



Nov 4, 2009: Working session for the contractor assurance working group (CAWG)

Presentations can be found on the CAWG website:

<http://www.efcog.org/wg/ca/events/fall09mtg/CAWGfall09meetinginfo.htm>

Introductions

The security share included a reminder to remember to put the temporary badges in the collection box at the guard gate on the way out.

Elements of a sound contractor assurance system – Roland Knapp, LANL

Roland set the stage by clarifying D'Agastino's and the DOE Reform Initiative's expectations to a sound contractor assurance system (CAS). As the CAWG Chair, Roland would like to gather your ideas and build a contractor assurance best practice or a white paper on the topic. We don't want this to be binding; this is about identifying effective ways to manage.

Open discussion:

- We need to let these elements be at the highest level; we don't want to be too descriptive.
- In the beginning CAS was a reporting tool; now we need to let it be about how you manage your system.
- If we can do something pro-active with our systems, there is less need for them.
- As a single contractor we don't have anything to do with NNSA. In general we go way beyond what the order calls for.
- Why is there not a DOE CAS system?
- We are not trying to impose the DOE way; this is just a good way of doing business.
- Start from scratch and get rid of the tricky phrases like "transparency".
- Where is the integration between CAS and ISM, ISSM, and QA?
- If the expectation is that nothing wrong ever happens, then the expectation is wrong.
- There is still a lot of detailed prescription out there and that is confusing at the field level.
- Clarification: elements, such as 3rd level certification, are optional.
- What question was CAS created to resolve?
- Get rid of the phrase "contractor assurance". We should instead be talking about the transparent application of management systems.
- We need to focus on #4 in the slides (slide 7): "Enables performance that is as good as or better than current performance, costs less, and requires fewer human resources".
- We need to tie our expectations to established successes.



CONTRACTOR ASSURANCE WORKING GROUP MEETING NOTES

Nov 4 and 5, 2009

U.S. DOE NNSA/Nevada Site Office, Las Vegas, Nevada

Steven Johnson (LLNL) and Steven Swenning (BNWT) have submitted the following CAS Elements:

1. Understand your work, risks and requirements.
2. Assess your work against requirements and based on your view of risk. A three-year schedule often works best.
3. Document assessment results. Monitor effectiveness/quality of assessments.
4. Understand your management systems and assess them periodically.
5. Document "issues" from assessments, management walk-through, etc.
6. Correct identified issues on a tailored basis.
7. Make sure you really understand the causes of your most significant issues – fix them so they stay fixed. Pay attention to the fixes in subsequent assessments.
8. Analyze your issue inventory for gremlins and trends. Periodically look at the base of Heinrich's triangle for spikes above the grass.
9. Define critical attributes of your performance and measure it with measure it – measures/metrics. Make sure you reinforce the desired behavior.
10. Learn from your mistakes and certainly learn by appreciating the painful experiences of others.
11. Communicate your results internally and externally. Share the benefit of your pain, and remember to share the things that work well – a law of human dynamics (Johnson's third law) is that everyone can find the same easiest way to do something wrong, but note and value when someone finds a way to do a hard thing well!

ACTION: CAWG, please respond to Roland and Camilla (camilla@lanl.gov) as to what high-level elements need to be in place in a sound contractor assurance system. You can build on the numbered list above if you wish to.

Distributing quick information of events Lessons learned utilization - Vaughn Hooks, B&W Y-12

Presentations showcased a timely way to distribute lessons learned information and included the forms used for collection and for reporting. The main benefit of the system is that it provides more consistent, actual, relevant, and timely reporting of lessons learned.

Results of pilot evaluation of the effectiveness of LOCAS at SNL and Sandia Site Office Results of pilot evaluation of the contractor assurance system at LANL and Y-12 - Albert MacDougall, NNSA Service Center

The two presentations, which include CRADs, generated the following comments/discussion:

- Focused oversight and effective CAS needs to be coupled.
- You need to get to the core question, namely "how do you know that you are effective?"
- CAS is moving from the compliance phase to the effectiveness phase.
- Start with the end in mind.
- Encourage LASO to use other external assessments.

Please direct comments and questions to Camilla Lopez, Secretary for the Contractor Assurance Working Group: Camilla@lanl.gov, (505) 665-2503



CONTRACTOR ASSURANCE WORKING GROUP MEETING NOTES

Nov 4 and 5, 2009

U.S. DOE NNSA/Nevada Site Office, Las Vegas, Nevada

- From an oversight point of view, if what you are showing us is credible, we will use it.

Risk categorization of issues at LLNL - Jill Farrell, LLNL

Presentation showcased LLNL's issues tracking system. A probability/significance matrix is used to determine significance level (1-5). The presentation motivated a discussion of how we define an issue, whether we are getting the CAT-1s and CAT-2s, and how we are dealing with security issues.

Evolution of LOCAS metrics in NNSA - Frank Russo, NNSA

Comments:

- Maybe HQ reacts too much to red. Red should only mean that a place needs attention. If the contractor is doing something to work the issue, then it is good.
- If there is too much green, maybe it is an indicator that the contractor is using a parallel system to manage with (and only using the metrics as a check the box for reporting).
- It is an advantage to be able to see what other sites' metrics are even though the golden rule should be not to compare site to site when you look at the LOCAS metrics.
- It is a balancing act because there needs to be *some* commonality. The comment that "we are all different" seems to be holding us back. Standardization makes sense in certain areas, for example emergency management. We have to avoid the stove-piped mentality.

