



Standards Board (SB)

January 14, 2021

Members Present (17/17 voting members = 100%):

Donald Eggett (Chair), Eggett Consulting LLC
Carl Mazzola (Vice Chair), Project Enhancement Corporation
Patricia Schroeder (Secretary), American Nuclear Society
Kathryn Murdoch (Secretary pro tem), American Nuclear Society
Amir Afzali, Southern Company
Robert Bari, Brookhaven National Laboratory
Robert Budnitz, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (retired)
George Flanagan, Individual
Michelle French, WECTEC
Dennis Henneke (Observer), GE Hitachi
Calvin Hopper (Observer), Individual
N. Prasad Kadambi (Observer), Kadambi Engineering Consultants
Mark Linn, Oak Ridge National Laboratory
Jean-Francois (Jef), Lucchini, Los Alamos National Laboratory
Charles (Chip) Martin, Longenecker and Associates
John Nakoski, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Frances Pimentel (Liaison), Nuclear Energy Institute
Robert Roche-Rivera (Observer), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Andrew Smetana, Savannah River National Laboratory
Andrew Sowder, Electric Power Research Institute
Donald Spellman, Xcel Engineering
Steven Stamm, Individual
William Turkowski, Westinghouse Electric Company, LLC
Ed Wallace (Observer), GNBC Associates
Larry Wetzel, BWX Technologies, Inc.

Others Present (2)

Louise Lund, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NRC Standards Executive
Steven Nesbit, LMNT Consulting, ANS Vice President/President Elect

1. Welcome and Roll Call

SB Chair Donald Eggett called the meeting to order. Roll call was taken and a quorum was achieved. The meeting was scheduled to complete the agenda items that were not able to be discussed during the meeting held November 17, 2020, due to limited remaining time available. Eggett expressed his appreciation to all for participating in the meeting today.

2. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved as presented. Donald Eggett recognized ANS Vice President/President-Elect Steven Nesbit's attendance at today's meeting. He added that he had a recent conversation with ANS Executive Director and Chief Executive Officer, Craig Piercy, regarding the challenges facing the industry in nuclear generation and nuclear energy, in general. Lastly, Eggett noted that Carl Mazzola will provide a summary of the Strategic Vision (Plan) just issued by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Nuclear Energy (NE) under other business as time permits.



3. Approaches to Obtain Industry Standards Needs

A. Centralized Industry Steering Committee ([Attachment 1: Proposal](#))

Donald Eggett explained that we as an industry need a way to collectively pull industry representatives together to help evaluate 1) what standards are needed, 2) how to move forward, and 3) how to approach this challenge. He believes that we should seek funding to support this industry group that he calls the “Centralized Industry Steering Committee” for purposes of this discussion which would focus primarily on advanced reactor standards needs along with other high-priority needs. Eggett feels that such a group is needed to help direct the industry path forward and believes this effort warrants funding from an external organization. The DOE would be the likely organization to approach for such funding. Eggett added that this concept was initiated by John Nakoski during a SB leadership meeting with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Standards Executive Louise Lund and other NRC personnel. Eggett has already socialized the idea with the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Board on Nuclear Codes and Standards (BNCS) leadership as well as representatives from the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI). All of these organizations are supportive of the concept.

John Nakoski stated that the idea of an industry group to help evaluate standards needs has been attempted previously. He believes it had not been successful because the concept was focused as a volunteer-led effort. Several members recalled efforts similar to this to prioritize and harmonize standards work by the Nuclear Energy Standards Coordination Collaborative, prior to its dissolution several years ago. Nakoski stated that we need a team to set priorities, administrate the process, seek funding, and monitor (i.e., project management) its implementation. Nakoski doesn't feel that the NRC is the right organization to lead this group but stated that they would certainly be supportive. The industry needs to “own” the process. Moving forward, the first step would be to determine where and how to get funding.

Steven Stamm expressed concern with the scope for a proposed Centralized Industry Steering Committee. He would want to see a scope matrix prepared and approved by each standards development organization (SDO) to clarify, in advance, the appropriate assignment for any proposed standard. He added that he has long thought that having an expeditor to help get a standard moving is the best practice to support working groups. Such an expeditor was proposed by Eggett earlier and would perform specific activities as determined by members of this central industry group. Robert Budnitz added that he is 100% in favor of this concept but feels that the group should be called an advisory committee, as opposed to a steering committee. Budnitz also stated that 20 years ago when the probabilistic risk assessment (PRA) initiative started, it was felt that an advisory committee was needed which led to the formation of the Nuclear Risk Management Coordinating Committee (NRMCC). The NRMCC was active for about 10 years and played a crucial role during its time. With that experience in mind, Budnitz believes an advisory committee on advanced reactors will make a difference. He offered that the charter from the NRMCC may be a useful start for developing a charter for a proposed advisory committee on advanced reactors. Eggett agreed that the name of the committee should be representative of its actual role.

Andrew Sowder, Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), also supports the idea of a proposed industry advisory committee for advanced reactors. He could see EPRI utilizing this “advisory committee” for its own parallel needs. However, representatives selected for the committee would need to have the bandwidth to support. Sowder would be willing to take the request to his management to appoint someone as their representative on the group and feel the concept would likely be supported either with staff time and/or funding. Prasad Kadambi mentioned that the ASME BNCS is working on forming a committee for the purpose of the harmonization of industry standards.



