

Key Regulatory Concepts to be Evaluated

March 21, 2016

Steven Arndt
Division of Engineering
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Presentation Outline

- **Current Challenges**
- **Key Technical and Regulatory Concepts**
 - **Changes in Standards and Regulation and the Effect on Evolving Technology**
 - **Technical Areas to be Reviewed**
 - **Assumptions in SECY-93-087 and BTP 7-19 to consider**
 - **Regulatory Issues**

Re-Evaluate the NRC Position on CCF

- **Current position includes software, firmware or programmable logic commonly used in digital systems (including EDDs)**
- **Significant lack of understanding by industry of need for evaluation and acceptance criteria**
- **Significant concern by industry associated with current position**

Re-Evaluate the NRC Position on CCF

- **Detail review of current methods, data and regulatory experience (nuclear and non-nuclear, US and international) of CCF**
- **Re-evaluate assumptions in SECY-93-087 and BTP 7-19 to consider impact of evolution in technology**
- **Evaluate options for updating NRC policy in light of any significant technology evolution**
- **Preparation of a technical basis paper and a SECY paper to gain alignment on direction**

Changes in Standards and Regulation

- **How has the changes to industry standards and regulatory guidance changed digital systems both safety and non-safety?**
- **Since the NRC position was established**
 - **SRP Chapter 7, 1997 has published including BTP-7-14**
 - **IEEE 7-4.3.2, IEEE 1012, and many other key standards have been published**
 - **Associated regulatory guidance**
 - **Guidance on new technology such as FPGA's has been published**

Technical Concerns and Evolving Technology

- **Technical Concerns**
 - **Ability to develop fault free digital systems**
 - **Ability to fully analysis digital systems**
 - **Ability to fully test digital systems**
- **Technical Progress**
 - **More complete design and quality standards**
 - **Better analysis methods**
 - **Better testing methods**
 - **More formal development and analysis methods**

Potential Areas for Review

- **Need to use deterministic analysis**
- **Scope of systems that need to consider CCF**
- **Definition of software and software failure in the context of the current NRC position**
- **Definitions of 100% test and internal diversity**
- **Concept of echelons-of-defense**
- **Inclusion of explicit position on hazards analysis**
- **Crediting manual operator actions**
- **Risk informing/Use of a graded approach**

Re-Evaluate the NRC Position

- **Deterministic Analysis / Assumption of Failure**
 - The technical concern was, that vendors can not product fault free (from design error) digital systems
 - We can not analysis new digital systems to the same level as earlier analog system
- **Issue to be evaluated: Has this changed?**

Re-Evaluate the NRC Position

- **Scope of systems that need to consider CCF**
 - The current position is focused only on software or logic errors
 - This was driven by the concern about unknowns associated with software faults
- **Issue to be evaluated: Should we only be focusing on software design errors or should we be look at broader digital failures?**

Re-Evaluate the NRC Position

- **Scope of systems that need to consider CCF**
 - **Current position requires analyze for each event that is evaluated in the accident analysis**
 - **Current position call for analysis of any device that can disable a safety function**
- **Issue to be evaluated: Is this the appropriate scope? Should some systems or events be evaluated in a graded manner?**

Re-Evaluate the NRC Position

- **Design Attributes to Eliminate Consideration**
 - There are two attributes that are sufficient to eliminate consideration of CCF, internal diversity and demonstrated simplicity
 - The concept of sufficient simplify as demonstrated by 100% testability has been a challenge to communicate and review
- **Issue to be evaluated: Are there other attributes that can be demonstrative to be sufficient to eliminate consideration?**

Re-Evaluate the NRC Position

- **Risk informing/Use of a graded approach**
 - **Current position is a consequence-based approach for addressing CCFs that does not relate to safety significance or plant risk**
 - **Formal risk analysis of digital systems is still very uncertain and may not capture all the hazards**
- **Issue to be evaluated: Can we develop a graded approach? Does it need to be based on risk or could we use a different metric?**

Re-Evaluate the NRC Position

- **SECY with Recommendations**
 - Key recommendation on technical issues
 - Should current position remain as a Commission direction on GDCs or become a rule?
 - How best to develop new rule or policy and regulatory guidance
- **Issue to be evaluated: Effectiveness and timing**

Questions/Discussion