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**Summary Record.**

The 48th meeting of the WGIP in the CNRA was held from 20 - 23 October 2014, at the NEA headquarters, Issy-les-Moulineaux, France. The following is the summary record of the meeting. Presentations and papers from the meeting have been posted in the WGIP member’s area of the NEA web site. The list of the participants is included as Appendix A. The status of WGIP action items is in Appendix B. Appendix C has the revised questionnaire regarding the role of the inspector during an emergency. Appendix D has the proposals of work for the 13th WGIP workshop topics. Appendix E has the Nuclear Power Plant (NPP) Observed Inspection Practices Programme.

**OPENING**

1. Introduction - Chair. Mr Olivier Veyret, WGIP Chair, welcomed members, informed the members of regrets from members, and welcomed new representatives. He invited people to make formal introductions. He also thanked the WGIP members for their continued support. He highlighted that at this meeting members would be selecting the topics for the 13th WGIP workshop to be proposed to CNRA, and approving the protocol document for controlling the NPP Benchmarking Inspection Practices task.

2. Adoption of the Agenda. The proposed agenda [NEA/SEN/NRA/WGIP/A(2014)2] was adopted noting that the timing of some agenda items will likely change to optimise the schedule.

3. Approval of Summary Record of the 47th WGIP meeting. The summary record [NEA/SEN/NRA/WGIP(2014)1] was issued on 20 May 2014. The summary record for the 47th WGIP meeting was approved without comment.

4. Report by the Secretariat - Update on current programme of work, recent actions taken by the CNRA, and other developments in OECD/NEA. Mr Javier Reig, NEA, provided a brief discussion of items of interest for WGIP members. He mentioned that Mr William D. Magwood, IV had taken up his duties of Director General of the OECD NEA as of 1 September 2014. He noted that Mr Magwood is interested in exploring vertical peer reviews involving risk insights. The CNRA will look forward to his views and interests. Mr Reig also provided a few highlights from the June 2014 CNRA meeting, specifically, the approval of the following: A) green booklet entitled, “The Characteristics of an Effective Nuclear Regulator; B) the senior level task group on defence in depth (STG-DiD) mandate; and C) the creation of a new STG on the safety culture of the regulatory body. On another topic, he noted that China will be invited to observe some CNRA working group meetings. Mr Reig envisions that China will one day participate in WGIP meetings, but the visa process is difficult in China so no specific dates were mentioned. The MDEP policy group will be evaluating its future at its next meeting in 2015. Some changes might involve changes in the vendor inspection co-operation working group. Lastly, Mr Reig recognised that the 50th WGIP meeting will be in the fall of 2015, and he supports doing something special for this meeting such as changing the meeting venue to Lyon, France. Ms Nancy Salgado, NEA also noted the CNRA vice-chair position was vacant with the recent retirement of Mr Eric Leeds, USNRC. She noted that CNRA requested WGOE to develop a proposal of work regarding non-conforming, counterfeit, fraudulent, and suspect items (NCFSI). Mr Alex Leblanc, CNSC will make a presentation on this topic on behalf of the WGOE chair in Section 10.2.
5. Role of the Inspector during an Emergency. The Chair presented a draft questionnaire on what role inspectors play during an emergency for WGIP approval. He reminded the members of the tasking from CNRA which was to for WGIP to provide an analysis of what is the role of the inspectors during an emergency. After extensive discussion, there was agreement gained on the content of the final questionnaire which is provided in Appendix C. Members were requested to respond to the questionnaire by 31st January 2015 to the Mr Olivier Veyret, ASN and Mr Jukka Kupila, STUK. The Chair will plan to provide CNRA the results of the analysis at the June 2015 CNRA meeting. **ACTION WGIP 47-3** is closed and a new item will be opened to reflect the new schedule.

**ACTION WGIP 48-1**: The NEA secretariat will provide the questionnaire on what role inspectors play during an emergency to WGIP members by 25 October 2014. WGIP members are requested to respond to the questionnaire by 31 January 2015 to the Mr Olivier Veyret, ASN and Mr Jukka Kupila, STUK. The Chair will report the insights to CNRA in June 2015.

6. Proceedings from the 12th WGIP workshop were published in October 2014 [NEA/CNRA/R(2014)8 and NEA/CNRA/R(2014)8/ADD1]. The Chair recognised that the commendable inspection practices documented in the proceedings would be of great value to all WGIP members.

7. Planning for 13th WGIP Workshop - Chair

7.1 It is recognised that Belgium will be the host country for the next workshop in 2016. Mr Pierre Barras, BEL V provided some preliminary insights regarding the planning of the workshop. At this time, it is tentatively planned for the workshop to be held in Bruges, Belgium. It was determined by the WG that the workshop and the 51st WGIP meeting would be held the week of the 17th of April 2016. The Chair reminded the WGIP members that each country should have at least three participants attend the workshop to support the topics. Mr Barras will provide an update at the spring 2015 meeting.

**ACTION WGIP 48-2**: Mr Barras will provide an update on the logistics for the 13th WGIP workshop at the spring 2015 meeting.

7.2 Members to discuss and approve three topics for the workshop. The members identified three topics of interest for the 13th WGIP workshop, each topic with two leads. Subsequently, the WG members split up based on interest and balance in numbers between the topics. The subgroups met separately to discuss and write the objective paragraph to present to the CNRA. The WG members agreed to the three CNRA proposals in Appendix D which the Chair will present to CNRA for approval in December 2014. The topic leads and support members are as follows:

- **Inspection Activities During the Transition from an Operating Reactor to a Defueled Status with a Commitment to Permanently Cease Power Operations**: Canada (Lead) and US (Vice-Lead)
- **Inspection of Modifications**: UK (Lead) and Belgium (Vice-Lead)
- **The Inspectors’ Role in the Enforcement Process**: Finland (Lead) and Germany (Vice-Lead)

**ACTION WGIP 48-3**: The Chair will present the CNRA proposals on three topics for the 13th WGIP workshop for discussion and approval at the December 2014 CNRA meeting.
8. NPP Benchmarking Inspection Practices - Chair

8.1 Observations from the inspection conducted in the UK in September 2014 - John Donald, ONR and Julio Crespo, CSN. (ACTION WGIP 46-2). The final report was presented by Mr Julio Crespo. The UK hosted the inspection, and the US, Sweden, and Spain participated. The inspection was conducted on 8-11 September at the Sizewell B NPP. The focus of the inspection was the main steam and steam generator blowdown systems during normal plant operations. The approach for this inspection was very different from the inspections conducted in the US and Spain. This inspection was heavily focused on documentation review. This type of inspection could prove to be difficult in the future depending on the language barriers. In addition to the inspection, the team had the opportunity to observe a public meeting, which took place in a village hall inside the emergency planning zone for the Sizewell site. Members of the public, local elected officials, the licensee, and several non-governmental organizations were in attendance. The final UK report was posted on the WGIP website. WGIP members were reminded that final reports from inspections would not require WGIP approval. Insights from the conduct of this inspection were incorporated into the final protocol document discussed in Section 8.3.

