



**Meeting Minutes
Feedback and Improvement SubGroup (SG)
Fall Meeting – Albuquerque, NM
November 6, 2003**

I. Welcome

Susan Kimmerly welcomed the meeting participants. Those who participated include:

- Craig Barnes (Bechtel Nevada)
- Rex Beach (Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory)
- Wayne Booth (Longenecker and Associates)
- Don Bridgers (Sandia National Laboratories)
- Meredith Brown (Los Alamos National Laboratory)
- Dan Burnfield (DNFSB)
- Marc Clay (Los Alamos National Laboratory)
- Linda Collier (Los Alamos National Laboratory)
- Tim Dwyer (DNFSB)
- Amy Ecclesine (Los Alamos National Laboratory)
- Melanie Gravois (Westinghouse TRU Solutions)
- Howard Hatayama (University of California)
- Susan Kimmerly (Bechtel Jacobs)
- Mike Madison (Duratek Federal Services)
- Emil Morrow (DOE—NNSA)
- Chuck Moseley (BWXT Y-12)
- Carl Ostenak (Los Alamos National Laboratory)
- Yolanda Padilla-Vigil (Sandia National Laboratories)
- Larry Pendexter (Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory)
- Jan Preston (UT-Battelle, ORNL)
- Linda Sickles (Sandia National Laboratories)
- Rick Steele (Pacific Northwest National Laboratory)
- Jack Todd (Bechtel Nevada)
- Christina Tolendino (Sandia National Laboratories)
- Hans Vogel (Oak Ridge National Laboratory)
- Joe Yanek (Westinghouse Savannah River)

II. Occurrence Reporting System Update

Joe Yanek provided an update of the new DOE Occurrence Reporting System. Approximately one third of the facilities have converted to the new system including Sandia, BNFL Oak Ridge, LANL, West Valley, LBNL, Pantex, SPRO, SRS and BWXT Y-12. The remaining facilities must convert to the new system by the end of November as the old system will go away on December 1, 2003. Joe also provided a summary of WSRC's experiences since implementing the new system in September 2003. Based on their limited time under the new system, the projected results for WSRC appear to be aligned with the expectations from the re-design project. Thus far the reduction in reporting appears to be in the 25-30% range under the new criteria and over 80% of the reports generated have a Significance Category 3 or 4 designation. Lessons learned from using the new software were provided to DOE HQ and several programming discrepancies have been corrected.



III. Integrated Assessments White Paper

Jan Preston presented a white paper on Integration of Assessment and Oversight. She indicated that this was a timely topic in that both DOE and NNSA have a draft notice and policy on this subject. The DOE policy number is 226.1. Jan indicated that Podonsky's office is interested in the white paper. **Action:** Everyone should review the white paper and provide comments to Jan by the end of November. Jan will provide the white paper to Podonsky's office after comments are incorporated.

There was a discussion regarding the draft notice and policy. They are not going through the formal DOE review and comment process. However, people were encouraged to review and provide comments. Emil Morrow indicated that he would be glad to take comments from the NNSA sites. Other contractors can provide comments through their DOE field office or directly to Pat Worthington's office.

The DNFSB has been concerned about DOE/NNSA plan to change contractor oversight and has held three public meetings to gather information. A fourth public hearing is scheduled for December 3. In the October 23 hearing, John Barry of the Columbia Accident Investigation Board made a presentation on Lessons Learned from the investigation. Some of the concerns mentioned were:

- Tightly coupled operations / organizations—where a technical flaw could produce a catastrophic event with no or few options for mitigation. The more tightly coupled it is, the more control / oversight is required.
- NASA has no formal training program to learn from past mishaps. Naval Reactors has trained over 5,000 personnel in lessons learned from the Challenger accident. NASA has no similar training program.
- Minority opinions should be encouraged. We need to make sure the person accepting the risk really knows all the facts.

Everyone was encouraged to read Chapter 7 of the Columbia Accident Investigation report. This can be accessed via the NASA web page (<http://www.nasa.gov>). Also, John Barry's presentation can be obtained from the DNFSB home page.

IV. Changes to ISM Working Group

Susan reviewed some changes to the ISM Working Group (WG) organization chart, some of which need to be reflected in the F&I subgroup charter. Major changes to the WG charter during the past year include:

- QA Task Group is now the QA Subgroup. Roy Lebel is the QA subgroup chair.
- Performance Metrics Subgroup has completed its mission and this subgroup has been disbanded. Any additional items in this area will be the responsibility of the F&I subgroup.
- A new Integrated Management task group has been established. Carl Ostenak and Hans Vogel are the co-chairs of the IM task group.
- The EFCOG board of directors has requested that the Working Group name be changed to Integrated Management

V. Feedback and Improvement Subgroup Charter

Susan presented the current subgroup charter and indicated that it had not been reviewed since March 2002. Several suggestions were made to improve the charter. **Action:** Susan will



incorporate the comments into a redline version and send it to the attendees for final review prior to issuing. (Note: The redline charter was sent out on 11/17/03).

VI. Best Practice Submission

A Best Practice had been submitted from West Valley Demonstration Project on their Integrated Assessment Program. Susan provided copies of the Best Practice submission to the group and reviewed the guidelines for submitting Best Practices from the EFCOG Best Practices web page. There were positive comments regarding the submission. However, it was generally agreed that additional information regarding several of the criteria areas, especially benefits and implementation approaches, would be needed prior to final acceptance as a Best Practice. It was agreed that in the future Best Practice submissions can be transmitted electronically to the group with discussion and voting via e-mail.

