



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

11/29/2011
74 FR 73738

4

RECEIVED

NOV 29 11 08 41

MAIL ROOM

SONSI Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-REDS = ADM-03
Add =
J. Lian (K5L1)

2011 Reactor Oversight Process External Survey

Thank you for participating in the survey. Your feedback is important to us and will be used in the ROP self-assessment program to evaluate the effectiveness of the ROP. There are 20 items in the survey and places for written comments. We seek constructive feedback to improve the program, and your comments with **specific examples** are welcomed. If you are filling out a hard copy, please use additional sheets for comments if needed.

Because your comments will not be edited to remove any identifying or contact information, the NRC cautions you against including any information in your submission that you do not want to be publicly disclosed.

If you cannot fill/save the pdf file, please fill out the Word version of the survey (<http://www.nrc.gov/NRR/OVERSIGHT/ASSESS/2011ROPsurvey.doc>) or print out a hard copy.

The survey ends on January 13, 2012.

Instruction: For each of the statements, please indicate if it's **reasonably** true. If you don't have enough knowledge/experience, please select U/A (unable to answer).

1. The performance indicator (PI) program provides useful insights, particularly when combined with the inspection program, to help ensure plant safety and/or security.

- Yes Can you
- No recommend any
- U/A improvements?

2. Appropriate overlap exists between the PI and the inspection programs to provide for a comprehensive indication of licensee performance.

- Yes Can you
- No recommend any
- U/A improvements?

3. NEI 99-02, "Regulatory Assessment Performance Indicator Guideline," provides clear guidance regarding performance indicators.

- Yes Can you
- No recommend any
- U/A improvements?

MSPI is complex and FAQ process is marginally effective but I can't come up with ways to improve it.

4. PI program effectively contributes to the identification of performance outliers based on risk-informed, objective, and predictable indicators.

- Yes Can you
- No recommend any
- U/A improvements?

5. Information contained in inspection reports is relevant, useful, and written in plain English.

- Yes
 - No
 - U/A
- Can you recommend any improvements?

6. The inspection program adequately covers areas that are important to plant safety and/or security and is effective in identifying and ensuring the prompt correction of performance deficiencies.

- Yes
 - No
 - U/A
- Can you recommend any improvements?

7. The Significance Determination Process (SDP) results in an appropriate regulatory response to performance issues.

- Yes
 - No
 - U/A
- Can you recommend any improvements?

8. The NRC takes appropriate actions to address performance issues for those plants outside the Licensee Response Column of the Action Matrix.

- Yes
 - No
 - U/A
- Can you recommend any improvements?

9. Information contained in assessment reports is relevant, useful, and written in plain English.

- Yes
 - No
 - U/A
- Can you recommend any improvements?

10. The ROP safety culture enhancements help in identifying licensee safety culture weaknesses and focusing licensee and the NRC attention appropriately.

- Yes
 - No
 - U/A
- Can you recommend any improvements?

11. ROP oversight activities are predictable (i.e., controlled by the process) and reasonably objective (i.e., based on supported facts, rather than relying on subjective judgment).

- Yes
 - No
 - U/A
- Can you recommend any improvements?

12. The ROP is risk-informed, in that actions and outcomes are appropriately graduated on the basis of increased significance.

- Yes Can you
- No recommend any
- U/A improvements?

13. The ROP is understandable and the processes, procedures, and products are clear and written in plain English.

- Yes Can you
- No recommend any
- U/A improvements?

See comment for item #3

14. The ROP provides adequate assurance, when combined with other NRC regulatory processes, that plants are operated and maintained safely and securely.

- Yes Can you
- No recommend any
- U/A improvements?

15. NRC actions related to the ROP are high quality, efficient, realistic, and timely.

- Yes Can you
- No recommend any
- U/A improvements?

16. The ROP ensures openness in the regulatory process.

- Yes Can you
- No recommend any
- U/A improvements?

17. There are sufficient opportunities for the public to participate in the process.

- Yes Can you
- No recommend any
- U/A improvements?

18. NRC is responsive to public's comments and inputs on the ROP.

- Yes Can you
- No recommend any
- U/A improvements?

19. The ROP has been implemented as defined by program documents.

- Yes
 - No
 - U/A
- Can you recommend any improvements?

20. The ROP does NOT result in unintended consequences.

- Yes
 - No
 - U/A
- Can you recommend any improvements?

Which of the following groups best describe your affiliation/interest?

- State/Local Government
- Public (interested member of the public or public interest groups)
- Industry (licensee and its employees, INPO, NEI, etc)
- Other:

Please press the Submit Survey button, or mail a hard copy (with docket ID NRC-2011-0270) to:

Cindy Bladey
Chief, Rules, Announcements, and Directives Branch
Office of Administration (Mail Stop: TWB-05-B01M)
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555_0001

If you submit this survey by email, you will receive an acknowledge email. If you do not receive such email in two business days, please contact us at ROPSurvey@nrc.gov. Please save a copy of the filled survey for your record.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This survey contains information collections that are subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.). These information collections were approved by the Office of Management and Budget, approval number 3150-0197, which expires August 31, 2012.

The burden to the public for these voluntary information collections is estimated to be 45 minutes per response. The information gathered will be used in the NRC's self-assessment of the reactor oversight process. Send comments regarding this burden estimate to the Information Services Branch (T-5 F53), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, or by Internet electronic mail to INFCOLLECTS.RESOL.RC@NRC.GOV; and to the Desk Officer, Chad Whiteman, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, NEOB-10202, (3150-0197), Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Public Protection Notification

The NRC may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a request for information or an information collection requirement unless the requesting document displays a currently valid OMB control number.

Submit Survey