8.2 Additional countries need to volunteer to participate in the 2015 inspections. Delegates were asked to check with their management to determine if their country could participate. Canada and France have volunteered to host the 2015 inspections. Mexico has volunteered in host in 2016 (tentatively, Belgium, Canada, and Spain plan to participate).

ACTION WGIP 48-4: Observation of inspection to be conducted in Canada in the spring of 2015. Finland, France, and the Republic of Korea will participate.

ACTION WGIP 48-5: Observation of inspection to be conducted in France in the late summer of 2015. Mexico, Poland, and the US will participate.

8.3 The protocol document for controlling the NPP - Benchmarking Inspection Practices task will be presented for approval by Mr Christopher Regan, USNRC. (ACTION 46-3). The WGIP members determined to call the protocol document, henceforth, Nuclear Power Plant Observed Inspection Practices Programme. Mr Regan highlighted resolutions to comments that he received from WG members on the draft document. After lengthy discussion, agreement was achieved on the final document that is in Appendix E.


9.1 On-going item for WGIP members to update the Status Report on Regulatory Inspection Philosophy, Inspection Organisation and Inspection Practices. NEA will place all updates on the member website (ACTION WGIP 43-7). Germany, Sweden, and Slovak Republic updates have been posted on the WGIP website.

10. Exchange of Information on Significant Inspection Related Events

10.1 Routine item - Delegates are encouraged to share significant inspection related events. Members held a round table on significant inspection related events. All presentations were posted on the WGIP website.

10.2 On-going item for WGIP members to bring non-conforming, counterfeit, fraudulent, and suspect items (NCFSI) issued identified by inspections. (ACTION WGIP 44-16). Canada and
France made presentations on NCFSI issues identified by inspections. In addition, Mr Leblanc, CNSC made a presentation on behalf of the WGOE chair regarding a draft proposal of work on NCFSI. He requested comments on the draft proposal by 5 November 2014.

10.3 On-going item for WGIP members to bring Fukushima issues identified by inspection (ACTION WGIP 45-6). None.

10.4 On-going item for WGIP members to bring inspection practices used during the transition period from the phase out announcement and the shutdown of a NPP (ACTION WGIP 46-4). None

11. National Inspection Program

11.1 The national inspection programme presentations were presented by the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic.

ACTION WGIP 48-6: The national inspection programme presentation will be given by the Netherlands and the Russian Federation at the spring 2015 WGIP meeting.

11.2 Presentation of the “Independent Safety Service” which is in place in all the French EDF NPP by Michaël Nataf, ASN. This item was rescheduled to the 49th WGIP meeting due to time constraints.

ACTION WGIP 48-7: Presentation by ASN of the “Independent Safety Service” which is in place in all the French EDF NPPs.

OTHER BUSINESS

12. Interactions with other organisations

12.1 IAEA. Mr. Tim Kobetz, IAEA made a presentation regarding the development of a walkdown inspector training programme using Zwentendorf a BWR, German designed unit which was constructed in 1972, but was never fuelled. The IAEA will be using USNRC training experts to provide the training for new countries embarking on the use of nuclear power. The target date for the first class is June 2015.

13. Cooperation with other working groups or MDEP.

13.1 Update on MDEP Vendor Inspection Co-operation Working Group (VICWG) activities. (ACTION WGIP 42-9). Mr Getachew Tesfaye, MDEP technical secretariat provided an update on MDEP VICWG activities. He highlighted that through mid-2014, the WG has conducted 10 MDEP inspections. New WG activities include: 1) develop a list of good practice for vendor oversight; 2) conduct survey on vendor inspector training; and 3) discuss lessons learnt from the Valinox Multinational Inspection and recommend changes to the VICWG documents as appropriate. Members of VICWG have made a proposal to the MDEP PG to continue coordination of vendor inspections.

14. Use of WGIP Results and Reports

14.1 A round table discussion will be held. Any representative may provide information on how WGIP results and reports are used within their countries. France provided a short verbal
discussion on how WGIP reports commendable practices are considered for improving ASN guides. Canada is developing a method to incorporate commendable practices into the organisation.

14.2 The Chair will discuss the future of the report on the Working Group on Inspection Practices (WGIP) Commendable Practices and Related Findings for Regulatory Inspection Activities. (ACTION WGIP 46-6). Mr Matthias Schneider, BFS made a short presentation on the background of the report. He noted that the 42nd WGIP meeting summary record [NEA/SEN/NRA/WGIP(2011)3] reflected a decision to keep the report as an on-line report. The WGIP members re-confirmed the decision to keep the report which incorporates WGIP commendable practices and related findings for regulatory inspection activities as an on-line report on the WGIP password protected website. The Chair thanked Mr. Matthias Schneider who routinely revises the report for WGIP.

15. Meeting Summary

15.1 Summary of Results to be presented to the CNRA - December 2014.

- Share the progress of the analysis of the role of the inspector during an emergency.
- Present the task proposals for the 13th WGIP workshop topics for discussion and request approval from CNRA. The Chair will provide some initial insights concerning the planning of the workshop including the dates.
- Share the insights gained from the UK observed inspection conducted in September 2014 at Sizewell B.
- Present the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme for CNRA to take note.
- Present the volunteer participants for the 2015 and 2016 NPP Observed Inspections.
- Highlight that the 12th WGIP workshop proceedings were published in October 2014.
- Request support for the 50th WGIP meeting being held in Lyon, France in the fall of 2015.

15.2 Summary of Action Items. The Chair and NEA secretariat discussed the opened and closed action items. See Appendix B.

16. Meetings

16.1 The 49th WGIP meeting will be held 13 - 16 April 2015 at 14:30 in NEA headquarters, Room B, Issy-les-Moulineaux, France. The Chair and Vice-Chair will hold a pre-meeting with the NEA Secretariat on the 13th from 10:00 - 12:00.

16.2 The 50th WGIP meeting will be held 19 - 22 October 2015 at 14:30 location is tentatively Lyon, France pending approval from CNRA. The Chair and Vice-Chair will hold a pre-meeting with the NEA Secretariat on the 19th from 10:00 - 12:00.

17. Other items. Mr Julio Crespo, CSN reported on the results of informal CSN survey regarding inspection reports. He expressed appreciation for the informal feedback that he received from WGIP members. The Chair noted that this type of initiative is an added value of an international group like
WGIP. Mr Alex Leblanc, CNSC sought and was granted approval to develop a short informal questionnaire to benchmark surveillance and monitoring practices among WGIP members. Surveillance and monitoring includes reviewing station logs, attending licensee meetings and reviewing problem/deficiency identification reports filed by licensee staff. Mr Leblanc will have the questionnaire ready for distribution to WGIP members before December 2014, and at the end of this task, he will summarise the observations in a presentation to the group.

