CoC Condition/TS Identifier: TS-1.1 (Form #13) Revision 4 (changes made and tracked)

^{**} In performing the risk insight evaluation above, the evaluator should think about subsequent changes to a relocated CoC requirement. Specifically, ask the question "what is the likelihood and worst possible consequences of a future change to this requirement in the less-conservative direction"?

nservative direction"?			TO 4 4 D 5: 111
Requirement			TS 1.1: Definitions
CoC Body Certified Design	Section I. Technology		No
	Section II. Design Features		No
Appendix A - Inspections, Tests, and			No
Evaluations	T		
	Section 1		Voc
	Definitions, Use and Application		Yes
	Application	A1	No
	Section 2		NO
	Approved Contents	A2	No
Appendix B.	(Selection Criteria)	А3	No
Technical	Section 3	L1	No
Specifications	Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCOs)* and Surveillance Requirements (SRs) (Selection Criteria)		NO
		L2	No
		L3	No
	Section 4		No
	Administrative Controls		
	A significant increase in)	
	the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the cask FSAR?		
			No
Risk Insight**: Will removing this requirement from the CoC/TS result in			
	The possibility of a new or		
	different kind of accident		No
	being created compared to		
	those previously evaluated		
	in the FSAR?		
	A Significant reduction in the margin of safety for		N.o.
	ISFSI or cask operation?		No
	isrsi of cask operation:		

^{*} All LCOs also require an Applicability, Condition(s), Required Action(s), Completion Time(s), Surveillance Requirement(s), and Frequency(ies). Refer to NUREG-1745 for additional guidance.

	Retain in CoC Appendix B, TS Section 1 since it meets the criterion for inclusion in the new TS format.
Evaluation Summary	No change except potentially to the List of Definitions later to reflect final TS reorganization (some definitions may no longer be needed and others added).
	Based on NRC staff feedback at the public meeting on 02/28/18, the definition for Operability has been added per the example provided in NUREG-1745.

CoC Condition/TS Identifier: TS-1.2 (Form #14) Revision 0 (no NRC questions – no changes made)

^{**} In performing the risk insight evaluation above, the evaluator should think about subsequent changes to a relocated CoC requirement. Specifically, ask the question "what is the likelihood and worst possible consequences of a future change to this requirement in the less-conservative direction"?

Requirement			TS 1.2: Logical Connectors	
CoC Body Certified	C Body Certified Section I. Technology		No	
Design	Section II. Design Features		No	
Appendix A - Inspec Evaluations	tions, Tests, and		No	
	Section 1 Definitions, Use and Application		Yes	
	Section 2 Approved Contents (Selection Criteria)	A1	No	
		A2	No	
Appendix B. Technical Specifications		А3	No	
	Section 3 Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCOs)* and Surveillance Requirements (SRs) (Selection Criteria)	L1	No	
		L2	No	
		L3	No	
	Section 4 Administrative Controls		No	
Risk Insight**: Will removing this requirement from the CoC/TS result in	A significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the cask FSAR?		No	
	The possibility of a new or different kind of accident being created compared to those previously evaluated in the FSAR?		No	
	A Significant reduction in the margin of safety for ISFSI or cask operation?		No	
Evaluation Summary			Retain in TS Appendix B Section 1 since it meets the criter for inclusion in the new TS format (Use and Application).	ion
			No change – Existing Purpose, Background, and Examples helpful to understand the TS Use and Application.	are

^{*} All LCOs also require an Applicability, Condition(s), Required Action(s), Completion Time(s), Surveillance Requirement(s), and Frequency(ies). Refer to NUREG-1745 for additional guidance.

CoC Condition/TS Identifier: TS-1.3 (Form #15) Revision 0 (no NRC questions – no changes made)

^{**} In performing the risk insight evaluation above, the evaluator should think about subsequent changes to a relocated CoC requirement. Specifically, ask the question "what is the likelihood and worst possible consequences of a future change to this requirement in the less-conservative direction"?

nservative direction"? Requirement			TS 1.3: Completion Times
	I		
CoC Body Certified	Certified Section I. Technology		No
Design Section II. Design Features		es	No
Appendix A - Inspect	ions, Tests, and Evaluation	าร	No
	Section 1 Definitions, Use and Application		Yes
	Section 2	A1	No
	Approved Contents	A2	No
Appendix B.	(Selection Criteria)	А3	No
Technical Specifications	Section 3 Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCOs)* and Surveillance Requirements (SRs) (Selection Criteria)	L1	No
		L2	No
		L3	No
	Section 4 Administrative Controls		No
Diek besiebt**	A significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the cask FSAR?		No
Risk Insight**: Will removing this requirement from the CoC/TS result in	The possibility of a new or different kind of accident being created compared to those previously evaluated in the FSAR?		No
	A Significant reduction in the margin of safety for ISFSI or cask operation?		No
Evaluation Summary			Retain in TS Appendix B Section 1 since it meets the criterion for inclusion in the new TS format (Use and Application).
			No change – Existing Purpose, Background, Description, Examples and Immediate Completion Time are helpful to provide guidance on Completion Times use in the TS.

^{*} All LCOs also require an Applicability, Condition(s), Required Action(s), Completion Time(s), Surveillance Requirement(s), and Frequency(ies). Refer to NUREG-1745 for additional guidance.

CoC Condition/TS Identifier: TS-1.4 (Form #16) Revision 0 (no NRC questions – no changes made)

^{**} In performing the risk insight evaluation above, the evaluator should think about subsequent changes to a relocated CoC requirement. Specifically, ask the question "what is the likelihood and worst possible consequences of a future change to this requirement in the less-conservative direction"?

nservative direction"? Requirement			TS 1.4: Frequency
CoC Body Certified	Section I. Technology		No
Design	Section II. Design Features		No
Appendix A - Inspection	ons, Tests, and Evaluations	No	
Section 1 Definitions, Use and Application			Yes
	Section 2 Approved Contents	A1	No
		A2	No
Appendix B.	(Selection Criteria)	А3	No
Technical Specifications	Section 3 Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCOs)* and Surveillance Requirements (SRs) (Selection Criteria)	L1	No
		L2	No
		L3	No
	Section 4 Administrative Controls		No
Dick Incight**. Will	A significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated in the cask FSAR	es	No
Risk Insight**: Will removing this requirement from the CoC/TS result in	The possibility of a new or different kind of accident being created compared to those previously evaluated the FSAR?)	No
	A Significant reduction in t margin of safety for ISFSI c cask operation?		No
Evaluation Summary			Retain in TS Appendix B Section 1 since it meets the criterion for inclusion in the new TS format (Use and Application).
			No change – Existing Purpose, Description, and Examples are helpful to provide guidance on the proper use and application of Frequency requirements in TS.

^{*} All LCOs also require an Applicability, Condition(s), Required Action(s), Completion Time(s), Surveillance Requirement(s), and Frequency(ies). Refer to NUREG-1745 for additional guidance.