

EFCOG Contractor Assurance Working Group

October 28 – 29, 2008 Meeting Notes

Introductions

After a brief safety share (winter weather slips, trips and falls, and a discussion of pedestrians wearing dark clothes and not being visible in the dark winter commute), Roland Knapp kicked off the meeting by discussing his desire for our WG to get better connected with the other EFCOG working groups. This topic was discussed at the recent EFCOG Directors and Working Group Chairs meetings.

Mark Frie introduced himself, and seconded Roland's recommendations. Mark joined Longenecker and Associates Inc. in early September, and will be the primary point of contact for EFCOG Working Groups. Mark retired this past May from the Department of Energy after 34 years of Federal service. He is a nuclear engineer by education, worked initially in the Atomic Energy Commission on the Clinch River Breeder Reactor Plant Project, worked in the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management on repository site characterization, facility engineering, and licensing, and worked in the Office of Environmental Management the last 20 years: working to open the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, waste management, site closures, contract acquisitions, business management, budget, and strategic planning, with the last 10 years as a Deputy Assistant Secretary in various positions and also served several months as Manager, Idaho Operations Office.

HSS Safety Directives Project Update

Steve Kirchhoff (HS-01) updated the group on Phase 1 and 2 of this effort (presentation attached). This has been a Fed-led effort, with contractor representation. Several of the CAWG members have participated in this effort. However, this is NOT a contractor-led effort.

Desired Attributes of HSS Directives:

- What vs. How (Clear requirements; Not *overly* prescriptive; "How" requirements for safety)
- Requirements Not Duplicative (no duplication of laws, regulations, or national standards)
- Clear Applicability
- Resolve Conflicting Requirements

There was much discussion on the status of DOE O 226.1A. HSS is considering removing the Contractor Requirements Document (CRD) from 226.1A and incorporating the requirements dealing with management systems in the QA Order (414.1C). There is also a possibility that the contractor requirements would be incorporated into the ISM manual (450.4-1). Our WG did not come to a consensus, but there seemed to be a general feeling that requirements associated with management systems (e.g., assessments, issues management, performance measures, etc.) are not part of the core QA function and should not be limited to ISM.

When this project was starting up, our WG discussed the wide distribution of requirements for management / performance assurance systems. Steve Johnson (LLNL), distributed a "white paper" he put together (re-attached, here) expressing his desire to consolidate these requirements in one location. This may be worth re-visiting.

At the request of HSS, a deliverable from the CAWG will be to develop a position paper (or something along these lines) outlining our group's position. If you are interested in leading this effort, please let me know.

Highlights and Challenges from HSS Inspections – Tom Staker (HS-64)

Tom Staker shared strengths and challenges HSS has seen during their inspections. HSS has their inspection reports, annual summary reports, CRADs, etc. on their website (<http://www.hss.energy.gov/IndepOversight/reports.html>)

One significant challenge identified by HSS is the development of sustainable corrective actions and the subsequent verification of effectiveness. The EFCOG ISM/QA working group developed a guide for performing effectiveness reviews in 2006 (<http://www.efcog.org/guides/EFCOG%20Guide%20-%20Performance%20of%20Effectiveness%20%20Reviews.pdf>). It was recommended that the CAWG

EFCOG Contractor Assurance Working Group October 28 – 29, 2008 Meeting Notes

members review this guide, and see if an update is in-order. This is a topic that we would work jointly with the ISM/QA WG.

Requirements Flowdown

Jack Anderson (ORNL), Chuck Murray (KCP), Steve Johnson (LLNL) and Jim Tisaranni (SRS) all gave short presentations on their respective site's approach to ensuring contractual requirements are implemented. Copies of these presentations are attached. It appears that many similarities exist, but the approaches are customized to each site.

Using Human Performance Principles to Produce Tangible Results

We had a two-part discussion on using Human Performance principles. On Tuesday, Larry Kimmel (PNL) discussed how PNL has tried to embed these principles into every-day activities. Roland Knapp (LANL) also gave a presentation on a glove box breach investigation at LANL that utilized an HPI approach (presentation attached).

