor
6 oversight, but to the degree that we have documented
7 that and provided assurance that those activities were
8 done on paper so they can be inspected and reviewed
9 has been less so. Okay.

10 Primarily we have always looked at the end
11 products like, you know, like Rich says. We've looked
12 at, we've witnessed testing, we've been there for
13 specific milestones in the design. We've always been
14 there from the beginning to the end for those
15 activities.

16 But usually we show up. We may do a trip
17 report and we may have a plan. We review the test
18 plans ahead of time, we do all this stuff.

19 So, there's things that was formally done,
20 but this oversight activity, since you guys are, we're
21 going to commit to doing it in the future and you're
22 going to base your licensing designs on those
23 activities, we thought we would formalize a little
24 more.

25 Now this, a lot of this guidance comes out

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of the EPRI, the digital engineering guide, and also
2 the guide for commercial grade dedication. A lot of
3 these things are very similar.

4 And like I said, we've done these
5 activities. A lot of plants have done critical
6 digital reviews which involves a lot of this stuff up
7 front where you make sure they have a quality process
8 that meets the expectations and that they follow their
9 process.

10 Kind of a mini audit type of activity.
11 Audit-like activity. And then we've done acceptance
12 reviews of a lot of these documents.

13 And so, so we thought because of C.2.2,
14 Item 1, that's primarily, to the QA program, we felt
15 the direction of this change is a little bit from just
16 checking the outputs to also checking the process to
17 make sure that the vendor is following a process that
18 they've obligated themselves to in our purchase order,
19 for the system. And, what we have obligated our self
20 to as well in the LAR.

21 And so, if you look at the wording there,
22 we expanded it beyond just the quality piece to
23 include all the stuff of the V&V requirements
24 traceability configuration management testing,
25 software QA.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And then we even added SDOE and applicable
2 PSAIs as well, because our oversight activities
3 include more than just the processes for software
4 development. And it includes all those aspects to
5 make sure that what we ask for is what we're going to
6 get.

7 We, in the Industry, typically like to say
8 we trust but verify. And so, the whole part of this
9 plan, this plan probably will be updated and refined
10 as we go along.

11 It's designed, it's really a living plan.
12 And it's designed to react to things that we find when
13 we go to a vendor facility. And so we would do that.
14 And every time we would change it would be available
15 for continuous inspection.

16 I said in the past, we've always, like I
17 say, as Rich said, they had a vendor oversight when he
18 was there, and we've always had one too. But we're
19 stepping up our game.

20 Primarily because the new standard design
21 process for standardized across the industry. We see
22 this activity as very important to getting a quality
23 output. So, we want to do that to ourselves to
24 satisfy our own expectations and make sure we get a
25 good thing.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And, again, the documentation activities
2 in the past have been somewhat lacking and so this is
3 going to formalize that to give you something to
4 inspect when you come to the sites.

5 And then the rigor of activities really
6 should be commensurate to safety. So we do a lot of
7 this stuff now but now we're going into that alternate
8 review process where the impacts are much more
9 significant than they were in the past. In the past,
10 we were saying 50.59, as long as we stay within our
11 licensing basis we're good, we can make those
12 decisions.

13 But now, we have to stay within our
14 licensing basis as approved in the LAR. And so, the
15 significance of any of those changes and impacts are
16 a lot more. So we have to do a better job.

17 And then, again, and then finally we want
18 to, this is a transactional agreement between us and
19 the NRC and we want you to feel comfortable that we
20 know what we're doing and that we can document that
21 and demonstrate that to you ahead of time so that you
22 feel good that we know what we're doing, how we're
23 going to do it.

24 And so, pretty much that's, that's the,
25 and it's all written here. You can see, there's the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 elements of it. It's kind of thin, but the plan
2 itself, which is a living document, would be available
3 for inspection and review as part of the licensing
4 process. Just to make sure we get all the parts.

5 MR. DARBALI: Thank you, Ray. You brought
6 up a point that the vendor oversight plan would be
7 available for inspection or audit. I would imagine
8 that if we needed to look at it during our review,
9 they would ask you to put it in the portal.

10 And a site, a regional inspector, would do
11 during inspections, would reference that. Post-
12 license amendment issues.

13 I do have a few questions. One is, I
14 would expect that the plan itself would have already
15 been developed or, the first revision of it or an
16 existing revision, would be in place by the time the
17 LAR is submitted?

18 MR. HERB: Yes, certainly.

19 MR. DARBALI: Okay. So, how big do you
20 think that document would be, length-wise?

21 MR. HERB: Typically we've see them maybe,
22 it just really just depends. Because it's going to
23 setup a framework, who is responsible, reporting
24 activities. And it would have schedule, it would have
25 a scope and so maybe ten, 20 pages total.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. DARBALI: Oh, okay.

2 MR. HARRELL: For a system, yes.

3 MR. DARBALI: Okay.

4 MR. HERB: For a system, yes.

5 MR. DARBALI: Okay. Because, looking at
6 this, I think this is very, I know the first three
7 words are, the project specific. The language of it
8 is not project specific.

9 MR. HERB: Well, we had to, when we would
10 put this in our LAR it would be --

11 MR. DARBALI: Right.

12 MR. HERB: -- we would mention the
13 platform --

14 MR. DARBALI: Right.

15 MR. HERB: -- and the application, the
16 scope --

17 MR. DARBALI: That would be helpful.

18 MR. HERB: We tried to keep it at a high-
19 level because we didn't --

20 MR. DARBALI: Yes.

21 MR. HERB: -- platform at high-level.

22 MR. DARBALI: Right. Right.

23 MR. STATTEL: Would you expect this to be
24 included in the LAR?

25 MS. GOLUB: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. HERB: This oversight --

2 MR. STATTEL: And the reason I ask is, I'm
3 looking at ISG-06 and I don't see a specific item in
4 the Enclosure B.

5 MR. HERB: There is not. Yes, there not.

6 MR. STATTEL: Should there be?

7 MR. HERB: No.

8 MS. GOLUB: The C.2.2.1 is the
9 prerequisite that's being fulfilled by the item.

10 MR. DARBALI: Right. The prerequisite is
11 for use in the alternate --

12 MS. GOLUB: Would you mind pulling up
13 C.2.2.1 --

14 MR. DARBALI: -- review process. But
15 right, there is no section.

16 MR. STATTEL: There is nothing in
17 Enclosure B?

18 MR. DARBALI: Yes.

19 MR. STATTEL: Good point.

20 MR. HERB: You're right.

21 MR. HARRELL: It should have been in
22 Enclosure B.

23 MR. STATTEL: Yes, that's what I'm
24 thinking.

25 MS. GOLUB: So, there is C.2.2.1 --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. HARRELL: Item 3.

2 MR. DARBALI: Right.

3 MR. HERB: I see it.

4 MS. GOLUB: Item 1 is the prerequisite for
5 the vendor oversight plan.

6 MR. HERB: Right. And I guess he is
7 asking is, is this in a section in the LAR? I guess
8 it would be in prerequisite section, right?

