

Facility: Diablo Canyon		Exam Date: Jan 25, 2021												
Admin	JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
				I/C Focus	Cues	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Overlap	Perf. Std.	Key	Minutia	Job Link		
														All Validation comments (in blue text below) were resolved with rev 1 of JPMs
A1			3											<p>E Critical step states per answer key but answer key doesn't state they have to get all of the items. If the answer key is everything critical then the key and task std should specify that. Could use a note like A2 and state that everything is critical in the note.</p> <p>Licensee revised Critical Steps to reference Task Standard which identifies specific details from the answer key that must be determined. Other minor markups from validation were incorporated.</p> <p>S Validation comments: Remove "from LCP Halt" from first bullet in Task Standard (pg 3)</p>
A2			3											<p>E Reference links are broken in JPM key-may have to type these in before converting to pdf. Licensee repaired reference links.</p> <p>Key does not specify how they arrive at the answers or if any error bars needed from graph to answer sheet. Have to show your work. Can't determine what is right or wrong from this JPM.</p> <p>Licensee added specific table look-ups references to answer key; no graphs involved.</p>

												S	<p>Validation comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Change Time Allotment to 15 minutes (pg 1) 2) Change water depth in Fuel Oil Tank 0-1 to 0 (procedure markup step 12.2.9) 3) Change water depth in Fuel Oil Tank 0-2 to 0 (procedure markup step 12.3.9) 4) Remove notification numbers associated with water depth > 0 and mark step N/A (procedure markup step 12.5) 5) Change answer key to reflect changes to water depth of 0 (pg 4)
A3		3										E	<p>This JPM has the task steps IAW NUREG and the standard for each step as well as critical and non-critical pieces. Others should look like this one.</p> <p>Licensee revised specific Critical Steps on JPMs A1, A2, A4, A5, A6, A7, and A8 to more clearly link these steps with body of JPM and/or answer key.</p>
												S	<p>Validation comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Replace "Description" with actual ESOMs title – "Equipment ID" (pg 6)
A4		3										S	<p>Validation comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Add box for Examinee Response with prompts "Basis for Conclusion" (pg 6) 2) Add examiner note to Task Standard to indicate basis for UNSAT is NOT required as part of written response (pg 2) 3) Change RM-15 and RM-15R to read the same values (pg 9) 4) Remove graphic of SJAE flow chart and replace with value given as part of Initial Conditions (pg 8) 5) Update Initial Conditions (pgs

												2, to include the following: a) SJAЕ flow is 8 scfm b) Rate of rise calculation is NOT required
A5 (SRO)		3										E Should specify on the key "IAW TS table xx" for the TS call. Licensee added reference to key for table and specific safety function. Validation comments: 1) List Tech Spec Binder as reference (pgs 1, 2) 2) Remove "in accordance with..." from first sentence of Initiating Cue (pgs 2, 7) 3) Add examiner note that Examinee may or may not list TS 3.3.2.A (TS to enter the table); not critical (pg 4)
A6 (SRO)		3										Validation comments: 1) Change Time Allotment to 20 minutes (pg 1) 2) Add Tech Spec Binder to references (pgs 1, 2) 3) Amend Initiating Cue to include "and list applicable Tech Specs, if any" (pgs 2, 6) 4) Add box for Examinee Response (pg 6)
A7 (SRO)		3										Validation comments: 1) Correct required ECG reference (should be ECG 18.7 not 18.3)(pgs 1, 2) 2) Add power level to Initial conditions for both units (pgs 2, 6) 3) Change Task Standard (pg 3) to: a) Determines listed Fire Areas are incorrect -should have been 6-A-3 and 6-A-4 b) Determines first rove was late or missed 4) Add User ID and Performer Signature to Student Handout and Key (pgs 5, 7)