George Flanagan expressed concern with the proposed group because of feedback received from past workshops, that advanced reactor standards are not currently needed, and vendors/designers are not supporting such an initiative. Their concern is that such standards could impede their licensing progress. One comment on the subject matter from the industry was that there aren't any current standards that pertain to advanced reactors, certainly not very many in comparison to light water reactors (LWRs). A commitment from advanced reactor vendors would be needed for this group to be successful.

Robert Bari also agreed with the concept for this industry group to provide direction on advanced reactors although he feels the proposal needs some more development. The NRMCC solved a problem of harmonization with ANS's and ASME's PRA standards and included other SDOs. He suggested that the rest of the fuel cycle should be brought in at some point. It is good to start with reactors, and then if successful, to incorporate others fuel cycle elements.

Louise Lund stated that the NRC looks at DOE's funding awards for non LWRs to provide more clarity and to help to focus their efforts. This information could also help to focus the efforts of this proposed industry group.

Stamm explained that the revision to the current ANS Standards Committee Strategic Plan (SCSP) that is in development also proposes an advisory group and acknowledged a bit of overlap that would need to be reconciled. This proposed advisory group is proposed in the revision of the SCSP. Its role would be to help collect concepts for ANS standards projects and to staff various committees within ANS. The proposed "central industry group" reaches out to other SDOs and industry organizations as a whole. More details will follow in the next discussion.

The following motion was made and second:

MOTION:

To proceed with evaluating the possible establishment of an industry coordination or advisory committee to prioritize and harmonize development of codes and standards to support advanced reactor and fuel cycle activities.

The motion was approved unanimously.

ACTION ITEM 1/2021-01: Pat Schroeder to issue the Centralized Industry Steering Committee proposal to SB members for comment.
DUE DATE: January 20, 2021

- B. Standards Board Technical Advisory Group ([Attachment 2: Pros/Cons](#))
Stamm explained in a proposal that a Standards Board Technical Advisory Committee is needed. He does not feel it will require a significant effort to support. The group would need to have one kick-off meeting to determine the scope, and then it would be off and running. Meeting attendance would not be a requirement. Group members would be asked to help staff working groups and to review Project Initiation Notification System (PINS) forms. This advisory group would consist of representatives from DOE, the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations, NEI, Chief Nuclear Officers, and vendors supporting the current fleet and advanced reactors. Ed Wallace stated that there is an NEI group called the Advanced Reactor Working Group with very high-level participants. He sees an opportunity to use the NEI group to provide this information.



American Nuclear Society

Stamm expressed concerns that NEI has not always supported our efforts, and he would want to ensure that ANS would have a lead in this effort. Wallace agrees that historically ANS and NEI have struggled to work together, but this activity might produce a different outcome. Sowder agreed and said that he felt he could promote engagement to NEI. Frances Pimentel offered to help facilitate NEI support and will provide information on their Advanced Reactor Working Group to Donald Eggett.

ACTION ITEM 1/2021-02: Frances Pimentel to provide Donald Eggett information on NEI's Advanced Reactors Working Group current activities.
DUE DATE: February 15, 2021

With support from the Standards Board members, Stamm would include the proposed Standards Board Technical Advisory Group in the revised Standards Committee Strategic Plan (SCSP). The group revising the SCSP includes Stamm (lead), Budnitz, "Chip" Martin, Mazzola, and Larry Wetzel. Stamm is currently structuring the goals to make sure all are covered in the strategic plan. The draft strategic plan will then be issued to the SCSP working group to review before submitting to Eggett for final review and eventually to the full Standards Board for approval. The revised SCSP will align with ANS's 2020 Change Plan. Like the 2015-2020 SCSP, an actionable SMART matrix will be prepared to include responsibilities, assignments, and due dates. Stamm estimates that the revised SCSP will be completed in time to be issued for ballot before the June 2021 annual meeting.

4. Fee-Based Training Proposal ([Attachment 3](#))

Steven Stamm reported on the proposal to develop a standards fee-based training program. ANS-3.5 Working Group Chair James Florence is interested in developing training on ANSI/ANS-3.5-2018, "Nuclear Power Plant Simulators for Use in Operator Training and Examination," but is currently overloaded with work. Stamm went on to explain the criteria for determining whether a standard would have enough interest and warrant consideration for the training program. Members questioned whether ANS sales reports could help determine which standards warrant training and then package a training option with the sale of the standard. The bulk of standards sales is through subscriptions sold by resellers. Pat Schroeder will check with resellers to see if they can provide detail on standards accessed through customer subscriptions.

ACTION ITEM 1/2021-03: Pat Schroeder to check with resellers to see if they can track downloads of individual standards on customer subscriptions.
DUE DATE: February 15, 2021

Members were in favor of proceeding with the standards fee-based training proposal. Schroeder confirmed that this proposal has ANS management support as a pilot.

5. RIPB Guidance Document Status (Brief Update Only)

Prasad Kadambi reported that the small group from the Risk-informed, Performance-based Principles and Policy Committee (RP3C), responsible for developing the draft Risk-Informed, Performance-Based Guidance Document (GD), are preparing responses to comments submitted on the September 2020 review of the GD. He is targeting to have responses completed in the near future.



