



JENSEN HUGHES

Advancing the Science of Safety

Panel “What’s Next for HRA?”



HRA SOCIETY OVERVIEW



A young professional society to promote the sharing of research, methods and data.

Members are regulator, research labs, consultants & utility staff.

Short history:

- Initial meeting in Seattle at PSAM'11 conference (2010)
- Follow-up meeting in Honolulu at PSAM'12 (2012)
- HRA Master Class in Paris last year, (2015)
 - Largest meeting, ~50 participants from 8 countries
 - Surveyed recent activities
 - Voted on new leadership
- *HRA Special Session at PSAM'13 (Seoul, 2016)*
- *PSAM HRA Topical Meeting (Munich, 2017)*



HRA SOCIETY VISION



- **Support Various Aspects of HRA – Research, Modeling, & Applications**
 - Human Reliability Analysis as part of PRA for Decision-Making
 - Human Factors
 - Human Error reduction programs
- **Improve Technical Bases**
 - HRA methods, models, 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
 - Looking to expand with “regional” chapters such as USA, EU & Asia
 - Open to new members



COLLECTING HRA DATA

- Address the “Elephant in the Room”
 - Which has been there for years.



COLLECTING HRA DATA

• Theme

What are the lessons learned from recent HRA data collection projects that can be used to support future HRA data development?

• Building off (an onto) HRA meetings

- PSAM HRA Topical Meeting, June 2017
- IAEA HRA workshop, November 2017
- SACADA workshop, March 2018
- Potential future meetings:
 - PSAM14 workshop, UCLA, September 2018
 - ANS PSA'2019, April 28 – May 3rd, 2019
 - Others like ESREL or ASHRAM?

• Promoting the idea of improved data sharing

- What is needed to succeed?
- What are the barriers to success?
- Next steps?



Fostering Collaboration Through a Communication Framework

(PSAM HRA Topical Slide by Mary Presley, EPRI)

- **Need**: To *define, prioritize and track* status of HRA related research needs to:
 - Promote collaboration between research organizations
 - Reduce redundant efforts
 - Communicate advances in state of knowledge
 - Make systematic progress as an international community towards filling knowledge gaps
- **Proposal**: To create a common format to communicate state of HRA research gaps and ongoing efforts to address those gaps. Agree upon a forum which all organizations can provide their input (face-to-face meeting not necessary?)
- **Question**: In sharing data, how do we gauge applicability of data given the potential difference in plant operations between countries?



Discussion

(PSAM HRA Topical Slide by Mary Presley, EPRI)

- Are the needs captured?
- Data Analytics – can we pool data?
- Thoughts on HRA Communication Framework
 - Can we use a structure like an HRA matrix regularly across organizations?
 - Are the categories correct?
 - Can we start filling it out now?
- Other collaboration opportunities?
 - HRA Researcher Wiki?
 - Additional topical conferences with broader audience?

| | | [Type of human action] |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| Driving PSFs | State of knowledge | <describe state of knowledge> |
| | Reducible gaps | <list reducible gaps> |
| | Ongoing research | |
| | Irreducible gaps | <list irreducible gaps> |
| Parameter Estimation | state of knowledge | |
| | reducible gaps | |
| | Ongoing research | |
| | irreducible gaps | |
| Quantification | state of knowledge | |
| | reducible gaps | |
| | Ongoing research | |
| | irreducible gaps | |
| Technology Transfer | state of knowledge | |
| | Ongoing research | |



It is an open issue how joint (nuclear industry wide) data collection and analysis could be arranged in a meaningful way.

- Examples and Insight from ICDE
- Organization of data projects requires technical and administrative considerations
 - Example ICDE Operation - OECD/NEA
- Technical
 - Format and structure, coding guideline, workshop?
- Administrative
 - Proprietary rights
 - In kind contribution/Exchange
- How to start, Initiation work shop
 - Need agreement on technical framework
 - Need “champions” to push the issue
- Role of HRA Society

HRA WORKSHOP AGENDA



Introductions – 35 participants from 11 countries

Workshop Concept / Overview

Selected Presentations

- ***SACADA Data Program***, James Chang
- ***Characteristics of the HuREX Framework as a Tool for HRA Data***, Yochan Kim
- ***MicroTasks and MicroWorld***, Andreas Bye and Ron Boring
- ***EPRI FLEX and MCR Abandonment***, Mary Presley & Kaydee Gunter