9 MS. GOLUB: Right. So there would be a
10 section --

11 MR. HERB: Yes.

12 MS. GOLUB: -- in the LAR that is for the
13 prerequisites, and we would address each of these
14 items that are on the list.

15 MR. DARBALI: Because maybe, to Richard's
16 point, maybe we do need a section of information to be
17 provided in vendor oversight plan and detail more
18 specifics of what you expect to see. Right.

19 MR. STATTEL: I don't remember the
20 conversation. I mean, did we consciously decide not
21 to choose not to include it in Enclosure B because --

22 MS. GOLUB: No.

23 MR. DARBALI: No.

24 MS. GOLUB: No, there was no conscious
25 decision. I think, what we did in Enclosure B we just

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 kind of went down the D, the D list.

2 MR. STATTEL: I mean, I don't know what
3 it's going to like. If it's going to be a 500 page
4 document.

5 MR. HERB: Oh, no, no, no.

6 MR. STATTEL: And that's --

7 MR. HERB: In the LAR, it would be a
8 couple of pages. It would be like this.

9 MR. DARBALI: So that's the --

10 MR. HERB: This is the description, pretty
11 much, that would go in the LAR with maybe a little
12 additional stuff about the system names and the
13 vendors names and stuff like that.

14 Now, the plan itself is probably ten to 20
15 pages long. And it would have attachments and reports
16 and outputs.

17 But it's a plan. A plan, you know, just
18 what we're looking at, what are the things we want to
19 do, what are the business, when is the timing. It
20 would be a schedule. And it would be there.

21 And it would also be a planning tool that
22 if you, I mean, I heard that if you guys felt like you
23 had to go to the vendor you could maybe pick a time
24 when we were going.

25 MR. DARBALI: Okay.

1 MR. BURZYNSKI: Ray, you intend this plan
2 to be a living document, right?

3 MR. HERB: Yes, and that's what I said.
4 Yes, it's a living document. That's where you don't
5 want to submit it on the docket and it be available
6 for you.

7 MR. DARBALI: Right.

8 MR. HERB: Because the plan will have, it
9 will have, you know, you look down here it says,
10 initial audits and reviews, periodic audits. On the
11 second page it says, periodic meetings to resolve
12 issues, additional technical resource surveillances,
13 management interventions, stop work order and recovery
14 plans.

15 And so, we won't put those in the plan
16 unless we have a problem.

17 MR. DARBALI: Right.

18 MR. HERB: But if we have a problem, the
19 plan will be revised to include those things. Those
20 additional.

21 MR. DARBALI: See, when I asked how long
22 it was I was hoping you could tell me, oh, it's 58
23 pages, and I can say, okay, then provide me a five
24 page summary.

25 MR. HERB: I was thinking it would be a

1 two page.

2 MR. DARBALI: Right.

3 MR. HARRELL: So, one previous experience
4 with this, my company and I did the one min complete
5 ABWR vendor oversight plan, it was 50 pages of techs
6 and templates for reports. So, it's not a huge
7 activity.

8 And that one --

9 MS. GOLUB: That was for the whole plant.

10 MR. HARRELL: That was for the whole
11 plant. So that included everything from reactor trip
12 systems to less important reactivity controls.

13 MR. DARBALI: Right. And, the point I'm
14 getting at is, basically you're describing what you
15 will do, I guess for, and we are relying on the vendor
16 oversight plan to cover those implementation
17 activities we won't be able to review. So I guess
18 what would be very useful to the Staff is the how
19 you're going to be doing those activities.

20 MR. HARRELL: And that would be in the
21 detailed report.

22 MR. DARBALI: Right.

23 MR. HARRELL: The plan itself.

24 MR. DARBALI: Okay. So, it does --

25 MR. HERB: Samir, the how you mean on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 vendor site with what forms, with thought process
2 procedures --

3 MR. DARBALI: Yes. Well, not to data
4 about detail but --

5 MR. HERB: I mean, be like thread audits
6 --

7 MR. DARBALI: Well, right.

8 MR. HERB: -- inspection of documents,
9 requirements --

10 MR. DARBALI: So you mentioned --

11 MR. HERB: -- tracing?

12 MR. DARBALI: No, no. You mentioned,
13 well, you mentioned SDOE but you only mentioned it,
14 you don't say what is the other activities you're
15 going to be doing.

16 MR. HERB: Oh.

17 MR. DARBALI: And again, I know it's hard
18 to bring a three page summary of a ten page document,
19 it doesn't add value.

20 MR. HERB: Right.

21 MR. DARBALI: So, maybe --

22 MR. HERB: Well, you know, as part of the
23 SDOE, we put that in there because we're committing to
24 certain activities in D.8.

25 MR. DARBALI: Right.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. HERB: And so, this is the vehicle
2 that we would do those activities. How we would
3 oversight the implementation of the secured
4 development environment at the vendor and SDOE.

5 MR. DARBALI: Because your D.8 would point
6 to this document?

7 MR. HERB: Well --

8 MR. DARBALI: But as I --

9 MR. HERB: -- I don't know that a D.8
10 would point to this document. It might. I think,
11 didn't we say, we did say in our summary of D.8 that
12 it was vendor oversight activities.

13 MR. DARBALI: Yes.

14 MR. HERB: So, yes.

15 MR. DARBALI: You could point to, what I
16 want to say is, you point to the vendor oversight plan
17 and the vendor oversight plan pulls back to D.8.

18 MR. HERB: No. Yes, no. Those activities
19 -- the way vendor oversight works is you sit down at
20 the very beginning --

21 MR. DARBALI: Right.

22 MR. HERB: -- in the negotiation stage
23 with the vendor and you say, these are the activities
24 that I need to see, that I need to look at.

25 And then you get that contractually put

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 into the purchase order, the hooks for those things.
2 And then generally there's a high-level schedule.

3 And there's whole points, there is points
4 where they have to call you, you have to make things
5 available. We show up at the vendor, we do that.

6 So those things, those activities for all
7 aspects would have to be covered in there. So we
8 would pull, the vendor oversight plan would pull from
9 D.8, they would pull from the D.2, the D.4. All those
10 sections. Even D.3, equipment qualification.