Action: Susan will request additional information from the submitter (Ron Farchmin). An updated submission will be forwarded to the group when received. (Note: The updated Best Practice submission was forwarded to the group on 11/21/03.)

VII. Line Oversight / Contractor Assurance (LOCAS)

There was a discussion about the NNSA LOCAS initiative. The objective of this initiative has been to establish a framework that will allow NNSA Line Oversight to be better aligned to Contractor Assurance Systems, allowing NNSA to place its emphasis on performance assurance areas that are less mature or of higher risk.

A draft NNSA policy has been developed that envisions a *“complementary and supportive relationship between the NNSA and contractor systems to provide assurance.”* Information access and flow between contractor and federal managers in the execution of line management accountability (e.g., for program, project and business management activities, etc.) is intended to be open and unfettered. When issued, the NNSA LOCAS policy will promulgate a Contractor Requirements Document that will drive the Contractor Assurance Systems to be tailored to the needs of each site. The draft policy envisions that NNSA will be a “Demanding Customer,” with focus on technical and business competency, in support of mission performance.

The Subgroup discussed the similarities and differences between the draft NNSA LOCAS policy and draft DOE Policy/Notice 226.1, including the apparent lack of coordination between the two initiatives.

VIII. Feedback and Improvement in Safeguards and Security

Chuck Moseley of BWXT Y-12 made a presentation on Feedback and Improvement in Safeguards and Security at Y-12. Y-12 is currently undergoing an extensive Safeguards and Security assessment by OA 10. Y-12 has a Feedback and Improvement (F&I) Working Group that reviews / analyzes various F&I information and issues a quarterly report. Last year security was identified as one of the major issues.

Chuck discussed the formal process used to review issues and establish ownership. The overall approach is:

- Analyze performance inputs
- Look for common themes/patterns or improvement areas
- Establish ownership accountability for action



- Establish corrective action plans / Security improvement plans
- Determine effects on Site Safeguards and Security Plan (SSSP) baseline

Chuck indicated that right now ISM and ISSM are two separate programs. He presented a feedback and improvement analysis process flow chart. All issues go to the Issues Management Prioritization and Risk Board. The security issues are then flowed directly to the Safeguards and Security (S&S) Issues Management Board for significance review, assignment of responsibility, action plan review, evidence review and root cause analysis. All issue actions are assigned to an owner for resolution. The S&S Issues Management Board also prepares a quarterly report which analyzes the various assessment results and issues, and derives overall conclusions which are compared to the SSSP baseline. Security Improvement Plans are initiated as a result of this review.

IX. Causal Analysis Update

Joe Yanek provided an update on the new DOE causal analysis process implemented as part of the ORPS re-design project. During the four regional workshops for the new ORPS a total of 127 people attended the causal analysis training. Of these individuals, 75 trainers were qualified through the Train-the-Trainer process. Average scores on the comprehensive exam were high and ranged from 91% to 94%. The training for the EH-6 staff is tentatively scheduled for November 20-21, 2003. A benchmarking causal analysis survey will be conducted for continuous improvement.

Computer Based Training (CBT) is being developed for the Causal Analysis, ORPS and Performance Analysis processes. The causal analysis CBT will have 14 interactive modules and the ORPS will have 7 interactive modules. Both will have interactive quizzes and the causal analysis training will include an end of course comprehensive exam. The initial DOE HQ review is expected in January 2004 with beta testing planned for April 2004. **Note:** Anyone interested in participating in the beta testing should contact Johnna Gregory at (803) 952-9879 or through e-mail to Johnna.Gregory@srs.gov.

X. Operating Experience (OE) Review

Joe Yanek talked briefly about DOE's transition from the Lessons Learned program to an Operating Experience Review process. This effort had been previously postponed at DOE HQ due to the implementation of the new ORPS. However, it is currently moving forward. As a separate initiative, EFCOG's Executive Directors have requested that the current EFCOG Best Practices web-based process be expanded to include Operating Experiences from the various EFCOG member companies. Joe has the lead for this task. Anyone who would like to volunteer to help should contact him directly. **Note:** Linda Collier of LANL volunteered to participate in this effort.

XI. Integrated Management

Carl Ostenak and Hans Vogel gave an update of the Integrated Management task group meeting from the previous day. Carl gave a history of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and how it was modeled after Integrated Safety Management. Debbie Monette assumed the lead DOE role for ISSM in March 2002. It was then the topic of a breakout session at the May 2002 Executive ISM workshop. During the breakout of that session, it was recommended that ISSM and ISM should be combined within the EFCOG structure. This recommendation was subsequently approved by the EFCOG board of directors.



During the first IM task group meeting (11/05/03) the team developed draft objective statement, principles and functions for Integrated Management. The goal is to look at risk management within all areas and to effectively manage all risk. The concept of developing a tool box for integrated management applications was discussed.

XII. Action Items

The following formal action items were identified:

1. Action: Publish white paper on Integration of Assessment and Oversight
Person Responsible: Jan Preston
Due date: December 31, 2003
2. Action: Publish revised charter
Person Responsible: Susan Kimmerly
Due Date: December 8, 2003

XIII. Next Meeting

Tentative plans are for the next meeting to be the last week of April 2004 in Las Vegas. Susan will provide additional information as it becomes available.