6. SB Task Groups

A. Proposal to Revise Task Group Charters ([Attachment 4](#))

Donald Spellman explained that he reviewed the current task group charters and has proposed a few changes for consistency and to update roles. Spellman would like to see the Priority Task Group and Sales Task Group resurrected. Pat Schroeder was asked to issue Spellman's draft task group charters to SB members as a ballot for consideration and approval.

ACTION ITEM 11/2021-04: Pat Schroeder to issue Donald Spellman's proposed revisions to the task group charters and a proposal to resurrect the Priority Task Group and Sales Task Group to the SB for approval.

DUE DATE: February 15, 2021

B. External Communications Task Group (ECTG) Plan

Spellman holds the role of Technical Committee (TC) 85/Subcommittee 6 Overall Advisor on the U.S. Nuclear Technical Advisory Group. In this capacity, he is attempting to get better harmonization between international and domestic standards to help U.S. designers to compete internationally. Spellman has expanded the charter of the ECTG to include one member that is active within TC 85. Spellman has drafted an ECTG Action Plan and has provided it to Steven Stamm for inclusion in the revision of the SCSP. Spellman will circulate the draft ECTG Action Plan to members as an example.

ACTION ITEM 11/2021-05: Donald Spellman to send Standards Board members his draft ECTG Action Plan as an example.

DUE DATE: February 15, 2021

William Turkowski provided a brief update on the Internal Communications Task Group (ICTG). He explained that he has been working with the Professional Divisions Committee, but unfortunately there has been limited participation. He doesn't feel the program should be abandoned, but ways to improve the program should be considered. The ICTG developed a training package a few years back on the committee's rules, policies, procedures, and process. The training was given too frequently, and ultimately, members lost interest. Donald Eggett recognized this struggle to get attention with so many challenges and activities in the industry today. An action item was assigned at the November 2020 meeting for Eggett, Carl Mazzola, and Turkowski to discuss the issue. Stamm added that there needs to be a way to determine what one needs to get out of a liaison relationship and how to go about achieving it.

- Proposal to revise liaison policy ([Attachment 5A&B](#))

Spellman proposed a revision of the liaison policy as part of the effort to improve communication with other organizations. The revised liaison policy also clarifies liaison responsibilities. Schroeder was asked to issue the revised liaison policy to members for approval.

ACTION ITEM 11/2021-06: Pat Schroeder to issue the liaison policy (A3) as revised by Donald Spellman to members for approval.

DUE DATE: January 20, 2021

7. Review of Action Items from This Meeting

New action items assigned at the meeting were reviewed and confirmed.



8. Other Business

A. Right Makeup of SB Membership (brief discussion)

Donald Eggett stated that a preliminary discussion on the makeup of the SB was initiated at the last meeting. However, he feels that the proposals for a Centralized Industry Steering Committee ([Attachment 1](#)) and the SB Technical Advisory Group ([Attachment 2](#)) discussed during today's meeting should be given priority and be evaluated before a discussion is made on the right makeup of the SB.

B. Miscellaneous

Carl Mazzola provided a summary of the DOE NE's Strategic Vision Plan, which was just issued. He reviewed the vision, mission, and five strategic goals of the plan, with each goal tied to a future action which looks 10 years into the future. Mazzola recommended that the SCSP group look at the NE Strategic Plan to see if it affects the SB's goals and the accompanying SMART matrix. DOE's Strategic Vision Plan is available at <https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2021/01/f82/DOE-NE%20Strategic%20Vision%20-Web%20-%2001.08.2021.pdf>.

9. Future Meetings (No decision yet on virtual or face-to-face)

- 2021 ANS Annual Meeting at the Omni/Convention Center in Providence, RI, from June 13-17. ANS is moving forward with plans for a physical meeting while monitoring the progress of the COVID-19 vaccine.
- 2021 ANS Winter Meeting at the Marriott Wardman Park Hotel in Washington, D.C. from October 31–November 4

10. Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Standards Board Action Item List as of 1/14/21

NOTE: Action items were not reviewed at the 1/14/21 meeting, just carried forward.

Action Item	Description	Responsibility	Status/Comments /Reassignments
1/2021-01	Pat Schroeder to issue the Centralized Industry Steering Committee proposal to SB members for comment. DUE DATE: January 20, 2021	Schroeder	OPEN
1/2021-02	Frances Pimentel to provide Donald Eggett information on NEI's Advanced Reactors Working Group current activities. DUE DATE: February 15, 2021	Pimentel	OPEN
1/2021-03	Pat Schroeder to check with resellers to see if they can track downloads of individual standards on customer subscriptions. DUE DATE: February 15, 2021	Schroeder	OPEN
1/2021-04	Pat Schroeder to issue Donald Spellman's proposed revision to task group charters and the proposal to resurrect the Priority Task Group and Sales Task Group to the SB for approval. DUE DATE: February 15, 2021	Schroeder	OPEN
1/2021-05	Donald Spellman to send Standards Board members his draft ECTG Action Plan as an example. DUE DATE: February 15, 2021	Spellman	OPEN
1/2021-06	Pat Schroeder to issue the liaison policy (A3) as revised by Donald Spellman to members for approval. DUE DATE: January 20, 2021	Schroeder	OPEN
11/2020-01	Donald Spellman to check with IEEE for feedback on consolidating standards endorsed by the NRC. DUE DATE: February 1, 2021	Spellman	OPEN
11/2020-02	ICTG to facilitate a review of NEI 19-03 (Rev. 1) by all eight consensus committees to identify additional standards in their program of work that may support the standards needs (new or revised) of the advanced reactor initiative. DUE DATE: June 1, 2021	Turkowski	OPEN
11/2020-03	Pat Schroeder to incorporate ANSI's recommendations into the Standards Committee Rules and Procedures and Policy Manual and provide to the Policy Task Group for review before issuing to the full SB for approval. DUE DATE: February 1, 2021	Schroeder	OPEN
11/2020-04	Donald Eggett and Donald Spellman to work with Thomas Vogan on evaluating ANS and ASME standards for overlap. DUE DATE: June 1, 2021	Eggett, Spellman	OPEN
11/2020-05	Donald Spellman to develop a presentation to interact with other organizations similar to ASME's presentation provided at the 11/17/20 SB meeting. The presentation needs to be closely coordinated with the Standard Board Chair and other proposed strategic actions to ensure coordination with SB industry initiatives. DUE DATE: June 1, 2021	Spellman Eggett	OPEN
11/2020-06	Carl Mazzola to pursue Michael Salmon as a direct liaison for ASCE to the ESCC. DUE DATE: March 1, 2021	Mazzola	Completed

