

Michael J. Yox
Regulatory Affairs Director
Vogtle 3 & 4
Nuclear Development

Southern Nuclear
Operating Company, Inc.
7825 River Road
Waynesboro, GA 30830
Tel: 706.848.6459



Docket No.: 52-026

MAY 31 2016

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Document Control Desk
Washington, DC 20555-0001

ND-16-0762
10 CFR 52.99(c)(1)

Southern Nuclear Operating Company
Vogtle Electric Generating Plant Unit 4
ITAAC Closure Notification on Completion of ITAAC 2.5.01.03c [Index Number 513]

Ladies and Gentlemen:

In accordance with 10 CFR 52.99(c)(1), the purpose of this letter is to notify the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) of the completion of Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP) Unit 4 Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria (ITAAC) Item 2.5.01.03c [Index Number 513] for verifying that any Diverse Actuation System (DAS) algorithm, logic, program architecture, executable operating systems, and executable software/logic are different than those used in the Protection and Safety Monitoring System (PMS). The closure process for this ITAAC is based on the guidance described in NEI 08-01, "Industry Guideline for the ITAAC Closure Process under 10 CFR Part 52," which was endorsed by the NRC in Regulatory Guide 1.215.

This letter contains no new NRC regulatory commitments. Southern Nuclear Operating Company (SNC) requests NRC staff confirmation of this determination and publication of the required notice in the Federal Register per 10 CFR 52.99.

If there are any questions, please contact David Woods at 706-848-6903.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Yox
Regulatory Affairs Director Vogtle 3&4

Enclosure: Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP) Unit 4
Completion of ITAAC 2.5.01.03c [Index Number 513]

MJY/KJD/amm

To:

Southern Nuclear Operating Company/Georgia Power Company

Mr. S. E. Kuczynski (w/o enclosures)
Mr. D. A. Bost (w/o enclosures)
Mr. M. D. Meier
Mr. M. D. Rauckhorst (w/o enclosures)
Mr. J. T. Gasser (w/o enclosures)
Mr. D. H. Jones (w/o enclosures)
Ms. K. D. Fili
Mr. D. L. McKinney
Mr. B. H. Whitley
Mr. D. L. Fulton
Mr. M. J. Yox
Mr. D. Woods
Ms. K. Stacy
Mr. J.J. Olson
Mr. W. A. Sparkman
Mr. J. P. Redd
Mr. D. R. Culver
Document Services RTYPE: VND.LI.L06
File AR.01.02.06

cc:

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Ms. C. Haney (w/o enclosures)
Mr. M. Delligatti (w/o enclosures)
Mr. L. Burkhardt (w/o enclosures)
Mr. C. Patel
Mr. B. M. Bovol
Ms. R. Reyes
Ms. M. A. Sutton
Mr. M. E. Ernstes
Mr. G. Khouri
Mr. M. G. Kowal
Mr. J. D. Fuller
Mr. T. Chandler
Ms. S. Temple
Ms. P. Braxton
Mr. M. Junge

Oglethorpe Power Corporation

Mr. M. W. Price
Ms. K. T. Haynes

Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia

Mr. J. E. Fuller
Mr. S. M. Jackson

Dalton Utilities

Mr. D. Cope

WECTEC

Ms. K. Stoner (w/o enclosures)

Mr. C. A. Castell

Westinghouse Electric Company, LLC

Mr. R. Easterling (w/o enclosures)

Mr. J. W. Crenshaw (w/o enclosures)

Mr. L. Woodcock (w/o enclosures)

Mr. M. P. Rubin

Mr. P. A. Russ

Mr. G. F. Couture

Mr. M. Y. Shaqqo

Ms. S. DiTommaso

Other

Mr. R. W. Prunty, *Bechtel Power Corporation*

Ms. K. K. Patterson, *Tetra Tech NUS, Inc.*

Dr. W. R. Jacobs, Jr., *Ph.D., GDS Associates, Inc.*

Mr. S. Roetger, *Georgia Public Service Commission*

Ms. S. W. Kernizan, *Georgia Public Service Commission*

Mr. K. C. Greene, *Troutman Sanders*

Mr. S. Blanton, *Balch Bingham*

**Southern Nuclear Operating Company
ND-16-0762
Enclosure**

**Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP) Unit 4
Completion of ITAAC 2.5.01.03c [Index Number 513]**

ITAAC Statement

Design Commitment:

- 3.c) *Software diversity between the DAS and PMS will be achieved through the use of different algorithms, logic, program architecture, executable operating system, and executable software/logic.*

Inspections, Tests, Analyses:

Inspection of the DAS and PMS design documentation will be performed.

Acceptance Criteria:

Any DAS algorithms, logic, program architecture, executable operating systems, and executable software/logic are different than those used in the PMS.

ITAAC Determination Basis

An inspection of the design documentation was performed to verify the algorithms, logic, program architecture, executable operating systems, and executable software/logic used within the Diverse Actuation System (DAS) are different than those used in the Protection and Safety Monitoring System (PMS).

The basis of diversity used for prevention of common mode failure is established by Sections 2.6.3 and 3.2.6 of NUREG/CR-6303, "Method for Performing Diversity and Defense-in-Depth Analysis of Reactor Protection Systems" (Reference 1). The DAS and PMS software were assessed on the elements of diversity established within the ITAAC Acceptance Criteria. The results of this inspection are documented in AP1000 Diverse Actuation System Diversity Analysis (Reference 2). A summary of inspection of differences between the DAS and PMS software are shown in the following table.