18. Closure of 48th WGIP Meeting. The Chair thanked WGIP members for their active support, and closed the meeting.
APPENDIX A: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

BELGIUM

Mr Pierre BARRAS Tel: +32 (0) 2 52 80 346
Bel V Eml: pierre.barras@belv.be
Rue Walcourt 148
B-1070 Brussels
BELGIQUE

CANADA

Mr Alexandre LEBLANC Tel: +1 613 947 8500
CNSC-CCSN Eml: alexandre.leblanc@cnsc-ccsn.gc.ca
280 Slater Street
P.O. Box 1046
Station B
Ottawa, ON K1P 5S9

CZECH REPUBLIC

Mr Miroslav JAKES Tel: +420 385 735 033
State Office for Nuclear Safety Eml: miroslav.jakes@sujb.cz
NPP Temelin Local Inspectorate
Temelín - Elektrárna, 37305

FINLAND

Mr Jukka KUPILA Tel: +358 9 759 88323
Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority (STUK) Eml: jukka.kupila@stuk.fi
Nuclear Reactor Regulation
P.O. Box 14
FIN-00881 Helsinki

FRANCE

Mr Olivier VEYRETT Tel: +33 426286145
Autorité de Sûreté Nucléaire (ASN) Eml: olivier.veyret@asn.fr
ASN Lyon Division
5, place Jules Ferry
69006 LYON
GERMANY
Dr Matthias SCHNEIDERTel: +49 + 49 3018 333 1561
Bundesamt für StrahlenschutzEm: m.schneider@bfs.de
Fachbereich Sicherheit in
der Kerntechnik (SK)
P.O.Box 10 01 49
D-38201 Salzgitter

HUNGARY
Mr Attila SÁGITel: +36 (1) 4364 906
Hungarian Atomic Energy AuthorityEm: sagi@haea.gov.hu
Nuclear Safety Directorate,
NPP Supervision Department
1036 Budapest, Fényes A. u. 4.
1539 Budapest 114, Pf. 676.

JAPAN
Mr Yusuke KASAGAWATel: +81 3 5114 2116
Division of Regulation for InspectionEm: yusuke_kasagawa@nsr.go.jp
of Nuclear Reactor Facilities
Nuclear Regulatory Authority (NRA)
1-9-9 Roppongi, Minato-ku,
Tokyo, 106-8450

Mr Hiroyoshi KOIZUMITel: +81 (0) 3 5114 2116
Senior FellowEm: hiroyoshi_koizumi@nsr.go.jp
Division of Regulation for Inspection
of Nuclear Reactor Facilities
Nuclear Regulatory Authority (NRA)
1-9-9 Roppongi, Minato-ku,
Tokyo, 106-8450

KOREA (REPUBLIC OF)
Mr Taesuk HWANGTel: +82 42 868 0653
Korea Institute of Nuclear Safety(KINS)Em: tshwang@kins.re.kr
62 Kwahak-ro
Yusung-Gu
Daejon 305-338

MEXICO
Mr Luis Miguel GUTIERREZ RUIZ Tl: +52 55 5095 3236
Comision Nacional de Seg. Eml: lgutierrez@cnsns.gob.mx
Nuclear y Salvaguardias CNSNS
Dr. Barragan 779, 3° Piso
Col. Narvarte
CP. 03020 Mexico DF
NETHERLANDS

Mr Ramon MULLERTel: +31 611 763 025
Ministry of Infrastructure and
the Environment
Koningskade 4
P.O. Box 16191
2500 BD the Hague

Mr Bert VERWEIJTel: +31 70 456 2061
Ministry of Infrastructure and
Koningskade 4
P.O. Box 16191
2500 BD the Hague

POLAND

Mr Andrzej GLOWACKITel:
National Atomic Energy Agency (PAA)
Krucza 36
00-522 Warsaw

SLOVAK REPUBLIC

Mr Michal MELICHAREKTel: +421 335991118
Nuclear Regulatory Authority of the
Slovak Republic/Urad jadroveho dozoru
Okruzna 5
91864 Trnava

SPAIN

Mr Julio CRESPO BRAVOTel: +34 91 3460 242
Consejo de Seguridad Nuclear (CSN)
C/ Justo Dorado, 11
28040 MADRID

SWEDEN

Mr Klas IDEHAAGTel: +46 8 799 4363
Dept. of Nuclear Power Plant Safety
Swedish Radiation Safety Authority
Solna strandväg 96
S-171 16 STOCKHOLM
SWITZERLAND

Mr Hans Rudolf FIERZ
Tel: +41 56 460 8691
Swiss Federal Nuclear Safety
Inspectorate (ENSI)
Industriestrasse 19
CH-5200 Brugg

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr John DONALD
Tel: +44 151 951 3848
Office for Nuclear Regulation
4N3 - Redgrave Court
Merton Road, Bootle
L20 7HS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr Christopher REGAN
Tel: +1 301 415 2768
Reactor Inspection Branch
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
M.S. O7E00
Washington, DC 20555

International Organisations

OECD Nuclear Energy Agency, Issy-les-Moulineaux

International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria

Mr Timothy KOBETZ
Tel: +43 (1) 2600 22608
Regulatory Activities Section
Division of Nuclear Installation Safety
IAEA
Wagramerstrasse 5 - P.O. Box 100
A-1400 Vienna

OECD Nuclear Energy Agency, Issy-les-Moulineaux, France

Ms Nancy SALGADO
Tel: +33 (0) 1 45 24 10 55
Deputy Head, Nuclear Safety Division
OECD Nuclear Energy Agency
12 Boulevard des Îles
92130 Issy les Moulineaux
APPENDIX B: STATUS OF WGIP ACTION ITEMS

**ACTION WGIP 48-1:** The NEA secretariat will provide the questionnaire on what role inspectors play during an emergency to WGIP members by 25 October 2014. WGIP members are requested to respond to the questionnaire by 31 January 2015 to the Mr Olivier Veyret, ASN and Mr Jukka Kupila, STUK. The Chair will report the insights to CNRA in June 2015.

**ACTION WGIP 48-2:** Mr Barras will provide an update on the logistics for the 13th WGIP workshop at the spring 2015 meeting.

**ACTION WGIP 48-3:** The Chair will present the CNRA proposals on three topics for the 13th WGIP workshop for discussion and approval at the December 2014 CNRA meeting.

**ACTION WGIP 48-4:** Observation of inspection to be conducted in Canada in the spring of 2015. Finland, France, and the Republic of Korea will participate.

**ACTION WGIP 48-5:** Observation of inspection to be conducted in France in the late summer of 2015. Mexico, Poland, and the US will participate.

**ACTION WGIP 48-6:** The national inspection programme presentation will be given by the Netherlands and the Russian Federation at the spring 2015 WGIP meeting.

**ACTION WGIP 48-7:** Presentation by ASN of the “Independent Safety Service” which is in place in all the French EDF NPPs.

**Routine Action Items:**

**ACTION WGIP 42-9:** The WGIP members would like to maintain contact with the MDEP vendor inspection working group and would like periodic updates on the MDEP VICWG activities.

**ACTION WGIP 43-7:** As an on-going process, members should update the Status Report on Regulatory Inspection Philosophy, Inspection Organisation and Inspection Practices, as practical. The NEA will place all updates on the WGIP and CNRA member websites.

**ACTION WGIP 44-16:** On-going item for WGIP members to bring non-conforming, counterfeit, fraudulent, and suspect items (NCFSI) issues identified by inspection.

**ACTION WGIP 45-6:** On-going item for WGIP members to bring Fukushima issues identified by inspection.

**ACTION WGIP 46-4:** Delegates are encouraged to bring inspection practices used during the transition period from the phase out announcement and the shutdown of a NPP.