11 We would pull all those things in here and
12 it would say, those are all the requirements that we
13 want to make sure that the vendor has done properly,
14 and we would put those hooks in our plan.

15 So, what do we do? We made point to other
16 criteria in our plan. And that criteria may be in our
17 LAR or those may be in our internal documents.

18 MR. ODESS-GILLETT: And, Samir, maybe --

19 MR. HERB: Our systems requirements --

20 MR. ODESS-GILLETT: -- I could add a
21 little bit, Ray, if you don't mind. Is, you were
22 asking, well, for instance, for SDOE, what's the how,
23 on how the licensee would review that.

24 And I think what the LAR could describe
25 are like, what are the critical characteristics in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 SDOE.

2 MR. DARBALI: Right.

3 MR. ODESS-GILLETT: And what would we be
4 looking for when we do that. And that would probably
5 be the extent of the how.

6 MR. DARBALI: Okay. I think what I'm, I'm
7 kind of thinking into the future because this is a
8 very important document to make our safety
9 determination on.

10 It seems like this is, for us, a mandatory
11 audit item. We're trying, so we can look at the
12 actual document.

13 Again, if you had told me it's a 200 page
14 document but you're going to provide me a ten, 20 page
15 summary, that should be enough. If it's a 20 to 30
16 page document, then we can audit that.

17 MR. DRAGOVICH: Yes, I just wanted to add,
18 in light of what we talked about this morning is that,
19 one of our objectives with adding this was to try to
20 take the place of what the Staff would normally do in
21 our inspections.

22 So, I think what one crucial thing is, we
23 mentioned the guidance document where we wanted to
24 detail a lot of those requirements, and so I think a
25 lot of the success of this is to make sure that we'll

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 work with you to make sure we cover what you would
2 expect to see in those vendor oversights so that when
3 we say project specific at the beginning, that's where
4 we would get into what would normally be looked at in
5 a typical audit.

6 MR. DARBALI: Okay. So, we're trying to
7 avoid having audit guidance in our, in the ISG.
8 Anything is up for audit.

9 But mainly, would you think it's
10 reasonable to add a little more detail on the what and
11 reference sections that provide more context to that?
12 Because, I mean, if I get this right now it's like, in
13 my safety evaluation, although the licensee provided
14 this summary, and the Staff went and audited it.

15 MS. GOLUB: Just so I'm clear, Samir. So
16 are you saying, when you said, could you provide more
17 detail, do you mean in the summary that's --

18 MR. DARBALI: Yes.

19 MS. GOLUB: -- submitted as part of the
20 LAR?

21 MR. DARBALI: Yes.

22 MS. GOLUB: Okay.

23 MR. DARBALI: I mean, Rich, I mean, do you
24 think this -- the thing is, if we need to bank, if we
25 need to rely on the full vendor oversight plan, safety

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 determination we need on the docket.

2 MS. GOLUB: Right. No, I understand what
3 you're saying. So, what you're saying is, if you
4 provide some material here in the summary, then we
5 don't have to put the whole VOP on the docket.

6 MR. DARBALI: Right.

7 MR. HERB: I see.

8 MS. GOLUB: Yes. Okay. So, I think
9 that's good feedback for us. Maybe we can take
10 another cut at this --

11 MR. HERB: Yes.

12 MS. GOLUB: -- and then when we have the
13 inspection workshops and vendor oversight and all
14 those activities --

15 MR. DARBALI: Right.

16 MS. GOLUB: -- there all kind of tied
17 together, maybe we can bring, maybe bring a version of
18 this that has a little more meat to it.

19 MR. DARBALI: Right. And if you can
20 tailor it to the Diablo sample or even Hope Creek,
21 just so that we can see --

22 MR. HERB: Okay, so actually use a real
23 example?

24 MR. DARBALI: Yes, that would --

25 MR. HERB: Okay.

1 MR. DARBALI: -- I think it would be more
2 helpful than a generic one.

3 MR. HERB: Okay.

4 MR. WATERS: For a hypothetical sake,
5 would it be a showstopper to put the 20 to 30 page
6 document on the docket, recognize this is a living
7 document?

8 Because it seems to be, as Samir said, a
9 crucial piece of information for a decision and the
10 confidence of the approved system early on.

11 MR. HERB: You know, it's not a problem to
12 put a 20 to 30 page document on the docket, but it is
13 a living document and so --

14 MR. WATERS: Understood.

15 MR. HERB: -- I'm a little reluctant to
16 put a living document that's on there. I would rather
17 have, if you can make a decision on a high-level
18 summary and then make sure that the document is
19 available for inspection at any time. Just to make
20 sure that it's still within those high-level --

21 MR. STATTEL: I think we can work through
22 that. I'm just looking at ISG-06 and looking for a
23 consistency here. And I look at the next item on the
24 list, which is the approved topical report.

25 Which literally is a yes/no question,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 right?

2 MR. HERB: Right.

3 MR. STATTEL: But that, it just says Item
4 1.4 in Enclosure B. And it has a Section D.5 that
5 talks about ASAI's.

6 MR. HERB: Right.

7 MR. STATTEL: So, for consistency, I would
8 think this would kind of be the same level. There
9 almost seems to me like there should be an item in
10 Enclosure B and it should point, not to C, but we
11 should have a D section or a D subsection to point to
12 which would have a paragraph or two describing, even
13 if it's a summary.

14 MR. HERB: Right.

15 MR. STATTEL: Even if it's a summary. To
16 me, just logistically, I think that would, it would be
17 consistent. Because it's kind of a similar --

18 MR. HERB: Well, we do have those words,
19 vendor oversight, I think several times through the D
20 sections and so maybe --

21 MR. STATTEL: Maybe we can find a --

22 MR. HERB: -- just part of the scope would
23 be --

24 MS. GOLUB: I think Mark has something he
25 would like to say.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BURZYNSKI: Yes, I wanted to follow-
2 up, just on Mike's thought. About the idea of putting
3 it on the docket.

4 Maybe we should hold open the idea that we
5 start with the summary in the LAR.

6 MR. HERB: Yes.

7 MR. BURZYNSKI: I will suspect that you
8 will have some feedback on it, after you audit what
9 might be on the SharePoint. And the changes that
10 might result from it are really what you would be
11 importing, or interested in.

12 And it could be a document that is put on
13 the docket, later in the process, after you've done
14 any auditing through the SharePoint so that it
15 reflects the content that's finally negotiated as
16 opposed to starting with it and then having to add it
17 again later to capture the things you really wanted.