Discussion – Breakout Groups

- Group 1 - Data Collection
- Group 2 - Data Analysis
- Group 3 - Application of HRA Data in Decision-Making

Breakout Session Results

Closing



HRA WORKSHOP BACKGROUND



Issues considered during pre-meeting discussion

- **Started with Data Collection**

- But “Data” can be different types & different sources:
 - Data from simulators, e.g. Human Error Probability measurement
 - Data from Expert Elicitation
 - Data impacting the Qualitative Analysis
 - Performance shaping factors
 - Timeline
 - Research on the different types of failure
- Data sources: simulator, microtasks, operating experience (incident reports), design basis

- **Data, once collected requires Analysis**

- **Last, Application of the HRA data**

- Applicability for sharing between countries or disciplines
- Meeting end-user needs



WORKSHOP BREAKOUT (GROUP 1)



Group 1 - Data Collection – How can we improve or facilitate data sharing? (Mary Presley lead)

Suggested questions:

1. What kind of framework did you initially start with for the following:
 - Tasks – is this the lowest level of data collection?
 - Performance shaping factors – positive and negative
 - Objective vs. Subjective evidence – what measurements are taken
 - How does data collection identify and distinguish the Context?
2. What issues did you need to address, beyond those listed above and beyond IP/Privacy/Confidentiality? And how did you solve these?





- **Halden**

- Collecting data for realistic scenarios with their procedures (CE, Westinghouse), but digital I&C (also at plant's simulator). PWR and BWR
 - More challenging than regular training scenarios (outside the basis of PRA?)
 - 3-4 hrs max
 - Working on SBO scenarios (2 crews)
 - Data stored at report, but working on moving them into a database (Katrina has loaded some into SACADA)
- Micro-tasks

- **KAERI**

- Advanced (fully digitalized) MCR; Only PWRs, full scope simulations
- Data is database and 3 information gathering templates (plant scenario, time analysis, context information/PSFs).
- OPERA database is operational experience data
- Scenarios decided based on discussion with trainers and use PRA to help pick scenario (training data)
- 50min-1hr

- **NRC**

- SACADA training data (not exam data or e-plan scenarios)
 - 1-2hrs; conventional MCR
- IDHEAS -> cognitive literature
- Expert elicitation for FLEX

- **CREIPI**

- HRA data collection is not yet in Japan
- Human Factors Root Cause database for maintenance failures mostly
- PWR and BWR training center has video recording and stuff, but not HRA data....not sure how they use that data

- **INL**

- HERA – incident reports...no further work being done in that area
 - Can we use SACADA to collect incident reports
- Validation studies for digital control upgrades
- timing data based on operator logs (SBO to support dynamic HRA)
- Microworlds to answer specific questions
- Using data to bound human performance (distributions)...“what if”

- **NASA**

- Space --- JSC Human and Performance Lab
 - Probability of operators hitting the launch abort button
 - Decision making when bad stuff happens in space
 - Data from shuttle, Apollo and ISS
 - Common matrix for the data
 - To support design decisions for Mars mission
- Oil & Gas
 - Well incident report (like LARs)



- Exam security and E-plan (security)
- The more challenging scenario that you run the more trained the crew has to be
- Extra workload to training department needs to show big benefit to adopt
 - How do we communicate benefit to the plants so they adopt the data collection?
 - Putting the information into the software helps distill the training findings and common issues the various trainers see and make them visible
 - Linking to utility need (regulator and/or risk drivers)
- HUREX monthly workshop key to keep data collection consistent and learnings passed on.
- Training can be very different from country to country
- How can we share data? Particularly with other industry (e.g., NASA, oil/gas)
 - 3rd party clearing house

WORKSHOP BREAKOUT (GROUP 2)



Group 2 - Data Analysis (Katrina Groth lead)

Suggested questions:

1. Did you need to revise an underlying taxonomy that is used to categorize, parse and understand the data?

2. How is the data analyzed?

- Direct HEP
- Factors that impact the HEP
- Bayesian-belief network
- New causes of error?



Main takeaways (1): Do you need to use an underlying taxonomy to categorize, parse and understand the data (i.e., beyond that in a data source)?