Standards Board Action Item List as of 1/14/21

NOTE: Action items were not reviewed at the 1/14/21 meeting, just carried forward.

Action Item	Description	Responsibility	Status/Comments /Reassignments
11/2020-07	Donald Eggett, Carl Mazzola, Steven Stamm, and William Turkowski to discuss the PD Liaison Program after this meeting. DUE DATE: March 1, 2021	Eggett, Mazzola, Stamm, Turkowski	OPEN
6/2020-01	George Flanagan to work with Pat Schroeder for a promotion to solicit volunteers for advanced reactor standards when ready. DUE DATE: June 1, 2021	Flanagan, Schroeder	OPEN
6/2020-03	Carl Mazzola to chair the 2021 Standards Service Selection Committee with support of Robert Budnitz, John Nakoski, William Turkowski, and Larry Wetzel. DUE DATE: May 1, 2021	Mazzola, Budnitz, Nakoski, Turkowski, Wetzel	OPEN
6/2020-05	Pat Schroeder to add JCNRM to the 2020 Consensus Committee Evaluation Report with information from Robert Budnitz. DUE DATE: January 31, 2021	Budnitz, Schroeder	OPEN
6/2020-06	Ed Wallace to help Mark Linn respond to comments related to NEI 18-04 from the RARCC preliminary ballot of ANS-30.1, "Integrating Risk and Performance Objectives into New Reactor Safety Designs." DUE DATE: February 1, 2021	Wallace, Linn	OPEN
6/2020-07	Pat Schroeder to draft an appeals policy and send to Steven Stamm, Robert Budnitz, George Flanagan and Carl Mazzola to review. DUE DATE: March 1, 2021	Schroeder, Stamm, Budnitz, Flanagan, Mazzola	OPEN Was put on hold due to ANSI request to wait until after audit report. Audit report received in October requesting changes to policy.
6/2020-08	James O'Brien and Prasad Kadambi to make a brief presentation on risk-informed, performance-based methods to the ANS-19 Subcommittee on Reactor Physics at their next meeting during the ANS Winter Meeting. DUE DATE: November 1, 2021	O'Brien, Kadambi	OPEN
6/2020-15	Prasad Kadambi to provide RP3C products to the Divisions for their information and feedback, and how that can be a value to their division goals and objectives. DUE DATE: November 1, 2021	Kadambi	OPEN Kadambi will work with Turkowski to make a presentation at a meeting (Guidance Document and the CoP presentations to be included).
11/2019-16	Pat Schroeder to draft a letter of invite on behalf of Donald Eggett to send to INPO once an INPO contact is identified. DUE DATE: This action will be CLOSED ~two weeks after contact identified.	Schroeder	OPEN This action item was amended to the current SB Chair, D. Eggett, to follow up. The INPO contact has been

Standards Board Action Item List as of 1/14/21

NOTE: Action items were not reviewed at the 1/14/21 meeting, just carried forward.

Action Item	Description	Responsibility	Status/Comments /Reassignments
6/2019-07	Donald Eggett (lead), George Flanagan, Prasad Kadambi, and Mark Linn to evaluate the current balance of interest definitions (Annex A) and propose a revision of the "Individual" category. DUE DATE: June 1, 2021	Eggett, Flanagan, Kadambi, Linn	OPEN ASME has the same issue; however, they allow self-employed to be categorized in the category of the majority of their work. Spellman offered to check with IEEE (see new ACTION ITEM 11/2020-04).
6/2018-02	Donald Eggett and Andrew Sowder to contact SB members on possible changes to industry priorities for standards development. DUE DATE: June 1, 2021	Eggett	OPEN A. Sowder offered to help D. Eggett.

