

<p>U.S. Department of Energy</p> <p>Office of Safety and Emergency Management Evaluations</p> <p>Criteria Review and Approach Document</p>	<p>Subject: Feedback and Continuous Improvement Inspection Criteria and Approach – DOE Field Element</p>  <p>Acting Director, Office of Safety and Emergency Management Evaluations</p> <p>Date: 12/4/12</p>  <p>Criteria Lead, Feedback and Continuous Improvement Inspection Criteria and Approach – DOE Field Element</p> <p>Date: 12/4/12</p>	<p>HS: HSS CRAD 45-21 Rev: 1 Eff. Date: December 4, 2012</p> <p>Page 1 of 15</p>
--	---	--

## 1.0 PURPOSE

Within the Office of Enforcement and Oversight, the Office of Safety and Emergency Management Evaluations' mission is to assess the effectiveness of those environment, safety, and health systems and practices used by field organizations in implementing Integrated Safety Management and to provide clear, concise, and independent evaluations of performance in protecting our workers, the public, and the environment from the hazards associated with Department of Energy (DOE) activities and sites. A key to success is the rigor and comprehensiveness of our process; and, as with any process, we continually strive to improve and provide additional value and insight to field operations. Integral to this is our commitment to enhance our program. Therefore, we have revised our Inspection Criteria, Approach, and Lines of Inquiry for internal use and also we are making them available for use by DOE line and contractor assessment personnel in developing and implementing effective DOE oversight and contractor self-assessment and corrective action processes on this WEB page. The CRADs are available at [http://www.hss.doe.gov/indepoversight/safety\\_emergencymgt/guidance.html](http://www.hss.doe.gov/indepoversight/safety_emergencymgt/guidance.html).

## 2.0 APPLICABILITY

The following Inspection Criteria document is approved for use by the Office of Health, Safety and Security.

### **3.0 FEEDBACK**

Comments and suggestions for improvements on these Inspection Criteria, Approach, and Lines of Inquiry can be directed to the Acting Director of the Office of Safety and Emergency Management Evaluations on (301) 903-5392.

**Feedback and Continuous Improvement  
Site Office  
Inspection Criteria, Activities and Lines of Inquiry**

**DOE Field Element Line Management Oversight Inspection Criteria** - DOE field element line management has established and implemented effective oversight processes that evaluate the adequacy and effectiveness of contractor assurance systems and DOE oversight processes. DOE field element assurance system programs and processes are in accordance with the policy and key elements outlined in DOE Policy 226.1B, *Department of Energy Oversight Policy*; DOE Order 226.1B, *Implementation of Department of Energy Oversight Policy*, Attachment 2; quality assurance requirements (as stated in 10 CFR 830, Subpart A, DOE O 414.1D *Quality Assurance and/* or other applicable regulations); and applicable DOE directives.

1. DOE field element line management has established and implemented oversight processes that evaluate contractor and DOE programs and management systems, including site assurance systems, for effectiveness of performance (including compliance with requirements). Such evaluations are based on the results of operational awareness activities; assessments of facilities, operations, and programs; and assessments of the contractor's assurance system. The level and/or mix (i.e., rigor or frequency in a particular area) of oversight may be tailored based on considerations of hazards, the maturity and operational performance of the contractor's programs and management systems (DOE O 226.1B 4b(1))
2. DOE field element line oversight program includes written plans and schedules for planned assessments, focus areas for operational oversight, and reviews of the contractor's self-assessment of processes and systems. (DOE O 226.1B 4b(2))
3. The DOE field element has an issues management process that is capable of categorizing findings based on risk and priority, ensuring relevant line management findings are effectively communicated to the contractors, and ensuring that problems are evaluated and corrected on a timely basis. For issues categorized as high significance findings, the issues management process ensures that :
  - (a) A thorough analysis of the underlying causal factors is completed;
  - (b) Corrective actions that will address the cause(s) of the findings and prevent recurrence are identified and implemented;
  - (c) After completion of a corrective action or a set of corrective actions, the conduct of an effectiveness review using trained and qualified personnel that can verify the corrective action/corrective action plan has been effectively implemented to prevent recurrences;
  - (d) Documentation of the analysis process and results described in (a) and maintenance tracking to completion of plans and schedules for the corrective actions and effectiveness reviews described in (b) and (c) above, in a readily accessible system.(DOE O 226.1B 4b(4))