18 MS. ALVARADO: This is Rossnyev. First,
19 I think it would be really helpful on, I think it
20 would be good to talk to some of the DORL people about
21 these because I don't know how we can handle
22 performing audits in the SharePoint.

23 I know we are allowed to see them and
24 stuff like that, but I don't think we have crossed
25 that line yet of the reporting and audit of documents

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in the SharePoint.

2 Because there's always the concern of
3 grabbing too much information and stuff like that. So
4 we might want to check with DORL about it, what we are
5 allowed or not to do regarding that.

6 MR. DARBALI: So, the ISG has some
7 language as to making the documents available in a
8 portal or an electronic document repository. And it
9 does say the staff should not download or anything
10 like that.

11 And DORL looked at the language --

12 MS. ALVARADO: That is not what I'm
13 talking about.

14 MR. DARBALI: Okay.

15 MS. ALVARADO: When we do the analysis we
16 are required to perform, to write a inventory audit
17 plan.

18 MR. DARBALI: Yes.

19 MS. ALVARADO: And you just need to
20 include all these mechanisms and be part of it
21 because, when you are using that information as
22 evidence, we need to write an audit plan and we need
23 to write an audit report.

24 So, with the portal, you need to talk to
25 DORL about how to treat these so it's with final

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 regulatory framework.

2 I understand the whole thing about same
3 documents and not using it and all that, I'm not talk
4 about it, it's more about making it part of a records
5 --

6 MR. DARBALI: Yes.

7 MS. ALVARADO: -- as in the regulatory
8 framework that we have.

9 MR. DARBALI: That's a good point, Ross.
10 I think in the past we have had open items and vendors
11 or licensees would put the documents and we would
12 review them to determine if we needed them on the
13 docket, bring preparation for an audit.

14 But we don't formalize an audit plan
15 saying, right, we can work with DORL, we can have an
16 audit plant that is open ended just one week or
17 something. But we can work with DORL to make sure
18 this is the type of information we want them to
19 docket. We would end up with a lot of audits.

20 MS. GOLUB: Yes.

21 MR. DARBALI: But yes, we do need to check
22 with DORL on that.

23 MR. STATTEL: So, some real-world
24 examples. We, Gush and I have performed several
25 audits on set point calculations.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And it's not, typically we don't require
2 those to be docketed. We do require, we have required
3 summaries of the calculation results to be part of the
4 license amendment. We're doing one right now.

5 But, we choose to audit the actual reports
6 in order to get the understanding of where the results
7 came from. But we base our safety conclusion on the
8 results.

9 And we do write formal audit plans and we
10 write audit reports. So, we are able to do that,
11 we've done it by visiting the facilities, we've done
12 it using SharePoint documents.

13 So, I mean, we have several precedence
14 that we can go through that activity. But, the point
15 is taken.

16 MR. HERB: And I may be speaking out of
17 line here, but I suspect that this plan, at least the
18 Rev 0, this plan, we may not have a schedule yet, but
19 it would certainly have activities and areas that are
20 being covered in scope, would be available at the time
21 of pre-application meeting.

22 Because that is, and again, we welcome, at
23 Southern we would welcome NRC as a stakeholder input
24 to that plan. Okay.

25 MS. GOLUB: Yes, so I wanted to speak

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 briefly to the idea because we weren't really prepared
2 to answer the question about whether or not it should
3 be put on the docket.

4 I guess from our perspective, I want to be
5 a little bit careful about committing to submitting
6 something on the docket like that. Number one, to
7 Mark's point, it's a living document, it's going to
8 change as the project evolves.

9 Number two, if we submit it on the docket,
10 we need to understand the regulatory basis, why we're
11 submitting it, how it's going to be evaluated. That's
12 a whole complicated, a complicated item that ISG-06,
13 that was not one of the intents was to put something
14 like that on the docket and then come up with some
15 basis for the review and whatnot.

16 So for us, the summary, we can beef up the
17 summary and submit that on the docket. Of course, you
18 have the vendor oversight plan for your review in the
19 portal or SharePoint site or whatever the right
20 mechanism is for doing that.

21 And if there are select portions that you
22 feel are critical, you know, for you to draw your
23 safety conclusions, those can be submitted on the
24 docket. Those portions of it.

25 MR. DARBALI: Okay.

1 MS. GOLUB: But I think for right now, I
2 think we should leave it, leave it at that and see if
3 we can make that work without having to put the whole
4 plan on the docket.

5 MR. DARBALI: Sure. I agree.

6 MR. ARMSTRONG: Yes, this is Aaron
7 Armstrong. I did look at the oversight plan.

8 I just want to make sure, like, in the
9 plan, one of our functions is to look at vendors and
10 the sub-suppliers of vendors, which is supplying
11 licensees as well.

12 Would you, would the licensees be taking
13 on that auditing or the inspection activity at the
14 sub-suppliers or sub-suppliers of those people as
15 well? They're supplying materials, parts, services
16 and components.

17 MR. NOVAK: From my experience, that they
18 have, actually have done that in the past, we've had
19 several entities who have gone to our suppliers. I
20 can speak from GE experience.

21 MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

22 MR. NOVAK: I guess it isn't clear if this
23 oversight plan, if the scope is meant to just cover
24 what they're doing and move what would have been Phase
25 2 activities or if this is the whole comprehensive

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 oversight plan. So, and we talked about that a little
2 bit during our pre-meeting.

3 Did we ever come to a final decision on
4 that?

5 MS. GOLUB: Yes. And this is just the,
6 this is the overall --

7 MR. NOVAK: The overall plan, okay.

8 MS. GOLUB: Yes, vendor oversight plan.
9 And there is going, we have C.2.2.1 up here but we
10 already know that C.2.2.3b is commitments that are
11 going to be made to performing later life cycle
12 activities per the licensee's QA program. And I know
13 there is talk of those being license conditions.

14 So, I think that kind of covers those
15 later life cycle activities and what the utilities are
16 going to be doing. And I don't know if we need to
17 make this specific to that. I think this is just,
18 this is the overall licensee vendor oversight plan.

19 And I want to go back to one thing Ray
20 said which is, and I don't know if, Ray, you want to
21 speak to this a little is, is that this sort of more
22 larger scope vendor oversight plan, this is not just
23 because of ISG-06, the ultimate review process and the
24 EPRI, or actually Dave Hooten is here and can speak to
25 it as well, but the EPRI digital engineering guide

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that's currently under works, it's going to be the
2 basis for the standard design process for the
3 licensees.

4 I mean, that has also expanded the vendor
5 oversight plan section, to add more information. So
6 this is not just something the licensees are doing to
7 make you happy in an ultimate review space.

