Which Is More Cost Effective: Safety-Related Nuclear Procurement or Commercial Grade Dedication Procurement?

In nuclear procurement, the least expensive purchase price is rarely the same as the most cost-effective procurement strategy. A safety-related item purchased directly from a qualified nuclear supplier may carry a higher initial price, but it can reduce technical uncertainty, documentation burden, and acceptance risk. A commercial grade item accepted through commercial grade dedication (CGD) may appear less expensive at the point of purchase, but the total cost must include engineering evaluation, critical characteristic verification, testing, supplier controls, quality records, and the risk of failed dedication. The more cost-effective option depends on the item, the safety function, supplier availability, schedule constraints, and the organization's ability to execute dedication correctly.

This article provides a practical framework for comparing procurement approaches based on total lifecycle cost, technical risk, and audit defensibility.

Understanding the Two Procurement Paths

Safety-related nuclear procurement means purchasing an item, service, or component from a supplier that provides it under an approved nuclear quality assurance program. Procurement documents typically specify applicable safety-related requirements, quality assurance criteria, traceability, inspections, documentation, reporting obligations, and acceptance criteria. This approach aligns with 10 CFR Part 50,

Appendix B quality assurance expectations for safety-related structures, systems, and components.

Commercial grade dedication procurement uses a commercially available item or service and applies a documented acceptance process to provide reasonable assurance that it will perform its intended safety function. The process identifies the safety function, determines critical characteristics, selects acceptance methods, verifies those characteristics, and documents the basis for accepting the item as a basic component.

Key Cost Drivers

Cost effectiveness in nuclear procurement includes more than unit price. It also includes engineering and quality assurance labor, inspection and testing, documentation, schedule impact, nonconformance risk, and lifecycle support. The comparison below highlights where those costs typically arise.

Key Cost Drivers for Safety-Related Procurement and Commercial Grade Dedication

Cost Driver	**Safety-Related Procurement**	**Commercial Grade Dedication Procurement**
Purchase price	Usually higher because the supplier maintains a nuclear quality assurance program, qualified personnel, controlled processes, traceability, records, and reporting controls. The price may include quality activities the buyer would otherwise perform internally.	Usually lower because the item is purchased through commercial supply channels. The price does not include dedication planning, engineering review, inspection, testing, or quality record development.
Direct procurement cost	Includes the quoted item price, procurement document preparation, supplier quality requirements, source inspection	Includes the commercial item price plus the internal or contracted cost of dedication activities, such as critical

	if required, review of certifications, and acceptance documentation provided by the qualified supplier.	characteristic identification, acceptance method selection, test planning, inspection, sampling, and documentation.
Engineering effort	Often lower when the item is already designed, manufactured, and documented for safety-related use. Engineering effort focuses on requirements, supplier documentation, and application suitability.	Often higher because the dedicating organization must identify the safety function, determine critical characteristics, justify acceptance methods, evaluate equivalency, and document the technical basis for acceptance.
Verification and testing	May be included in the supplier's nuclear quality controls or procurement documentation. The buyer may still incur costs for receipt inspection, review of certificates of conformance, or independent verification when required.	May be significant when inspection, testing, analysis, source verification, destructive testing, or third-party laboratory support is required. These activities can reduce or eliminate commercial price savings.
Supplier qualification	Requires supplier evaluation and oversight, but the supplier may already be approved. Cost includes audits, surveillances, performance reviews, and periodic requalification.	May reduce reliance on a nuclear-qualified supplier, but the dedicating entity must still control dedication and any third-party activities. Supplier or laboratory surveys should be included when required.
Documentation and records	Costs are often embedded in the supplier's nuclear-grade price and may include material certifications, test reports, inspection records, nonconformance documentation, traceability records, and quality assurance records.	Documentation costs can be substantial because the dedicating organization must create and maintain the dedication package, including safety function analysis, critical characteristics, acceptance results, test reports, supplier evaluations, and final acceptance records.
Schedule cost	May increase lead time when qualified suppliers have limited capacity, long lead times, or obsolete product lines. Schedule impact may include delays,	May improve availability when commercial items are in stock, but testing, engineering review, dedication approval, or failed

	outage effects, expediting fees, or work holds.	verification can offset the schedule advantage.
Risk-based cost	Lower when requirements are clearly flowed down and the supplier has proven nuclear quality controls. Risk includes nonconforming items, incomplete records, supplier issues, and acceptance delays.	Higher if critical characteristics are incomplete, acceptance methods are weak, or the commercial item fails verification. Risk includes rework, retesting, replacement purchases, engineering disposition, nonconformance processing, and audit defensibility concerns.
Lifecycle cost	May be lower over time when the item has stable configuration control, supplier support, replacement availability, and documented nuclear pedigree. Lifecycle cost includes future replacement, maintenance, spare parts, and long-term records retention.	May be lower for repeat purchases if a robust dedication package can be reused or adapted. However, lifecycle cost increases when commercial designs change frequently, suppliers discontinue items, or each purchase requires renewed technical evaluation.

