APPENDIX A

Babcock & Wilcox Company Docket No. 99900400/82-03

NOTICE OF NONCONFORMANCE

Based on the results of an NRC inspection conducted on August 17-18, 1982, it appears that certain of your activities were not conducted in full compliance with NRC requirements as indicated below.

Section 5 of the Babcock & Wilcox (B&W) topical report, BAW-10096A, states in part, "The (B&W quality assurance program) QAP requires that activities affecting quality be prescribed by documented instructions, procedures, and drawings of a type appropriate to the circumstances and accomplished accordingly."

Exhibit C of procedure NPG-0903-13 documents the instructions to be followed in assessing the impact of errors identified in hybrid computer codes.

Contrary to the above, an error identified in the hybrid computer code POWER TRAIN on or about June 21, 1982, was not processed in accordance with the instructions of Exhibit C of NPG-0903-13. The following are specific examples of this nonconformance.

- Paragraph 1 of Exhibit C requires, "When an error is found in a computer program, promptly notify the responsible technology unit manager in writing."
 - Contrary to the above, the responsible technology unit manager was notified, but not in writing, consequently, it could not be determined if an evaluation of the error was performed within 5 working days as required by paragraph 2 of Exhibit C.
- Paragraph 4 of Exhibit C requires the responsible technology unit manager to notify, in writing, several individuals and groups to discontinue use of the program. Among those to be notified are, "... those on the computer program manual distribution list."
 - Contrary to the above, less than half of those on the POWER TRAIN program manual distribution list were notified by the responsible technology unit manager.

3. Paragraphs 5 through 10 of Exhibit C relate to actions that are to be taken by the affected unit manager. In this instance it appears only one group is affected, the manager of the Operational Analysis Unit. The types of actions required by those paragraphs include: (1) written notification to all users of the affected program; (2) written notification to Licensing if any topical or other licensee documents may be affected; and (3) determine if the error could result in a potential safety concern, document the findings, and provide a copy of the findings to the responsible engineer and the Licensing Manager in either case.

Contrary to the above, it was not evident that the Manager of the Operational Analysis Unit had made any written notifications or documented any results of findings made by his unit.