8 MR. ARMSTRONG: I guess on the second
9 question I had is, obviously with inspection activity
10 objective evidence of activities affecting quality is
11 what we looked at. How readily available, in our
12 current setup, how readily available would that
13 objective evidence be, roughly?

14 I mean, would that be something that's
15 only really, something that Rich would have to look at
16 or would be made available to the vendor group as part
17 of like developing plans to go inspect, I mean, I
18 guess this is kind of a big picture question of --

19 MS. GOLUB: Well, under Tier 1 what do you
20 guys do? Under Tier 1.

21 I mean, I thought under Tier 1 that there
22 was an obligation for, during the licensing process,
23 that the I&C branch staff would do their audits, and
24 then after the SER was issued, the regional inspection
25 folks would use the I&C branch as proposed inspection

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 items, and their own items, and do their inspections.

2 I mean, I don't think under that scenario,
3 do you play role in the project LAR or licensing
4 action?

5 In my mind, I thought you guys were more,
6 you would go and do your vendor work separate from the
7 specific licensee --

8 MR. ARMSTRONG: We would take direction --

9 MS. GOLUB: -- licensing action?

10 MR. ARMSTRONG: -- by them. And in this
11 fashion, not all the fashions of a vendor group, but
12 we would take action as they deem fit. I mean, as
13 they decide to do.

14 If they scope out an inspection for A, B
15 and C because those are areas of interests, we would
16 go do what NRR requests.

17 MS. GOLUB: Absolutely. But I guess the
18 question is, in the past, for Oconee and for Diablo
19 Canyon did you, I don't remember any inspection items
20 that looked like they were allocated to the vendor
21 quality branch to go do, in those previous ones.

22 MR. DARBALI: Right. So, for developing
23 life cycle activities on the vendor side, when we do
24 our tier review, typically we don't involve the vendor
25 group.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 However, when we'd have issues with, and
2 this applies more to typical reports, but when we've
3 had issues with the vendor's QA program, we engage the
4 quality group for guidance that somehow participated
5 in our reviews.

6 MS. GOLUB: And this is our understanding
7 as well.

8 MR. DARBALI: Right.

9 MS. GOLUB: What cause you would --

10 MR. DARBALI: Several issues can occur on
11 vendor side that the NRC staff aren't prepared to
12 handle. So the vendor group would help with that.

13 With the alternate review process, the
14 vendor inspection group is the vehicle that allows the
15 staff to confirm that those activities are performed.
16 So, there is several roles that the vendor inspection
17 group performs.

18 One is, a vehicle for the staff. For both
19 licenses and amendment inspection activities. Another
20 is, and that might the bulk of their work is handling
21 specific issues that might be generic, maybe not
22 applicable to all licensee, it could be applicable to
23 all licensee.

24 But, issues at the vendor side that the
25 staff, the technical staff, is not prepared to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 address.

2 MS. GOLUB: And so I guess, and I'm just
3 going to throw out a scenario and you can tell me if
4 this, and I want to make sure I'm hearing what you
5 guys are saying appropriately.

6 So, if the licensee conducts one of their
7 audits inspections, one of their oversight activities,
8 they write up their report, you take a look at what
9 they've put together and you see that there are some
10 quality issues that the licensee has identified, and
11 they're significant enough to you that you think, you
12 know what, we need to take another look at what the
13 vendor is doing, that seems like the type of trigger
14 that you would use to ask your vendor quality branch,
15 versus building that into the process from the
16 beginning for every single project. I'm struggling a
17 little bit with which path we're on.

18 MR. DARBALI: I would say both paths.

19 MR. ARMSTRONG: You're correct on this.
20 Another observation was --

21 MS. GOLUB: Wait, I'm sorry, so the answer
22 was?

23 MR. DARBALI: Yes and yes. So none of
24 our, one or two, both are within the purview.

25 MS. GOLUB: So that's a change then from

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the previous tiered processes. And for the previous
2 process, when we described it, it sounded like it was
3 only the one case where there was a quality issue and
4 you wanted your vendor quality branch folks to go in
5 and investigate.

6 MR. DARBALI: Yes, there is change, but
7 understand that the ultimate review process, by
8 itself, is a change. And, yes.

9 MR. ODESS-GILLETT: Samir, so, Aaron had
10 said, habitual question was, would the vendor
11 documentation be available, readily available --

12 MR. DARBALI: Yes.

13 MR. ODESS-GILLETT: If you are doing this
14 inspection, let's say that looking at the licensees'
15 rigor and you question something about the inspection,
16 would the vendor documentation be readily available to
17 support that inspection? And I think the answer is
18 yes.

19 Because the licensee has reviewed most of
20 the documentation that comes with the deliverables of
21 the system. And if there isn't, it can be with
22 today's portals. These things can be provided fairly
23 immediately.

24 MR. ARMSTRONG: Yes, I agree. Thank you.

25 MS. GOLUB: Thank you, Warren. My

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 apologies for not answering that.

2 MR. HERB: Right. And when you say
3 objective quality evidence, that means something
4 specific to me. It means like, it means documentation
5 of my reports, traceability back to the documents I
6 looked at, the activities that I did, maybe threads
7 that I pulled and then signatures that we all did.

8 But are you actually talking about the
9 actual source documents we looked at to do those
10 conclusions?

11 MR. ARMSTRONG: Well, the objective
12 evidence would be if you established thresholds or
13 limits or envelopes, you tested them, where are the
14 values.

15 MR. HERB: Okay.

16 MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay. If NRTE is required
17 to report those values, it was an NRTE operation.

18 MR. HERB: Oh, okay.

19 MR. ARMSTRONG: And all these things are
20 --

21 MR. HERB: You're right.

22 MR. ARMSTRONG: -- in which you weren't
23 going to basically be not responsible for. So, all
24 those records, when you get to looking at them --

25 MR. HERB: Right.

1 MR. ARMSTRONG: -- wherever they're at --

2 MR. HERB: Right.

3 MR. ARMSTRONG: -- should be available for
4 our inspection.

5 MR. HERB: Okay. Yes, that wouldn't be in
6 our report, that would be --

7 MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

8 MR. HERB: -- yes, that would be at the
9 vendor's site, for the most part.

10 MR. ARMSTRONG: The last one, is there any
11 more questions or comments? Okay.

12 In reference to the plan, I did notice
13 that in NAQ-1 2015, which is the guidance we're
14 quoting, there is approximately, there's 117 shalls.
15 Now, not all these shalls would be a mechanism for
16 instruction, but I would assume that when you guys are
17 invoking this on a vendor, there should be at least
18 117 mechanisms that you would be overseeing if they
19 were applicable to the vendor.