When Is Safety-Related Procurement More Cost Effective?

Safety-related procurement is often more cost effective when the item is complex, highly engineered, difficult to test after manufacture, or directly tied to a critical safety function. In these cases, a defensible dedication package may cost more than the premium paid to a qualified nuclear supplier. This path also provides value when the supplier already has qualified design controls, manufacturing controls, traceability, certified test reports, configuration management, and proven nuclear performance.

This approach is especially useful for custom-fabricated components, pressure-retaining items, qualified electrical equipment, engineered assemblies, software-controlled components, and items requiring extensive material traceability. The purchase

price may be higher, but total ownership cost can be lower because the buyer avoids recreating supplier-level quality assurance controls through dedication.

When Is Commercial Grade Dedication More Cost Effective?

Commercial grade dedication is often more cost effective when the item is readily available, simple to evaluate, and has critical characteristics that can be verified through practical inspection, testing, analysis, or supplier assessment. CGD may also be advantageous when safety-related suppliers are unavailable, lead times are excessive, original equipment manufacturers no longer support nuclear-grade supply, or commercial supply offers equivalent items at substantially lower cost.

Examples include commodity electrical parts, mechanical hardware, standard instruments, replacement subcomponents, consumables, and items whose safety function can be translated into measurable critical characteristics. CGD becomes less cost effective when acceptance requires extensive testing, destructive examination, specialized analysis, repeated supplier audits, or significant engineering judgment.

Total Cost of Procurement: A Better Decision Model

The best comparison is total procurement cost, not safety-related purchase price versus commercial purchase price. Total cost includes purchase price, supplier qualification, engineering evaluation, procurement document preparation, inspection and testing, dedication planning, quality records review, nonconformance resolution, schedule impact, rework risk, and lifecycle support. A lower commercial price can be misleading if dedication work or failed verification causes delay, rework, or added technical review.

Use the decision model below to compare procurement options by total cost, technical risk, schedule impact, and audit defensibility.

Procurement Path Decision Model

Decision Question	**If the Answer Points Toward Safety-Related Procurement**	**If the Answer Points Toward Commercial Grade Dedication**
Is the item complex, custom, or difficult to verify after receipt?	Select safety-related procurement when supplier design controls, manufacturing controls, traceability, and nuclear documentation reduce technical uncertainty.	Consider CGD only if the safety function and critical characteristics can still be verified using practical and defensible acceptance methods.
Are the safety function and critical characteristics clearly defined?	Use safety-related procurement when the safety function is complex or when critical characteristics cannot be confidently verified by the buyer.	Use CGD when the safety function is clear and the critical characteristics are measurable, inspectable, testable, or otherwise verifiable.
Are qualified nuclear suppliers available at a reasonable cost and schedule?	Use safety-related procurement when qualified suppliers are available and their documentation reduces internal workload and acceptance risk.	Use CGD when nuclear suppliers are unavailable, lead times are excessive, or commercial supply offers meaningful savings without compromising technical acceptance.
Will dedication require extensive engineering, testing, or third-party support?	Use safety-related procurement when dedication cost would approach or exceed the nuclear-grade purchase premium.	Use CGD when dedication activities are limited, repeatable, technically straightforward, and less costly than nuclear-grade procurement.
Is schedule risk a major concern?	Use safety-related procurement when a qualified supplier can provide complete	Use CGD when commercial availability improves schedule and the dedication package can

	documentation and reduce the risk of acceptance delays.	be completed without delaying use of the item.
Will the item be purchased repeatedly?	Use safety-related procurement when each purchase involves high complexity, changing requirements, or supplier-specific design controls.	Use CGD when one well-developed dedication package can be reused or adapted for repeat purchases, creating long-term savings.
Which option produces the lowest defensible total cost?	Select safety-related procurement when the higher purchase price is offset by lower engineering, testing, documentation, schedule, and risk costs.	Select CGD when the lower commercial price remains cost effective after adding dedication, verification, records, schedule, and risk costs.