**Completed Action Items:** 47-1, 47-2, 47-3, 46-2, 46-3, 46-5, 46-6.
APPENDIX C: QUESTIONNAIRE - THE ROLE OF THE INSPECTOR DURING AN EMERGENCY

Background:
The WGIP report entitled, Inspection of Emergency Arrangements (ref: NEA/CNRA/R(2013)2) was presented and approved by CNRA at the December 2013 meeting. At this meeting, the CNRA recommended that WGIP provide an analysis of what is the role of the inspectors during an emergency.

The following short questionnaire has been generated to respond to CNRA’s recommendation. The responses will be evaluated and might identify additional commendable practices. It is envisioned that WGIP may initiate a addendum to NEA/CNRA/R(2013)2 with the new insights.

Responses are due to the listed contacts by 31st January 2015

Contacts:
Lead: Olivier Veyret (ASN) - olivier.veyret@asn.fr
Co-Lead: Jukka Kupila (STUK) - Jukka.Kupila@stuk.fi

Members are requested to respond (being concise if possible) to the following questions:

1. What is the onsite role of the responding inspectors during an emergency (whether this emergency is onsite or offsite)?

2. What is the interaction between responding inspectors and licensees during an emergency?

***

Note: When responding to the two questions above please consider the following items (Members do not have to answer the following items as they are just guides).

What is the responding inspector’s location during plant emergency? They may be located in:
- main control room;
- emergency centre (licensee’s emergency management on site);
- licensee’s technical support center (licensee’s on-site/off-site support functions);
- regulatory body’s own office at site;
- local emergency service’s emergency centre;
- local/area administration; or
- other.
Do the inspectors have their own dedicated technical procedure to implement that will inspect the licensee’s action in the operating of the facilities, especially in the control room?
- Is this procedure established by the licensee or the RB?

During the situation, do the inspectors have the duty to make their own technical assessment of the safety of the facilities?
- How often?
- Do they compare it with the licensee’s technical assessment?

Safety assessment and specific role of the inspectors during the emergency
- Are the inspectors specifically trained to understand all information and the control room indications that are used during the emergency management?
- Are the inspectors allowed to operate some buttons / switches in the control room or to actuate some components on the field if necessary during an emergency?
- Are the inspectors specially trained and therefore able to understand the licensees’ emergency running procedures of the facilities into details? Do they have to assist/witness to some key operations in these procedures?
- Are the inspectors periodically trained on simulators?
- Do the inspectors participate in exercises to test the role?

What is the role of the inspectors towards the licensee during the emergency management?
- Supervision with more or less advice?
- Inspect with the possibility for immediate enforcement if there are any violations?
- Gathering information for the remote RB teams?
- Gathering information to support potential enforcement after the emergency?

What are the key elements in the share of responsibilities between the licensee and the inspectors?

Hierarchical chain of these inspectors: Do inspectors communicate with only one person or do they have to respond to different managers, or to a kind of "working group"?

How does the inspector interact with the licensee during an emergency?
- Is there a procedure?
- If the inspector identifies a violation during an emergency, what does he/she do?

What kind of important practices would you recommend concerning the role of the inspector during an emergency?
APPENDIX D: PROPOSALS OF WORK FOR THE 13TH WGIP WORKSHOP TOPICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective/Scope</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Outputs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Process</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schedule/ Milestones</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction with Others</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approved by CNRA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective/Scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule/ Milestones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved by CNRA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Title**  
The Inspectors’ Role in the Enforcement Process

**Objective/Scope**  
The purpose of the task is to identify commendable inspection practices associated with the inspectors’ role in the enforcement process. Specifically, evaluating the findings, participating in the determination of appropriate enforcement measures, and following up on the licensee’s response.

**Relevance**  
This task meets Challenge 2 of CNRA Operating Plan and Guidelines (2011-2016) [NEA/CNRA/R(2011)2].

This task meets Challenge 2, Effectiveness And Efficiency Of Activities Related To Safety, which mentions, in part, the relationship between regulator and operator is an area for consideration, and the balance between regulatory tools.

**Expected Outputs**  
This task will input into the 13th WGIP Workshop in spring 2016. The output will be conclusions and commendable practices that will be issued in the proceedings of the workshop.

**Work Process**  
A questionnaire among the member countries will be created and discussed during the 49th and the 50th WGIP meetings. The final questionnaire will be developed as part of the notification for the 13th WGIP Workshop in 50th meeting. The responses will be reviewed by a lead WGIP member and a presentation will be given at the beginning of the workshop.

**Schedule/ Milestones**  
The task will be led by Finland with support by Germany. The questionnaire will be developed and discussed at the 49th and the 50th WGIP meetings, in preparation for issuance of the workshop notification in late 2015.

**Interaction with Others**  
As part of an NEA workshop, it will be open to all interested countries.

**Approved by CNRA**  
Being requested at the 2014 December CNRA meeting.
APPENDIX E: NUCLEAR POWER PLANT (NPP) OBSERVED INSPECTION PRACTICES PROGRAMME
CNRA Working Group on Inspection Practices (WGIP)

Nuclear Power Plant
Observed Inspection
Practices Programme

WGIP-01

(1 November 2014)
NPP OBSERVED INSPECTION PRACTICES PROGRAMME

WGIP-01-01 BACKGROUND

The Working Group on Inspection Practices (WGIP) initiated a task, at the suggestion of the Committee on Nuclear Regulatory Activities (CNRA), relating to the benchmarking of inspection practices among the different international regulatory bodies (RBs) that are members of Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA). The WGIP’s proposal in response to the suggestion was approved in a June 2012 meeting of the NEA’s CNRA.

WGIP-01-02 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of the WGIP task is to implement a process to collect and make available information to member countries for improving inspection techniques. This is to be accomplished by observing the planning, performance, and enforcement actions of inspections by other member countries and for documenting commendable practices and lessons learned. This effort will support the CNRA Operating Guidelines (CNRA NEA/CNRA/R(2011)1, Appendix A which states that the main objectives of the WGIP are to:

02.01 Promote cooperation and learning to mutually enhance regulatory effectiveness of existing regulatory inspection practices, prepare reports and disseminate lessons learnt, and by sponsoring and holding international workshops on regulatory practices;

02.02 Consider what inspection and practices are appropriate to address the future regulatory challenges as identified by CNRA; and

02.03 Consider the lessons learnt from regulators and regulatory inspections and practices from operational experience.

WGIP-01-03 OBJECTIVES

03.01 To facilitate volunteering member countries (called visiting countries) traveling to a nuclear power plant (NPP) facility in a host member country annually or semi-annually, depending on the scheduling of WGIP inspection workshops and availability of member state host countries, and to observe plant operations and inspection techniques implemented by the Regulatory Body (RB) and/or the licensee (the licensee if delegated to by the RB, e.g., in France), respectively;

03.02 To expand member country knowledge of different country-specific inspection programs, rules, regulations, configuration and layouts of plants and licensee and RB interactions, organisations and operations;

03.03 To exchange inspection techniques and determine “commendable practices” that may be implemented by RBs in other countries;
03.04 To facilitate networking of individuals employed by member country RBs with the objective to foster cooperation and a free-flow of information exchange and knowledge related to safe operation of NPPs worldwide; and

03.05 To provide assessment input into the inspection report for the host country RB at the discretion of the RB.

WGIP-01-04 APPLICABILITY

The NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme will be conducted in one (1) country if it is to occur during a year concurrent with a WGIP inspection workshop or, in two (2) separate host countries for years when a workshop is not scheduled. This annual/semi-annual schedule is also contingent on the expectations of the CNRA and the availability of member countries to both provide inspectors/observers to visit and to host an observed inspection. NEA member countries participate in the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme on a voluntary basis. Volunteer member countries are to use approval protocols specific to the RB and country requirements to gain permission and acquire the necessary funds for its observers to travel.