4. Oversight processes are tailored according to the effectiveness of contractor assurance systems, the hazards at the site/activity, and the degree of risk, giving additional emphasis to potentially high consequence activities. (DOE O 226.1B 4b(5))
5. DOE line management has established and communicated performance expectations to contractors through formal contract mechanisms. Such expectations (e.g., safety performance measures and commitments) are established on an annual basis, or as otherwise required or determined appropriate by the field element. (DOE O 226.1B 4c)
6. DOE line management has in place effective processes for communicating oversight results and other issues in a timely manner up the line management chain, and to the contractor as appropriate, sufficient to allow senior managers to make informed decisions. (DOE O 226.1B 4d)
7. Field elements have developed and implemented an Operating Experience (OE) Program and identified and designate an OE Program Coordinator. The OE Program uses a graded approach when addressing the applicability of requirements and the basis for this approach is documented based upon the review and analysis of the hazards and risks for the program and its operational activities. (DOE O 210.2A 4a)
8. DOE field element line management reviews and approves the initial contractor assurance system program description (if formally delegated, otherwise reviews and forwards to Headquarters for approval). The field element reviews and assesses the effectiveness of the Contractor Assurance System (DOE O 226.1B 5e(4))
9. DOE field element initially approves and, thereafter, annually reviews and approves integrated safety management system description updates (if formally delegated, otherwise reviews and forwards to Headquarters for approval). (DOE G 450.4-1C sec 6.3)
10. An effective employee concerns program has been established and implemented in accordance with DOE O 442.1A, *DOE Employee Concerns Program*, which encourages the reporting of employee concerns and provides thorough investigations and effective corrective actions and recurrence controls. (DOE O 442.1A)
11. An effective, differing professional opinion process or program has been established and implemented, in accordance with DOE O 442.2, *Differing Professional Opinions For Technical Issues Involving Environmental, Safety, And Health Technical Concerns*.(DOE O 442.1A)

**DOE Field Element Operating Experience/Lessons Learned Program Inspection Criteria –** Field elements are to implement Lessons Learned (LL) program roles and responsibilities as identified in DOE O 210.2A, *DOE Corporate Operating Experience Program*. Specified criteria include:

1. Designate OE Program coordinators who have access to senior management to fulfill the responsibilities assigned DOE O 210.2A. (DOE O 212.2A)
2. Develop and promulgate relevant operating experience through the DOE Corporate Operating Experience Program, including lessons learned following completion of major program missions and contract transitions, and submit lessons learned to the DOE Corporate Lessons Learned Database. (DOE O 212.2A)
3. Ensure appropriate coordination and responses for DOE Corporate Operating Experience Documents, in accordance with Appendix A of DOE O 210.2A. (DOE O 212.2A)
4. Ensure that operating experience is incorporated into applicable activities and processes. (DOE O 212.2A)
5. Identify contracts to which the Contractor Requirements Documents should apply and notify the cognizant contracting officers. (DOE O 212.2A)
6. As part of self-assessments conducted to evaluate organizational performance in Integrated Safety Management (ISM), include an assessment of the effectiveness of the organization's operating experience program. (DOE O 212.2A)
7. Consistent with DOE O 226.1B, *Implementation of DOE Oversight Policy*, perform appropriate contractor oversight, and performance trending analysis. (DOE O 212.2A)

**DOE Field Element Facility Representative Program Inspection Criteria** - The following criteria are designed to examine the strength and maturity of the field element's Facility Representative Program and the effectiveness of its Facility Representatives by assessing performance at meeting the five objectives of the Facility Representative Program (in accordance with *DOE O 422.1, Conduct of Operations*, and DOE-STD-1063-2011, *Facility Representatives*).

1. A facility training and qualification program is established and results in well-trained, qualified Facility Representatives. (DOE-STD-1063-2011 sec.5.4)
2. There is adequate Facility Representative coverage for DOE facilities. (DOE-STD-1063-2011 sec. 5.1)
3. Facility Representatives provide effective oversight to determine that the contractor is operating DOE facilities in a safe manner. (DOE-STD-1063-2011 sec.4.1)
4. The Facility Representative Program receives adequate functional support from field element Management. (DOE-STD-1063-2011 sec.4.2)
5. An adequate performance assessment and feedback program is in place to assess the effective implementation of the Facility Representative Program. (DOE-STD-1063-2011 sec 5.7)

