

**Society for Effective Lessons Learned Sharing (SELLS)  
Break-Out Session Summaries  
Oct 13 – 14, 1999**

This document provides a compilation of the notes from each of the breakout sessions conducted during the SELLS Workshop held October 13 – 14, 1999 at the Fernald facility.

**Standard, Handbook, and Resource Material Revisions Breakout Summary**

During the breakout session titled “Standard, Handbook, and Resource Material Revisions,” attendees primarily discussed the handbook, which was originally issued as two volumes in 1995 and has never been updated. The handbook focuses on basic program development elements such as a program description document, and it provides detailed instructions on how to create and distribute a lessons learned alert document. The program elements are named and, in some cases, examples are provided in Volume II; however, the examples are outdated for the most part. Nor does the handbook mention ISM.

Much of the program development information and the ties between ISM and lessons learned are included in the latest revision of the Standard, which lays out DOE’s expectations regarding lessons learned. The Standard is expected to be the yardstick by which auditors measure site’s lessons learned programs. Additionally, attendees noted that SELLS has tended to use fact sheets as its vehicle for providing help tools like writing a lessons learned alert, screening information for potential lessons learned, or conducting a self-assessment of lessons learned activities. The fact sheets are detailed stand alone documents that are easily updated. New fact sheets may also be created as needs are identified. For example, during the October SELLS meeting, an action item was documented to develop a fact sheet on performance measures, which are briefly mentioned in the handbook.

Session attendees concluded that the Standard and the fact sheets incorporate the information that is contained in the 1995 handbook. Therefore, by consensus agreement they recommended:

1. That the handbook be retired. The session lead will review the handbooks and identify information that is still relevant, which will be included in the Standard or into the appropriate fact sheet. This information is expected to mainly consist of resource references such as TRADE. (Action Lead: Meredith Brown)
2. A new fact sheet will also be created outlining a lessons learned program model (Action Lead: Matt Jones).
3. Additionally, attendees recommended that SELLS review their help tools in one year and assess whether they are adequately supporting programmatic development and providing sufficient guidance regarding assessing, developing, disseminating, and utilizing lessons learned products.

## Electronic Systems Breakout Summary

Do we need a common template?

- Reformatting limits distribution
- Need to be able to use graphics
- Need to be able to use hyperlinks for more information
- Lessons Learned in site-specific systems (i.e., linked) are not on the list server or the DOE database
- Commonality at the site level, but not really common across DOE
- Categorization of LL (i.e., LO/TO) helps with easy search
- Current formatting limits the information flow
- Need to remember to use plain text wherever possible
- Emphasize going behind fire-walls to get information
- Concerns about viruses with use of attachments

Current Process:

LL Generated → Goes to List Server → Earl Hughes Receives (DOE-EH) → Reformats and puts on electronic DOE LL Database

Need to be careful about distributing inaccurate or incomplete information

Recommend requesting help prior to distributing a LL

Need to evaluate whether everything needs to go the List Server, can some just go to the database

Need to remember to keep it short and to the point; use of references for additional information

Need to have a process to evaluate LL for potential archival after 2 years

Have a short summary for each LL at the beginning (see example from Craig Daniels)

Need some guidance to help people understand how you can search through the database

Sources for LL:

- Job safety analysis/pre-job walkdowns
- Post-Job briefings to capture LL
- Emphasize good work practices, not just bad experiences

Look at concepts similar to Yahoo or Forums

Need to have drill-down capabilities; let the data determine where we need drill-downs

How can we identify people with experiences in specific areas? Set up links with SME's and core technical experts

Evaluate concepts for users to identify types of information they are specifically interested in; customized e-mail distribution lists or "My Page" concept; may be able to send a URL as the message; have to be careful that people get the right information

Evaluate setting up Forums to share lessons learned information

INPO stores messages (archival) by functional area

Start out with one type of forum

Need to remember to keep it simple; must be able to maintain in the future

OE Weekly summary very important source of LL

Keep the customer in mind when defining systems; Don't just focus on electronic methods of dissemination; remember many workers don't have access to computer systems

Action: Check with Technical Standards Program (Don Williams) on whether we can modify the functional categories (Eubanks)

Action: Determine if we really want lists in the Technical Standard – constrains future changes (Earl Carnes)

Action: Solicit input from SELLS members on what should be in the functional categories, hazards, work activities (Earl Hughes – Lead; Rotella; Steinke; Hurst; Tabor; Bickford)

Action: Check the costs, volume, benefits associated with "push" technology; benchmark others (Earl Hughes)

Action: Evaluate how to accept LL in local formats for input into system ( ????)

