

Integrated Safety Management Program Management and Integration Subgroup Meeting Minutes – Idaho Falls, Idaho

August 26, 2008

Cynthia Adair (OST)
Norm Barker (Energy Solutions)
Beth Bilson (Fluor)
Neil Blatnick (INL)
Bob Brandhuber (SNL)
Will Brocker (ANL)
Rich Brown (BNI – WTP)
Byron Burkhard (B&W Pantex)
Shane Bush (Bushco, Inc.)
James Cantwell (LANS)
Richard Caummisar (PXSO)
Grant Ceffalo (BNI-WTP)
Steve Coleman (BNL)
David Compton (DOE-HSS)
Todd Conklin (LANL)
Victor Edens (BNI-WTP)
Lynn Ellsworth (INL)
Tim Flake (SRNS)
J. Kent Fortenberry (Parsons)
Melanie Gibson (WSRC)
Gary Hagan (B&W Y12)
Don Harvey (NNSA/HQ)

Richard Hoffman (Isotek)
Farren Hunt (INL)
Mike Kinney (NSO/NTS)
Sharon Kohler (ORNL)
Steve Lindamood (Parsons)
Alan Macenski (LLNL)
John McDonald (CH2M Hill)
Theron McGriff (INL)
John Miller (SRNS-SRNL)
Doug Minnema (DNFSB)
George Mortensen (Institute of Nuclear Power),
Chuck Meyers (Sandia)
Sonya Pelot (SM Stoller)
Michelle Reichert (B&W Y12)
Wayne Schofield (Dade Moeller)
Roy Schepens (Parsons)
Gordon St. Hilaine (OST)
David Swale (Energy Solutions)
Steve Williams (SLAC)
Alan Wood (INL)
Joe Yanek (Fluor/Gov't Group)

Key ISM Website Links

1. EFCOG Link <http://www.efcog.org/>
2. DOE ISM Champions Link <http://hss.energy.gov/HealthSafety/ism/>
3. Idaho National Laboratory 2008 Champions Workshop Registration Site <https://secure.inl.gov/ismws08>

08:30 – 09:45 Introductions/Meting Minutes Review

John McDonald, the ISM Program Management and Integration Subgroup Chair opened the ISM Program Management and Integration group session. Participants introduced themselves and provided a brief overview of their roles and responsibilities within their respective Institutions/Corporations. The primary purpose for the meeting was to discuss the joint EFCOG/DOE Safety Culture Task status and then get feedback on practices to improve safety culture.

John McDonald provided an overview of the joint EFCOG/DOE Safety Culture Project. Discussion points included the following:

- ◆ Safety Culture definition and vision statement from the safety culture task team.
- ◆ Overview of Task Team Members and their affiliation
- ◆ John and meeting participants discussed at length the case for safety culture change. How change ties into ISM implementation improvements. In addition to discussing the need for change, John provided graphical representations of ISMS and improved DOE performance from 1993 to 2007, safety culture and commercial nuclear performance improvement from 1994 – 2007.
- ◆ Participants discussed improvements in safety for each stage of safety culture maturity in all levels of management and leadership activities.

Integrated Safety Management Program Management and Integration Subgroup Meeting Minutes – Idaho Falls, Idaho

- ◆ Key activities the task team plans to complete over the next 2 years (2008-2010)

Other key discussion points were:

- ◆ Union involvement should be considered and addressed by the team.
- ◆ How to get senior management engaged is an area that needs to be specifically addressed.
- ◆ Page 4 of the path forward document should clearly indicate violation instead of intentional shortcut.
- ◆ There was discussion on identifying attributes associated with the 3 safety culture stages in the IAEA model. The task team attempted to do this earlier but found it too difficult due to the lack of related reference material. It may be more practical to identify the stage 3 characteristics and make judgments about the degree that characteristic is implemented in a facility.
- ◆ When describing tools to implement safety culture, it would be beneficial to include a discussion on what elements relate to improving safety culture. Everyone has expectations, but there would be value in identifying specific expectations that would support a positive culture as an example.

John communicated that the task team was focused on three focus areas: 1) leadership, 2) worker involvement, and 3) learning organization. In an effort to obtain feedback and project improvements, meeting participants were broken into and assigned to one of the three safety culture focus areas. Dave Compton was the team lead for learning organizations, John McDonald for worker involvement, and Norm Barker for the leadership group participants. Each of the teams was asked to consider the following 7 questions and safety culture documents discussed above in their breakout sessions:

1. Do you agree with the implementation practices?
2. Are there any you would add?
3. Are there any you would take away?
4. Do you think the right level of detail is provided?
5. If more is needed, can you identify?
6. If less is needed, can you identify what should be taken out?
7. Is there anything else you would like to be considered?