**DOE Field Element Review Approach:** Review appropriate oversight directives, policies, program descriptions, procedures, instructions, and guidance. Review operational awareness and

assessment activity planning documents and schedules. Review operational awareness data and assessment reports for adequacy in selected areas. Interview DOE managers and staff to determine how assessments are planned and performed and how they are used to improve performance. Review documentation related to deficiencies (e.g., procedures, completed assessments, employee concern case files, causal analyses and corrective action plans, verification/validation records, and effectiveness determinations). Review trend analysis and performance indicator reports and evaluate the analyses, conclusions, and any related corrective actions. Review training and qualification records and interview personnel to determine the adequacy in establishing and enhancing competence of oversight personnel. Review the LL program description documents and products and interview personnel (managers, LL Coordinator, etc.) to determine adequacy of implementation and continuous improvement of the field element LL program. Review FR program process descriptions and implementing procedures (i.e., training & qualification; performance indicators; occurrence reporting; and logs and reports). Interview personnel associated with the FR program (i.e., program sponsors; FRs; FR supervisors; line managers; contractor facility managers; subject matter experts (health physics, explosive safety, etc.). As time allows, conduct walkthroughs or surveillances with Facility Representatives. Review Differing Professional Opinion implementing processes or procedures. Interview personnel processing Differing Professional Opinions, and verify their clear understanding of assigned roles and responsibilities. Collect and review an appropriate sample of Differing Professional Opinions (if any have been processed since the last Independent Oversight inspection).

**DOE Field Element Oversight Program Lines of Inquiry** - Are the DOE field element line management oversight programs, plans, processes and schedules compliant with DOE O 226.1B, *Implementation of Department Of Energy Oversight Policy*, coordinated, documented, risk informed and historically aware, while ensuring significant deficiencies are identified, documented, communicated, evaluated, tracked and appropriately resolved?

1. Are the roles, responsibilities, and authorities for quality assurance documented in DOE field element Quality Assurance Plans (QAP) in accordance with DOE Order 414.1D, *Quality Assurance*?(DOE O 414.1D)
2. Are responsibilities for implementing field element line oversight and self-assessment plans formally assigned and documented? (DOE O 226.1B 6b)
3. Are the requirements of the Headquarters QAP reflected in a site-level QAP?(10cfr830.121)
4. Has DOE field element line management established and communicated appropriate criteria for determining the effectiveness of DOE field element and contractor programs, management systems, and assurance systems? (DOE O 226.1B3b(1) )
  - a. Do the criteria include consideration of previous assessment results; effectiveness of corrective actions and self-assessments; and evidence of sustained management support for site programs, management, and assurance systems? (DOE O 226.1B3b(1) )
    - i)
5. Do DOE field element line management oversight programs include effective processes for performance assessment and monitoring of the scope and implementation of contractor activities, management programs and assurance systems, including:

- a. Operational Awareness Activities, the majority of which are performed by the DOE field element that include:
  - Routine day-to-day monitoring of work performance through facility tours/walk-throughs, work observations, document reviews, meeting attendance and participation, and ongoing interaction with contractor workers, support staff, and management.
6. Do the DOE field element line management oversight programs and processes described above for performance assessment and monitoring of the scope and implementation of the contractor's programs and activities require:
  - a. Determination of the overall scope, content, and frequency of assessments included in the coordinated DOE Headquarters and field element line management oversight program to be based on the assessed effectiveness of DOE line management and contractor assurance systems, the hazards at the site/activity, and the degree of risk involved;
  - b. Increasing oversight activity frequency and/or depth based on performance deficiencies or events, or decreasing frequency and/or depth to reflect sustained effective site performance;
  - c. Conducting more frequent assessments focusing on areas needing improvement in site programs, management systems, or assurance systems (e.g., insufficient rigor or comprehensiveness in existing systems);
  - d. Regular assessment of site assurance systems to determine the appropriate level of overlap and redundancy of DOE field element line management oversight;
  - e. Consideration of the results of external organization reviews and the effectiveness of assurance systems in determining DOE line management oversight priorities and the scope and frequency of oversight activities, while still implementing the defined minimum baseline oversight process;
7. Do DOE field element line management oversight programs require monitoring and self-assessment of DOE field element line management programs and activities, including requirements for:
  - a. Establishment and implementation of oversight processes for monitoring and ensuring continuous improvement in internal operations and required activities, such as reviewing and approving safety analysis reports and security plans, performing emergency management functions, adjudicating security clearances, implementing computer security programs at DOE office buildings, operating classified and sensitive information identification and protection programs, and operating employee concerns programs and other such functions? (DOE O 226.1A attachment 2)
8. Do DOE field element line management oversight programs and processes require results of oversight activities to be appropriately validated, documented, communicated, classified, evaluated, tracked and resolved?
  - a. Are structured and rigorous processes required for validating the accuracy of information collected during assessments?

- b. Are deficiencies in programs or performance identified during assessment activities required to be communicated to appropriate managers for resolution through a structured issues management process?
  - c. Are dissenting opinions required to be documented and appropriately communicated with assessment results?
  - d. Are processes for resolution of disputes about oversight findings and other significant issues established including, where necessary, approved processes for interpretation of requirements?
  - e. Are effective processes established for independent technical reviews of significant issues?
  - f. Are effective processes established for communicating line management oversight results and other issues up and down the DOE line management chain, using a graded approach based on the hazards and risk?
  - g. Are findings required to be tracked and resolved through structured and formal processes, including provisions for review of corrective action plans?
  - h. Is DOE line management required to verify that corrective actions are complete and performed in accordance with requirements before findings identified by DOE assessments or reviews are closed?
  - i. Are deficiencies required to be analyzed both individually and collectively to identify causes and prevent recurrences?
9. Are DOE field element line management oversight programs and the annual schedule of planned assessments and focus areas documented and approved?
10. Do DOE field element line management oversight programs define the process for modifications of the annual oversight activity schedule and for DOE line management approval in response to changing circumstances?
11. Has an effective differing professional opinion process or program been established and implemented, in accordance with *DOE O 442.2 Differing Professional Opinions for Technical Issues Involving Environment, Safety and Health*? Were differing professional opinions appropriately supported?(DOE O 442.2)
12. Has an effective employee concerns program been established and implemented that encourages the reporting of employee concerns and provides thorough investigations and effective corrective actions and recurrence controls (in accordance with DOE O 226.1 B and DOE O 442.1A)?
- a. Has the organization established and implemented documented program plans to implement program requirements? (DOE O 442.1A4a(2))
  - b. Has order required organizational Employee Concerns Program (ECP) training been conducted? (DOE O 442.1A4e)
  - c. Has an appropriate 24-hour ECP hotline been established and been advertised (i.e., posters, website, etc.)? (DOE O 442.1A4a(4))

- d. Have concerns been properly documented, investigated, and closed-out as required? (DOE O 442.1A4b)
  - e. Are “independence of investigations” and “concerned individual confidentiality” addressed and appropriately executed? (DOE O 442.1A4b(5))
  - f. If any were reported, were concerns that involved an imminent danger or condition or a serious condition immediately reported to competent authority, as appropriate? (DOE O 442.1A4b(7))
  - g. Have appropriate offices (i.e., those with program, project, or health and safety responsibility) determined whether actions are needed to minimize, correct, or prevent recurrence of program, process, or management weaknesses that were identified and substantiated through the ECP? (DOE O 442.1A4b(8))
  - h. Are controls in place to appropriately address classified information handled by the ECP? (DOE O 442.1A4b(9))
  - i. Are records retained as required? Is sensitive information and confidentiality protected? (DOE O 442.1A4d(3))
  - j. Are quarterly and annual reports developed, reviewed, and forwarded as required? (DOE O 442.1A4d(1))
  - k. Have personnel responsible for implementing the ECP or investigating concerns been trained to properly carry out their responsibilities (e.g., training on the identification and classification of health and safety issues, how to investigate workplace, and administrative issues and dispute resolution techniques)? (DOE O 442.1A4e)
  - l. Has the ECP manager assessed, at least annually, the effectiveness of the ECP and processes used to implement the Order? (DOE O 442.1A4f)
  - m. Are transfers or referrals of concerns handled appropriately, as defined in implementing processes or procedures? (DOE O 442.1A4c(1)(c))
  - n. Are contractors required to have ECPs (DOE O 442.1A attachment 1)? Is appropriate oversight conducted?
13. Are continuous improvement mechanisms (e.g., corrective action processes) in place to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of oversight programs and site operations? (DOE O 226.1B5e(6))
14. If DOE Headquarters and field element line management oversight processes are implemented as written, would DOE Headquarters and field element line management maintain sufficient knowledge of site and contractor activities to make informed decisions about hazards, risks and resource allocation, provide direction to contractors, and evaluate contractor performance? (DOE O 226.1B4a(2))

**DOE Field Element Training & Qualification Lines of Inquiry** – Are DOE field element staff adequately trained and qualified to perform assigned oversight activities (in accordance with DOE O 226.1B, DOE O 360.1C *Federal Employee Training*, and DOE O 426.1 chg 1 *Federal Technical Capability*)?

1. Has DOE line management defined the requirements for experience, knowledge, skills, and abilities for personnel implementing the assurance system elements?
2. Has DOE line management established, maintained, and implemented appropriate qualification standards for personnel with oversight responsibilities? (DOE O 226.1B5b(3))
3. Has DOE line management provided and ensured completion of appropriate training for personnel implementing the DOE field element line management assurance system elements?

**DOE Field Element Implementation of Program Responsibilities Lines of Inquiry**– Does DOE field element line management maintain sufficient knowledge of contractor programs and activities to make informed decisions about hazards, risks and resource allocation, to efficiently evaluate contractor performance, and to provide direction?

1. Were the following assessments required by DOE O 226.1B performed; what were the results; how were the insights used; and how effective were the corrective actions?
  - a. Do DOE field element line management personnel regularly review the results of DOE Headquarters and contractor oversight activities to maintain awareness of site conditions and trends and to determine the effectiveness of DOE line management oversight processes? (DOE O 226.1B4b(1)&(4))
  - b. Does DOE field element line management periodically review established performance measures to ensure performance objectives and criteria are challenging and focused on improving performance in known areas of weakness? (DOE O 226.1B4c)
  - c. Does DOE field element line management (unless not formally delegated) annually review and approve contractor assurance system program descriptions updates? (DOE O 226.1B att.1 2(6)c)
  - d. Does the DOE line managers determine the adequacy for approval and frequency of updates of both their DOE offices' and their contractors' ISM System Description Documents? (DOE O 450.2 4b)
  - e. Does DOE field element management regularly assess whether field elements are assessing site activities adequately; self-identifying deficiencies; and taking timely and effective corrective actions?
  - f. Does DOE field element line management regularly assess the effectiveness of field element issues management and corrective action processes, lessons learned processes, and other feedback mechanisms (e.g., worker feedback)?
  - g. Does DOE field element line management evaluate field element processes for communicating information, including dissenting opinions, up the management chain?
  - h. Does DOE field element line management regularly assess field element assurance systems to determine the appropriate level of overlap and redundancy with DOE headquarters and contractor assessment activities?
  - i. Are the effectiveness of the site assurance system; the hazards at the site/activity; and the degree of risk factored into determining the scope and frequency of line management assessment activities?

- j. Do DOE organizations perform self- assessments of programmatic and line management oversight processes and activities (e.g., security surveys, personnel qualification standards, and training programs) to assess whether requirements and management expectations are met and to identify opportunities for improvement?
  - k. Are continuous improvement mechanisms (e.g., corrective action processes) in place to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of oversight programs and site operations?
2. Are managers, supervisors, and workers held accountable for assigned performance assurance responsibilities?
  3. Are oversight program responsibilities appropriately implemented?
  4. Are the coordinated DOE Headquarters and field element line management oversight programs effective in ensuring that site operations are performed safely, securely, and in compliance with applicable requirements?

**DOE Field Element Oversight Results and Corrective Action Process Lines of Inquiry –**  
Are the results of oversight activities appropriately validated, documented, communicated, classified, evaluated, tracked and resolved?

1. Are structured and rigorous processes used for validating the accuracy of information collected during assessments?
2. Are deficiencies in programs or performance identified during assessment activities communicated to appropriate management for resolution through a structured issues management process?
3. Are these deficiencies appropriately addressed in a timely manner?
4. Does DOE line management have effective processes for communicating line oversight results and other issues up and down the management chain? (DOE O 226.1B 4d)
5. Do the DOE line management oversight processes provide sufficient technical basis to allow senior DOE managers to make informed decisions?
6. Are findings tracked and resolved through structured and formal processes, including provisions for review of corrective action plans?
7. Does DOE line management verify that corrective actions are complete and performed in accordance with requirements before findings identified by DOE assessments or reviews are closed?
8. Are deficiencies analyzed both individually and collectively to identify causes and trends and prevent recurrences?

**DOE Field Element Operating Experience Program Lines of Inquiry -** Has the field element implemented a Lesson Learned process in accordance with the requirements of DOE O 210.2A, *DOE Corporate Operating Experience Program*?

1. Are field element OE roles and responsibilities fully described in a formal program description document? (DOE O 210.2A 4a)

2. Has an OE Coordinator been designated for the organization? (DOE O 210.2A 4a)
3. Does the field element process cause the incorporation of lessons learned into training, maintenance and work planning, work processes, operations, and design and construction? (DOE O 210.2A 5d(4))
4. Do line managers routinely review OE program data and determine appropriate actions to resolve any identified risks and vulnerabilities? (DOE O 212.2A4c(4))
5. Is contractor-developed operational experience reviewed for operational awareness?
6. Does the field element appraise senior management of emergent operating experience issues or adverse trends that need management attention? (DOE O 210.2A5e(4))
7. Are locally developed lessons learned recommended for inclusion in the DOE Corporate Lessons Learned Database? (DOE O 210.2A 4(2))

**DOE Field Element Facility Representative (FR) Program Lines of Inquiry - Has the field element implemented an effective FR Program? [References from DOE-STD-1063-2011, *Facility Representatives*]**

1. Facility Representatives are well trained and qualified to perform their assigned duties.
  - a. Do training records demonstrate that Facility Representatives, who are listed as qualified, have the proper education and experience, and that they have completed all qualification requirements as specified in General Technical Base Qualification Standard (DOE-STD-1146-2008), Facility Representative Functional Area Qualification Standard (DOE-STD-1151-2010), and local directives? [S DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5.4 ]
  - b. Do field element managers qualify Facility Representatives? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5.5 ]
  - c. Do the training records show that Facility Representatives complete all re-qualification requirements at the periodicity specified in the program directive? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5.5.6 ]
  - d. Are exceptions/extensions for re-qualification intervals properly documented and approved? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5. 4.11 ]
  - e. Are the qualifying officials involved in the qualification of Facility Representatives formally identified? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 sections 5.4.5and 5.4.13]
  - f. Is the process used to ensure that qualified Facility Representatives maintain or regain proficiency formally defined and effective? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5.4.12]
  - g. If Facility Representatives have failed to qualify or re-qualify within the time allowed, what actions were taken by the responsible field element manager? [DOE-STD-1063-2011section 5.5.8.d 5.4.13 e]
  - h. Does the examination process challenge the candidate sufficiently to verify the proper level of knowledge of all qualification areas and facilities? Do they test the Facility Representative's technical understanding of facility processes, judgment and decision-making abilities, and ability to communicate expectations to the contractor? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5.4.13]

- i. How well does the Facility Representative understand his/her roles and responsibilities under the field element's Facility Representative Program? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 4.1]
  - j. How well does Facility Representative continuing training provide hazard-related and activity-related information to Facility Representatives? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5.4.3]
2. There is adequate Facility Representative coverage for DOE facilities.
- a. Is the Facility Representative staffing analysis performed in accordance with DOE-STD-1151 are Facility Representatives staffed to the indicated level? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5.1 and Appendix C, *Process To Determine Facility Representative Staffing*]
  - b. Are sufficient numbers of Facility Representative candidates undergoing qualification to fill known or projected Facility Representative vacancies? If not, what is being done to correct the situation? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5.1]
  - c. How long have current Facility Representative vacancies existed? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5.1]
  - d. What is the trend of the reported time spent in the field and time performing oversight? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5.7.1 and Appendix A]
  - e. What methods are used by the field element manager to ensure that adequate facility coverage is maintained by qualified Facility Representative during periods of leave? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5.1 and Appendix C]
3. Facility Representatives provide effective oversight of facilities.
- a. Have Facility Representatives unencumbered access requirements and "Stop Work" authority in their assigned facilities been adequately implemented? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 4.1.7 and section 5.3]
  - b. Has "Stop Work" authority been exercised? Was it appropriate? Was it effective? Are there occasions when it was appropriate for Facility Representatives to exercise "Stop Work" authority, but it was not used? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 4.1.7]
  - c. What is the effectiveness of the Facility Representatives as verified by observing selected qualified personnel who are monitoring training, operations, or maintenance evolutions? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 4.1]
  - d. Based on a sample of occurrence reports, are Facility Representative reviews of the occurrence reports accomplished in a timely manner while insuring that the root cause has been determined and effective action proposed? [DOE O 232.2]
  - e. Do Facility Representatives accomplish facility assessments, surveillances, and audits as scheduled and are the findings meaningful and consistent with facility performance? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 sections 4.1 and 5.2]
  - f. Have Facility Representatives documented operational awareness entries regularly and in accordance with implementing procedures? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 sections 4.1.1 and 5.2.a]