A8 (SRO)		3											<p>E</p> <p>“Critical steps per answer key” is not always legally correct. There are lots of items in the answer key so if you don’t use the standard JPM template (so you can identify the math derivation, error bars, etc.) then it is harder to use that statement. You could state “everything in the task standard is critical unless noted” if you don’t want to break it down by step. One example is projected leak rate (it isn’t in the calculation or the task standard, but you have it in red on the answer key so everything doesn’t agree. If they transpose that item incorrectly, is it critical for this JPM? I don’t think so unless it makes them redo the math and then miss the answer.</p> <p>Licensee revised Critical Steps to reference Task Standard which identifies specific details from the answer key that must be determined.</p> <p>S</p> <p>Validation comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Add box for Examinee Response with prompts “Basis for Conclusion” and “Applicable Action Level and Actions if any” (pg 6) 2) Edit Task Standard to indicate that Attachment 1 is UNSAT for either of the reasons listed (pg 2) 3) Change RM-15 and RM-15R to read the same values (pg 9) 4) Remove graphic of SJAE flow chart and replace with value given as part of Initial Conditions (pg 8) 5) Update Initial Conditions (pgs 2, to include the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) SJAE flow is 8 scfm
----------	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

													b) Rate of rise calculation is NOT required
A9 (SRO)		3											<p>E</p> <p>Does notification within 15 minutes include filling out the form? If so that should be the key. If not, then the EAL should be the code and what level (NOUE, SAE, etc)</p> <p>S</p> <p>Licensee added EAL level to code to Task Standard and added a note specifying the 15 minutes is for classification only, no ENF required as part of JPM.</p> <p>Validation comments: 1) Add box for Examinee Response (pg 6) 2) Identify as Time Critical in Initiating Cue (pgs 2, 6)</p>
Simulator/In-Plant JPMs	1 Safety Function and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3a I/C	3b Cues	3c Critical	3d Scope	3e Overlap	3f Perf.	3h Key	4a Minutia	4b Job Link	5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
General comments for all JPMS													
S2	2 (13 A2.06)	2										E	I don't think this is alt path but we can discuss it during validation. The question is what diagnostic piece do they have to complete to be credited for alt path? We cue them on

												S	local SI reset step and the init cue states to realign charging. Exam team validated that the Alternate Path is alt path during NRC validation week.
S3	3 (006 A4.02)	3										S	Validation comments: 1) Delete last bullet from Initial Conditions (pgs 2, 9) 2) Revise Initiating Cue to start JPM on procedure step 25.d (pgs 2, 9) 3) Remove "restoring power to the breakers" from Task Standard (pg 2) 4) Delete procedure steps 25.a – 25.c from body of JPM (pg 3)
S4P	4P (011 EA1.11)	3										S	Validation comments: 1) Revise Initiating Cue to start JPM on procedure step 6.1 (pgs 2, 8) 2) Revise 3rd bullet of Task Standard to "Gov Valve position as left setting < 37.1% (pg 2) 3) Modify step 6 examiner note to indicate JPM may be terminated once Gov Valve setting is less than initial position of 37.1% (pg 5) 4) Modify Sim Setup instructions to place rods back in Auto or use setup IC (pg 7)
S4S	4S (045 A4.01)	3										S	
S5	5 (022 A4.01)	2										S	
S6	6 (062 A4.07)	3										S	Validation comments: 1) Include Attachment 1 with reference procedure (pgs 1, 2) 2) Correct typo on EOA step 2.1 (shows bus F, should be G) (pg 3) 3) Correct typo on procedure step 6.1.20 and EOA step 4.1 (shows S/U for feeder breaker, should be Aux) (pg 4) 4) Add verbiage for procedure steps 6.1.25 and 6.1.26 to left hand column (pg 6)
S7	7 (073 A4.02)	2										S	Validation comments: 1) Add "after approximately 3 second delay" to EOA step 3.1 describing Filter Not In Motion status light (pg 4)
S8	8 (029 A1.02)	2										S	Validation comments: 1) Correct typo in Initial Conditions procedure step; currently shows steps 10.1 through 10.5 – should be 11.5 through 11.5 (pgs 2, 8) 2) Correct typo in Initiating Cue procedure start point; currently shows step 10.6 – should be step

