

Meeting Minutes

Energy Facility Contractors Group (EFCOG) Integrated Safety Management Working Group Feedback and Improvement Sub Group

Fall Meeting – Las Vegas, NV
October 25, 2007

I. Welcome, Announcements and Introductions..... *Rex Beach, Chair, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory*

Rex Beach kicked off meeting which will focus on integration of Feedback and Improvement activities with other elements of ISM. Rex reviewed the agenda and noted an addition to the agenda; Pat Worthington will discuss DOE O 226.1 perspective and what lies in store. The attendees at the meeting were:

List of Attendees:

Beach, D. Rex	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
Carpenter, Marla	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
Crippen, Terri	Sandia National Laboratory, Livermore
De Grange, Connie	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
Pam Horning	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
Knapp, Roland	Los Alamos National Laboratory
Leonard, William L.	Fluor, Hanford
Priestley, Terry B.	Los Alamos National Laboratory
Selman, Chuck A.	Wackenhut Services, Inc.
Smith, Lawrence R.	UDS, LLC
Yanek, Joseph R.	Fluor Corporation

II. EFCOG Perspectives.....*Pam Horning, EFGOG Chair, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory*

- Pam Horning provided an overview of EFCOG
- Suggested folks visit the Nevada Test Site Museum; interesting and informative.
- Shared EFCOG's background
- Discussed some of the cornerstones of EFCOG:
 - Knowledge transfer is key
 - Not an enforcement function
 - Issue resolution is key
 - Dissemination of useful tools; e.g., electrical safety tool
 - Performance analysis is a strong focus where metrics and tools are offered and discussed.
 - Supportive community provides excellent resources to customers and members.
 - A few organizations per year are visited; customers and DOE provided assistance with critical issues, many of which are reworked and resolved.
- Mentioned that issues around 10 CFR 824 are now worked through the Safety and Security WG; 10 CFR 851 still being worked through the ISM WG.

- The Safety and Security WG has been in place a couple of years now and is making good progress.
- The ISM WG is making good progress with DOE sponsors and is developing a reputation as a resolution-focused WG with a strong DOE interface.
- 10 CFR 851 was difficult, but with DOE's assistance, implementation was successful.
- DOE STD-1189 is coming up; currently the interface with DOE has been excellent with a strong focus on proactive readiness of implementation.
- DOE G 413.3 is being rewritten; EFCOG has a strong voice which can influence a positive outcome.
- Pam made the following general observations from a top-level EFCOG perspective:
 - Project performance tends to start off on the wrong foot, but things are improving.
 - The CEO forum is working out well.
 - Electrical safety is a great effort – excited to see the good progress.
 - QA issues are being resolved – lots of good work being done.
 - The EFCOG led PAAA reviews at contractor sites (four so far) have been a tremendous success. No current need for more assessments due to such an outstanding job of self-assessing. The self-assessment tool is being used in other areas and is proving to be a powerful tool – well-received by DOE.
 - In the safety analysis arena, training has been cost effective and valuable.
 - Third party financing has received some mixed feelings; some see it as a risk and some see it as value added. Overall, there have been many successes.
- EFCOG had a huge impact on the success of the Technical Review of Safeguards and Security Interface (TROSSI) Report – very good thing.
- Future focus of EFCOG:
 - Keep commitments and focus on the mission.
 - Expect to see changes in administration; stay keen to what the new focus might be.
 - Safety and security is always a primary focus.