Quick Procurement Screening Checklist

Use this checklist as a concise recap of the decision model. The stronger the evidence for a clear safety function, measurable critical characteristics, practical verification, and repeat purchasing, the more likely CGD will provide value. The stronger the evidence for complexity, supplier-specific controls, documentation burden, or schedule risk, the more likely safety-related procurement will provide value.

- **Safety function clarity:** If the safety function and critical characteristics are clear and measurable, CGD may be cost effective.
- **Item complexity:** If the item is complex, custom, or difficult to verify after receipt, safety-related procurement may be the better value.
- **Supplier availability:** If qualified nuclear suppliers are available and lead times are reasonable, direct safety-related procurement may reduce overall risk.
- **Testing burden:** If dedication requires expensive testing, destructive testing, or specialized analysis, the apparent commercial savings may disappear.
- **Documentation burden:** If required records are already available from a qualified supplier, safety-related procurement can reduce internal effort.
- **Schedule sensitivity:** If a delay would affect outage work, system availability, or project milestones, the lower-risk procurement path may be more cost effective.

- **Repeatability:** If the same item will be purchased repeatedly, developing a robust CGD package once may create long-term savings.

Practical Examples

A simple replacement relay may be a good CGD candidate if the safety function is clear and critical characteristics such as voltage rating, contact configuration, environmental limits, and functional performance can be verified. In contrast, a complex safety-related valve assembly may be more cost effective through qualified nuclear procurement when pressure boundary requirements, material traceability, design controls, qualification records, and supplier documentation would be difficult or costly to recreate through dedication.

Conclusion

Commercial grade dedication is often the better value for simple, available items with well-defined safety functions and verifiable critical characteristics. Safety-related procurement is often the better value for complex, highly engineered, difficult-to-test, or high-risk items where supplier quality controls and nuclear documentation reduce downstream effort and uncertainty.

Bottom line: The more cost-effective path is the one that provides defensible safety-function assurance at the lowest total lifecycle cost—not necessarily the lowest purchase price.

References

Electric Power Research Institute. (2014). *Plant engineering: Guideline for the acceptance of commercial-grade items in nuclear safety-related applications* (Report No.

3002002982). Electric Power Research Institute. https://restservice.epri.com/publicdownload/000000003002002982/0/Product

U.S. Department of Energy. (2011). *Commercial grade dedication guidance*. Office of Environmental Safety and Quality. https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/em/CommercialGradeDedicationGuidance.pdf

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. (2022). *Commercial-grade dedication*. https://www.nrc.gov/reactors/new-reactors/how-we-regulate/oversight/quality-assurance/vendor-insp/comm-grade-dedication

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. (2024). *Regulatory Guide 1.164, Revision 1: Dedication of commercial-grade items for use in nuclear power plants*. https://www.nrc.gov/docs/ML2403/ML24038A310.pdf

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. (2026). *Appendix B to 10 CFR Part 50—Quality assurance criteria for nuclear power plants and fuel reprocessing plants*. Electronic Code of Federal Regulations. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-10/chapter-I/part-50/subject-group-ECFR89aa6ca4aada73c/appendix-Appendix%20B%20to%20Part%2050

Author Information

Laura Suddath is an NQA-1 subject matter expert and quality assurance professional experienced in nuclear quality programs, supplier evaluation, auditing, commercial-grade dedication, and technical documentation. She is a Quality Engineer, Lead Auditor for AS9100 and NQA-1, and Certified Welding Inspector focused on translating nuclear regulatory and code requirements into practical, auditable controls for engineering, procurement, and fabrication activities.

Distribution and Use Notice

This article is provided for general informational and educational purposes only. It reflects the author's professional perspective and does not establish, revise, or replace company, contractual, technical, regulatory, licensing-basis, or quality assurance requirements. It is not legal advice, regulatory direction, engineering direction, procurement authorization, or approval to classify, dedicate, accept, or release any item or service. Users are responsible for confirming applicable requirements against current NRC regulations, customer contracts, procurement documents, licensing-basis commitments, approved quality program procedures, and governing industry standards before applying the information in this article.

For questions about this article or requests for permission to reproduce or adapt the material, please contact Laura Suddath at laurasuddath@gmail.com.