																							3) 11.6 (pgs 2, 8) Correct reference procedure step typos; currently shows step 10.x.x – should be 11.x.x (pgs 3, 4, 5)
P1	6 (040 AA1.03)	2																					Validation comments: 1) Remove TCOA Time field from front page (pg 1) 2) Add examiner note that gloves and a ladder required. Recommend backpack for carrying exam material (pg 1) 3) Edit Initiating Cue to direct Examinee to start on Appendix L, step 3 (pgs 2, 6) 4) Remove cue "The valve is positioned AS-SEEN" after EOA (right column) step 1.1 (pg 3) 5) Add "Cut Seal" to EOA after step 1.1 (pg 3) 6) Amend cue following EOA step 2.1 to note CCW rotation is as viewed from bottom (pg 3) 7) Break EOA step 3.2 into two separate steps (one for each valve) (pg 4) 8) Circle/slash steps 1 and 2 of Examinee procedure handout (E-2, Appendix L)
P2	2 (004 A2.06)	2																					Cues for flow should be "examiner uses pen to point to value of 10 gpm" or 0 gpm as appropriate for the step. Not allowed to just read them flow from the cue if they can read it with the instrument (See P3 cues). Since the plant flow meter is a digital readout, the licensee added an examiner note to clarify the value since you can't point to a digital meter and give its value. Validation comments: 1) Revise description of CVCS-1-8539 to indicate it is "in hall with other valves – midway down hall on opposite side" (pg 3) 2) Change cue for all EOA steps that describe valve after being closed to read "Rising stem is all the way in" (applies to EOA steps 1.2, 2.2, 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.2, 5.4, 6.2, 9.4, 7.2, and 7.4) 3) Add examiner note/cue that Examinee has permission to open panel PM-96 to view FIT-111 (pg 8) 4) Add examiner note that FIT-111 is a digital reading (before cue of indicated flow)(pg 8) 5) Add cue following closure of

													CVCS-8469 (stem all the way in and won't rotate) (pg 8) 6) Add "JPM Complete" after last step (pg 8)
P3	5 (010 A2.01)	2										S	Validation comments: 1) Cleanup Examinee Handout EC to make it more readable 2) Add "JPM Complete" after last step (pg 4)

Instructions for Completing This Table:

Check or mark any item(s) requiring a comment and explain the issue in the space provided using the guide below.

1. Check each JPM for appropriate administrative topic requirements (COO, EC, Rad, and EP) or safety function requirements and corresponding K/A. Mark in column 1. (ES-301, D.3 and D.4)
2. Determine the level of difficulty (LOD) using an established 1–5 rating scale. Levels 1 and 5 represent an inappropriate (low or high) discriminatory level for the license that is being tested. Mark in column 2 (Appendix D, C.1.f)
3. In column 3, “Attributes,” check the appropriate box when an attribute is **not met**:
 - The initial conditions and/or initiating cue is clear to ensure the operator understands the task and how to begin. (Appendix C, B.4)
 - The JPM contains appropriate cues that clearly indicate when they should be provided to the examinee. Cues are objective and not leading. (Appendix C, D.1)
 - All critical steps (elements) are properly identified.
 - The scope of the task is not too narrow (N) or too broad (B).
 - Excessive overlap does not occur with other parts of the operating test or written examination. (ES-301, D.1.a, and ES-301, D.2.a)
 - The task performance standard clearly describes the expected outcome (i.e., end state). Each performance step identifies a standard for successful completion of the step.
 - A valid marked up key was provided (e.g., graph interpretation, initialed steps for handouts).
4. For column 4, “Job Content,” check the appropriate box if the job content flaw **does not meet** the following elements:
 - Topics are linked to the job content (e.g., not a disguised task, task required in real job).
 - The JPM has meaningful performance requirements that will provide a legitimate basis for evaluating the applicant’s understanding and ability to safely operate the plant. (ES-301, D.2.c)
5. Based on the reviewer’s judgment, is the JPM as written (U)nacceptable (requiring repair or replacement), in need of (E)nhancement, or (S)atisfactory? Mark the answer in column 5.
6. In column 6, provide a brief description of any (U)nacceptable or (E)nhancement rating from column 5.

