



**U.S.NRC**

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

*Protecting People and the Environment*

## **cROP PILOT PROGRAM FEEDBACK**

**September 20, 2012 Category 2 Meeting**



# Meeting Purpose

**Solicit stakeholder feedback on the  
cROP Pilot Program**

# Background

- **Construction Reactor Oversight Process (cROP) pilot began at Vogtle Units 3 and 4 on January 1, 2012 and at V.C Summer Units 2 and 3 on March 30, 2012**
- **Pilot planned to end on December 31, 2012**
- **Report pilot results to the Commission in April 2013**

## **External Feedback**

- **Stakeholder feedback will be formally solicited**
  - **September 20 Category 2 public meeting to solicit stakeholder feedback**
  - **External surveys planned for end of calendar year**
  - **Public meetings in vicinity of the sites planned for early 2013 to solicit feedback**
- **ACRS meeting scheduled for February 7, 2013**

# **Inspection Reports and Finding Screening**

- **Issued 5 Vogtle construction inspection reports and 1 Summer construction inspection report**
- **Processed several issues through the construction significance determination process**
- **5 Green findings and 1 Severity Level IV violation identified to date**

## **Findings and Violations Identified To Date**

- **Inadequate Design Control of Software Development**
- **Failure to Assure Design Services were Accomplished with the Appropriate Design Control Measures (rebar issue)**
- **Failures to Properly Classify Conditions Adverse to Quality**
- **Failure to correct a condition adverse to quality**
- **Failure to Establish an Adequate Authentication Process for Records in Electronic Media**
- **Failure to obtain required NRC approval for design change (SL IV)**

# Assessment Program

- **Quarterly and mid-cycle assessments completed**
- **All units in licensee response column**
- **No substantive cross-cutting issues**

# **Success Criteria (Discussion Points)**

- **Are inspection findings being processed in a timely manner?**
- **Can inspection findings be properly assigned a safety significance rating in accordance with established guidance?**
- **Can the assessment process be performed within the scheduled time?**
- **Can the construction action matrix be used to take appropriate NRC actions in response to indications of licensee performance?**

# **Success Criteria (Discussion Points)**

- **Do the inspection findings provide an adequate indication of licensee performance?**
- **Does the process provide a reasonable assurance that the cornerstone objectives are being met and the plant is being constructed in accordance with its design?**
- **Are the mid-cycle and end-of-cycle assessments effective in communicating licensee performance?**
- **Does the use of the new assessment program and action matrix result in more consistent and predictable NRC action decisions**

# **Success Criteria (Discussion Points)**

- **Are enforcement actions taken in a manner consistent with the assessment of inspection findings by the risk characterization guidance**
- **Are the assessment data and results readily available to the public?**

## **Additional Areas For Discussion**

- **Are there any lessons learned regarding Corrective Action Program implementation and NRC verification?**
- **The current timeframe for counting findings and baseline program cross-cutting aspects in the assessment program is 6 months. Is this sufficient time to effectively evaluate licensee performance?**
- **General feedback from meeting participants**