WGIP-01-05 DEFINITIONS

05.01 Committee on Nuclear Regulatory Activities (CNRA). The CNRA of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA) is an international committee made up primarily of senior nuclear regulators. It was set up in 1989 as a forum for the exchange of information and experience among regulatory organisations and for the review of developments which could affect regulatory requirements. CNRA is responsible for the programme of the Agency concerning the regulation, licensing and inspection of nuclear installations with regard to safety.

05.02 Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA). The Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA) is a specialised agency within the OECD, an intergovernmental organisation of industrialised countries based in Paris, France. Its mission is to assist its member countries in maintaining and further developing, through international co-operation, the scientific, technological and legal bases required for a safe, environmentally friendly and economical use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. To provide authoritative assessments and to forge common understandings on key issues as input to government decisions on nuclear energy policy and to broader OECD policy analyses in areas such as energy and sustainable development.

05.03 Working Group on Inspection Practices (WGIP). Established by the CNRA, the purpose of WGIP is to facilitate the exchange of information and experience related to regulatory safety inspections between CNRA Member countries.

WGIP-01-06 RESPONSIBILITIES AND AUTHORITIES
06.01 Chair of the WGIP

a. Coordinates, facilitates and participates in meetings between the member countries RBs related to WGIP topics;

b. Ensures tasks generated during WGIP meetings are captured, tracked and completed; and

c. Ensures that experience and lessons learned from observed inspection activities are documented in a formal NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme report developed by the observed inspection report author and observation team.

06.02 NEA Secretariat

a. Assists Chair of the WGIP;

b. Acts as liaison among NEA and WGIP members;

c. Arranges and coordinates meetings and teleconferences for NEA and WGIP members as needed;

d. Develops WGIP meeting agendas and meeting summaries; and

e. Posts the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme Report to the WGIP website.

06.03 Host Country/RB of the Host Country (e.g., RB Inspector/Inspection Team Leader)

a. Fulfils the role of the RB’s inspection team leader for the host countries inspection activities. Works closely with the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme Coordinator (see Section 06.06);

b. Selects the dates and NPP site;

c. Determines subject and scope of the observed inspection, if possible provides the applicable inspection procedures to be observed;

d. Determines the duration of the observed inspection and develops the schedule/agenda of activities to be accomplished during the observed inspection;

e. Coordinates site access between the licensee and the observation team and coordinates with the licensee areas to be accessed;

f. Provides a list of requirements (e.g., site access training, passports, medical, radiological, etc.) and documentation (forms to read and sign, training material, dosimetry forms, etc.) to the observation team necessary for accessing the site of the host country;

g. Provides specific directions to the site, directions from the airport or railway station to the vicinity of the site, and a list of local accommodations to visiting observers; and
h. Determines the maximum number of visiting observers/observation team members;

06.04 NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme team

a. Designates the report author who is responsible for assembling the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme report input and issuing it. Also designates the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme coordinator (see Section 06.06);

b. Supports presentation of the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme report to the WGIP if possible;

c. Participates in planning meetings for NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme activities;

d. Uses a list of accommodations provided by host country to make necessary travel and hotel bookings, seek funding and travel to host country;

e. Completes forms and training activities and provides required forms, documentation and credentials to the RB of the host country for site access;

f. Each visiting observer is responsible for his/her own radioprotection (including dose management under his/her domestic requirement) and respects the local rules of radioprotection during the observed inspection;

g. Attends plant, public, and RB meetings;

h. Tours host country NPP to gain an understanding of the plant layout and assessment of plant activities and evolutions;

i. Provides NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme report input to the report author; and

j. Participates in end of the day caucus to discuss activities observed, meetings attended, and areas inspected and discusses similarities and differences in plant operations, inspection techniques, communications, site programs (particularly the corrective action programme) and identifies commendable practices.

06.05 NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme Report Author

a. Is a member of the observation team (may also be the observation team coordinator);

b. Collects observation and/or inspection input from the observation team and documents observations using the report format template in Attachment 1;

c. Provides draft report to the team for comments and incorporates comments accordingly;
d. Finalises the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme report and forwards final product to the NEA WGIP Secretariat for posting to the WGIP website, respectively; and

e. Collects report input from observation team and provides the information to the RB if the RB of the host country uses the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme visit as credit for inspection at the visited site.

06.06 NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme Coordinator

a. Is a member of the observation team who ensures consistent application of the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme and acts as the principal point of contact/leader for the observation team. May also be the report author (see also Section 06.05 NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme Report Author);

b. Works collaboratively with the RB of the host country to execute the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme at the host NPP;

c. Leads team planning discussions. If possible, the WGIP representative of the hosting county participates in the observed inspection, in the role of the coordinator, in order to ensure consistency with the programme and that the principles of this programme are followed. If the WGIP representative from the host country cannot attend the observed inspection, they should provide support to the host country representative to the greatest extent possible (see also Section 06.07, NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme Facilitator);

d. Leads end of day caucus discussions to develop observations and “commendable practices”;

e. Ensures the observation team is aware of predetermined logistics (meeting times, locations and areas to be inspected) and that site access requirements (forms, documentation and credentials) have been satisfied and that the RB has been notified (see section 06.03, Host Country - RB of the host country) (see also Section 06.07, NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme Facilitator);

f. Ensures that the observation team provides required NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme report input to the report author and that due dates and milestones are met regarding completing the report; and

g. Supports presentation of the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme report to the WGIP if possible.

06.07 NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme Facilitator

a. In the event that the WGIP member is unable to be a member of the observation team and to perform the responsibilities of the observed inspection coordinator (see section 06.06, NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme Coordinator), it is highly recommended that the WGIP
member/facilitator provide support for the planning and conduct of the observed inspection;

b. Ensures consistency with the programme to the greatest extent possible and that the principles of this programme are followed;

c. Ensures observation team members are aware of predetermined logistics (meeting times, locations and areas to be inspected) and that site access requirements (forms, documentation and credentials) have been satisfied and that the RB has been notified (see section 06.03, Host Country - RB of the host country); and

d. Supports presentation of the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme report to the WGIP.

**WGIP-01-07 METHODOLOGY**

07.01 The following steps outline recommendations for Pre-site Preparation, Site Visit and Post Site Activities during visits to the host country NPPs during the year.