Save initial review comments and detail subsequent comment resolution so that each exam-bound JPM is marked by a (S)atisfactory resolution on this form.

Facility: Diablo Canyon			General comments on scenarios						Exam Date: Jan 25, 2021	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Event	Realism/Cred.	Required Actions	Verifiable actions	LOD	TS	CTs	Scen. Overlap	U/E/S	Explanation	
									<p>General Comments for all scenarios</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Measurable Performance indicators for CT table and in the D-2 body of the guide should have the actual switches manipulated for success of the CT. As an example, lets say that a NSSS Group isolation fails to isolate AFW as expected in scenario x, so the applicant must manually close the inbd and outbd isolation valves for AFW. Both of these valves should be listed in the CT table. See examples below for each scenario but here are the attributes for a CT <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) the expected actions and b) the boundary conditions for completing the expected actions. c) Performance feedback 2. For parameters to record for grading purposes, we will need to work thru the required parameters to capture for scenarios for grading during validation week. 	

Facility: Diablo Canyon		Scenario: 1						Exam Date: Jan 25, 2021	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Event	Realism/Cred.	Required Actions	Verifiable actions	LOD	TS	CTs	Scen. Overlap	U/E/S	Explanation
1								S	All Validation comments (in blue text below) were resolved with rev 1 of simulator scenarios.
2				2				S	
3				3	✓			S	MFP 1-1 Trip From validation comments: 1) Add examiner note: Potential exists for crew to trip on this event. If this happens, TS for event 4 becomes 3.4.13.B (D-1, pg 1; D-2, pg 5) 2) Add examiner note – Slow ramp time for next event, cue during TS review (D-2, pg 5)
4				3	✓			S	300 gpm RCS Leak: 1) Designate id for second charging pump started (may be 1-1 or 1-2) (D-2, pg 6) 2) Remove BOLD form CVCS-8194A/B (already closed) (D-2, pg 7)
5				3				S	Major 100% DB LOCA: 1) Add examiner note – Adverse containment conditions exist (D-2, pg 8) 2) Add detail on CT manipulations for Containment Spray alignment (D-2, pg 8) 3) E-1.3, Cold Leg Recirc Alignment: 4) Add examiner note – Both RHR pumps trip at 33% RWST level (D-2, pg 14) 5) ECA-1.3, Sump Blockage: Remove BOLD form 9003A/B (already closed) (D-2, pg 18)
6				3		✓		S	
7				3		✓		S	
8				3		✓		S	

Facility: Diablo Canyon			Scenario: 2 (spare)					Exam Date: Jan 25, 2021	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Event	Realism/Cred.	Required Actions	Verifiable actions	LOD	TS	CTs	Scen. Overlap	U/E/S	Explanation
								S	This one could use another I or C failure. Will check during validation. NRC Exam team determined that this scenario has adequate failures/board manipulations during NRC validation week. All Validation comments (in blue text below) were resolved with rev 1 of simulator scenarios.
1				2	✓			S	Event 1: S/G Blowdown RM-23 Fails High 1) Bold valves closed by BOP (D-2, pg 1) 2) Remove steps after ECG call (2.1.5-2.1.11)(D-2, pg 2) 3) Add LCO letter to ECG 8.7.A (D-2, pg 2)
2				3	✓			S	CCP 1-3 Shaft Shear 1) Modify examiner note to include case where pump 1-3 is already shut down.
3				3				S	
4				3				S	Pzr Spray Valve PCV-455B fails open 1) Add LCO letter to TS 3.4.1.A (D-2, pg 10)
5				3				S	Major - Loss of Heat Sink: 1) Typo "steam" (D-2, pg 16) 2) List valve designators for Main Feedwater Isolation Valves (D-2, pg 17) 3) Add examiner note for expected MFW pump speed for feeding forward (D-2, pg 18) 4) Modify required S/G NR level from greater than 15% to greater than 0% (D-1, pg 2,3; D-2, pg 19)
6				3		✓ ✓		S	

