



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
ENERGY



ISM Workshop on Activity-level Work Planning and Control (WP&C)

Special ISM Champions Workshop

DOE Forrestal HQ Building
and Video and Web Conferencing
Washington, DC

May 15-16, 2013



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
ENERGY

ISM Workshop on Activity-level Work Planning and Control (WP&C)

Action 2c
Criteria Review and Approach Document
(CRAD) for Performing Assessments of Activity-
Level Work Planning and Control

Bradley K. Davy
HSS

Director, Office of Worker Safety and Health Assistance



Background

- Both DOE and DNFSB “...acknowledged the Energy Facility Contractors Group (EFCOG) effort to develop a work planning and control guideline document.”
- “The Board notes that the EFCOG document is not a recognized national standard, is not formally incorporated into the DOE directives system, and as such, is not official DOE guidance.”



- DNFSB Tech 37 “...sustained enhancements can be achieved through the development of review criteria and through headquarters, site office, and contractor use of these criteria to periodically evaluate the effectiveness of work planning and control processes and procedures.



ISM Workshop on Activity-level Work Planning and Control (WP&C)

- November 2005 – EM provided a broad set of criteria review and approach documents (CRAD) (Triay, 2005).
- January 2006 – NNSA provided a similarly broad set of CRADs, and an attributes, guidance, and best practices document on ISM at the activity level (D'Agostino, 2006).
- These criteria became the foundation for the EFCOG Work Planning and Control Guide



Approach

- Recognizing that EFCOG built on the initial guidelines from EM and NNSA, we began by reviewing the EFCOG CRAD.
 - Did the CRADs reflect DOE requirements?
 - How did the criteria need to be modified to be used from a Federal oversight perspective?
 - Were the CRADs sufficiently inclusive?



- The CRADs could not create requirements.
- The CRADs needed to be useful at Hazard Category 3 and above Nuclear Facilities.
- The resulting CRAD needed to be useful for all DOE line program offices.
- Line programs need to be able to use the CRAD to tailor specific assessment activities.



A Draft CRAD has been created, and is essentially ready for broader review.

Key differences between the Draft CRAD and the EFCOG document include:

- Approaches have been consolidated into a single approach section to remove redundancy.
- Some criteria that were not DOE requirements or were focused on “how to perform” rather than outcomes were revised or removed.



Next Steps

- Revision of the Draft will continue in order to incorporate lessons from the analysis report (action 1b), and ensure consistency with the 2a and 2b products.
- The final document will be Included in Guide 226.1 -2 using the REVCOM process.