07.02 Pre-Site Visit Preparation Activities

a. The WGIP holds regular meetings twice a year. During these meetings the WGIP will review the status of the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme. The WGIP will manage the programme of observations considering the CNRA’s request and the capabilities of the different member states. The WGIP should balance the participation of the different member states for both hosting and visiting. This includes the frequency of each member states volunteering, the geographic distribution of participating member states, and any concerns regarding the languages used. This review will also specifically include the one or two proposed sites selected for the upcoming year and will provide a review of the observed inspections performed since the last meeting.

b. In any given year, it is preferred that the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme will be conducted by several member countries (it is suggested there be at least five (5)) that volunteer to participate in the programme (See also Section 06.03(g) regarding limitations on the specific number of inspection observers per observed inspection). Two (2) of the member countries participating in the programme will volunteer to host the programme in their respective countries. The WGIP members may select the specific volunteers during the WGIP Meeting preceding the year the site visits are conducted;

c. Consideration is to be given to having an additional country volunteer as a backup in the event a country cannot participate. It is expected that volunteers that are unable to participate give notice to the WGIP at least six (6) months in advance, if possible, but not less than two (2) months.

d. It is expected that nominated observation team members are, in general, experienced/senior operating reactor inspectors. It also is highly recommended that the participating inspection observer be a strong English speaker. If the inspection observation is focused on a particular discipline the nominee must be cognizant and experienced in the particular area of the inspection.
e. Once the volunteer/host countries have been established the NEA Secretariat coordinates a teleconference with the inspection observation team by February or March (for inspection observations conducted in the fall) or September or October (for inspection observations conducted in the spring). During this teleconference:

1. The host country RB provides the proposed dates (about one week in length - highly recommended to take place Monday through Friday) and the location/site(s). The observed inspection may be either conducted during normal operation or outage phases. Since refuelling outages occur during the spring and fall, there is a good opportunity for the team to observe the host country RB’s oversight during outages. The dates and locations are to be provided nine (9) months in advance of the conduct of the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme, but no less than four (4) months, and confirmed by the NEA secretariat.

2. The host country RB provides the observation team with the licensee’s and RB’s organisational chart (if available) and a list of hotels that are close to the site being visited.

3. The host country RB communicates the requirements (such as passports, medical certificate, dosimetry records, completing a site access exam, completing necessary plant access documents, etc.) for site access.

4. If possible, the host country RB develops an agenda using the checklist in Attachment 2 as a guide and provides the proposed agenda to the observation team. Attachment 2 is based on inspectable areas and inspection procedures used by the U.S and Spanish regulators. The inspection procedures are hyperlinked to provide inspection area ideas.

5. It is recommended that a member of the NEA participates in the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme and when possible it is preferred that they act as the observation team coordinator for the effort (See Section 06.06 NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme Coordinator). The NEA and the RB of the host country work collaboratively to execute the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme conducted at the host NPP.

f. Approximately two months before traveling to the site, the observation team provides the RB that is hosting the site visit all required documentation/forms/credentials necessary for accessing the site – this may be transmitted using the most efficient and secure means (e.g., by fax, e-mail or postal service).

g. Approximately one month before visiting the site, if it is considered necessary, the NEA Secretariat coordinates a second call with the observation team, and during this call, logistics, meeting times and agendas can be confirmed. Also the team selects a observation team
coordinator, if not already done so, and a report author from the group who will be responsible for generating the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme report using the template located in Attachment 1.

07.03 Site Visit Activities

a. The day before arriving onsite, the observation team, including the host country RB inspectors, decides on a meeting location outside of the site (such as a local hotel) so the observation team members can get to know other members and exchange information regarding directions to the site, where to park and meet at the site and the initial meeting times. It is recommended that the following information also be discussed:

1. brief history of the site,
2. recent operational history,
3. recent significant issues or licensing actions,
4. a reinforcement of site access, radiological or industrial safety requirements, and
5. an overview of the RB and licensee organisational chart.

This activity is recommended so the team can use the time on the first day to focus on observation activities rather than administrative items.

b. On the day of the visit, the observation team will meet at the agreed location and time. The RB for the host country provides a brief of pre-planned activities. It is preferred that this brief is conducted daily throughout the week. It is expected that consideration is given to inviting the licensee, or if specifically requested by the licensee, to discuss with the observation team the following:

1. radiological conditions and requirements (radiation work permits and high dose areas and activities);
2. industrial safety requirements; and
3. Emergency Preparedness and evacuation protocols in the event of a plant emergency

c. For the duration of the observed inspection (recommended for 5 days), the team follows the schedule/agenda developed by the host country with the goal of touring and observing as much of the plant areas as possible including:

1. control panel walk-downs;
2. a tour inside containment (if accessible);
3. the observation of plant activities such as maintenance, testing, and RB-related inspections;

4. meeting with key members of the licensee organisation when available and at their convenience; and

5. attending plan of the day meetings, industry, public or RB exit meetings, corrective action review board meetings, plant oversight review committee meetings, shift turnover meetings, and the RB organisation (by teleconference if possible) meetings.

d. Any safety issues that the observation team identifies are to be immediately communicated to the host country RB so the RB may use proper protocols of informing the licensee and RB’s management of the issues.

e. At the conclusion of each day, the observation team gather for an end-of-day caucus. The purpose of the caucus is to discuss activities observed, meetings attended, and areas inspected by the host country RB, and to discuss similarities and differences in plant operations, inspection techniques, communications, site programs (particularly the corrective action program) and to identify “commendable practices.” From this list, the observation team agrees on the commendable practices. The designated report author captures the “commendable practices” in the report.

f. The day before the last day of the visit, the observation team collectively develops exit notes that will be communicated to the observation team coordinator. The coordinator collates any pertinent information and provides this information to the RB (it is recommended that this is through the RB’s inspection team leader who is supporting the observation team) for sharing with the licensee on the last day if they request the information.

1. It is expected that the RB of the host country coordinates with the licensee on exit meeting times, location and recommended key licensee personnel (senior managers and supervisors) who should attend the exit meeting. It is expected that the observation team attends the meeting; and

2. The purpose of the exit meeting is for the RBs inspectors, and other managers from the RB to communicate the preliminary results of their inspection to the licensee. The host country may request that the observation team also share their preliminary observations as well at this time.

3. The observation team could take advantage of this opportunity to communicate the observation team’s appreciation for the licensee’s accommodating the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme. It is anticipated that the observation team communicates that the product from the visit is an NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme report containing insights from observations gathered during the week, “commendable practices,” and any country-specific similarities and differences in plant
operations, rules and regulations and the implementation of inspection programs. If the host RB requested that the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme visits were considered part of an inspection activity, the observation team will acknowledge that input will be turned over to the RB of the host country for disposition. The observation team will communicate to the host country RB any significant safety issues and how the issue was resolved (as applicable).