Unofficial Use
“For Information and Discussion Only”

Proposal for the
Creation of a “Centralized Industry Steering Committee” to Establish Prioritization
of Codes & Standards Primarily to Support Advanced Reactors

by
ANS Standards Board Chair, Don Eggett

October 20, 2020

Background

An ANS/NRC leadership meeting was held September 10, 2020 with the primary outcome to establish a collaborative and more active working relationship between the two parties. In addition, this meeting was intended to further discuss the codes and standards (C&S) needs and strategies of the industry to obtain NRC’s perspectives on what they see as near-term priorities. These discussions were driven by ANS Standards Board (SB) Chair, Don Eggett, and set the stage for John Nakoski’s (NRC) proposed initiative that a central industry led team be formed/come together with ANS as the suggested lead with all the right participants (DOE, NEI, Standards Development Organizations (SDOs), reactor vendors, end-users, among others) to set priorities on C&S for the industry, primarily for the advanced reactors. The NRC indicated that they wanted to remain independent of the team but wanted to be kept abreast of the planned activities and associated timelines and would interact with the team as needed; hence, they would be engaged but not necessarily directly as a team member.

Prior to the September 10th ANS/NRC meeting, an ANS/NEI June 23, 2020 workshop was held which was well attended by industry, received excellent feedback, and noted the need to capitalize on the workshop’s momentum. As an current update, ANS SB Chair Eggett has already reached out to NRC (noted above), DOE, NEI, and ASME (all with scheduled meetings) to discuss what the next actions should be including further discussions with NEI on moving forward with the prioritized list of C&S identified in NEI’s Assessment Report (NEI 19-03) and a parallel effort in the creation of an industry led team of technical experts to determine what the next appropriate C&S actions would be and where and how to direct the work. This team would direct writing proposals for funding of those standards deemed to be of highest priority. Nakoski proposed that funding should come from DOE that would support the prioritized work.

Concept of Industry Steering Committee

The focus would be primarily on the prioritized needs of advanced reactors, but non-reactor nuclear facilities, current LWRs, and any needs for other current operating or planned facilities would be evaluated on a as needed priority basis.

The central led industry steering committee would develop prioritized actions, approve these action(s), capture these actions in a proposal(s), and send them to DOE recommending funds be allocated for these “project(s).” Nakoski also proposed that the committee should consider using a contractor that would facilitate the team’s needs both administrative, technical, and otherwise. The contractor would remain as the facilitator for whatever term the team agreed to and negotiated with that organization. One of the contractor’s primary responsibilities would be

to develop proposals for the committee based on the committee's consensus of identified priorities. All proposals would be reviewed by the committee before being submitted to DOE for consideration of approval. The objective is to obtain the needed financial support to support development of prioritized, near-term advanced reactor codes and standards. This recommended approach needs the industry support of DOE, NEI, all SDOs, reactor vendors, and other group members.

In addition, the Industry Steering Committee would:

- Determine the membership (e.g., SDOs (ANS, ASME, IEEE), Industry Users (e.g., Babcock & Wilcox, Holtec, and NuScale), NEI, DOE, National Labs, Consultant(s))
- Determine if a “core group” is needed from the total membership to drive near-term prioritized, needed, and approved projects. Would the “core group” need to be from advanced reactor developers complimented by individuals that are familiar with existing standards?
- Set goals, objectives, responsibilities, and the reporting structure of committee
- Establish the Process
 - Would suggest standards requiring prioritization
 - Primary focus would be advanced reactor standards, other areas may be considered
 - Group would consider and determine lead SDO/Co-Lead SDOs
 - NEI would be looked to focus on standard development rather than a separate NEI document
 - Standards would be expedited by using a paid consultant and production of initial trial use standard.
 - Majority of work to be done online, face-to-face steering committee meetings initially quarterly, then as needed

Key Benefits of Industry Steering Committee to Industry

- Improve identification of needed standards for advanced reactors
- Assign topics which are better covered by standards than other industry documents
- Coordination of SDO activities
- Expedite standards development (funding and Trial Use)

Should Other SDOs and Industry Groups (INPO/NEI) be Members of ANS SB Advisory Board??

ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES	Suggested Alternative
Bring potential access to large number of industry personnel	<u>In the past, these industry groups</u> H have been hesitant to forward ANS items to their members <u>members</u> . If they did most recipients <u>information</u> would not be relevant <u>to most members</u> . There is less interest in replying to third party	
Have a unique perspective on the interface with their standards	Some have continuously discouraged <u>the use of</u> ANS standard (e.g. NEI, GE) Other SDOs are not very interested in commenting on ANS standards or helping ANS.	<u>The best we can do here is by using interested liaison members of ANS committees.</u>
Have extensive mail lists.	Have been unwilling to share <u>their</u> email lists or forward <u>ANS</u> emails to their lists.	
Bring a wide range of expertise	<u>In general, H</u> have not been interested in providing meaningful comments <u>ad hoc</u> . Focused on their own activities	<u>Better use by liaisons</u>
Have direct interest in the impact of standards on their organizations.	Difficult to get their time <u>tem to commit employee time to ANS or other SDO activities.</u>	
Can include participants from a wide range of organizations: plant operator, reactor vendors, fuel suppliers, waste management companies, decommissioning contractors, DOE, NRC, Owners Groups, and National Labs.	Only those with direct impacts should comment. We may need to provide additional information in the PINs to make intent clear.	<u>This should be a goal of the External Communications Task Group, not the standards board.</u>
Represent actual users		<u>Again, better served by liaisons</u>
Bring a wide range of expertise		<u>Again, better served by liaisons</u>

Fee Based ANS Standards Training Program Proposal

Updated 12/28/2020

Concept: The standards Committee would offer training on specific standards shortly after issuance where it was anticipated that sufficient interest would exist for training in that specific standard. Training would be done using a webcast approach. A reasonable fee ((\$50 to \$100) would be charged for each attendee. The trainer would be the chairperson of the standards developing work group or someone with similar knowledge of the contents and background of the specific standard. The presenter would be paid a reasonable fee (\$300.00 to \$600.00) depending of the volume of the material in the standard. Group rates or discounts may be available for companies with more than 5 attendees. Training would not be offered unless a minimum of at least 20 attendees was anticipated.