20 Is that an adequate assumption or are you
21 just going to say, follow 2.1.7?

22 I mean, there should be, if you have to
23 have configuration control, they should have a
24 mechanism that you verify that there is configuration
25 control.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. GOLUB: Isn't 115 in Subpart 2.7?

2 MR. ARMSTRONG: One hundred seventeen
3 shalls --

4 MS. GOLUB: In 2.7.

5 MR. ARMSTRONG: -- in 2.7 alone. But 2.7
6 also bounces you back to --

7 MR. HERB: Yes, all the other ones.

8 MR. ARMSTRONG: -- design control and
9 procurement, which also probably have as many or more
10 shalls. So, I mean --

11 MR. HERB: If you look at the actual worry
12 from the, I actually don't have it in front of me, I
13 think it says, consistent with, doesn't it?

14 MS. GOLUB: It does.

15 MR. DARBALI: It does.

16 MS. GOLUB: Yes.

17 MR. HERB: And so we're not, we're not
18 inspecting the NQA-1 2015 --

19 MS. GOLUB: Every single --

20 MR. HERB: -- all those shall statements.

21 MR. DARBALI: But I think Aaron's point
22 is, how do we determine that it is consistent with --

23 MR. HERB: Well, again, our NUPIC audit,
24 the QA process is compliant, is our primary means for
25 determining whether their process is compliant with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 NQA-1 2015. Okay.

2 And so, once they have a process that's
3 complainant, we just look at their processes and make
4 sure that they're living within their process. We
5 don't necessarily have to bounce that back.

6 I think we're relying on our NUPIC to make
7 sure that they have an acceptable process. And we put
8 NQA-1 2015 because that's what NRC, you guys use, for
9 an acceptable QA like process.

10 MS. GOLUB: And the vendors are compliant
11 too in NQA-1 2015. I mean, this was not something new
12 for the vendors.

13 Okay, yes. Okay, so, Warren is saying we
14 can take a look at 117 shalls and see which ones would
15 be applicable here.

16 But, I mean, to be clear, you're not going
17 to see like 117 separate activities in the licensee's
18 vendor oversight plan for each and everyone one of
19 those, that's not at all --

20 MR. DARBALI: You're not going to see
21 that.

22 MS. GOLUB: Yes, that's not --

23 MR. ARMSTRONG: I was just wondering --

24 MS. GOLUB: That's not. And there's
25 other, as Ray said, there is new NUPIC audits, there's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 other mechanisms that the licensing community uses.
2 Yes, the licensee community uses to make sure that the
3 vendors are, the vendor processes, quality processes
4 are up to snuff.

5 It's not going to be just on a project
6 specific basis --

7 MR. HERB: Right. And we're using --

8 MS. GOLUB: -- it's --

9 MR. HERB: Yes. And we're also using a
10 NRC approved topical report --

11 MS. GOLUB: Right, it is.

12 MR. HERB: And so we are also relying on
13 the fact that you guys are good with it.

14 MS. GOLUB: And that you do your own
15 inspections, right?

16 MR. HERB: Yes.

17 MS. GOLUB: Your vendor quality branch
18 does inspections. This is part of a bigger framework
19 that we're operating in.

20 MR. HERB: Yes.

21 MR. ODESS-GILLETT: Yes, really, if you
22 think about it, the, really the, sort of like the
23 tradeoff of what the NRC Staff used to do with the
24 tier reviews, we're now moving that to the licensees.
25 And certainly the NRC Staff, when they did their

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 review, did not do the whole 117 shalls of NQS-1 or
2 stuff like --

3 MS. GOLUB: Yes, thank you, Warren. I
4 think that's a really important point. So I mean,
5 part of the idea here is we're trying, the licensees
6 are trying to step up and take on that part.

7 And, I mean, I'll be frank. At some of
8 our team meetings, some of our vendors have provided
9 NRC audit plans, audit reports. We've actually gone
10 through those in detail at Diablo Canyon.

11 You know, you mentioned there was two of
12 them. And we actually looked through those in detail,
13 in our meetings, with the idea that when we put
14 together guidance for the, the Industry guidance
15 companion document, that we're going to put templates
16 that are based on your templates for audit plans and
17 reports with the idea being that if Industry documents
18 those the way you would have documented them when you
19 come in to take a look at what Industry did, you're
20 going to see something that hopefully looks familiar
21 to you.

22 That you would view as adequate as the
23 work that you had done previously. So I don't want to
24 overstate what Industry is committing to do here.

25 MR. DARBALI: Do you have access to the

1 proprietary attachments to some of those audit
2 reports?

3 MS. GOLUB: I mean, we're not sharing
4 proprietary --

5 MR. ODESS-GILLETT: But it's certainly --

6 MS. GOLUB: -- material.

7 MR. ODESS-GILLETT: But what has public
8 clearly identified as the scope and how.

9 MR. DARBALI: Right. It's just, sometimes
10 we have done audit reports where what's public is very
11 high-level but the detailed audit evaluations are in
12 proprietary attachment. And it just, just a comment.

13 MS. GOLUB: Yes, no, good. That's good
14 feedback on this.

15 MR. DARBALI: Okay.

16 MS. GOLUB: Yes. Because, you're right,
17 if we're looking, we can --

18 MR. DARBALI: To the level of detail of
19 what we have done. The proprietary attachments might
20 give you more information.

21 MS. GOLUB: Give you more information,
22 yes.

23 MR. DARBALI: Yes.

24 MS. GOLUB: So hopefully somebody here
25 will have access to them. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. DARBALI: So, I'm thinking there are
2 more ISG-06 development. It seems like a section
3 vendor oversight plan summary description needs to be
4 added.

5 And then we'll have information to be
6 provided and an application. And we'll take what
7 we've discussed here as equal to that.

8 What I'm thinking of is we're past the
9 draft sessions. We are in the concurrence process.
10 Obviously we're going to take notes from this tabletop
11 and the ACRS full committee recommendations and the
12 concurrence comments.

13 I'm thinking I would not want to spring
14 new language in a new section to Industry.

15 MS. GOLUB: We certainly appreciate that.
16 Yes, thank you.

17 MR. DARBALI: But if our process allows us
18 to do otherwise.

19 MS. GOLUB: Well, is it? I mean, we can't
20 do what we've done in the past in terms of OneDrive
21 and whatnot, because you guys are in the more formal
22 part of your process, but, I mean, is it possible to
23 not maybe share the exact language but to give us some
24 ideas on what you're putting in there? I think that
25 would be very helpful.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. DARBALI: Right.

