From:	Fowler, Wren
To:	Markley, Chris
Cc:	Baldner, Heath; Chapman, Deborah
Subject:	[External_Sender] RE: Pre-App inspection results (CoC 1025)
Date:	Friday, February 21, 2020 8:33:56 AM

Thanks Chris. I don't see any problem with putting that level of detail out of the inspection report and putting it in the application directly as a high-level summary.

Wren Fowler

Director, Licensing NAC International Inc. Office: 678.328.1236 Email: <u>sfowler@nacintl.com</u>

From: Markley, Chris <Christopher.Markley@nrc.gov>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2020 2:12 PM
To: Fowler, Wren <wfowler@nacintl.com>
Subject: Pre-App inspection results (CoC 1025)

۰	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
٠		-																					1
						-	7		-		-	-	-	-		~	•	-	-		н		
				г	н.	2	٢.		L	а.	-	_		F			н	C	-		н		

Hi Wren,

I was talking to the lead technical reviewer about the level of non-proprietary detail for the inspection report. His thinking is that the findings and conclusions should be public. He understands that you'd probably want to keep the method and acceptance criteria proprietary. The key is that at least to some level, he thinks the findings should be there to support the conclusion.

I've seen some different approaches to reporting the inspections. Here are some examples... 72-27 provides a fairly detailed overview of their inspection (<u>ML18215A202</u>). 72-17 provides more of a high-level summary, but they also refer to previous inspection reports that are public (<u>ML17086A039</u>). Some of the CoCs I've seen are also variable (details, cite public presentations, etc).

Feel free to give me a call next week if you want to discuss further before moving forward with any potential revisions.

Thanks, -Chris

