

ADVANCED REACTOR SAFEGUARDS & SECURITY

Allocating Performance Margin Using Multi-Attribute Top Event Prevention Analysis

PRESENTED BY

Bob Youngblood Supported by Dave Blanchard and Mihai Diaconeasa

May 15, 2024

Sandia National Laboratories is a multimission laboratory managed and operated by National Technology and Engineering Solutions of Sandia LLC, a wholly owned subsidiary of Honeywell International Inc. for the U.S. Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration under contract DE-NA0003525.



Task Overview



- The present task is part of a broader effort to understand better how to apply modern modeling techniques to understanding, and ameliorating, cyber risk at nuclear power plants.
 - The premise is that the most efficient way to do this involves being selective about what we protect.
 - It's combinatorial optimization. (See SAND83-0085, Combinatorial Optimization with Boolean Constraints, Hulme and Worrell)
- The scope of the present task is to carry out an analysis demonstrating the following points:
 1. Framing of risk management decisions can beneficially consider multiple attributes (multiple performance figures of merit, or FOMs) rather than just public safety. Risk management expenditures can do more good if they are based on a broader set of objectives.
 - To illustrate this, a baseline risk model has been developed, addressing both severe accident risk and risk to "generation."
 2. Given risk model results for the attributes of interest, a technique called Top Event Prevention Analysis (TEPA) is a useful way to select a combination of assets to protect.
 - Preliminary Top Event Prevention Analysis has been carried out on the baseline risk model.
 3. Because "probability" is problematic in modeling adversarial scenarios, we need to consider an alternative concept, such as "margin."
 - This will be undertaken in coming months.

Team



- Bob Youngblood, PI
- Mihai A. Diaconeasa
 - Assistant Professor of Nuclear Engineering, North Carolina State University
- Dave Blanchard
 - Applied Reliability Engineering, Inc. (AREI)
 - Dave rescued Top Event Prevention Analysis from obscurity, and has applied it for many clients in the safety domain.
 - The model used in this work has been developed by Dave, based on a plant model that originated with one of his clients
 - The commercial software needed to do Top Event Prevention Analysis was developed by Dave in collaboration with Dick Worrell, author of SETS



Multiattribute?


What do we mean by “Multiattribute?”

=> Considering Different Consequence Types (not just severe accident risk)

We will see later that there are synergies between preventing safety problems and preventing interruption of plant generation.

Scenario Types and Consequence

Categories (Youngblood and Eggers)





Top Event Prevention Analysis?

What is “Top Event Prevention Analysis?” (“Prevention Analysis” for short)

=> It’s a way of choosing what subset of assets to

- Protect
- Assure
- QA
- ...

... Based on plant-level requirements on safety, availability, ...

Risk Analysis vs. Top Event Prevention Analysis



Usual Application of Risk Analysis

Need To Predict This



$$\text{Freq (Damage State)} = \sum_{\text{IE}} \text{Freq (IE)} * P (\text{Damage State} | \text{IE})$$

Characterize This



Model This



Prevention Analysis

Infer Target From Policy



$$\text{Freq (Damage State)} = \sum_{\text{IE}} \text{Freq (IE)} * P (\text{Damage State} | \text{IE})$$

Characterize This



Solve For Requirements On This:
Which SSCs To Include, What Failure Probability...




... And Apply Engineering Knowledge To Determine What Engineering Requirements To Apply To Achieve Desired Performance Profile

Safety Applications

Key Technical Elements: Derivation of Component Level Target Reliability (App. I)

- Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA) is usually used to integrate the individual reliabilities into the risk index.
- The developed method uses PRA **in a reverse way** to derive component level structural reliability from the plant level risk target.





To extend risk analysis to cyber, we need the concept of “systematic event.”



- Operationally, systematic events are ones in which “something happens (e.g., a functional failure occurs) but where no specific component can be ‘blamed.’”
- Rather than occurring randomly, or being caused by other random events, systematic failures are caused by things like flawed design, flawed software, or perhaps by cyberattack.
 - If a circuit breaker is open when it is not supposed to be, this could be due to a physical failure of the breaker, or perhaps an upstream physical failure resulting in an incorrect control signal, or perhaps a cyberattack having corrupted the control signal. The latter case is a “systematic event.”
- Identifying systematic events is a major emphasis of STPA (System-Theoretic Process Analysis). (Beyond the scope of this talk)
- In this work, we will postulate a large class of systematic events, incorporate them into a risk model, and analyze the resulting scenarios to determine a combination of systematic events whose prevention will result in an appropriate level of protection at the facility level.

