


Limerick Generating Station  
Digital Modernization Project  
Lessons Learned and Challenges

NRC Digital I&C Workshop  
March 23, 2022



# Agenda

- ISV versus MSV
- NRC Pre-submittal Plus / Minus
- NRC Review

# Integrated Systems Validation / Multi-Stage Validation

- Multi-stage Validation (MSV) introduces a degree of regulatory uncertainty:
  - Neither IEEE-2411 nor NEA Report 7466 has been endorsed by the NRC
  - There is no existing precedent or model that can be drawn upon to establish acceptable content / structure
- From NUREG-0800, Chapter 18:

*"In the case of operating reactors, the ISV must be complete prior to implementation of the proposed action or program..."*

*"Where feasible, the ISV should be subjected to an inspection or audit"*
- The development and execution of an MSV in addition to the ISV Implementation Plan is likely to add more burden than value

# Pre-submittal Meeting Lessons Learned + / -

- Using the pre-submittal meeting to determine LAR content is helpful since there is no one document from the NRC that lists all the content required for complex digital modernization projects.
- The interaction with the NRC staff during pre-submittal meetings is highly beneficial but determining when a topic has been covered in sufficient depth to remove it from further discussion can be difficult.
- The NRC post-meeting summaries are sometimes at a level that is high enough that a licensee cannot confirm that staff questions have been fully addressed – deeper detail would be advantageous for both the licensee and NRC staff – three-way communications is a powerful tool.
- Strictly following the ARP becomes more complicated when other NRC guidance come into play due to LAR scope – HFE is a representative example.
- The ability to get staff comments on presentation material in advance of the pre-submittal meeting has proven to be beneficial in the form of being able to assemble information in advance and provide responses to staff questions in timely fashion.

# NRC Review Plans

- The proposed LAR review cycle timeline is currently 17 months leaving little installation margin
  - 2 months for acceptance
  - 15 months for review
- It is plausible that complex LAR's may have limited populations of artifacts that may evolve or be augmented during the review cycle

*Questions?*