07.04 Post Site Visit Activities

a. Before the exit meeting, the observation team will send observation input to the designated NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme report author.

b. In circumstances where the host RB will include inspection input developed by the observation team, the observation team will send input to the designated report author who will then provide the RB with a copy of the final report when completed. Draft versions of the report may be shared with the host country RB for comment if desired.

c. After the observed inspection, the observation team shall keep a strict neutral approach and abstain from any communication on the results (including deviances) of the inspection. They shall deliver no external information (e.g., external stake holders, press, etc.) before the host country has completed their post-inspection activities. If any observers from a visiting country are compelled to provide a formal communication concerning their participation in the observed inspection, the observer(s) are to notify the host country in advance of the impending communication.

d. Within thirty (30) days of the exit meeting date, the report author will write the report using Attachment 1 as a template and send a final draft copy to each observation team member for review/comment and approval. It is highly recommended that a first draft be developed by the report author as soon as possible after the inspection observation. All observation team members are required to (or must) complete their review within seven (7) days after receiving a copy of the final draft report;

e. The report author/inspection team coordinator incorporates comments from the observation team and sends the final report to Chair of the WGIP and NEA Secretariat. The report will be presented by a team member (designated by the observation team) at the next subsequent WGIP meeting. Included in the presentation are both the perspectives of the observation team and the host country RB;

f. The NEA WGIP Secretariat will post the NPP Observed Inspection Practices Programme report to the WGIP website for reference by WGIP members. Identified commendable practices will be published as part of a periodic report on WGIP Commendable Practices (every three years). This will be presented to the CNRA.

WGIP-01-08 RECORDS
• Inspection Report: See Attachment 1
• Main challenges and benefits.
• Commendable Practices.
• Observations
• Inspection Input
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1. INTRODUCTION. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE INSPECTION OBSERVATION

The task proposed by the Working Group on Inspection Practices (WGIP) relating to the benchmarking of inspection practices among the different regulatory bodies (RBs), which are members of NEA, was approved in the meeting of the NEA’s Committee on Nuclear Regulatory Activities (CNRA) of June 2012.

Any WGIP task proposal is accompanied by a document where the task’s purpose, relevance, work process and expected results are detailed; they are the following:

- **Title of the task:** Inspection Observation.

- **Purpose and scope:** The purpose of the task is to implement a process for improving the inspection techniques of member states by witnessing/observing the planning and execution activities and other activities imposed by the RB on the inspections conducted by other member states.

- **This task satisfies the requirement of having appropriate nuclear skills and infrastructures,** pursuant to the CNRA/CSNI Joint Strategic Plan - 2011-2016, which specifically states that CNRA programs should include development of exchange programs for the inspectors and the scientific and technical experts of the different RBs.

- **Relevance of the task:** This effort will help support the WGIP’s main goals.
  
  - Promoting mutual cooperation and learning so as to improve the regulatory effectiveness of existing inspection practices, preparing reports, and disseminating learnt lessons by sponsoring and organising international workshops on regulatory practices.
  
  - Considering which inspection practices are suitable for tackling future challenges faced by RBs.
  
  - Taking into account the lessons learnt by regulators and those derived from inspections and operating experience.

- **Expected results:** At the end of each witnessing or observation of an inspection, the results will be documented, setting out the way in which they may be used to...
improve the inspections of NEA member states.

This task was proposed by the NRC (USA); the development of the proposal was initially supported by Mexico, Poland, South Korea and Spain. The WGIP decided to begin the task by conducting two pilot inspection observations in order to analyse its applicability to other future inspections.

The Working Group agreed that the first pilot inspection would take place in the USA, with the participation of France and Spain, and the second one in Spain, with the participation of Canada and South Korea. The agreed mission in both cases was to observe the inspections made by inspectors during a refuelling outage.

2. INSPECTION OBSERVERS

The inspection took place from [Date] through [Date] during the [Plant Condition (forced shutdown/normal operations/refuelling outage)] of the [Name of Plant], which is located in [Province/Republic/State], [Country].

The participating inspectors included:

- [Country]: [Names], [Titles] of [Name of Plant];
- [Country]: [Names], [Titles] of [Name of Plant];
- [Country]: [Names], [Titles] of [Name of Plant]; and
- [Country]: [Names], [Titles] of [Name of Plant];

This report has been performed with the contribution of the whole observation team members and written by the inspector from [County], [Name of author].

3. SUMMARY OF INSPECTION OBSERVATION ACTIVITIES.
The visiting inspectors spent [number] days at the [Plant name]. Briefly describe a summary of inspection activities that are planned for the entire week.

The most relevant activities are detailed below:

[Day], [Date] (List under the day of the week and date of that day the activities recommended below that were conducted.)

- Briefly describe requirements to access the site (such as the need for passports, medical certificates, whole body counts, issuance of thermoluminescent) and any noted differences in access control between Regulatory Bodies (RBs).

- On the first day, it is expected that the host country inspectors would provide a general discussion of plant layout, major activities occurring throughout the day followed by a tour of the facility. [A brief description of what was discussed should be provided here].

- Based on time and availability, the visiting observation team may meet with the senior managers at the site if possible and convenient with the licensee (and if deemed appropriate by the host country RB) (such as the Site Vice President Operations Manager, Licensing Manager, Radiation Protection Manager, Engineering Manager and/or the Shift Outage Control Center Manager) During these meetings, the observation team asks appropriate and pertinent questions regarding plant status, plant conditions, major operational concerns, and these managers’ understandings of the RB inspectors role at the site. The questions should be asked with the intent of trying to understand the differences between plant operations and the RB’s role at the site. At a minimum, the observation team are to receive a briefing on radiological conditions, major plant evolutions and plant status. [A brief description of whom and what was discussed and noted differences between RBs are provided here].

- Since safe continued operation depends significantly on the health of the corrective action program, the observation team discuss with the host inspectors and/or with the licensee Quality Assurance manager if possible how the corrective action program works at the site. [A brief description of
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whom and what was discussed and noted differences between RBs are provided here].

- The host country inspectors and the observation team conduct field walk downs of the plant focusing on areas that contain safety-related equipment and areas that contain equipment that are important to safety. The write-up includes information on work control processes (such as the robustness of implementing protected train concept and inspection techniques used for this area) and the differences in experiences of the RB inspectors are briefly described] [Some examples of these areas are listed below]:

  o [Control Room]: After obtaining permission from the operators and while keeping the number of observers entering into the control room to a minimum to prevent congestion and distractions, the host provides a brief walk down of the control room panels,

  o [Safety-related Cable and Battery Rooms],

  o [Control Room HVAC Rooms],

  o [Emergency Diesel Generators and Station Blackout Diesels],

  o [Fire Protection System and associated pipes, pumps and tanks],

  o [Safety-related Water Systems (Service Water, Component Cooling Water, Essential Water) Canals, Pond, Pumps and pipe galleries],

  o [Reactor Building – Fuel Pool],

  o [Reactor Building – Accumulators for Control Rod Drive (for BWRs)],

  o [Reactor Building – Standby Liquid Injection System (for BWRs)],

  o [Reactor Building – Safety Injection Pumps, piping and valves]

  o [Auxiliary Building – Essential Air Compressors]
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- [Portable FLEX equipment],
- [Switchyard and Transmission],
- [Cooling Towers],
- [Ultimate Heat Sink],
- [Turbine Building – Auxiliary Feedwater Pumps],
- [Turbine Building – Motor and Steam Driven Feedwater Pumps],
- [Turbine Building – Main Turbine and Generator],
- [Turbine Building – Standby Feedwater System],
- [Tour of Plant Simulator],
- [Tour of Technical Support Center],
- [Tour of Emergency Operations Facility],
- [Tour of Operational Support Center]
- [Tour of Safe Shutdown or Remote Panels]

- Briefly describe meetings attended throughout the week and describe the differences between RBs (frequency/content/scope) with respect to meetings with the licensee staff. Also identify any practices that the observation team feels are “commendable practices.” Some examples of meetings are described below:
  - [ALARA Planning Meetings],
  - [Plan of the Day Meetings],
  - [Outage Planning Meetings (if applicable)],
  - [Periodic Meetings with licensing points of contacts],
[Periodic debriefings with plant management],

[Public Meetings (such as End of Cycle meetings) conducted during the week]

[Corrective Action Review Board meetings], and

[Daily conference call between the resident inspectors and their regional manager].