Status: The above concept was presented at the June 2016 ANS Standards Board meeting and the members agreed that further evaluation was justified. An evaluation approach was to be prepared with the goal of determining if such a program could be implemented by the American Nuclear Society. .

Evaluation Approach: The first step in the evaluation approach was to define the potential roadblock that may exist to the implementation of the proposed Fee Based ANS Standards Training Program. Each potential roadblock would be evaluated including discussions with the ANS staff group with direct knowledge in that area. The results of this evaluation would be used to determine if such a program could be implemented by ANS and to identify any areas of difficulty or concern. If the result of this portion of the evaluation justifies continuation, the details of the training proposal would be further defined and a cost-benefit evaluation presented to ANS Management and Board.

Evaluation of Potential Roadblocks:

The following areas were identified for evaluation:

1. ANS Payment to Presenters: Is ANS able to legally make payments to individual presenters? If, so what is involved in making such payments? Are the presenters treated as independent contractors? Do they have to be incorporated? What is the effort involved with setting up and implementing such payments? Is this any different than paying for a plenary speaker? If direct payment is too difficult would it be more practical to offer a credit that could be used to pay for meeting fees or publications
 - a. *Evaluation Status as of 12/28/2020: It is possible to pay the presenter a stipend in the range for \$300 to \$600 as a one-time payment. ANS would not be required to report amounts in this range to the IRS.*
2. Attendee Registration and Payment: Does ANS have a system that could be used to allow attendees to register and pay for course fees on line? What is the level of effort needed to adapt to this application? Would the Standards Manager be able to set-up and manage the registration process and payment collection for each standards course?
 - a. *Evaluation Status as of 12/28/2020: It is possible to set up a webpage to allow the potential users to register and pay for training classes. However, it is not clear when this could be done. We need a firm commitment from ANS management so we can plan the training.*
3. Liability Potential: Would such a training program result in increased liabilities to ANS should a presenter say the wrong thing? Is this different then having a presenter saying something at a regular meeting session?
 - a. *Evaluation Status as of 12/28/2020: Liability protection wording should be approved by the ANS executive director and committed to by users as part of the sign in process. Wording shall also be included on the presentation slides.*
4. Speaking contracts: Is a contract between ANS and the speaker needed? If needed, how detailed/ complicated should it be? What does it need to address? Do similar contracts already exist?
 - a. *Needs further evaluation.*

5. Disclaimers: What disclaimers need to be developed and incorporated into this program? How should they be identified?
 - a. See item 3.a.
6. Instructor Availability: Will ANS standards working group members be interested and able to support this program for the payments discussed above? If not, what level of payment would be required? Should presenters be offered an incentive to recruit attendees?
 - a. Evaluation Status as of 12/28/2020: *Two standards were originally designated as pilots 2.8 and 3.5. The chair of 3.5 is not currently available due to COVID-19 impacts. This should be revisited in late spring. ANS-2.8 was available during earlier considerations but that needs to be updated. We are also looking at standards issued in the last year to see if any others would be better pilots*
7. Attendee Interest: Is there sufficient interest in attendance of such sessions to make this program worthwhile? How can this be predetermined? How should this be advertised? How should prospective attendees be targeted?
 - a. Evaluation Status as of 12/28/2020: *We worked with the working group chairs for the standards under consideration to develop rough estimates of potential attendees.*
8. Webcast Programs: What webcast programs are suitable for this application? What are the associated program and IT costs?
 - a. Evaluation Status as of 12/28/2020: *ANS is currently using two different webcast programs, either one would be suitable.*

ANS Standards Board Task Groups
(Revised 11/16/16)**
(Proposed revision 12/30/2020)

Purpose: The purpose of the Standards Board Task Groups is to promote the development and industry use of ANS standards.

Policy Task Group

Scope: Function as an advisory group to the chair of the Standards Board (SB) on administrative or procedural issues referred to the Task Group from the SB. Interface with the ANS Board of Directors and Standing Committees on policy issues that affect the ANS strategic plan. Resolve questions referred to the policy task group from the SB relative to questions or clarifications of Standards Committee policies, rules, and procedures. Membership includes the current and past chairs of the ANS SB, the current SB vice chair, and the ANS Standards Manager.

Donald Eggett, Chair*
Steve Arndt
George Flanagan
Prasad Kadambi
Carl Mazzola
Steve Stamm
Patricia Schroeder

NOTE: Current SB Chair = Policy TG Chair

Standards Priority Task Group

Scope: Evaluate ANS standards data to show a priority list of ANS standards that need the most immediate attention to benefit the industry including current, in progress, and withdrawn/historical standards. Provide a short commentary on why immediate attention is needed. Communicate that list to the ANS SB, SB Task Groups, consensus committees and subcommittees.

