







## Use of HRA Insights to Improve Decision-Making

IAEA Conference on Human Factors & Safety Culture , Vienna



Jeff Julius, Scientech



## **Co-Authors**

**Parviz Moieni,** Scientech, Curtiss-Wright San Diego, California, USA

**Kaydee Kohlhepp** Scientech, Curtiss-Wright Seattle, Washington, USA







Jan Grobbelaar Scientech, Curtiss-Wright Seattle, Washington, USA



## **Presentation Outline**

#### **Overview of HRA & PRA**

 Human Reliability Analysis & Probabilistic Safety (Risk) Assessment Support of Decision-Making

#### **EPRI HRA Users Group**

- Mission & Members
- Halden Benchmarking

#### Examples of Using Risk Insights in Decision-Making

Applications around the world

#### HRA Professional Society



## **PRA as a Tool Supporting Safety Culture**

#### PRA is an analytical tool that systematically answers.....



- 1. What can go wrong?
- 2. How likely is it?
- **3.** What are the consequences?

PRA can **directly** support Safety Culture by identification and prioritization of issues based on risk-significance.

PRA can **indirectly** support Safety Culture by promoting organizational awareness of Risk and consider questions asked by PRA.



## **Overview of Human Reliability Analysis in U.S. PRA**



## **Overview – Using HRA & PRA to Improve Decision-Making**

### **Decision-Making**:

- 1. Operation of a NPP
  - Online maintenance
  - Training and procedure
- 2. Maintenance infrequent tests also regular, scheduled T&M
- 3. Licensing of a NPP
  - Initial plant design
  - Periodic Safety Reviews
  - Life extension
- 4. Fire Protection Upgrade

## Examples of HRA/PRA Insight:

## 1. Operations

- Configuration Risk Management
- Improve operator response
- 2. Maintenance reduced (e.g. ISI) or more on-line maintenance
- 3. Licensing plant mod evaluation
  - Prioritize design changes
  - HRA has cross-cutting impact
  - Post-Fukushima Response
- 4. Fire Recovery Actions incl. Level 2

Improves Safety Culture by promoting Organization Awareness of Risk!



## **PRA and HRA Provides a Structured Approach & Models**



7 | February 23, 2016 | © 2014 Curtiss-Wright

## **EPRI HRA Users Group – Missions & Members**

## <u>Missions</u>:

- 1. Develop a software tool to enabling different analysts to obtain **comparable results** for same action & method at similar plants.
- 2. To develop guidelines & training for application of HRA methods.
- 3. Key goal is to enable industry to **converge on common methods**.
- **4. Coordinate with industry groups** such as USNRC, Owners Groups, & within EPRI to develop guidelines and training materials.

## Members:

- All USA Utilities; recently added US NRC
- Vendors Areva, Bechtel-Bettis, KEPCO E&C, PBMR, Rolls Royce, & Westinghouse
- International: CANDU Owners Group, Europe, Africa and Asia

## **EPRI HRA Users Group – Approach and Methods**

#### Framework:

- SHARP & SHARP1 (EPRI NP-3583, 1984 & EPRI NP 7183-M, 1990)
  - Qualitative analysis considering Context
  - Cues, procedures, training, timing
  - Quantitative analysis using various methods

#### Latent/Pre-Initiator HRAs:

- THERP Model (NUREG/CR-1278, 1983)
- **ASEP Model** (NUREG/CR-4772, 1987)

#### Dynamic/Post-Initiator HRAs:

- CBDTM (cognitive) / THERP (execution) combination
  - Combination consists of "cognitive" & "execution" errors
  - CBDTM (EPRI TR 100259, 1992)
- HCR/ORE (cognition) /THERP (execution) combination
  - HCR/ORE replaces THERP Time-Reliability Correlation (EPRI TR 100259, 1992)
- Alternative Approaches
  - Annunciator Response Model (NUREG/CR-1278, 1983)
  - SPAR-H for cognition & execution