Regarding feedback received in this session, every effort will be made to consider and incorporate changes. However, there may be related topics that can be combined, or comments that are difficult to address. The minutes will be reviewed by the Task Team to verify the comments have been considered and addressed.

10:00 – 1630 Worker Involvement Breakout Session (John McDonald)

Worker Involvement Discussions:

An exercise to rank the attributes was conducted. This was attempted because the group thought it would provide more emphasis on important characteristics. Based on how close the results were, this led to a discussion on an observation of the task team about the interdependency between all of the important cultural elements. It is very difficult to focus on one attribute over another since they all play a role in improving performance. The ranking was very close:

1. Trust
2. Teamwork and mutual respect
3. Participate in work planning activities
4. Mindful of hazards
5. Personal commitment to safety

Integrated Safety Management Program Management and Integration Subgroup Meeting Minutes – Idaho Falls, Idaho

There was an extensive discussion to apply HPI and VPP tools to improve worker involvement. This should be pursued further.

The group then conducted a session to identify activities to promote each sub attribute identified by the task team. The table below defines the sub attributes identified:

Trust	Teamwork and mutual respect
Do what you say Judicious application of disciplinary action Clear and certain consequences Culpability matrix Participative management Senior management involvement in disciplinary actions Don't shoot the messenger Open communications Mutual respect Timely response to concerns Never ascribe motive Seek first to understand rather than to be understood	Team building activities (challenges) Management (peer) recognition Integrated project teams (both vertical and horizontal) Caring and support lunches Community bulletin board Outreach to local area Remember the little stuff Importance of first line supervisor Glasnost (provide the context of the task)
Mindful of hazards	Personal commitment to safety
Appropriate training Operator aides Posting and labeling of workplace POW/POA (reminders) Outside speakers (or inside speakers) JSA (worker development of) Mentor/protégé Joe schmoe videos Se one, do one, teach one Proficiency (part of training) Posting of statistics Poster contests	Develop and communicate expectations My brothers keeper program Timeout cards Personal pledge Questioning attitude Why I work safe Reward system for safety performance List of observable artifacts Annual site wide safety conference Mentoring and coaching Positive reinforcement of desired behaviors Hazard id cards Surveys Workshops (focus groups) which are facilitated
Work planning	
Activity level work planning CRADs (NNSA document) 851 requirements Safety is non negotiable agreements between union and management Plan of week/plan of day reviews with worker involvement Worker involvement in post job debrief Self assessment of level of participation (VPP tools) INPOs post job survey tool Worker involvement in policy/process development Participation means participation, not awareness	

Integrated Safety Management Program Management and Integration Subgroup Meeting Minutes – Idaho Falls, Idaho

10:00 – 1630 Leadership Breakout Session (Norm Barker)

Participants in the leadership breakout session begun discussions on the issues and challenges associated with safety culture leadership. The leadership team identified the following critical issues associated with leadership and should be evaluated for impact on the safety culture task group activities and path forward.

