

Panel Session Notes

Working Session #1 – Implementing DOE O 226.1 Issues Identified Per EFCOG and PSO

Contractors (EFCOG)

- Expanded Scope not clearly defined (example Business)
- Need definition of what's acceptable/expectations for independent reviewers
- Redundancy with other directives (QA,PAAA)
- Need uniform approach for Significance Categorization
 - Consider adopting ORPS significant category approach
 - Resolve concern with under assignment of significance to issues
- Need consistent tailored approach to causal analysis—recommend ORPS approach
- Need clear set of CRADs for oversight, to prevent lack of consistency between different DOE elements
- CRD includes hidden issues like differing opinions program
- To implement will need a holistic, tied together CAS

National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA)

- Complete list of criteria
- Risk models variability is concern-needs consistency for CAS
- Federal oversight overlaps too much
- Need more detail in FRAMS to help overlaps & oversight planning
- Lack of cross-cutting looks between sites to pick strengths/weaknesses
- Understanding Big Scope—such as business, etc.
- Risk informed portions not there yet
- Timeline is a concern
- Need HQ procedure for flow-down
- Sense not getting feedback after assessments/weakens oversight back to the field
- Should the manual clarify those roles?
- Effects of NA-10 new reporting alignment
- Consider Mil Standard 82 for hazard/risk determination levels
- Chuck Spencer had a good risk management program

Office of Science (SC)

- Manual contains too many hows & uses different terminology than the order
- CRADS should be guidance
- How do the expectations of the contract & oversight activities mesh into concerted effort, overlap with 10 CFR 851, significance levels for oversight concern

Office of Nuclear Energy, Science & Technology (NE)

- How is this integrated with HQ & Field & Contractors
- Issues related to risk basis
- Expanding beyond ES&H concerns to business

Office of Environmental Management (EM)

- Business/project management definition
- Manual needs to be guidance not requirements
- Observations shouldn't require a corrective action plan
- Existing resources stretched too thin

Commitment Made

- **Question: What are you going to do with all this?**
Answer: Request everyone to put comments in RevCom now, then will present to the 226 team, recognizing decisions are needed – will have them by September 2006.