TBD, Chair*
Pat Schroeder
SB NEI Representative
SB NRC Representative
SB DOE Representative
SDO Representative(s)

External Communications Task Group

Scope: Improve the links and harmonization efforts between the ANS standards committees and its standards users (utilities, designers, suppliers, architect engineers, universities, national labs, and fuel fabricators), and with national regulators, government agencies, other U.S. SDOs, and international SDOs. Review external requests from other SDOs, government organizations, and the public for relevance to the activities of the standards committee and make recommendations on these requests to the SB chair. This does not include clarifications and inquiries on specific standards that are handled under the Standards Committee rules and procedures. One member should be actively involved with ISO TC 85 NTAG or ISO committees.

Donald Spellman, Chair*
Amir Afzali
Charles Martin

Internal Communications Task Group

Scope: Establish closer relationships with ANS governance and technical divisions. Seek out more direct representation from technical divisions on standards committees. Revise the training module into several modules for different audiences and schedule regular presentations at the ANS biannual meetings and/or pre-selected professional division, youth member group (YMG), and student meetings. Develop an active/inactive Standards Committee members grouping system and methods to encourage non-involved volunteers to become active working group members.

Bill Turkowski, Chair (SB)*

Sales Task Group

Scope: At least twice annually, evaluate the ANS standards sales data and evaluate it for potential areas of increased sales, evaluation of where sales are being made, and coordinate with the ECTG to make contact with potential new customers.

David Sachs, Chair* (accepted 12/17/20)

* Chair (may be changed at the discretion of the task group)

** No CC chairs should be on the task groups other than by personal preference or desire

A3 RESPONSIBILITIES OF ANS STANDARDS COMMITTEE LIAISON PERSONNEL

1 BACKGROUND

The development of standards for the nuclear industry is facilitated through communications with other Standards Development Organizations (SDOs) and industry organizations. In many cases it is not possible to develop an effective standard whose scope is solely within the purview and interest of one society. In addition, the requirements of any one standard will often affect the criteria, and their interpretation, of several other standards. Furthermore, input and feedback from interfacing organizations is important to the development of a useful standard.

The purpose of this policy is to set forth guidance for selection and functioning of individuals to provide liaison between the ANS Standards Committee and other SDOs or industry organizations. It also addresses the qualifications of such individuals to ensure they have the requisite experience to be able to effectively fulfill these liaison responsibilities.

2 POLICY

2.1 *Selection of Individuals to Provide Liaison Services*

Formal Standards Board liaison members may be appointed by the Standards Board Chair. Other ANS Standards Committee liaison members may also be established to serve at any other Standards Committee level. The need for a liaison member shall be established by the Standards Board, Consensus Committee, Subcommittee or Working Group. Liaison members do not need to be members of the ANS Standards Committee.

Liaison members assigned to the Standards Board are non-voting members of the Board. The Standards Board liaison member may be asked to assist Consensus Committee, Subcommittee or Working Group Chairs with interface needs. A Consensus Committee, Subcommittee, or Working Group may appoint separate temporary committee liaison members from a particular interfacing organization when a closer level of coordination is needed with an external organization in relation to a standard being developed or revised. The committee chair shall identify the interface needs of the committee and determine the best way to fulfill those needs. If a liaison is needed, preference shall be given to an existing committee member who may also be a member of another Standards Development Organization. Otherwise, the committee should consider recruiting such a member from the appropriate industry, regulatory or government organization.

The committee appointing the liaison member may designate the liaison member as a full voting member of the committee or as a non-voting member that solely performs the needed technical interface function. Any appointed liaison member shall have recognized expertise in the technology of primary interest to the assigned committee and should be familiar with ANS standards that are relevant to the assignment. The liaison member shall be willing to assume the duties set forth in this policy and abide by the ANS Standards Committee Policies, Rules and Procedures.

2.2 Requirements of Liaison Members

A liaison member shall perform the following functions:

1. Advise the ANS assigned committee chair of activities of the interface organization that are relevant to ANS standards.
2. Advise their interfacing organization of relevant ANS standards activities that may impact activities of the interfacing organization.
3. Solicit members from the interface organization to support other working groups and subcommittees when requested.
4. Respond to ANS committee questions regarding the interfacing organization policies for their standards activities.
5. When appropriate, solicit relevant documents from the interfacing organization.
6. ANS liaison members from other Standards Developing Organizations should work with their organization to permit the ANS consensus committee to review and comment on interfacing organization standards that may have technical issues with ANS standards of the ANS committee.
 - a. The ANS liaison member should seek the review and comment of members of the appropriate ANS committee when the ANS committee's scope of responsibility closely resembles that of any interfacing organization standard that is being developed, revised, or balloted. Requests for such input should be sought by the Chair of the appropriate ANS Consensus Committee.
 - b. When an ANS standard is balloted or offered for discussion at the committee to which the liaison is assigned (including initial discussions of scope, working group membership, and other relevant interface issues), the liaison should become sufficiently familiar with the pertinent issues to be able to fully present the viewpoint or position to an interface organization. This may be accomplished by allowing a member of the ANS Standards Committee to attend an interface organization meeting or by allowing the ANS committee member to draft an appropriate position paper to be presented to the interfacing organization committee.
7. The liaison member shall adhere to the ANS Standards Committee Policies, Rules and Procedures particularly policy B2 on speaking for the ANS Standards Committee. If policy issues arise as part of this assignment, the liaison member should seek the guidance of the ANS Standards Board Chair.

