

Talking Points

- Section 1, footnote #1 Last sentence
 - Why there?
 - Appears to penalize for extra redundancy.
 - AP1000 redundancy within channels
- Section 1, #3
 - ... supports or enhances the "performance"
 - Mean 'reliability'?
 - Subjective guidance
 - Concern on spurious trips
- Section 2, #3
 - Safety related commands. . . must always have the highest priority
 - Always?
- Section 2, #6
 - If 100% tested. . . .
 - Not defined; subjective
 - Even with text in parens
 - . . . then validation . . .
 - Not defined; subjective
 - Recommend using the wording from IEEE Standard 7-4.3.2
 - Per IEEE Standard 7-4.3.2 Section 5.3.2, validation of the tool can also be reduced if the software tool is used in a manner such that defects not detected by the software tool will be detected by safety function V&V activities.
 - This change is especially important for priority modules that are implemented in software blocks that are part of the function processor, since V&V is not required for the tools used to develop the function processor software.
- Section 3.2
 - Why does it take so many words to say "provided separately".
 - Discuss during the Human Factors scheduled phone call on Thursday afternoon (1300-1700).
 - We need to make sure:
 - (1) this section doesn't say anything incorrect or inappropriate, and
 - (2) something important doesn't get dropped in the handoff between communications and human factors (the last sentence of section 3.2 says, "Guidance concerning general Human Factors considerations is provided separately.").
 - 1st paragraph
 - Referring top TMI accident
 - Better to refer to specific regulation and or guidance
 - NUREG 0588; RegGuide 1.97?
 - 4th paragraph
 - Not criteria or guidance
 - Too editorial and opinionated; no value