- **“YES. This is essential.”**
 - To enable consistent interpretation of the data
 - To map across different data collection activities
 - To map data across industries
 - To enable using multiple data sources (similar data types or different)
 - To capture causes and effects beyond a single data source;
 - To incorporate qualitative information
 - To enable text mining & automated data extraction
- **“YES but..”**
 - These is a tradeoff between comprehensiveness of the taxonomy and data quantity.
 - We need multiple taxonomies: PSFs, task types, error types, database types – “HRA data” is uniquely multifaceted.
 - This requires a serious investment

Main takeaways (2) How is the data analyzed (why did you choose this approach)?



- **Multiple types of HRA data & multiple goals for data analysis - lends itself to a variety of analytical approaches.**
 - Several groups directly quantify HEP and/or PSF->HEP effect using statistical techniques on the data
 - Several groups use BNs (either with or without causal maps)
- **Considerations that led to the choices of modeling framework:**
 - Need to capture data/information beyond what exists in a single source
 - Need to combine data from different sources & accommodate data together with industry-specific expert judgment;
 - Need to combine both data and scientific process models; enables consistent use of multiple types of data; enables handling differences with simulator
 - Cannot alter aspects of the data (whether that be the simulator environment or the observed accident data); so we can't fully decouple HEP effect from the context.
 - Can't directly assess a "nominal" HEP without considering the context (i.e., a large set of PSFs which need to be mapped onto HEP)
 - Treatment of PSF interdependencies -- potential combinatorial explosion of PSF states dependencies.
 - Potential for controlled PSF->HEP experiments
 - Secondary benefits beyond HRA – i.e., influence training

WORKSHOP BREAKOUT (GROUP 3)



Group 3 - Application of HRA Data in Decision-Making (Kaydee Gunter lead)

Suggested questions:

1. How do you ensure your data collection and/or analysis supports the end-user needs?
2. How does your data provide insights and support to decision-making?





- Data development teams carry out case studies by comparing collected data to existing HRA methods such as CREAM.
 - Verification activity
 - Question applicability of another country's data
- UK – not collecting enough data to support end users.
 - Lots of opportunity but need to define the studies.
- From applications side - need to review key qualitative factors and compare to insights from the existing data sets.
- Start with feasibility and identify qualitative insights of applications align with data insights.
- Availability of data is a tough issue
 - Use of expert judgement
- Adapted THERP to have plant specific factors.



- Different levels of applications require different scope of data
- To answer this question we need to first list what the applications are.
 - Applications can include
 - HRA model and methods development.
 - Human error mitigations
 - Procedure updates – Formatting and content
 - Training
 - Control room design
 - New digital I&C
 - Plant design changes
 - Organizational changes

HRA WORKSHOP CONCLUSION



The workshop concluded with:

- Presentation of Breakout Group results
- Short discussion of the Next Steps
 - Collect and distribute workshop materials to participants
 - Dialogue continues with PSAM14 HRA Data Analysis sessions on Tuesday
- Recommendation to continue the discussion during PSAM and in PSA'2019 (as a minimum)



FUTURE OF HRA (1 OF 2)



• Data Collection

- Trending up
 - Simulator data at the task level (Korea) and the training objective level (USA); both more than 20,000 data points
 - MicroTasks and MicroWorlds to complement simulators
 - End-user, plant data such as FLEX and MCRA
- Did not discuss Operating Experience as a data source
 - EPRI Pre-Initiator
 - ICDE CCF Data is 30-50% HRA
- Not sure – Dependency data?

• Data Analysis

- Needs a theoretical framework
- Link to Context or de-couple
- Ability to correlate PSF?
- Finding new failure modes



FUTURE OF HRA (2 OF 2)



• Application of Data

- Identify gaps, is data being collected to fill?
- Consider:
 - Changes in plant design beyond Digital Controls such as Small Modular Reactors with multiple cores
 - Changes in Hazards (e.g. new information such as consequential or combination hazards like seismic-fire)
 - Changes in models/methods (PRA, HRA, HF)

• Next Steps

- Establish a taxonomy and guidelines that relates the different types of data and different levels
- Identify current research and current gaps
- Need champions/sponsors

Bottom line – lots of current activity, the time is now to synchronize activities, but needs continued pressure such as elevating to a project.



QUESTIONS?



Contact

Jeffrey Julius

+1 206-276-8229

jjulius@jensenhughes.com

For More Information Visit

www.jensenhughes.com



JENSEN HUGHES

Advancing the Science of Safety