III. Feedback: ISM WG Reorganization*Joe Yanek, Fluor Corporation*

- Joe Yanek led the discussion regarding the ISM WG reorganization.
- Looking for input and focusing on benefiting the customer.
- Want to integrate multiple systems; considering creating a systemic link as an opportunity.
- Considering opportunities to assist with the integration and implementation of DOE O 210.2.
- Need clarity on the life-cycle of the ISM WG.
- QA is not looking at the big picture effectively.
- The effort on safety culture is strong and going well.
- More work is needed in the area of Performance Improvement.
- The ISM WG's new name will be, "ISM/QA WG."
- Joe's discussed his vision for ISM/QA WG:
 - Flatten organization

- Reorganize some of the Subgroups and Task Groups.
- Create a Senior ISM/QA WG Advisory Board to capture knowledge as people depart from EFCOG, HSS, DOE, etc.
- Rex expressed some concern regarding the overlap and interface between the newly formed Operating Experience (OPEX) Program Coordinator meetings and the ISM/QA WG. These meetings will be held separately from the EFCOG meetings. Currently, the ISM WG restructuring is an open book. The interface/continuity issue between the ISM WG and the Operating Experience Program Coordinators should be considered and addressed.
- Joe shared a focus-area idea involving a 2008 initiative to assist DOE with ideas on how to integrate OPEX, ORPS, Performance Improvement, etc. to strengthen value for the customer.
- The 2008 session on Six Sigma will be something to focus on and is expected to generate some interest and opportunities.
- Joe shared updates to the ISM WG org. chart:
 - Asked for a volunteer to fill the position of Secretary for the ISM WG
 - ORPS to move from TG to SG, which invites the question, “*What does that do to F&I SG?*” (Pat Worthington later shared her view that the F&I SG should be an element of CAS).
 - Dave Tuttle is the new vice chair of the QA Subgroup.
 - Training and Education has moved up to the ISM WG level. (Additional “full training days” will be added to the next EFCOG meeting’s schedule. Training-only dates will be dedicated to instruction such topics as Six Sigma, ORPS reporting, HPI, and possibly more.)
 - F&I SG looking for a sponsor from DOE.
 - Connie De Grange made the following suggestions, which were well-received by the group:
 - Rather than ORPS becoming a SG, link ORPS to Issues Management more closely.
 - Create an Issues Management SG, adding ORPS and Lessons Learned as TGs.
 - Create an Injury/Illness TG within the F&I SG.
- The next EFCOG conference call or meeting with DOE will include many of the items discussed above. Joe will provide an overview at the next board meeting (on 11/14/07) with anticipated direction.
- Need to look at overlaps among the WGs, SGs, TGs and Project Teams. Will the organizational changes be sustainable?
- Pam Horning mentioned that Nuclear ConOps needs to be looked at and applied at high-hazard levels. Will Nuclear ConOps go to the F&I SG?
- Joe Yanek stressed the importance of maintaining consistency across EFCOG and providing a credible product. Documents should be reviewed once they are posted to the Web and only published *after* peer review. When this doesn’t happen, EFCOG looks bad. Must consider the issues management process from *cradle to grave*.
- Joe Yanek asked Connie De Grange how 10 CFR 851 was being implemented and whether or not it should be integrated with ISMS.

- Connie responded that it *should not* be integrated with ISMS; rather it should go to the ES&H WG.
- Joe confirmed that 10 CFR 851 is being looked at from an implementation standpoint within the ES&H WG.
- Pam Horning spoke up to say that the PAAA SG has not taken on 10 CFR 851, and that she would look into opportunities for integration.

III. Introduction to the Contractor Assurance WG..Roland Knapp & Terry Priestley, Contractor Assurance Working Group

- Terry Priestley made a presentation introducing the Contractor Assurance Working Group (CA WG). Please see the presentation for the details.
- Roland Knapp and Rex decided to put the CA WG discussion on hold for the time being and move on to DOE O 226.1. It was determined that there are a number of potential overlaps between the CA WG and the F&I SG that need to be worked closely to ensure the overlaps are minimized.
- The first meeting of the CA WG will be held on November 8 and 9, 2007. Roland asked for people to attend. If interested, contact Terry Priestley or Roland.

