

April 13, 2011

MEMORANDUM TO: Frederick D. Brown, Director  
Division of Inspection and Regional Support  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Rani L. Franovich, Chief */RA/*  
Program Assessment Branch  
Division of Inspection and Regional Support  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: REACTOR OVERSIGHT PROCESS ANNUAL PERFORMANCE  
METRIC REPORT FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2010

The Reactor Oversight Process (ROP) self-assessment program evaluates the effectiveness of the ROP through its success in meeting preestablished goals and intended outcomes. The staff evaluates performance metrics to determine the success of the ROP in meeting these goals and outcomes. The staff performed the calendar year (CY) 2010 performance metric analysis in accordance with Inspection Manual Chapter (IMC) 0307, "Reactor Oversight Process Self-Assessment Program."

IMC 0307 describes performance metrics associated with each of the four ROP program areas: the performance indicator (PI) program, inspection program (IP), significance determination process (SDP), and assessment (AS) program. The staff designates the program-specific metrics as the PI, IP, SDP, and AS metrics, respectively. The staff also monitors and analyzes metrics of a more general nature, which are designated as the O metrics, to assess the overall performance of the ROP. The staff uses the metric analyses as input to the annual Commission paper on ROP self-assessment.

The staff's CY 2010 metric analyses is enclosed. The staff found that the ROP met 43 out of 45 performance metrics by meeting the criteria defined in Appendix A to IMC 0307, "Reactor Oversight Process Self-Assessment Program. This includes 8 out of 8 metrics in the PI program area, 7 out of 7 metrics in the IP area, 6 out of 6 metrics in the SDP area, 6 out of 8 metrics in the AS program area, and 16 out of 16 overall ROP program metrics. There are 168 respondents for the internal survey, an increase from the previous internal survey in CY 2008.

CONTACT: Jocelyn Lian, NRR/DIRS  
301-415-4666

The agency failed to meet the AS-1 metric because of an increase in the number of Action Matrix deviations issued in CY 2010. Although the spike does not constitute a trend, staff considers this metric not met consistent with metric determinations in prior years. The staff is proposing changes to the ROP to address the underlying causes of the deviations. Metric AS-4 was not met because of an increase in the average number of days between issuance of the assessment letters and the completion of the supplemental inspection. The increase is mainly caused by the licensee not being ready for the supplemental inspection. A feedback form will be initiated to recommend that ROP guidance be clarified to reinforce the fundamental program objective of timeliness in NRC response albeit licensee readiness should be considered in scheduling a supplemental inspection.

The staff added, deleted, and revised some questions in the CY 2010 survey to better assess the applicable metrics. The staff will directly address the survey respondents' comments in its consolidated response to internal ROP survey comments.

Enclosure:

As stated

The agency failed to meet the AS-1 metric because of an increase in the number of Action Matrix deviations issued in CY 2010. Although the spike does not constitute a trend, staff considers this metric not met consistent with metric determinations in prior years. The staff is proposing changes to the ROP to address the underlying causes of the deviations. Metric AS-4 was not met because of an increase in the average number of days between issuance of the assessment letters and the completion of the supplemental inspection. The increase is mainly caused by the licensee not being ready for the supplemental inspection. A feedback form will be initiated to recommend that ROP guidance be clarified to reinforce the fundamental program objective of timeliness in NRC response albeit licensee readiness should be considered in scheduling a supplemental inspection.

The staff added, deleted, and revised some questions in the CY 2010 survey to better assess the applicable metrics. The staff will directly address the survey respondents' comments in its consolidated response to internal ROP survey comments.

Enclosure:  
As stated

DISTRIBUTION:

RidsNrrDirspab	RidsNrrOd	Nrr_Distribution lpab
Nrr_Distribution Irib	RidsOgcMailCenter	RidsNrrAdro
RidsAcrsAcnwMailCenter	RidsOPAMail	RidsRgnIMailCenter
RidsRgnIIMailCenter	RidsRgnIIIMailCenter	RidsRgnIVMailCenter
JMchale	FBrown	PWilson
BWestreich	RFranovich	TKobetz
MAshley	JClifford	DRoberts
CMiller	JMunday	SReynolds
KKennedy	HChristensen	SWest
GShear	KO'Brien	WJones
AVegel	RCroteau	UShoop
TPruett	RPowell	RCostello
JLara	MHay	
TBarry		

ADAMS Accession Number: ML110740073

Concurrence by email\*

OFFICE	NRR/DIRS	NRR/DIRS	BC:NRR/DIRS	BC:NRR/DIRS	BC:NRR/DIRS *	BC:NRR/DIRS*
NAME	JLian	RFrahm	TKobetz	RFranovich	UShoop	JMcHale
DATE	04/13/11	04/07/11	04/05/11	04/07/11	04/04/11	03/31/11

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY