

## Attachment 2

### Review Criteria

1. Chapter 2, Definitions:

- Are they technically accurate? If not, provide a correct definition.
- Are the definitions sufficiently specific and detailed to be used? If not, please provide a definition.
- Are they consistent with how they are used in the standard? If not, identify where and the inconsistency.
- What definitions are missing and what are their definitions?

2. Chapter 3, Application Process:

- Where does the process **not** result in achieving the aim of establishing that there is sufficient confidence that the PRA results can be used as intended to support an application? Where not, what is the problem?
- Where does the process **not** provide the needed confidence that it will identify important differences between an existing PRA and the technical requirements of the standard, and provide adequate resolution for these differences if updating the PRA is not chosen as the resolution? Where not, what is the problem?

3. Chapter 4, Technical Requirements:

- Where are the categories **not** sufficiently defined to be able to develop the supporting requirements for each technical element? Where not, what is the problem?
- Where do the high level requirements **not** adequately match the desired attributes and characteristics in Attachment 3? Where not, what is the problem?
- Where are the supporting requirements **not** sufficient to achieve the objective of the high level requirement? Where not, what is the problem?
- What technical issues, critical to the confidence in the PRA results, are not addressed by the standard?
- Where are the requirements **not** sufficient in identifying the needed attributes for the codes such that improper codes are not used? What are these missing attributes?
- Where are the supporting requirements **not** consistent within a category? What are these inconsistencies?
- Where are the supporting requirements **not** logical across categories? What are these illogical parts?

4. Chapter 5, PRA Configuration Control:

- Where is the process **not** adequate to allow the reviewer (at the time of consideration of an application) to determine if the current PRA sufficiently reflects the as-built and as-operated plant? Where not, what is the problem?

5. Chapter 6, Peer Review:

- Where are the qualifications for the peer reviewers and the requirements for the peer review process **not** sufficient such that you would **not** have a high level of confidence that the peer review would identify deficiencies that would have a significant impact on the PRA results, and therefore, have little confidence in

using these results to support an application? Where and what are these insufficiencies?

- Where are the qualifications for the peer reviewers and the requirements for the peer review process **not** sufficient to minimize NRC staff review of the PRA, given the licensee, under oath and affirmation, meets the peer review requirements of the standard? Where and what are these insufficiencies?

6. Which NRC previous comments are critical and were they adequately addressed in Revision 12?