Action: Evaluate setting up a Forum; benchmark INPO system; look at ES&H Portal as a tool (Nafziger, Pierce, Bickford, Hughes, Beall)

## Implementation of Corporate Lessons Learned Program Breakout Summary:

This Breakout Session started with a general brainstorming session on areas to focus or consider when implementing a corporate lessons learned program. Based on the brainstorming, several primary areas were identified and specific actions specified.

### General Brainstorming Concepts:

Quality of information determines the knowledge gained  
Increase awareness/effectively communicate the message  
Schedule constraints don't give workers time to input LL  
Simplicity – easy to report (worker); let someone else do the writing  
No fix – no LL; positive LL reinforce the right way  
Do workers have time to read/use LL?  
Clarify expectations for what is required to submit a LL; cookbook approach  
Need to be sure that roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities are specified and understood  
Don't forget the worker!!  
What is "DOE Corporate" – need to help people understand what it is  
Adequate resources must be dedicated to the program  
Marketing/communication key in all areas; active usage shows success  
Worker involvement important  
Change perceptions on value of LL  
Management support  
Buy-in by the workers; bottom of the chain  
Use of "push" technology  
Recognize participation – incentivize  
Need to stimulate reporting and sharing of Good Work Practices  
Program must be owned by Sr. Management and Project Mgrs.  
Ensure work scope clearly defined; helps find LL to apply  
Need to get people to input LL  
DOE and contractor staffs need to be working in the same direction

### Management Support

Top level management **must** support; top-down support  
Convince management that effort is value-added  
Provide good performance measures  
Eliminate management perception that LL is sharing dirty laundry  
Reduce the perception that LL follow-up will require additional resources  
Management doesn't understand LL process; perception that it is more of a post-mortem summary  
Incorporate implementation of LL Corporate Program into contractual requirements; put the \$\$ on the table for implementation

## **Implementation of Corporate Lessons Learned Program Breakout Summary:** continued

### **Marketing/Communication**

Lessons Learned are a tool for ISM implementation

Highlight benefits of LL in local news and information

Help management own the program

Recognize that Learning is work

Share stories and experiences from ISM verification reviews to implement LL

Sr. Management needs to “sell” program to other Sr. Mgrs (i.e., EFCOG)

Develop a video that demonstrates benefits

Action: Take Technical Standard to Sr. Management; discuss the program elements; ask for input and commitment to support implement

### **Adequate Resources/Dedicated**

Demonstrate that it pays for itself

Provide negative and intangibles

Participate in corporate process to derive full benefits (i.e., across DOE)

Ensure overall process is efficient

Emphasize avoidance of PAAA violations; tie to ISM

Put requirement for implementation of Technical Standard in contracts (already included through ISM requirements)

Action Review how LL Program and use of LL is described in the ISM program plan; is it clear; are there opportunities to improve

### **Recognize Participation:**

Management needs to do both at the contractor and DOE levels

Is there some sort of professional recognition that could be implemented

Both originator and user should be recognized; EM program is a model

Recognize participation in performance evaluations and project reviews

Action: Provide input on approaches currently used or planned at DOE facilities

### **Buy-in from Workers:**

Management must show support and establish policies

Need to have infrastructure and process; keep it simple; communicate, have the workers help develop the process

Get the workers involved in defining and developing programs; part of core team;

Use team concept when defining program; workers, planners, professional engineers – each have different goals and concepts

Clearly define responsibilities and communicate; LL Coordinator primarily provides administrative support, information systems tasks; workers and SME's provide the input on the LL

Ensure workers are not punished for providing input

## **Implementation of Corporate Lessons Learned Program Breakout Summary: continued**

### **How to stimulate reporting of Good Work Practices:**

Workers don't think it is that important

Trusting environment/encourage the positives

Education – many people don't know that Good Work Practices are a type of LL

Need to have a “water cooler” environment to encourage sharing and bragging

Post work critiques are a good source of good work practices; add to tool box criteria