- ◆ Insufficient time and resources - customer does not give or provide resources to execute the myriad of orders, directives, mandates, etc... Participants stated that they are unsure management factors in, ask or raises the resource constraint questions.
- ◆ Participants believed that appropriate leadership theories are in place. However, the challenge is management embracing, implementing, and executing theories in an efficient manner.
- ◆ Another issue discussed is organizations need to build a lasting program / process or relationship that both union and management can embrace and say it's our program collectively. Instead, what usually occurs is through contract transitions, the new contractor or contractors' come in with a new philosophy or as they say a better way of doing things and fails to include organizational personnel or the personnel that built the process. The bottom line is employees are not considered a stakeholder in leader minds hence the dysfunctional safety culture.
- ◆ Metrics should be built into manager/executive annual performance measures. One participant stated that "DOE requires all senior management federal employees to have critical safety performance element/standard included in their individual performance plan." (a frequently asked question document detailing this requirement can be found at http://www.efcog.org/wg/ism_pmi/index.htm along with these meeting minutes. Participants also stated that metrics need to be meaningful in order to be effective.
- ◆ In reference to the "EFCOG/DOE Draft Processes and Practices to Improve Safety Culture and ISMS" document, participants communicated that the task team should focus on building trust and having a more positive spin on safety culture processes and practices. The document appears to be geared more towards citing negative attributes. The participants also stated that more leadership and management dialogue is needed.
- ◆ Another area discussed was the perception that scientists have limited management and leadership skills. Personnel are appointed to leadership positions in an inconsistent manner and in most cases not held accountable for leading or managing staff because they are exceptional scientists.
- ◆ Participants communicated that in many cases there are several different fiefdoms or silos within organizations. Each of these silos or fiefdoms do what they feel will benefit their individual area of responsibility and not for the benefit of the institution or organization as a whole. Significant stove piping.
- ◆ The safety culture task team should consult with INPO and inquire on how they got the commercial nuclear CEO's and/or COO's to buy in and pay attention to safety culture improvement. What changes did INPO make/ How did they go about communicating or getting buy in?
- ◆ Another concept discussed on the topic of leadership is the ISMS Program. A common thought is the ISMS program does not belong in the safety or ES&H group and should be at the executive (CEO/COO) level or laboratory director level. The safety culture team should consider or determine the level of responsibility from senior leadership and not delegated to the line.
- ◆ The leadership team also communicated that the DOE rewards/funding may be unrealistic for the small steps or gains and improvements made in safety. A comparable program for rewards that is proportional to performance should be considered.
- ◆ Participants also stated that lessons learned do not exist for safety leadership and management failures at the executive level. Line impact or lack of program impact or future work.
- ◆ Executives or senior management should visit the site often in an effort to show compassion and concern and to build trust on what can be done better (promote open dialogue and communication) in the absence of punishment.
- ◆ Union, craft, technologist, maintenance, technician staffs, specifically union leadership support and buy in is critical and should be obtained early on. Cascading sponsorship and embracing top down and bottom up strategies. There should be better understanding of whom the workers are and the culture they work in, and recognizing and rewarding those networks.

Integrated Safety Management Program Management and Integration Subgroup Meeting Minutes – Idaho Falls, Idaho

- ◆ A question participants believe the safety culture task team must consider is “how do you convert culture and make the business case?”
- ◆ Another question for consideration is what is being done with the massive levels of data? Processes are being stacked or piled onto programs with no endpoint in sight. The cycle of stacking new programs on top of existing programs is beginning to take its toll and very little is getting done due to the constraints from the multiple levels of programs employed.
- ◆ Another leadership activity to consider is the identification of personnel across organization(s) that are respected and have influence over others. These personnel should be identified as the change agents and be involved in promoting changes or improvements espoused by senior managers.

The leadership team summarized the aforementioned into 8 activities that should be considered. Below is an overview of the 8 activities:

1. Break safety culture document into ISMS guiding principles “format”
 - a. One section for each of the 7 guiding principles
2. Bin each of the 5 leadership attributes (from brochure) into the appropriate ISMS guiding principle section
3. Incorporate the additional 18 items that our sub team identified (hard copy list will be given to team) into the appropriate ISMS guiding principle section
4. Incorporate the existing safety culture draft content into the appropriate ISMS guiding principle section
5. Develop an assessment process/tool that fosters continuous improvement/assessments
 - a. Baseline leadership against safety culture document
 - b. Perform a Gap Analysis
 - c. Develop a Corrective Action Plan(CAP)
 - d. Execute CAP
 - e. Continually Assess Safety Culture Leadership to improve process
6. Positive spin to safety culture document instead of “this is not what to do”
7. Capture INPO information to find out how they facilitated improvement in Nuclear Facility Safety Culture Leadership
8. Define Line leadership vs. ES&H leadership of safety culture

10:00 – 1630 Learning Organization Breakout Session (Dave Compton)

General Feedback on Safety Culture Project

- ◆ The project needs a clearer and firmer tie to ISMS. It should not be presented as separate or apart from ISMS. The “focus areas” are good but need to be clearly linked to and fitted with existing ISMS expectations. For example, the first focus area, “Leadership,” relates most closely to Guiding Principle #1, Line Management Responsibilities for Safety; the second focus area, “Worker Involvement,” relates most closely to Supplemental Safety Culture Element #1, Individual Attitude and Responsibility for Safety; and the third focus area, “Learning Organization,” relates most closely to Supplemental Safety Culture Element #4, Organizational Learning for Performance Improvement.
- ◆ The project terminology regarding “Learning Organization,” is confusing because there are two separate and distinct uses of this term, one as the third stage of development of a safety culture, from the IAEA maturity model (from stage 1, “compliance,” to stage 2, “best practices,” to stage 3, “learning organization”) and one related to the third focus area for safety performance improvement. It is recommended that the focus area be renamed, using something like “Continuous Learning” or “Continuous Improvement,” leaving “Learning Organization” for the third stage, per the IAEA model.
- ◆ The two big issues that will influence impact of these efforts are (1) line management buy-in and commitment, and (2) organizational priority and resources devoted to improvement. Increased attention needs to go toward how to secure

Integrated Safety Management Program Management and Integration Subgroup Meeting Minutes – Idaho Falls, Idaho

adequate management commitment and organizational resources. Line management, including DOE line managers, must be fully engaged for this to succeed.