Facility: Diablo Canyon		Scenario: 4						Exam Date: Jan 25, 2021	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Event	Realism/Cred.	Required Actions	Verifiable actions	LOD	TS	CTs	Scen. Overlap	U/E/S	Explanation
								S	All Validation comments (in blue text) resolved with rev 1 of simulator scenarios.
1				3	✓			S	
2				3	✓			S	Letdown Hx Inlet Valve, CVCS-8152 fails 90% closed 1) Provide valve name in description (D-1, pg 1) 2) Remove bold from 8149C (D-2, pg 6)
3				3				S	
4				3		✓		S	Feedwater Reg Valve FCV-540 fails open 1) Modify CT to cover Reactor Trip or Reactor Trip via Turbine Trip (D-1, pg 1 & 2; D-2, pg 11)
5				3				S	
6				3				S	Loss of all A/C: 1) Remove bold from NSSS sample valves (D-2, pg 13) 2) Add ECA-0.3 steps for bus restoration (D-2, pg 13, 14, and separate App at end of Examiner's Guide) 3) Revise cues for App 1 (Booth Operator) to state D/G walkdown identifies no issues – D/G should be able to start when reset from C/R. 4) Revise cue from Grid Control that 500 kV is not available but should have working in about an hour. Main Feedline Break: 1) Add examiner note to S4CT-3, Feedline break isolation, to cover potential for isolation to occur in the C/R or in the field, depending on the order in which bus power is restored (D-2, pg 21) 2) Add examiner note to by CT ensure App HH is complete prior to scenario termination, reference pg 25 (D-2, pg 17)
7				3		✓		E S	Should put the bus switches necessary to complete CT2 in CT table. Licensee enhanced scenario to cover specific switch manipulations dependent on which of three D/Gs are returned to service first. CT deemed acceptable during NRC validation week.
8				3		✓		S	

Facility: Diablo Canyon		Scenario: 5							Exam Date: Jan 25, 2021	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Event	Realism/Cred.	Required Actions	Verifiable actions	LOD	TS	CTs	Scen. Overlap	U/E/S	Explanation	
								S	This one could use another I or C failure. Will check during validation. NRC Exam team determined that this scenario has adequate failures/board manipulations during NRC validation week. All Validation comments (in blue text) resolved with rev 1 of simulator scenarios.	
1				2				S	Letdown High Pressure during 120 gpm Letdown Alignment 1) Add approximate letdown flow target of 87 gpm for charging restoration after failure (D-2, pg 3)	
2				2	✓			S	DRPI Power Failure 1) Add TS 3.1.7.A (D-1, pg 1, 3; D-2, pg 5)	
3				3	✓			S		
4				3				S		
5				3		✓		S	ATWS: 1) Modify CT S5CT-1 to indicate add negative reactivity by driving rods (D-1, pg 2, 3; D-2 pg 11) 2) Add examiner note for emergency boration valve manipulation to cover case that valves will automatically swap on low VCT level (D-2, pg 11) Intersystem LOCA: 1) Add examiner note to describe potential procedural loop at E-0, step 12 if pressure not lowering when step first reached; break size increased on action taken in step 12 RNO (D-2, pg 15)	
6				3				S		
7				3		✓		S		