IV. DOE O 226.1 Discussion.....Pat Worthington, DOE-HQ, HS10

- Pat Worthington spoke about DOE O 226.1, providing an overview of DOE's expectations and focus areas.
- DOE O 226.1 provides a mechanism for moving away from "stovepipes."
 - There are four main *oversight* elements to DOE O 226.1:
 - Primary oversight
 - Field oversight
 - Contractor Assurance oversight, although less of a focus
 - DOE oversight
 - DOE O 226.1 asks the question, "*Are we in the spirit of continuous improvement?*"
 - It also contains specific requirements for non-safety areas.
 - DOE O 226.1 requires a Contractor Assurance System (CAS).
 - There is a strong need to manage elements of CAS.
 - A CAS helps to ensure that we move towards integration management across the DOE Complex.
 - DOE O 226.1 is a comprehensive oversight plan that assures a system in set up and in place based on priorities and high-hazard requirements.
 - The formality and maturity of DOE O 226.1 suggests that DOE took the time needed to develop a quality product and did not simply "shoot from the hip."
 - DOE is looking for a CAS to be simple, clear and transparent. Pat stressed that this is supposed to be a good thing for everybody.
 - A CAS description document is typically a stand-alone document; however, each DOE counterpart should be flexible with how it is packaged and submitted.
 - Pat shared her opinion that feedback and improvement should be an element of CA WG.

- DOE's final message is that the goal should be to develop and implement a CAS robust enough to successfully aid in the prevention of reoccurrences.

V. QA versus ISM Assessments.....Norm Baker and Rex Beach

- The session was established to open a discussion of overlaps an possible integration of assessments required for the Quality Assurance Program and the ISM program and/or DOE O 226.1. The attendees agreed that
 - Definitions used in the various assessments should be reviewed and made consistent if possible.
 - Effectiveness of management and independent assessments are often inconsistent
 - Training and expectations for the assessments are often different
- It was agreed that a Task Team should be established to work on in details of integration of QA and ISM/226.1 assessments Members of the TG should come from of the QA Subgroup, F&I SG, and possibly the new Contractor Assurance Working Group
- Rex Beach took an action to write a Task Plan and establish a Task Group to work on this issue.

VI. Task Group Status Report.....G. Branson; C. De Grange; W. Brocker

Due to the length of the discussions of the agenda topics it was determined that the report out of the Task Groups would be tabled.

**VII. Open Forum.....Rex Beach,
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory**

- Participants revisited the reorganization of the ISM WG, reinforcing many of the comments and ideas discussed earlier in the day.
 - Create an Injury/Illness TG under F&I SG (which reinforced Connie's suggestion from earlier in the day).
 - Create an Issues Management SG, adding ORPS and Lessons Learned TGs (again, reinforcing Connie's earlier suggestion)
 - o Issues management cradle to grave
 - o Issues identification through causal analysis
 - o Corrective action, causal analysis, extent of condition, etc.
 - Some feel this approach is too compacted
 - A suggestion was made to remove the F&I SG and replace it with more focused subgroups (i.e., *more than one subgroup* would replace the existing F&I SG)
 - Nuclear ConOps needs to be looked at and applied to high-hazard facilities, which reinforced Pam's statement made earlier in the day.
 - o The suggestion was made to create a Nuclear Ops. TG to go under the F&I SG, (provided it remains in tact).
 - More discussions around the OPEX Program Coordinator Group.
 - o Jeannie Boyle to lead.
 - o Upcoming ISM meeting to focus on the startup of the OPEX Program Coordinator Group.

- Throughout the day's meetings, Jeannie encouraged people to attend the ISM meeting and to participate in the OPEX Program Coordinator Group sessions.
- The OPEX Program Coordinator Group is a "blank piece of paper." Now is the time to share ideas and formulate a strong Group containing the elements needed to provide value added and be successful.

VIII. Items for the Spring 2008 Meeting

The attendees suggested the following topics be considered for the spring 2008 meeting

- Discuss CAS risk level determinations
- Decide on future placement of the CAS WG
- Decide on future placement of F&I SG; under CA WG or ISM/QA WG?
- Discuss Injury and Illness reporting

IX. Closing Issues and Adjourn:

- Briefly discussed upcoming issues for the next meeting (see Section VIII. Items for Spring 2008 Meeting).
- Rex wrapped up the afternoon and thanked everyone for their participation.