2 MS. GOLUB: Because otherwise we're just
3 going to end having to make public comments and I feel
4 like it drags out the process.

5 MR. DARBALI: Right. So, we'll consider
6 that internal --

7 MS. GOLUB: Okay.

8 MR. DARBALI: -- see where our processes
9 allows this. But, being sensitive to how we've worked
10 in the past and then being it was a good process that
11 we've had in how to continue that, but I added that as
12 one of the actions coming out this meeting, to add
13 that section. So we'll work through that.

14 MR. WATERS: Yes, I want to add, I concur
15 with what Samir said. To the extent that we can be
16 transparent with what's changing, we want to do that.

17 But the fuse is getting short to meet the
18 July 24th date. But at some point, really becomes
19 frozen to get at the final version of the C for final
20 legal review, things like that. And there is
21 administrative procedure as well.

22 So, at some point we need to make the
23 final tweaks to it, somehow communicate what those are
24 and essentially freeze that they get it actually
25 published for formal public comment.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. DARBALI: Right.

2 MS. GOLUB: Yes. I mean, smaller tweaks
3 that's, you know, and we were at the ACRS meeting so
4 we did hear some of the feedback, but I don't think we
5 had any fundamental concerns with the feedback that
6 was given, it was mostly on the Tier 1, 2, 3 processes
7 anyway.

8 MR. DARBALI: Right.

9 MS. GOLUB: But adding a section for
10 vendor oversight, for example, it's a bit more than a
11 tweak and that, we would love to have at least some of
12 your thoughts on that.

13 MR. WATERS: Yes, I agree. I didn't mean
14 to give that connotation --

15 MS. GOLUB: Okay.

16 MR. WATERS: You're right there.

17 MS. GOLUB: Because there is going to be
18 an evaluation basis that's included there. And we
19 would just like to have some understanding as to what
20 that is. For your consideration.

21 MR. DARBALI: So, I guess we're done with
22 our last session tabletop. The next item is really to
23 go over summary action items or any stakeholder
24 feedback.

25 I'll just point out the note. I mean,

1 we're lucky to have a transcript so we can go back and
2 look at that.

3 MS. GOLUB: Yes, thank you guys.

4 MR. DARBALI: I'll just list the major
5 items that I took from yesterday and today.

6 I think on Section ISG-06, Section
7 D.5.1.2, I think the second to the last paragraph on
8 the application specific action items, in the
9 information to be provided it says, a license
10 condition should be established. We're going to move
11 that to the evaluation portion.

12 And I had a separate conversation with
13 Booma. And she pointed to somewhere else in the LAR,
14 I think Section B.

15 And the ISG Section B said, the Staff may
16 convert a commitment to a condition. So, here we'll
17 say a license condition should be.

18 So, we'll work internally to get some
19 agreement. Whether the work should be, should or may.
20 That's one.

21 Another item is, when we're talking about
22 human factors in engineering, I think we had discussed
23 having a future call on a HFE example.

24 And then --

25 MS. GOLUB: I'm contemplating two

1 examples.

2 MR. DARBALI: Okay.

3 MS. GOLUB: One was, one of them was the
4 situation where the HFE changes were, or the human
5 factors changes were, were minor changes and evaluated
6 under a separate design change package, a separate
7 50.59 and documented in the LAR and then a second
8 where, and somebody can jump in if I'm off track here,
9 and a second one where we justified how it meet Level
10 3 from the NUREG-1764 that was listed. Is that what
11 we agreed to, Dave?

12 MR. HARRELL: Yes, that's what we agreed
13 to.

14 MS. GOLUB: I think we were looking at
15 providing both of those examples.

16 MR. DARBALI: Okay. And I think the other
17 major item is, what we just talked about, adding a,
18 the vendor oversight plan description to the ISG in
19 Enclosure B.

20 MR. HERB: And did you want us to update
21 that, and also the document, right, to have more, you
22 said more section on scope?

23 MS. GOLUB: The vendor oversight plan
24 summary.

25 (Simultaneous speaking.)

1 MR. HERB: Yes. The actual description.

2 MR. DARBALI: So, I think that's something
3 that we'll cover in the September workshop yes. But
4 I can maybe write that --

5 MR. HERB: Right.

6 MR. DARBALI: I guess I'm --

7 MR. HERB: That's your, that's not your
8 actions.

9 MR. DARBALI: There's no action there.
10 I'm not only thinking about the discussion items we're
11 talking, but one of the major items in the tabletop is
12 how we can perform our updates, the ISG.

13 MS. GOLUB: Yes.

14 MR. DARBALI: So, those were my items. I
15 don't know if anybody else had any other items.

16 MS. GOLUB: No, I mean we, I think the
17 part that I'd like to talk about just a little since
18 we have a few moments is the September inspection
19 workshop. When the time is right. I don't know if we
20 have to do public comments yet or if we have an
21 opportunity to talk about that?

22 MR. DARBALI: Did you want to talk
23 specifically about the workshop or the dates?

24 MS. GOLUB: No, the workshop.

25 MR. DARBALI: Okay, go ahead. Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. GOLUB: Yes, because we have a few
2 minutes

3 MR. DARBALI: Yes.

4 MS. GOLUB: And I guess what I wanted to
5 talk about was that, and I think this tabletop was a
6 very successful exercise.

7 MR. DARBALI: I would actually, I would
8 call this a workshop.

9 MS. GOLUB: Yes. Right, this workshop was
10 --

11 MR. DARBALI: Good.

12 MS. GOLUB: -- I think this was very
13 successful. And I think it, in large part, because we
14 had planned this out for months ahead of time, so we
15 all, we kind of knew what the outcomes were that we
16 wanted, we knew what our goals were, objectives, all
17 that good stuff months ago.

18 And so I'd like to do the same thing for
19 the September workshop. Make sure we understand who
20 are the participants in the workshop.

21 And we spent a little time at our industry
22 meeting yesterday putting together a list of outcomes
23 we were looking for. We would love if maybe you guys
24 could do the same activity, we could compare them.

25 Just like we did for this table top

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 exercise. To make sure that if we're going to
2 dedicate time and resources to that workshop, that we
3 all get what we want out of it.

4 And so, like I heard, one of the things I
5 heard was, okay, the vendor oversight plan summary,
6 that's going to be a document we'll bring to the
7 workshop.

8 MR. DARBALI: Right.

9 MS. GOLUB: I think our discussions on the
10 alternate review process, specific inspection items
11 and how these are phrased, that's another good topic
12 for the workshop.