A3 RESPONSIBILITIES OF ANS STANDARDS COMMITTEE LIAISON PERSONNEL

1 BACKGROUND

The development of standards for the nuclear industry is facilitated through communications with other Standards Development Organizations (SDOs) and industry organizations. In many cases it is not possible to develop an effective standard whose scope is solely within the purview and interest of one society. In addition, the requirements of any one standard will often affect the criteria, and their interpretation, of several other standards. Furthermore, input and feedback from interfacing organizations is important to the development of a useful standard.

The purpose of this policy is to set forth guidance for selection and functioning of individuals to provide liaison between the ANS Standards Committee and other SDOs or industry organizations. It also addresses the qualifications of such individuals to ensure they have the requisite experience to be able to effectively fulfill these liaison responsibilities.

2 POLICY

2.1 Selection of Individuals to Provide Liaison Services

~~Liaisons-Formal Standards Board liaison members~~ may be appointed by the Standards Board Chair. Other ANS Standards Committee liaison members may also be established at to serve the at any other Standards Board or consensus committee Committee level. Liaison members do not need to be members of the ANS Standards Committee. The need for a liaison member shall be established by the ~~committee.~~ Standards Board, Consensus Committee, Subcommittee or Working Group. Liaison members do not need to be members of the ANS Standards Committee.

Liaison members formally assigned to the Standards Board are non-voting members of the Board, and should be considered as serving the entire Standards Committee and. ~~The Standards Board formal liaison member may be used by the~~ be asked to assist Consensus Committee, ~~Subcommittee, and or Working Group~~ Chairs ~~to help with their interface needs. However, as requested. A Consensus Committee, Subcommittee, or Working Group may appoint separate temporary committee liaison members from a consensus committee may appoint a separate consensus committee liaison in certain instances where particular interfacing organization when~~ a closer level of coordination ~~may be~~ is needed ~~between that consensus committee and an with an~~ external organization. ~~Subcommittees and working groups in relation to a standard being developed or revised. That member may establish an interface with an outside organization and may have a member of that organization be either a voting member or a non-voting member, but this of that committee although the position is not considered as a formal Standards Committee liaison position.~~

The committee chair shall identify the interface needs of the committee and determine the best way ~~for to~~ fulfill those needs. If a liaison is needed, preference shall be given to an existing committee member who ~~is may also be~~ be a member of ~~the another interfacing Standards Development Organization. or organization.~~ Otherwise, the committee should consider recruiting such a member ~~or soliciting a liaison member~~ from the appropriate industry, regulatory or government organization. ~~The committee may solicit the assistance of the~~

~~Standards Board External Communications Task Group for coordination of the recruitment of a properly qualified liaison member.~~

The committee appointing the liaison member may designate the liaison member as a full voting member of the committee or as a non-voting member that solely performs the needed technical interface function. ~~The Any appointed~~ liaison member shall have recognized expertise in the technology of primary interest to the assigned committee and should be familiar with ANS standards that are relevant to the assignment. The liaison member shall be willing to assume the duties set forth in this policy and abide by the ANS Standards Committee Policies, Rules and Procedures.

2.2 Requirements of Liaison Members

A liaison member shall perform the following functions:

1. Advise the ~~ANS assigned~~ committee ~~chair~~ of activities of the interface organization that are relevant to ANS standards.
2. Advise their interfacing organization of relevant ANS standards activities ~~that may impact activities of the interfacing organization.~~
3. Solicit members from the interface organization to support other working groups and subcommittees when requested.
4. Respond to ~~ANS~~ committee questions regarding the interfacing organization policies for ~~their~~ standards activities.
5. ~~When appropriate,~~ Solicit relevant documents from the interfacing organization.
6. ~~ANS liaison members from other~~ Standards Developing Organizations ~~liaisons~~ should work with their ~~interfacing~~ organization to permit the ANS consensus committee to review and comment on interfacing organization standards that may have ~~significant~~ technical issues with ANS standards of ~~that consensus~~ ~~the ANS~~ committee.
 - a. The ~~ANS~~ liaison ~~member should shall specifically~~ seek the review and comment of members of the appropriate ANS ~~consensus~~ committee when ~~that the ANS~~ committee's scope of responsibility closely resembles that of ~~the any~~ interfacing organization standard ~~that is being developed, revised, or~~ balloted. Requests for such input should be sought by the Chair of the ~~appropriate ANS~~ ~~e~~Consensus ~~e~~Committee.
 - b. When ~~an ANS~~ standard is balloted or offered for discussion at the ~~consensus~~ committee to which the liaison is assigned (including initial discussions of scope, working group membership, and other relevant interface issues), the liaison ~~shall should~~ become sufficiently familiar with the pertinent issues to be able to fully present the viewpoint or position to ~~an~~ interface organization. This may be accomplished by allowing a member of the ANS Standards Committee to attend an interface organization meeting or by allowing the ANS committee member to draft an appropriate position paper to be presented to the interfacing organization committee.
7. The liaison member shall adhere to the ANS Standards Committee Policies, Rules and Procedures particularly policy B2 on speaking for the ANS Standards Committee. If policy issues arise as part of this assignment, the liaison member should seek the guidance of the ANS Standards Board Chair.

11/5/2016
06/14/88
(JFM edit, 8/16/99)
(JFM revised, 1/13/04)