- Briefly describe major evolutions/inspection areas observed, and inspection procedures used. Some examples of those activities are listed below:
  - Inspection Procedure (IP) ######.##, Reactor Safety-Initiating Events, Mitigating Systems, Barrier Integrity;
  - IP ######.##, Adverse Weather Protection
  - IP ######.##, Equipment Alignment
  - IP ######.##, Fire Protection Annual/Quarterly
  - IP ######.##, Fire Protection (Triennial)
  - IP ######.##, Flood Protection Measures
  - IP ######.##, Heat Sink Performance
  - IP ######.##, In-service Inspection Activities
  - IP ######.##, Licensed Operator Requalification Program and Licensed Operator Performance
  - IP ######.##, Maintenance Effectiveness
  - IP ######.##, Maintenance Risk Assessments and Emergent Work Control
  - IP ######.##, Operability Determinations and Functionality Assessments
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- IP #######.##, Evaluations of Changes, Tests, or Experiments and Permanent Plant Modifications
- IP #######.##, Plant Modifications
- IP #######.##, Post Maintenance Testing
- IP #######.##, Refuelling and Other Outage Activities
- IP #######.##, Component Design Basis Inspection
- IP #######.##, Surveillance Testing
- IP #######.##, Drill Evaluation
- IP ######, Performance Indicator Verification
- IP ######, Problem Identification and Resolution
- IP ######, Event Follow-up
- PLANT STATUS

- Review of Accessing to Licence Holder Databases and Documentation.
- Development of Regulatory Actions

End of the day caucus: Observers are to discuss activities observed, meetings attended, and areas inspected and discuss similarities and differences in plant operations, inspection techniques, communications, site programs (particularly the corrective action program) and identify commendable practices. The similarities and differences are to be listed here and commendable practices are to be agreed upon. These items accumulate and are to be developed daily and eventually rolled into the conclusions section of the report.

- [Optional] The observation team should consider holding an exit meeting with site staff and report experiences gained from the visit and any insights or observations developed from the tour of the facility.
4. CONCLUSIONS

The visiting observers proceeded to set out their conclusions, which were divided into general conclusion and potential good practices.

General Conclusions

The team considered the inspection observation as a good opportunity to share experiences with other regulators. There were many similarities and a few differences identified in inspection practices between the [place the names of the participating member states here].

List any obstacles (such as communications, plant/unit entry requirements (need for medical certificate, dosimetry records, training requirements) that were encountered during the trip.

[Optional] Note the level of licensee cooperation and major differences in RB and license holder communications (i.e., how inspection findings are transmitted). Also note major program differences (i.e., the use of radiological protection signals, green, yellow, orange, and red, was identified)
Similarities/Differences and Potential Good Practices (complete the table below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>Similarities</th>
<th>Commendable Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspectio<strong>n</strong> Techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Programs (Inspection Scoping and Procedures, Performance Indicators, Findings, Violations and Enforcement)</td>
<td>Differences</td>
<td>Similarities</td>
<td>Commendable Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication: (with License Holder/within RB/with public)</td>
<td>Differences</td>
<td>Similarities</td>
<td>Commendable Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Structure (License Holder and RB)</td>
<td>Differences</td>
<td>Similarities</td>
<td>Commendable Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations** - Brief description of any relevant observations.
# NPP Inspection Observation Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Visited:</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>Host</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objectives:

Were the Objectives met? (Yes/No): If "no", why?

### Vendor:

Dates:

### Observations/Comments/Noted Difference Between RBs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Tour:</th>
<th>General Tour (cont.):</th>
<th>Observations/Comments/Noted Difference Between RBs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Tour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Inside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation</th>
<th>Engineered Safety Features Rooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Support Center</td>
<td>Pumps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Operating Facility</td>
<td>Safety-related R Batteries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Controlled Area</td>
<td>Emergency Diesel Generators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Area</td>
<td>Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake Structure</td>
<td>Reactor Protection System/Relay/Breakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Pumps</td>
<td>Spent Fuel Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Blackout Equipment</td>
<td>Laboratory (Post Accident Sampling System/Hot Chem Lab)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety-related R Heat Sink</td>
<td>Containment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings Attended:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbine Building</td>
<td>Shift Turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Room</td>
<td>Plan of the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Feedwater/Auxiliary Water Pumps</td>
<td>Inspection Entrance/Exits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## NPP Inspection Observation Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>√</th>
<th>Observations/Comments/ Noted Difference Between RBs</th>
<th>√</th>
<th>Observations/Comments/ Noted Difference Between RBs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condensers</td>
<td>Corrective Action Review Board</td>
<td>Turbine</td>
<td>Plant Onsite Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Steam Isolation Valves</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steam Dumps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Interactions:</td>
<td>Inspections Observed:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site VP</td>
<td>IP 71111, Reactor Safety-Initiating Events, Mitigating Systems, Barrier Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ops Mgr</td>
<td>IP 71111.01, Adverse Weather Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maint Mgr</td>
<td>IP 71111.04, Equipment Alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Mgr</td>
<td>IP 71111.05AQ, Fire Protection Annual/Quarterly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP Mgr</td>
<td>IP 71111.05 T, Fire Protection (Triennial)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA Mgr</td>
<td>IP 71111.06, Flood Protection Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Mgr</td>
<td>IP 71111.07, Heat Sink Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP Mgr</td>
<td>IP 71111.08, Inservice Inspection Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outage Mgr</td>
<td>IP 71111.11, Licensed Operator Requalification Program and Licensed Operator Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## NPP Inspection Observation Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>√</th>
<th>Observations/Comments/Noted Difference Between RBs</th>
<th>√</th>
<th>Observations/Comments/Noted Difference Between RBs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security Mgr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP 71111.12, Maintenance Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP 71111.13, Maintenance Risk Assessments and Emergent Work Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB Senior Inspector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP 71111.15, Operability Determinations and Functionality Assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP 71111.17, Evaluations of Changes, Tests, or Experiments and Permanent Plant Modifications&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB Inspector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP 71111.18, Plant Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP 71111.19, Post Maintenance Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB Inspector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP 71111.20, Refuelling and Other Outage Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB Support Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP 71111.21, Component Design Basis Inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB Support Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP 71111.22, Surveillance Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP 71114.06, Drill Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP 71151, Performance Indicator Verification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTACHMENT 2

### NPP Inspection Observation Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>√</th>
<th>Observations/Comments/ Noted Difference Between RBs</th>
<th>√</th>
<th>Observations/Comments/ Noted Difference Between RBs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RB Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IP 71152, Problem Identification and Resolution</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RB Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IP 71153, Event Follow-up</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RB Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MC 2515, Appendix D, PLAN STATUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Did the Process Work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>