13 And then just getting more clarity on
14 whose doing what, when.

15 MR. DARBALI: Yes.

16 MS. GOLUB: And making sure that, because
17 I don't think we still have a line, and I still think
18 we have some preconceived notions of how this is going
19 to play out. And I think you guys have different
20 ones.

21 And then it sounds like, from that
22 regulatory transformation, I don't know what the t
23 was, team --

24 MR. DARBALI: The SECY document.

25 MS. GOLUB: -- the SECY document. That

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 also had some, sounded like some changes for vendor
2 quality, maybe some expansion of scope or change in
3 scope. That wasn't clear to me either.

4 I did talk to Bernie about that a little
5 bit but I'm still not clear. So I thought this, the
6 inspection workshop would be another opportunity for
7 us to just get some clarity on if there are changes
8 occurring, they are certainly going to affect the
9 first adopters of the alternate review process and
10 we'd like to understand that.

11 MR. DARBALI: Sure.

12 MS. GOLUB: So, I guess this is a long-
13 winded appeal for, we'd really like to plan this out
14 for you.

15 Of course we would like you to be
16 involved. Aaron, if you're representing your branch
17 we'd like you. And we would like someone from the
18 regional inspection group to also be involved in the
19 planning, just so we're all on the same page.

20 MR. DARBALI: Right.

21 MS. GOLUB: And then we can setup, we can
22 work on some schedule of planning meetings or public
23 meetings or whatever the right mechanism is to do
24 that.

25 MR. DARBALI: Sure.

1 MR. WATERS: Yes, I agree.

2 MS. GOLUB: And the date would be helpful
3 too because we do need a date for that. We proposed
4 two weeks.

5 MR. WATERS: I agree. And I clearly heard
6 what you said, you want to focus on ISG-06 and
7 subsequent inspections.

8 Just one point of clarity. I don't know
9 if we'll be prepared, able to talk about the
10 independent recommendations in that transformation
11 SECY, that's a future activity so I'm not going to
12 commit, and we can talk about that in September.

13 MS. GOLUB: Understood.

14 MR. DARBALI: Did you feel there was a
15 need, understood on the inspection side and the
16 workshop, do you feel there was a need to have a joint
17 discussion on that same workshop or a separate
18 discussion on conditions?

19 MS. GOLUB: Yes, that's a good question.
20 Today's, the conversation today, I mean, it was a good
21 discussion but it, I'm not sure we have clarity on
22 that, on that C.2.2.3b item.

23 And licensees can certainly propose
24 things, but the part that I'm struggling with is,
25 making regulatory commitments frankly is not that big

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of deal.

2 MR. DARBALI: Right.

3 MS. GOLUB: There's guidance on how to do
4 it and it's very much in the licensee's purview to
5 make those decisions. That's fine.

6 The catch is that condition part.

7 MR. DARBALI: Right.

8 MS. GOLUB: Right. What qualified then,
9 what will the NRC take and turn into license
10 conditions. And from today's discussion, it wasn't
11 clear maybe if you guys already had that in mind.

12 So I think your question is a good one and
13 I think we should follow-up on that.

14 MR. DARBALI: Okay.

15 MS. GOLUB: Yes. I don't know, it could
16 be in that workshop, but maybe that's not relevant to
17 the workshop. Maybe we could just do it on a public
18 meeting phone call as well.

19 MR. DARBALI: Sure.

20 MS. GOLUB: Yes. Thank you for bringing
21 that up, I appreciate that.

22 MR. DARBALI: So, I guess, Pete, before we
23 turn it over to Joe and go for public comments, I want
24 to thank Industry for not only being here but all the
25 preparation effort you put into this.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I know it's sometimes it seems like you
2 spent a lot of times creating one document and you
3 might get the impression that we just take a couple of
4 minutes to look at them, but we did look at them and
5 we appreciate the work that you're doing.

6 And we appreciate you're taking this
7 seriously. We'd like to see a licensee coming in, but
8 we understand that the MPR industry team is working
9 really hard on this.

10 And as we've said many times before, we're
11 making a lot of effort in this ISG. There are some
12 areas where we're not on the same page, especially in
13 the inspection activity. Hopefully we can solve or
14 get to common ground soon.

15 But, I want to thank you all for all
16 listening.

17 MS. GOLUB: Thank you, Samir. I'm going to
18 echo that. We really thank the NRC as well for
19 supporting this activity, going through all the
20 planning with us over the last day and a half. Thank
21 you.

22 It really, having examples is just, it
23 makes a huge difference. You know, reading words on
24 a page, it's difficult to understand what the intent
25 was.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 If all of us retired tomorrow, for some
2 reason we all simultaneously win the lottery, we
3 really want the people that try to use all of this,
4 use these documents to have a good understanding of
5 what we had in mind.

6 And just to your point about not having a
7 lot of comments back, because I know, I guess what it
8 says to me is that the process we used to get here was
9 a good process because it turns out that as we work
10 together to craft those sections, and then we
11 interpreted those sections and produced documents to
12 them, and most of the feedback we got was, it was
13 pretty close.

14 And so I, I mean, I kind of take that as
15 a positive that we had, we did have the same things in
16 mind. And so, yes, it's a positive. So thank you
17 very much.

18 MR. DARBALI: And I also thank Aaron and
19 Booma and John Hughey, Brian Green --

20 MR. WATERS: OGC.

21 MR. DARBALI: -- OGC, Sheldon Clark and
22 Bob Weisman who have supported us throughout this
23 whole process. And we catch some of their viable
24 time, but their input is very valid, so thank you.

25 MR. HANSON: I'm Jerud Hanson with NEI,

1 just one quick comment. I want to, just again,
2 complement all the hard work that's being done on this
3 effort and understand the desire to get applications
4 in for digital mods and upgrades, but also need to
5 understand we need good, effective guidance in place
6 as well as inspector criteria, and that's what we're
7 working on, that's why we're here.

8 And I think this is moving very well. And
9 if we keep going this direction we will see
10 applications and we'll see our plants upgrading and
11 modifying their equipment.

12 So, thank you very much to everyone, I
13 thought this was a very productive meeting.

14 MR. DARBALI: Thank you.

15 MR. GOLLA: Okay, thanks, Jerud. So, just
16 one more thing. This is Joe Golla by the way.

17 Folks on the phone, in particular any
18 members of the public that may be on the line, do you
19 have any questions or any comments? Members of the
20 public?

21 Okay, hearing none, so, everyone, thanks
22 for a very good productive meeting and we'll see you
23 again real soon.

24 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
25 off the record at 10:52 a.m.)