- ◆ Tools to measure and assess progress need to be included in the project package, with a core set recommended for use across the all organizations. Measurement tools will help to focus improvement efforts (“What gets measured gets managed”). They will allow comparison and learning across sites and organizations. To evaluate status and progress, a combination of passive performance metrics (such as open work requests) and active, intrusive measures (such as focus groups, interviews, surveys) will be needed.
- ◆ Themes for the three focus areas can be refocused as follows:

Leadership	from Management to Leadership
Worker Involvement	from You to Us
Continuous Improvement	from Correction to Prevention
- ◆ Care needs to be used is associating “Leadership” solely with the organizational managers. While senior managers are in influential positions, they are not the only ones who can show leadership on safety culture. Workers can also show leadership. An alternate construction to “Leadership” and “Worker Involvement” would be “Management Engagement” and “Worker Engagement.”
- ◆ Sometimes, the terminology is confusing between principles, attributes, elements, focus areas, bullets, and stages. Simplifying the terminology without losing essential meanings is encouraged.

Feedback and Input on Tools (“Draft Processes and Practices to Improve Safety Culture and ISMS”)

- ◆ The toolkit should include one that helps organizations to understand what stage of safety culture they are in. This helps them to correctly select the right improvement activities in the right order and on the right schedule. The INPO performance metrics and assessment approaches should be reviewed and integrated.
- ◆ Tools for this focus area break down into three groups: (1) correction tools, (2) benchmarking tools, and (3) anticipation and prevention tools. There is room for all these tools at all stages of safety culture (see attached figure). Emphasis on the various tools will change at the different stages, with more emphasis on anticipation and prevention tools at more advanced stages. Still, even at advanced stages, the organization must be adept at identifying, diagnosing, and correcting performance deficiencies.
- ◆ The following table summarizes a review of the tools package:

Learning Organization Bullets	Applicable Tools in Draft Toolkit	Additional Tools to be considered
Open Communications	Open Communications (SCWE), Training, Clear Expectations	How to develop a Just Culture; Alignment sessions for managers; How to communicate and learn across organizational silos;
Reporting errors & problems	Problem Identification Process	How to develop a Reporting Culture; Good Catch programs;
Questioning Attitude	Differing Professional Opinions	
Effective problem resolution		[Enlightened] Causal Analysis; Extent of Condition Analysis; Stream Analysis; Effectiveness Reviews; Corrective Action Tracking
Performance monitoring through multiple means	Self-Assessments; Oversight; Performance Indicators; Surveys; Direct Observations;	Trending; Six Sigma learning tools; HPI;
Use of Operational experience	Benchmarking (External Organizations)	Internal Operating Experience Programs

Integrated Safety Management Program Management and Integration Subgroup Meeting Minutes – Idaho Falls, Idaho

- ◆ Some good metrics: employee knowledge of alternative avenues for reporting problems; employee concern anonymity requests; maintenance backlog; corrective action problem resolution; repeat maintenance issues; check with INPO for recommended metrics.

Summary

- ◆ The overall project is a worthy undertaking and needs to be meshed well with ISMS.
- ◆ Management commitment and resources are critical for success.
- ◆ The toolkit is a good start. The essential elements of a total package (resource document) need to include: (1) clear description of what is the target (focus areas + attributes), (2) clear description of how to get key managers to commit time and resources to improve, (3) clear description of tools to use to improve, and (4) recommended tools to measure and assess progress.

Common Themes Identified from Group Discussions

Expectations (Develop, communicate, reinforce)	Glasnost between management and workers
Worker involvement activities Pre/post jobs Planning Work week review JSA NNSA document items Safety meetings	Daily briefings Decision basis Mission critical activities Brown bag lunches Formal and informal communication methods State of the mission
Leadership commitment	Miscellaneous
Visible in workplace Rewards Management support of worker involvement in key policies/activities/decisions Clear and certain consequences Don't ascribe motive Culpability matrix Senior management involvement in significant disciplinary actions Participative management	Surveys Assessments Training

Integrated Safety Management Program Management and Integration Subgroup Meeting Minutes – Idaho Falls, Idaho

Figure 1, Continuous Improvement Tools by stages

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT TOOLS – OPTIMAL COMBINATION VARIES BY STAGE

