

Oak Ridge National Laboratory

OIO S&S and Cyber Inspection of ORNL

Sept – Nov, 2009

Ron Smith

Jan 20, 2010

This document does not contain, UCNI, ECI, or other unclassified sensitive information and been approved for release to the public by:

David R. Hamrin, ORNL Technical Info. and Classification
Officer 1/22/2010



OIO Inspection became an OIO SAV

- **Instead of 6 weeks at ORNL; visit was 10 days.**
- **Instead of team consisting of 50+; two separate teams.**
 - **S&S team consisted of 5 personnel.**
(Yonkoff, team lead; Nowak; Schultheiss; Rich; Schmidt)
 - **Cyber team consisted of 2 personnel.**
- **Scope was very limited. No tactical exercise.**
(OIO was on-site for locally conducted FoF conducted in Aug. 2009.)
- **Total report for S&S was 16 pages in length vs. mammoth document.**
- **Report delivered to local DOE-ORO, ORNL Site Office and Site.**

SAV Scope

- **Several months of coordination between HSS, OS, DOE-ORO, Site Office, and Site.**
- **Final Scope based on previous OIO Inspection (2006), annual ORO Surveys, and Self-assessments.**
- **Areas reviewed during SAV:**
 - **Efficiency of Contractor S&S Assurance/Performance Assurance/Self-Assessment program.**
 - **Information Security - ACREM.**
 - **Personnel Security - HRP and how it is incorporated into the VA process.**
 - **Physical Security - 3019 systems and deviations**
 - **Pro Force - previous Force-on-Force reports and other Performance Training reports.**
 - **Program Management and Planning - Self-Assessments; Performance Assurance and VA .**

SAV FOCUS

- **“To ADD VALUE To The Site”**
- **Report would be for local dissemination only.**
- **There would be no Findings...only Recommendations that would ADD VALUE To The Site.**
- **Skeptical...of course we were!**
- **Yonkoff reinforced “ADD VALUE” daily and he was obviously getting reminded of that daily from HQ.**
- **First daily report from Team used “inspection terminology.”**

Final Results: Like no previous OIO Inspection or SAV!

- There was always good and open communications with the team.
- There were no hidden agendas.
- There were no Findings...only recommendations.
- Report appears to have only been disseminated locally.
- Truly was a SAV with a focus of adding value to the Site.

Summary of Recommendations

Four Programmatic Recommendations:

- Archive ACREM items rarely used.
- Enhance level of detail contained within the list of essential protective elements.
- Tie performance metrics to baseline Performance Assurance Program requirements
- Add more measurable criteria to the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP).

Four Recommendations that pertain to Cat 1 Nuclear Facility:

- Two dealt with self-assessment activities.
- Enhance level of detail contained within the list of critical protective elements.
- Expand scope of annual Performance Assurance Report.

Summary of Recommendations (cont.)

Four ProForce Recommendations:

- **Two dealt with increasing coordination with UT-Battelle and Isotek.**
- **Two dealt with Performance Testing.**