Facility: Diablo Canyon			Scenario: 6					Exam Date: Jan 25, 2021	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Event	Realism/Cred.	Required Actions	Verifiable actions	LOD	TS	CTs	Scen. Overlap	U/E/S	Explanation
								S	This one could use another I or C failure. Will check during validation. Was determined to have adequate failures/board manipulations during NRC validation week. All Validation comments (in blue text) resolved with rev 1 of simulator scenarios. Adjusted timing on RWST leak rate to eliminate spot where leak appear to stop (approximately 33%). Reran scenario to verify timing and check time from 0% RWST level and pump cavitation (11 minutes).
1				3	✓				ASW Pump 1-1 OC Trip 1) Add "standby requires manual start" to Event Description (D-2, pg 1)
2				3	✓			S	Power Range Nuclear Instrument NI-42 Slow Failure High 1) Add PK03-09, Power Range Rod Stop C-2 to list of diagnostic indicators (D-2, pg 3) 2) Add "A" letter designator to ECGs 37.2 and 37.3 (D-2, pg 5) 3) Detail out rod pull steps taken to return delta I to normal (D-2, pg 5)
3				3	✓			S	RWST Crack 1) Add examiner note for expected ramp rate (D-2, pg 6)
4				3				S	Small Break LOCA: 1) Unbold SI and Rx Trip (will happen automatically) (D-2, pg 8) 2) Add examiner note – Both RHR pumps trip at RWST 33% (D-2, pg 11) RWST drains to 4% due to seismic damage: 1) Add "may secure CCP 1-3" to list of pumps stopped in CT (but not part of CT) (D-2, pg 17)
5				3		✓		S	
6				3		✓		S	EOP E-0, Appendix E at end of guide 1) Change Phase A indications to Red lights OFF, White Lights OFF (D-2, pg 18) 2) Add examiner note regarding Phase A – No red light indicating Phase A, but is an expected automatic action for a LOCA; follows RNO (D-2, pg 18)

Facility: Diablo Canyon		Scenario: 7						Exam Date: Jan 25, 2021	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Event	Realism/Cred.	Required Actions	Verifiable actions	LOD	TS	CTs	Scen. Overlap	U/E/S	Explanation
								S	All Validation comments (in blue text) resolved with rev 1 of simulator scenarios.
1				3				S	Raise Power to 100% 1) Have procedure step 6.6.1 complete as part of Sim setup and have crew start on step 6.6.2 (D-2, pg 1) 2) Change designation for Primary Water Pump from 1-2 to 1-1 (D-2, pg 3, 4)
2				3				S	Load Tap Changer Auto Control Failure 1) Add ~107V to description of Low Side Voltage abnormally low (D-2, pg 5) 2) Bold BOP manipulations on procedure steps 2.2.1.a and b (D-2, pg 5) 3) Add "and FCV-111A and 111B back in auto" to "proceed to next event" guidance at bottom of page (D-2, pg 6)
3				3	✓			S	PCV-455B Drifts Open Following Seismic Event 1) Change check spray valve position to "open" – part of initial conditions (D-2, pg 8) 2) Change status of pressurizer backup heaters to "on" – part of initial conditions (D-2, pg 8)
4				3	✓	✓		S	
5				3				S	Condenser In-Leakage 1) Add examiners note showing equivalence of □S/cm to □mho (D-2, pg 10)
6				3		✓		S	Main Steamline Break: 1) Add BIG examiner note – might perform throttling of AFW in ECA-2.1, but more likely in FR-P.1. (D-2, pg 16) 2) Remove note regarding MSIVs closing in ECA-2.1; MSIVs will remain open for duration of scenario (D-2, pg 16)
7				3		✓		S	

Facility: Diablo Canyon		Exam Date: Jan 25, 2021								
Scenario	1 Event Totals	2 Events Unsat.	3 TS Total	4 TS Unsat.	5 CT Total	6 CT Unsat.	7 % Unsat. Scenario Elements	8 U/E/S	11 Explanation	
1	8	0	2	0	3	0	0	S		
2	6	0	2	0	2	0	0	S	See above comments for edits	
4	8	0	2	0	3	0	0	S	See above comments for edits	
5	7	0	2	0	2	0	0	S		
6	6	0	3	0	2	0	0	S	See above comments for edits	
7	7	0	2	0	3	0	0	S		

Instructions for Completing This Table:

Check or mark any item(s) requiring comment and explain the issue in the space provided.