### **Ensure Work Scope Clearly Defined:**

Can help avoid incidents

Helps to search for “right” LL

### **DOE & Contractor Working in the Same Direction:**

Agreement on what a quality program looks like

Define similar expectations and desired results

### **Education of Managers and Workers:**

What is a quality LL document – how can knowledge be gained

Understand they input; someone else does the formatting and distribution

Prepare a cookbook on how to submit or input a LL; don't intimidate workers; use different approaches

Clarify roles and responsibilities; communicate

Need to evaluate training issues

# Lessons Learned Performance Measures Breakout Summary

**Introduction** Sells October 13-14, 1999 Workshop provided a breakout session for the purpose of developing a set of basic LL performance measures for the DOE complex.

**Approach** The approach consisted of reviewing a typical lessons learned process flow, i.e., an activity occurs, undesirable/positive outcomes are identified, documenting what could prevent the undesirable outcome or what could be done to capitalize on the positive outcome, and then the distribution and utilization of the knowledge gained. Resources would not be a constraint.

**Categories** The Basic Lessons Learned process flow was divided in to four (4) categories:

Contributing Sources	Work package closeout Self-Assessments Management walk-arounds	Audits Operation activities Etc.
Distribution - Sharing	Within own organization DOE complex wide	Site wide
Utilization	Training plans changed or developed Procedures changed Changes in maintenance work packages	Drawing changes Audit Plan Changed Etc.
Positive results	value added	

**Contributing Sources** Measure the involvement of personnel to share lessons they have learned.

- The number of LL provided to the LL Program compared to the total hours worked or number of employees (assuming each employee learns at least one lesson per year that would benefit others.)
- Number of LL provided internal compared to disseminated external.

**Distribution - Sharing** Measure the timelines of actions taken to implement LL information.

- LL implementing actions completed within original scheduled commitment date compared to the total implemented LL actions.

## Lessons Learned Performance Measures Breakout Summary continued

### Utilization

Measure utilization of Intranet or Internet site.

- The number of visits on the LL home page compared to the total number of employees with access.
- The number of searches on the LL home page compared to the total number of employees with access.
- The number of jobs/tasks listed in work control documents that contain information derived from the LL Program compared to the total number of jobs completed with work control documents.

Measure utilization to learn from both internal and external sources of LL information.

- The number of LL (reactive) in response to internal events compared to the number of LL (proactive) in response to LL from external sources.

Measure the LL Program compliance.

- Total number of LL requirements found in noncompliance compared to the total number of internal LL requirements.

Measure the completeness of information addressed by the LL Program.

- Total number of unwanted events compared to the total unwanted events not previously addressed in a published LL.
- Total number of LL implemented before the same or similar unwanted events occur compared to the total number of LL provided.

Use of LL in work processes.

- Number of post job briefings versus number LL generated.
- Number of job packages charged versus the number post job LL generated.
  - Prints
  - NCRs
  - Procedures
- Number of Work Packages versus number of LL issued from doing work.
- Number of unwanted events per activity versus LL per Work Package.
- Number of positive events per activity versus number of LL per Work Package.

## Lessons Learned Performance Measures Breakout Summary continued

### Positive Results

Measure the effectiveness of actions taken to implement LL.

- Number of corrective actions taken compared to the number of LL issued.
- The number of repeat unwanted events discussed in a previously issued LL compared to the total LL issued.
- The percentage of change experienced in a related performance measure after a LL is implemented (e.g., a reduction in fall injuries or fatalities after fall protection training is initiated to implement a lessons learned).
- Number of recurring events.
- The number of jobs/tasks listed in work control documents that contain information derived from the LL Program compared to the total number of jobs completed with work control documents.

Calculate the cost benefit of sharing LL information on a case by case basis.

- Total cost savings from adopting good practices plus cost avoidance from preventing unwanted acts, conditions, and events compared to the LL Program budget plus the cost to implement the LL information.

Measure the LL Program Office's ability to screen information, i.e., match the correct information with the correct people.

- The total LL disseminated compared to the total LL that result in evidence of implementing action taken (e.g., training, change in procedure).

Measure management support of the LL Program.

- Resources provided to the LL Program compared to the total laboratory budget.
- Average resources across the DOE compared to local resources.
- Total internal generated LL produced by management compared to the total LL produced.