EPRI HRA Calculator 3.04 - []	DEMO.HRA] - [Su	nmary]				
🖹 File Edit Tools View Window	Help					
Open Save Pre	All/Def. Delete	E Сору	Reports Ne	ew Edit	Proc.	Criteria Screening Screening Depend.
Summary 🕉 FEEDBLEED1						
Basic Event	🛆 Туре	P(cog)	P(exe)	Total HEP	EF	Description
FEEDBLEED1 — Annunciator Response/THERP	Post					Operators Initiate RCS inject and RCS bleed before CD
CBDTM/THERP	Х	1.3e-02	5.5e-03	1.9e-02	5	
HCR/ORE/THERP		1.3e-03	3.3e-02	3.4e-02	5	
Screening HEP		-	-	1.0e+00	1	
SPAR-H		5.0e-03	2.0e-02	1.6e-01	-	
E FEED2	Post					Operators Initiate RCS inject before CD
Annunciator Response/THERP						
CBDTM/THERP	x	6.9e-03	2.6e-03	9.5e-03	5	
-HCR/ORE/THERP		1.3e-03	3.3e-02	3.4e-02	5	
- Screening HEP		-	-	1.0e+00	1	
SPAR-H		2.0e-04	4.0e-04	6.0e-04	-	
E RHR-R1	Post					Operator Recovers RHR Before Core damage
— Annunciator Response/THERP						
CBDTM/THERP	X	3.0e-03	1.0e-03	4.0e-03	5	
HCR/ORE/THERP		6.8e-03	6.5e-03	1.3e-02	5	
Screening HEP		-	-	1.0e+00	1	
SPAR-H		2.0e-04	1.0e-03	1.2e-03	-	
RHR-R2	Post					Operator Recovers RHR Before Core damage
<ul> <li>Annunciator Response/THERP</li> </ul>						
CBDTM/THERP	X	3.0e-03	1.0e-03	4.0e-03	5	
HCR/ORE/THERP		6.8e-03	6.5e-03	1.3e-02	5	
Screening HEP		-	-	1.0e+00	1	
SPAR-H		2.0e-04	1.0e-03	1.2e-03	-	



### **EPRI HRA Users Group - Halden Benchmarking** Compare HRA predictions with Simulator Observations

- CBDT/THERP: EPRI (Scientech)
- THERP: NRC staff + Consultants
- THERP w Bayesian Enhancement : VTT
- ATHEANA: NRC staff+Consultants
- SPAR-H: NRC staff+Consultants, INL
- Decision Trees + ASEP: NRI
- MERMOS: EDF
- PANAME: IRSN

- HEART: Vattenfall & Ringhals
- KHRA: KAERI
- CREAM: NRI
- CESA: PSI
   Simulations –
- Microsaint: Alion
- IDAC: University of Maryland
- QUEST-HP: Riso

## **Bottom Line – Qualitative Analysis is Important!**





## **Examples of Using Risk Insights in Decision-Making**

- Increasing number of PRA & HRA applications in the USA
- Increasing number of international users in the EPRI HRA Users Group
  - Europe recent training class conducted in Spain
  - Middle East UAE is using the HRA Calculator to help start-up 4 plants
  - Asia Korea & Japan recently joined (or joining this year)
  - Africa long-time interest
- HRA analysts in other countries may have different applications/uses and thus different needs from the EPRI Users Group.
- This presentation addresses:
  - 1) Five examples of HRA insights from different countries
  - 2) An overview of the HRA Society, a professional organization



### **World List of Nuclear Power Plants**



## **HRA Use in PRA Models & Applications**

## In the United States (Example-1):

- Fire Protection Program change to NFPA 805, risk-informed performance-based:
  - Recovery Actions to mitigate variances from design requirements
  - Recovery Actions to reduce radioactive release such as Containment Isolation & H2 Igniters

#### Configuration Risk Management:

- Develop contingencies for events occurring in certain plant line-ups
- Examples, protected train & high risk evolutions
- Feedback to Operator Training:
  - Identification of PRA-important Scenarios & Procedures
- Address Licensing Issues:
  - Impact of plant design modification such as Timing/Instrumentation
  - Post-Fukushima insights such as actions in advance of External Flooding
    - Timeline & cues from other organizations
- Evaluation or prioritization of proposed plant changes

