

**From:** [SLIDER, James](#)  
**To:** [Govan, Tekia](#); [Lewin, Aron](#)  
**Cc:** [Garmoe, Alex](#); [YOUNG, David](#)  
**Subject:** [External\_Sender] DEP Whitepaper  
**Date:** Friday, September 20, 2019 3:26:31 PM  
**Attachments:** [WP on Counting DEP After Retraction \(to NRC\).docx](#)

---

Tekia/Aron,

In case you have not already seen this, here is the EP whitepaper we want to introduce at next week's ROP public meeting.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Best regards,

Jim

**James SLIDER** | *Technical Advisor, Regulatory Affairs*  
1201 F Street, NW, Suite 1100 | Washington, DC 20004  
P: 202.739.8015  
[nei.org](http://nei.org)

*This electronic message transmission contains information from the Nuclear Energy Institute, Inc. The information is intended solely for the use of the addressee and its use by any other person is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient, you have received this communication in error, and any review, use, disclosure, copying or distribution of the contents of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone or by electronic mail and permanently delete the original message. IRS Circular 230 disclosure: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS and other taxing authorities, we inform you that any tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties that may be imposed on any taxpayer or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.*

---

Sent through [www.intermedia.com](http://www.intermedia.com)

**NEI Reactor Oversight Process Whitepaper -  
Counting of DEP Opportunities from an Actual Emergency  
Following a Retraction of the Emergency Declaration**

## **Introduction**

This Reactor Oversight Process (ROP) Whitepaper proposes the addition of new guidance to NEI 99-02, “Regulatory Assessment Performance Indicator Guideline,” to clarify reporting of Drill/Exercise Performance (DEP) indicator data from an actual emergency declaration, if the declaration is subsequently retracted.

## **NEI 99-02 Section Affected**

The change proposed by this whitepaper affects the “Clarifying Notes” section of the DEP indicator. The text is on Page 48, lines 11 through 14:

“As a minimum, actual emergency declarations and evaluated exercises are to be included in this indicator. In addition, other simulated emergency events that the licensee formally assesses for performance of classification, notification or PAR development may be included in this indicator (opportunities cannot be removed from the indicator due to poor performance).”

## **Discussion**

Each nuclear power plant licensee has provisions to collect and report data for the DEP indicator described in NEI 99-02. This indicator monitors timely and accurate licensee performance in drills and exercises when presented with opportunities for classification of emergencies, notification of offsite authorities, and development of protective action recommendations (PARs). It is the ratio, in percent, of timely and accurate performance of those actions to total opportunities.

With respect to the DEP indicator, NEI 99-02 states, “As a minimum, actual emergency declarations and evaluated exercises are to be included in this indicator.” However, there may be cases where a licensee makes an after-the-fact determination that an actual emergency declaration was not warranted based on a subsequent review of the conditions present at the time of the event. In these cases, a licensee may retract the emergency declaration by following the guidance in NUREG-1022, “Event Reporting Guidelines: 10 CFR 50.72 and 50.73 (NUREG-1022).”

Based on a review of industry operating experience, there is a need to clarify how to count DEP indicator data associated with an actual emergency declaration that is subsequently retracted. The proposed guidance would have a licensee not count DEP indicator data for an actual emergency declaration that is subsequently retracted or, if reported to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) before the retraction was finalized, remove the data via the fleet/site performance indicator data correction process. This position reflects the licensee’s ultimate decision that the emergency declaration was not warranted - if there was no actual emergency condition (i.e., a valid DEP opportunity), then the performance opportunities associated with the event should not be counted, whether successful or not.

Should the guidance proposed in this white paper be incorporated into NEI 99-02, there would be no effect on DEP indicator data already reported to the NRC prior to the effective date of the Frequently Asked Question (i.e., there is no expectation to “backfit” this guidance to previously reported data).

**NEI Reactor Oversight Process Whitepaper -  
Counting of DEP Opportunities from an Actual Emergency  
Following a Retraction of the Emergency Declaration**

**Proposed Changes to NEI 99-02**

On page 48 at line 11, add the new sentence shown below in italics to the existing paragraph.

As a minimum, actual emergency declarations and evaluated exercises are to be included in this indicator. In addition, other simulated emergency events that the licensee formally assesses for performance of classification, notification or PAR development may be included in this indicator (opportunities cannot be removed from the indicator due to poor performance). *DEP indicator opportunities associated with an actual emergency declaration that is subsequently retracted should not be counted or, if already reported to the NRC, removed from a prior quarterly count through the fleet/site performance indicator data correction process.*