Top Event Prevention Analysis: Simple Example



Safety Domain

$10^{-7} \quad N * A$
 $10^{-10} \quad N * C_1 * SW$
 $10^{-10} \quad N * C_1 * C_2 * C_3$

Top Event

$N * A +$
 $N * C_1 * SW +$
 $N * C_1 * C_2 * C_3.$

Fussell-Vesely

	N	A	C ₁	C ₂	C ₃	SW
Fussell-Vesely	1.0	~1.0	10 ⁻³	10 ⁻³	10 ⁻³	10 ⁻³

Risk Achievement Worth


Risk Achievement Worth	10 ⁴	10 ³	1.2	1.1	1.1	10
------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----	-----	-----	----

**Prevention Sets
Level 2**


$(N * A) *$
 $(N * C_1 + N * SW + C_1 * SW) *$
 $(N * C_1 + N * C_2 + N * C_3 +$
 $C_1 * C_2 + C_1 * C_3 + C_2 * C_3).$

Minimal Prevention Sets

$N * A * C_1 +$
 $N * A * C_2 * SW +$
 $N * A * C_3 * SW.$



DGA breaker to Safeguards Bus A failure to close



Current Results



“Results”

1. Find a Level 2 Prevention Set (including systematic events) that works fairly well in preventing core damage. Now: what do we have to do in order to address loss of generation?
2. Test the Prevention Set on Generation Risk.
 - Find that it prevents some contributors to loss of generation, but not all. ←
3. Run Prevention Analysis on Generation Risk cut sets, conditioning the analysis on credit for systematic events already in the selected Core Damage Prevention Set.
4. This process adds more systematic events. Test the new Prevention Set on Generation Risk.
5. Still not ideal. Look at the cut sets that are causing the problem. Identify a few more events whose prevention would address those cut sets.
6. Looks Good!

The fact that the Prevention Set for safety actually helps with generation risk illustrates part of the point of considering the two attributes together. In principle, one could consider generation risk in the original process of formulating the “safety” Prevention Set...

Base Case

(Syst Evs Not Added Yet)

Systematic events from ...

Selected Core Damage Prevention Set:

Selected Core Damage Prevention Set + Level 1 GRA Prev Set

Selected Core Damage Prevention Set + Level 1 GRA Prev Set + GRA Importance Meas

GRA results as of 2/29/2024

159 systematic Events (out of 386 added to the model)

18 additional systematic events to help with GRA

7 add'l systematic events

Selected Core Damage Prevention Set Alone does ...

GRA freq (1/yr)

GRA freq(1/yr)

GRA freq(1/yr)

GRA freq (1/yr)

Loss of FW (total)

0.018

Little for FW

243

0.015

Good

Loss of FW (partial)

0.19

730

0.22

Good

Loss of Main Condenser

0.036

504

17

Still BAD

0.041

Now OK

MSIV Closure

0.011

0.028

0.015

OK

Instrument Air

1.1E-02

2.7E-02

2.7E-02

Not Bad

Component Cooling

7.5E-04

5.5E-03

5.0E-03

So-so

Service Water (BOP)

5.1E-03

5.0E-03

5.0E-03

Good

Service Water (CCW htxs)

9.6E-04

4.4E-03

4.4E-03

So-so

Service Water (total)

9.4E-04

But lots for SOME IEs

HV Swgr (Trip)/bus

6.0E-02

1146

3.7

Still BAD

0.063

Now OK

HV Swgr (LOOP w/Tran)

8.8E-02

How were these metrics quantified?



- We aren't using probabilities for the systematic events. So we can't really "quantify" the risk metrics in the usual way. So where are the frequencies coming from?

A drastic sensitivity study:

- The Prevention Sets are tested in the following way. Note that for a selected Prevention Set, every systematic event is either included, or not. So:
 - Set included breaker systematic events to False (assume they are successfully prevented)
 - Assumes controls and treatment result in low likelihood of failure mode as compared to components the breakers are supporting.
 - Set breaker systematic events that were not included to True
 - Assumes breaker failure modes represented by these systematic events **occur with certainty.**

DRASTIC

Summary



- The model has been developed and exercised. The calculational process works.
- The results displayed seem worthwhile:
 - We can reason qualitatively about the pros and cons of protecting different collections of assets.
 - Reasoning quantitatively would require probabilities ...
- Looking ahead: So far, this crudely equates “number of things protected” to “attack difficulty.” Can we do better?
 - “Margin?”
 - Is diversity (prevent cut sets by preventing unlike cut set elements) in the prevention set needed?
 - This is still a research topic (it’s the scope of the rest of this FY).