USA focus has been on Operating Plants where International HRA applications focuses more on Licensing and New Build

## **Example-2 PRA & HRA Application in The Netherlands**

- Part of the 10-Year Periodic Safety Review.
- Level 1 Insights to Reducing Risk:
  - In 2015, plant conducted its 3<sup>rd</sup> Periodic Safety Review
  - Hardware modifications have eliminated significant operator actions
  - HRA provided insights into staggering calibration
  - Still finding / addressing new challenging, potential initiating events
- Level 2 Insights to Reducing Risk:
  - Impact on Public Health & Safety is important
  - Plant, like all NL industries, has individual risk and societal risk goals
- All Modes, All Hazards PSA:
  - Peer Review.2013



## Example-3 PRA & HRA Application in the United Kingdom

### Some plants in the General Design Assessment (GDA) phase of licensing.

- PRA (Level 1, 2 & 3 PRAs) is assessed against Regulator requirements as well as the ASME/ANS PRA Standard:
  - Some supporting requirements (SRs) cannot be met by a plant in the design phase.
    - Example, operator interviews.
    - SRs that cannot be met are not assessed.
  - Intent of some SRs can be met.
    - Example by considering generic information or information from similar plant/s.
- Some inputs often need to be assumed to perform HRA:
  - Appropriate operator-information interface will be developed.
  - Procedures will be developed.
  - Operators will be trained to perform their procedures.
  - Such inputs will need to be validated in later phases of design (or transition to operation).
- Inputs available at this stage:
  - Timing & Success criteria



## **Example-3 PRA & HRA Application in the UK** (cont'd)

- Uncertainties in applicability of current HRA methods to digital I&C as well as the digital plant interface.
  - THERP was used based on analog instrumentation & data from 1980's or before
  - New failure modes e.g. "tunnel vision"?
  - CCF of digital interface a concern warranting analog backup I&C for systems important to safe shutdown
  - All HEPs can be considered screening HEPs as many inputs are assumed, so OK for GDA process

#### • Apparently less reliance on operator actions than earlier generation:

- PRA does not credit operator actions within first 30 minutes per the design basis, but may have to in future iterations if PRA needs them (e.g. ATWS)
- At-Power: About a dozen post-initiator Level 1 operator actions, similar for Level 2
- LPSD: About 10 Level 1 operator actions, no additional operator actions for Level 2
- SFP: Several operator actions for Level 1, with 1 late action for Level 2



## **Example-4 PRA & HRA Application in the United Arab Emirates**

- First 4 plants developing all modes, all hazards PRA as part of the FSAR to support obtaining an operating license.
- Similar experience to the UK (see Example-1):
  - PRA (Level 1, 2 & 3 PRAs) is assessed against Regulator requirements as well as the ASME/ANS PRA Standard.
  - Some inputs often need to be assumed to perform HRA:
  - Inputs available at this stage are limited to Timing & Success Criteria, and some procedures.
  - Uncertainties in applicability of current HRA methods to digital I&C as well as the digital plant interface.
- Generally less reliance on operator actions than the earlier generation:
  - Example, MCR Abandonment is low as the plant essentially has a 2<sup>nd</sup> MCR.
  - Exception: reduced safety goal levels have increased the importance of beyond design basis events, which has led to the need for more operator actions.

## **Example-5 PRA & HRA Application in Japan**

- Many plants in re-start, or working on re-start.
- Level 1 internal events:
  - In 2015 EPRI provided Risk Professionals training, including HRA.
  - Working on incorporating insights from new methods (IDHEAS).
- Fire PRA:
  - After re-start, some plants working on Fire PRA.
  - Generally follow the NUREG/CR-6850 FPRA approach, including NUREG-1921 guidance.
- Seismic PRA:
  - All have re-evaluated their peak ground acceleration.
  - Looking at HRA improvements to better support larger earthquakes.