Diversity Type	DAS (FPGA Based)	PMS	
		Common Qualified Platform (Common Q – Processor Based))	Component Interface Module (CIM) Subsystem (FPGA Based)
Algorithms	<p>DAS is a digital system that provides plant protective actions based on setpoint comparisons to plant parameter incoming signals.</p> <p>Inspection of the DAS algorithms concluded that DAS uses simple mathematical conversion calculations to convert raw signal levels to percent of scale values and comparison with setpoints.</p> <p>DAS also uses Cyclic Redundancy Check (CRC) for digital communications. DAS CRC polynomials implementation was inspected and concluded that DAS CRC uses different code implementation from the CIM subsystem.</p>	<p>PMS is a digital system that provides plant protective actions based on setpoint comparisons to plant parameter incoming signals.</p> <p>Inspection of PMS algorithms implemented in Common Q concluded that PMS uses numerous calculations based on complex operation that are different than DAS scaling conversions.</p>	<p>CIM subsystem is a component of PMS that provides priority control of the components and feedback.</p> <p>Inspection of CIM concluded that CIM does not use mathematical calculations (i.e., algorithms) for its operation. CIM uses simple priority logic to establish priority of commands.</p> <p>CIM uses Cyclic Redundancy Check (CRC) for digital communications. CIM CRC polynomials implementation was inspected and concluded that CIM CRC uses different code implementation from the DAS subsystem.</p>
Logic	<p>Inspection of DAS implementation concluded that DAS uses Field Programmable Gate Array (FPGA) technology.</p> <p>Inspection of design also concluded that, CIM portion of PMS uses FPGA but DAS FPGA is different than CIM FPGA, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Different gate structure / over one million gates - Different clock cycle - Larger Random Access Memory (RAM) - Larger number of I/O Channels - Six Phase-Locked Loop (PLL) 	<p>Inspection of Common Q portion of PMS concluded that logic is performed within software. Common Q portion of PMS is processor based which is different than FPGA.</p>	<p>Inspection of CIM design concluded that CIM uses FPGA that is different than DAS FPGA, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Different gate structure / Less than one million gates - Different clock cycle - Smaller Random Access Memory (RAM) - Smaller number of I/O Channels - Two Phase-Locked Loops (PLL)

Diversity Type	DAS (FPGA Based)	PMS	
		Common Qualified Platform (Common Q – Processor Based))	Component Interface Module (CIM) Subsystem (FPGA Based)
Program Architecture	<p>Inspection of the design documents concluded that DAS uses FPGA that is different than PMS Common Q (processor based) and CIM FPGA (see Logic section above). In addition, DAS program architecture has the following unique features that are different than CIM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Different clock conditioning circuits (e.g., frequency, delay, number of blocks) - Different communication bus architecture / protocol - Different size chip 	<p>Common Q portion of PMS was inspected and it was concluded that it is Central Processing Unit (CPU) based which is different than DAS FPGA. Inspection also concluded that PMS also uses different communication bus architecture / protocol than DAS.</p>	<p>Inspection of the design documents concluded that CIM uses FPGA that is different than DAS FPGA (see logic section above). In addition, CIM program architecture has the following unique features that are different than DAS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Different clock conditioning circuits (e.g., frequency, delay, number of blocks) - Different communication architecture / protocol - Different size chip
Executable Operating Systems	<p>Inspection of DAS design concluded that executable operating system is not used for its operation since it is FPGA based.</p>	<p>Inspection of PMS design concluded that PMS uses proprietary operating system. In contrast, DAS does not use executable operating system.</p>	<p>Inspection of CIM design concluded that executable operating system is not used for its operation since it is FPGA based.</p> <p>CIM uses FPGA that is different than DAS FPGA (see Logic section above).</p>
Executable Software / Logic	<p>Inspection of DAS design concluded that DAS does not have executable software since it is FPGA based.</p> <p>Inspection of DAS FPGA also concluded that there is no software based executable logic. The logic operation is performed by unique gate structure that is different than CIM (See Logic and Program Architecture sections above).</p>	<p>Inspection of Common Q portion of PMS executable software/logic concluded that it uses a combination of proprietary and common programming language in contrast with DAS which is FPGA based.</p>	<p>Inspection of CIM design concluded that CIM does not have executable software since it is FPGA based.</p> <p>Inspection of CIM FPGA also concluded that there is no software based executable logic. The logic operation is performed by unique gate structure that is different than DAS (See Logic and Program Architecture sections above).</p>

Note: Specific model numbers and low level details have not been included due to cyber security considerations.

Reference 2 concludes that the software diversity between DAS and PMS has been achieved through the use of different algorithms, logic, program architecture, executable operating systems, and executable software/logic.

ITAAC Finding Review

In accordance with plant procedures for ITAAC completion, Southern Nuclear Operating Company (SNC) performed a review of all ITAAC findings pertaining to the subject ITAAC and associated corrective actions. This review found that there are no relevant ITAAC findings associated with this ITAAC. The ITAAC completion review is documented in the Vogtle Unit 4 ITAAC Completion Package for ITAAC 2.5.01.03c (Reference 3) and available for NRC inspection.

ITAAC Completion Statement

Based on the above information, SNC hereby notifies the NRC that ITAAC 2.5.01.03c was performed for Vogtle Unit 4 and that the prescribed acceptance criteria are met.

Systems, structures, and components verified as part of this ITAAC are being maintained in their as-designed, ITAAC compliant condition in accordance with approved plant programs and procedures.

References (available for NRC inspection)

1. NUREG/CR-6303, *Method for Performing Diversity and Defense-in-Depth Analysis of Reactor Protection Systems*, December 1994
2. APP-DAS-J0R-002, *AP1000 Diverse Actuation System Diversity Analysis*, Rev. 1
3. SVP_SV0_003889, *Submittal of Inspections, Tests, Analyses and Acceptance Criteria (ITAAC) Completion Package for Unit 4 ITAAC 2.5.01.03c [COL Index Number 513] (DAS/PMS Software Diversity)*