Discussion of contractor assurance best practices - Camilla Lopez, LANL

The CAWG looked at three suggested best practices:

1. Contractor Assurance Deployed Staff Model
2. Performance Communication Center
3. Human Performance Factors Considered in Causal Analysis

The three suggested best practice candidates started a discussion of what criteria the CAWG would like to use as we submit best practices. The following decisions were made:

- We want to use the definition and protocol established by EFCOG for submitting best practices: <http://www.efcog.org/bp/guidance.htm>
- The main objective for the contractor assurance best practices is to create a forum for learning and sharing with information that is relevant, new, and significant to the group.
- We should start with a best practice for CAS (hence our presentation and discussion of "elements of a sound contractor assurance system") and let subsequent best practices flow from that.
- Bob Stuewe (LANL, rstuewe@lanl.gov) will screen submitted best practices for readability.
- The desired end-state is to have a "library" of best practices covering a wide range of both topics and levels of details.

Please direct comments and questions to Camilla Lopez, Secretary for the Contractor Assurance Working Group: Camilla@lanl.gov, (505) 665-2503



CONTRACTOR ASSURANCE WORKING GROUP MEETING NOTES

Nov 4 and 5, 2009

U.S. DOE NNSA/Nevada Site Office, Las Vegas, Nevada

- It is furthermore desired that there are best practices for all sizes of organization, from the smallest one-man operation to the biggest of the national laboratories.

ACTION: The CAWG and other interested stakeholders are encouraged to submit best practices while they use what they have and worry less about format (for example, if you already have a white paper on a CAS topic, don't reformat it, just submit it).

Enterprise Integrated Safety Management - Shawn Dolan, Northrup Grumman

The discussion that followed focused on the fact that these types of enterprise solutions come with a price tag. If you are interested in using enterprise systems as a contractor, you have to set up your enterprise criteria up front or you will fail.

Improvement of the contractor assurance process through application of six sigma methodologies - Jane Fitzpatrick, Kansas City Plant

The example that was used was how to apply six sigma methodologies to streamline and improve the quality of the audit process at KCP.

Upgraded Performance Feedback & Improvement System - Camilla Lopez, LANL

The presentation covered the new performance feedback and improvement system at LANL that is in the process of being implemented. The system promises:

- better integration with other tracking systems
- improved trending and analysis capabilities that utilizes artificial intelligence technologies, and
- more flexibility for the manager on how to manage issues

Recap and open discussion

- The CAWG could benefit from doing more work between working group meetings so that we progress/mature faster as a working group.
- The sharing and the open discussions were great.
- It is useful to compare across sites, to find commonalities and to identify places where we are doing things well.
- This time the agenda was somewhat NNSA focused; we should try to more actively incorporate a DOE perspective.
- Looking forward we should focus more on sustainability in our CAS plans, for example how our organizations deal with reducing the greenhouse gasses.
- Performance measures is always a worth-while topic.
- Focus on NNSA/DOE/CAS collaboration and how we keep progressing.
- Support for working on best practices.

Please direct comments and questions to Camilla Lopez, Secretary for the Contractor Assurance Working Group: Camilla@lanl.gov, (505) 665-2503



Nov 5, 2009: Joint session between the Contractor Assurance Working Group (CAWG) and the ISM/QA Feedback and Improvement (F&I) Subgroup

EFCOG Working Group Chair meeting highlights, Roland Knapp and Patricia Allen

Roland Knapp, CAWG Chair, presented slides covering the Group's accomplishments since the last CAWG meeting and a look ahead at the focus and planned actions.

Patricia Allen talked about the importance of focusing on leading indicators, QA metrics, and how to mine data out of ORPS.

Independent and self-evaluation of CAS - Bob Stuewe, LANL

The presentation covered planning, scheduling, CAS maturity, management system progression, and integration between the different types of CAS assessment.

Performance communication center - Camilla Lopez, LANL

Presentation and live demonstration of a new, interactive web site that enhances the communication of performance management at LANL. The initiative encompasses blogs, chat with an expert, communities of practice, and other innovative ways to use social media to share performance feedback and generate interest in the contractor assurance and feedback and improvement system.

Kansas City governance - Jane Fitzpatrick, Kansas City Plant

Presentation showcased oversight model for a non-nuclear organization (KCP), including operating requirements model and lessons learned.

Insight into the ORPS database - Sam Formby - University of South Carolina

The presentation went over different techniques to mine and analyze ORPS data.

Unraveling the assessment Gordian knot - Dexter Ray, Savannah River Remediation

The presentation showcased how SRR successfully had reduced the number of assessments, reduced redundancies, developed clearer R2A2s, and achieved better integration.

It was agreed to share the tools LANL is using as well, particularly the assessment schedule and the risk analysis tool. These tools are posted as attachments to this presentation.



CONTRACTOR ASSURANCE WORKING GROUP MEETING NOTES

Nov 4 and 5, 2009

U.S. DOE NNSA/Nevada Site Office, Las Vegas, Nevada

QA metrics - Rich Salizzoni - Savannah River Remediation

The presentation covered the development and implementation of a corporate QA performance metrics system. A lessons learned was to stick with ONE numbering system.

Wrap-up

A comment was made to consolidate CAWG and F&I into *one* group; there are no advantages in having two separate groups.

Next CAWG meeting will be in April 2010 (tentatively around 4/19/2010). The meeting will be held jointly with the Safeguard & Security Working Group and the Safety & Security Regulatory Working Group.