## Summary of PRA & HRA Insights Internationally

## <u>Technically</u>

- HRA needs to support an increased PRA Scope, such as
  - Level 1 Spatial Hazards (internal and external)
    - Examples: Fire, Flood with plant & site impact
    - Examples: Seismic, External Flood, High Winds with regional impact
  - Level 2 & Level 3
  - Shutdown PRA including Spent Fuel Pool PRA
- HRA for Digital Control systems is an issue

## Organizationally

- Support for new PRA/HRA practitioners
  - Training
  - Guidelines
  - HRA Tools implementing new/updated methods
- EPRI HRA UG supports each of these











# **HRA Society**

January 2016







Jan Grobbelaar Scientech



## Human Reliability Analysis Society

- A new professional society to promote the sharing of research, methods and data.
- A short history:
  - Initial meeting in Seattle at PSAM conference (2010)
  - Follow-up meeting in Honolulu at PSAM'12
  - HRA Master Class in Paris, 2015
    - Largest meeting, ~50 participants from 8 countries
    - Surveyed recent activities
- Members include regulator, research labs, consultants & utility staff.



## **Vision for the HRA Society**

- Support Various Aspects of Human Reliability
  - Human Reliability Analysis as part of PRA for Decision-Making
  - Human Factors
  - Human Error reduction programs

## Improve Technical Bases

- HRA methods, data & guidance
- HRA for Digital Control systems
- HRA for increased PRA Scope such as External Hazards & Level 2/3

## Support Expansion & Growth

- Support for emerging countries Regulators & Utilities
- Open to new members



## **HRA Society – Upcoming Events**

#### • PSAM'13, Seoul, October 2-7

- HRA master class/meeting/workshop
- Plenary session
- Evening social event

#### PSAM Topical Meeting – Germany 2017

- In the planning phase to decide the number of tracks
- HRA methods, data & guidance
- Support Expansion & Growth
  - Looking to expand with "regional" chapters such as USA & EU
  - Looking to support expansion of the nuclear industry

## **Summary**

- PRA & HRA have provided insights to improve decision-making for over 30 years.
- EPRI HRA Calculator<sup>®</sup> approach meets all the current U.S. industry needs for PRAs used in regulatory requirements.
- EPRI HRA UG has 15 years of successful HRA improvements and the approach meets all the current U.S. industry needs for PRAs used in regulatory requirements.
- Approach/methods satisfies the ASME PRA Standard & the NRC Good Practices in Implementing HRA.
- Annual Users Group Meeting January, Juno Beach, Florida
  - Sharing technical improvements & best-practices
- Developing new methods and monitoring research work by others to determine if other improvements can add value to its mission using these criteria:
  - Traceable, Defensible, Consistent
  - Extend HRA beyond Level 1, internal events PRA



## Summary (cont'd)

- PRA & HRA provides a structured, systematic approach.
  - Address challenging issues and situations
  - Evaluate with a model
  - Address considerations such as Uncertainty
- A strong Safety Culture considers risk insights and makes risk information available to decision-makers:
  - Plant Design and Engineering
  - Plant Operations, Maintenance, and Training
- PRA process and results (risk-significance) can support Safety Culture.
  - Directly by identification and prioritization of issues based on risk-significance.
  - Indirectly by promoting organizational awareness of risk, to consider the questions asked by PRA - "what is the most likely thing to go wrong" & "what is the most consequential"

## **EPRI HRA Users Group – Points of Contact**

## **Points of Contact:**

- Websites
  - Public website: <a href="http://hra.epri.com/">http://hra.epri.com/</a>
  - HRA UG Support site: <a href="http://www.epri.com/hra">http://www.epri.com/hra</a>
    - Used for bug reporting, suggestions, downloads
- HRA Users Group Executive Committee
  - Chair: Mark Averett <u>Mark.Averett@fpl.com</u> 561 694.3857
  - EPRI HRA UG PM: Mary Presley mpresley@epri.com 704 595.2821
  - Scientech PM: Jan Grobbelaar jgrobbelaar@curtisswright.com
     800 862.6702
  - Support: Kaydee Kohlhepp <u>kkohlhepp@curtisswright.com</u> 800 862.6702

## Jeff Julius jjulius@curtisswright.com +1 206-248-1818 ext. 230





Jeff Julius jjulius@curtisswright.com 1-800-862-6702 ext.230



27 | February 23, 2016 | © Curtiss-Wright