1, 3, 5 For each simulator scenario, enter the **total** number of events (column 1), TS entries/actions (column 3), and CTs (column 5).

This number should match the respective scenario from the event-based scenario tables (the sum from columns 1, 6, and 7, respectively).

2, 4, 6 For each simulator scenario, evaluate each event, TS, and CT as (S)atisfactory, (E)nhance, or (U)nsatisfactory based on the following criteria:

- a. Events. Each event is described on a Form ES-D-2, including all switch manipulations, pertinent alarms, and verifiable actions. Event actions are balanced between at-the-controls and balance-of-plant applicants during the scenario. All event-related attributes on Form ES-301-4 are met. Enter the total number of unsatisfactory events in column 2.
- b. TS. A scenario includes at least two TS entries/actions across at least two different events. TS entries and actions are detailed on Form ES-D-2. Enter the total number of unsatisfactory TS entries/actions in column 4. (ES-301, D.5d)
- c. CT. Check that a scenario includes at least two preidentified CTs. This criterion is a target quantitative attribute, not an absolute minimum requirement. Check that each CT is explicitly bounded on Form ES-D-2 with measurable performance standards (see Appendix D). Enter the total number of unsatisfactory CTs in column 6.

7 In column 7, calculate the percentage of unsatisfactory scenario elements: $\left(\frac{2 + 4 + 6}{1 + 3 + 5}\right) 100\%$

8 If the value in column 7 is > 20%, mark the scenario as (U)nsatisfactory in column 8. If column 7 is ≤ 20%, annotate with (E)nhancement or (S)atisfactory.

9 In column 9, explain each unsatisfactory event, TS, and CT. Editorial comments can also be added here.

Save initial review comments and detail subsequent comment resolution so that each exam-bound scenario is marked by a (S)atisfactory resolution on this form.

Site name: Diablo Canyon		Exam Date: Jan 25, 2021				
OPERATING TEST TOTALS						
	Total	Total Unsat.	Total Edits	Total Sat.	% Unsat.	Explanation
Admin. JPMs	9	0	5 / 0	4 / 9		Red numbers denote the submittal numbers for edit, and there were no unsat items for the initial submittal.
Sim./In-Plant JPMs	11	0	2 / 0	9 / 11		
Scenarios	6	0	3 / 0	3 / 6		
Op. Test Totals:	26	0	10 / 0	16 / 16	0.0%	Satisfactory submittal.

Instructions for Completing This Table:

Update data for this table from quality reviews and totals in the previous tables and then calculate the percentage of total items that are unsatisfactory and give an explanation in the space provided.

- Enter the total number of items submitted for the operating test in the "Total" column. For example, if nine administrative JPMs were submitted, enter "9" in the "Total" items column for administrative JPMs. For scenarios, enter the total number of simulator scenarios.
- Enter the total number of (U)nsatisfactory JPMs and scenarios from the two JPMs column 5 and simulator scenarios column 8 in the previous tables. Provide an explanation in the space provided.
- Enter totals for (E)nhancements needed and (S)atisfactory JPMs and scenarios from the previous tables. This task is for tracking only.
- Total each column and enter the amounts in the "Op. Test Totals" row.
- Calculate the percentage of the operating test that is (U)nsatisfactory (Op. Test Total Unsat.)/(Op. Test Total) and place this value in the bolded "% Unsat." cell.

Refer to ES-501, E.3.a, to rate the overall operating test as follows:
 - satisfactory, if the "Op. Test Total" "% Unsat." is $\leq 20\%$
 - unsatisfactory, if "Op. Test Total" "% Unsat." is $> 20\%$
- Update this table and the tables above with post-exam changes if the "as-administered" operating test required content changes, including the following:
 - The JPM performance standards were incorrect.
 - The administrative JPM tasks/keys were incorrect.
 - CTs were incorrect in the scenarios (not including postscenario critical tasks defined in Appendix D).
 - The EOP strategy was incorrect in a scenario(s).
 - TS entries/actions were determined to be incorrect in a scenario(s).