On Wednesday, Dan Swaim (B&W Pantex) discussed the use of "low consequence – information rich" events to drive improved performance (presentations attached). Pantex has also developed two books ("High Reliability Operations – A Practical Guide to Avoid the System Accident" and "Causal Factors Analysis – An Approach for Organizational Learning") that are available free of charge to DOE and its contractors. To get copies of these books, please contact Karl Waltzer, the Pantex NNSA Site Office Senior Tech Advisor at either KWaltzer@pantex.com or 806-477-3148. Rick Hartley is the resident HPI and HRO expert at Pantex, and is a wealth of information. He can be reached at rhartley@pantex.com or 806-477-6480.

An Approach to Developing Leading Indicators – Marc Clay (LANL)

At the request of the DNFSB, EFCOG has been asked to propose a process to develop effective leading indicators. A presentation by Pam Horning (EFCOG Chair) and John Longenecker is pending (possibly November). To prepare, Marc Clay (LANL Performance Feedback Office Director) led the group through a discussion (presentation attached).

As is the case in most of our topics, there was much discussion. There was an overwhelming concern that DOE (and the DNFSB) may view leading indicators as a "silver bullet" that can predict all-things evil. We also had a philosophical discussion on whether there is such a thing as a "leading indicator." We came to the general conclusion that all metrics are, by nature, lagging indicators. BUT, some indicators can be used in a manner to "predict" future performance. Example: On a submarine, the main turbine bearing temperature is a lagging indicator of bearing temperature, but can be used to predict propulsion plant availability.

Also much concern that DOE will begin to mandate specific metrics. There was consensus among the group that metrics must be customized to the situation. There is merit to sharing ideas and metrics, but a "one-size-fits-all" approach is not appropriate. In addition, there are many management tools (e.g., assessments, issues management, etc.) that are used to monitor and evaluate performance. Metrics are just one tool, of many.

In the end, the group agreed that we should pursue the development of a process to identify leading indicators. Attached is a draft copy of the presentation Pam and John plan to use in their discussion with the DNFSB. **Please forward any feedback on the draft to Roland Knapp and Marc Clay (Knapp@lanl.gov and MClay@lanl.gov).**

Effective Use of Worker Feedback Programs

Vaughn Hooks (Y12) and Jeannie Boyle (HS-32) shared their approach to processing and using lessons learned to improve performance (presentations attached). Again, much discussion followed. There seemed to be a consensus that every contractor (and DOE) continues to struggle with sorting through the seemingly

EFCOG Contractor Assurance Working Group October 28 – 29, 2008 Meeting Notes

endless volume of information, and finding the “jewels” that can then be acted upon. We are victims of information overload. This is a topic that seems ripe for pursuing with the ISM/QA working group.

NNSA LOCAS Update (Frank Russo – NNSA)

Frank gave the group an update on the progress of implementing the NNSA Line Oversight / Contractor Assurance System (LOCAS) effort. NNSA has approved a LOCAS Supplemental Directive (attached) that outlines the relationship between HQ and field offices.

NNSA sites (including Field Offices) have also begun monthly reporting to NNSA site-specific metrics that address the following performance categories:

- Credible Performance
- Integrated Management System
- Effective Resource Management
- Continuous Improvement
- Line Oversight

September data is the first set to be reported. Although this information is available to NNSA HQ, it is still unclear how NNSA will utilize the information. NNSA is planning to use the first 6 months of reporting as a “pilot,” and then re-evaluate the program.

EFCOG ISM/QA Working Group Draft White Paper – “Process for Integrating Assessment Programs

We ran out of time and did not get a chance to discuss this draft white paper (attached). The ISM/QA WG has asked for our participation. **Please review and send comments to Tricia Allen at patricia.allen@srs.gov**

A date and location for our next meeting was not discussed. However, we should plan on meeting again in the April – May timeframe. So far, all of our meetings have been in the Forestall building, which better-enables DOE HQ participation. If you have ideas for a different location, or would like to host the next meeting, please let me know.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at TPriestley@lanl.gov, or 505-665-1330 with any questions or comments.

Terry Priestley