- g. Based on a sample of deficiencies identified by Facility Representatives during reviews, have Facility Representatives evaluated the overall effectiveness of the operating contractor in implementing corrective actions? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 sections 4.1.5 and 4.1.10]
  - h. Has the field element manager implemented a process to track identified issues or discrepancies to satisfactory closure? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 sections 4.1.5, 4.1.10, and 4.2.4]
  - i. How adequate is the documentation of Facility Representative activities (e.g., reports, log keeping)? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 4.1.10]
  - j. How are Facility Representative findings reported (formally and informally) to the contractor? Are the reports provided to the contractor consistent with the information recorded by the Facility Representatives? How clear is the process of reporting findings to the contractor? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 4.1.10]
  - k. Does the Facility Representative have access to and communicate effectively with all levels of contractor management? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 4.1.10]
  - l. Are the Facility Representative interactions with the operating contractor effective in meeting the shared goals of safe and efficient facility operations? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 4.1.10]
4. The Facility Representative Program receives adequate functional support from field element management.
- a. Is Facility Representative attrition excessive? What are the reasons (i.e., are Facility Representatives leaving for promotions, lateral transfers, downsizing, or other factors)? Have steps been taken to counter excessive attrition? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5.7]
  - b. What steps have management taken to ensure that the Facility Representative positions are career enhancing? Are there senior or supervisory Facility Representative opportunities available? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 4.2.4]
  - c. What continuing training, professional certifications, graduate studies, or similar development activities are actively supported? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 Section 5.6]
  - d. What role does field element management have in the qualification process? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 sections 4.2.4 and 5.4]
  - e. Does management provide the resources necessary to qualify Facility Representatives within a defined schedule? [DOE O 426.1 Chg1 4(6) (b) and DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5.4]
  - f. How does line management support the actions taken by the Facility Representatives at the respective facilities? [section 4.1.8]
  - g. What is the interface relationship between the Facility Representatives and each level of DOE line management? [Section 4.1.8]
  - h. Do Facility Representatives periodically meet with senior line managers within the field element to provide information related to the assigned facilities? [Section 4.2.4]

- i. How does DOE line management track and follow up on issues raised by the Facility Representatives? [Section 4.1.10]
  - j. What process does DOE management use to address differing professional opinions and has it been used effectively? [DOE O 442.2, *Differing Professional Opinions For Technical Issues Involving Environmental, Safety, And Health Technical Concerns*]
  - k. What local processes exist to allow Facility Representatives access to field element technical expertise regarding contractor issues? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 4.1.9]
  - l. What performance indicator data is used to provide indication of the Facility Representative program status? What trending and analysis is done on performance indicator data? How is this information used? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5.7.1 and Appendix A]
  - m. What incentive programs are in place and used effectively for the Facility Representative position? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5.6.2]
  - n. Do these programs make the Facility Representative position desirable and career enhancing? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5.6.2]
5. Performance assessment and feedback programs are in place.
- a. How often does the field element conduct self-assessments of the entire Facility Representative program? [ DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5.7.2]
  - b. Are peer reviews incorporated into the self-assessment process? [Section 5.7.3]
  - c. How does the Cognizant Secretarial Officer ensure that program performance assessments are accomplished, and any indicated corrective actions are completed? Mechanisms could include providing a representative to participate in assessments. [ DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 4.2.3]
  - d. How well does the self-assessment program ensure that the evaluators have adequate knowledge and experience to conduct meaningful reviews? Based on self-assessment reports, have adequate reviews been conducted to be able to properly evaluate the assigned area of assessment and have the self-assessments generated meaningful recommendations for improvement and corrective actions? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5.7.2 and Appendix B]
  - e. Did the field element manager pursue improvements to the Facility Representative program resulting from self-assessments of the program? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 sections 4.2.4 and 5.7]
  - f. How are the Facility Representatives kept informed on changes to their facilities and their operating practices? [DOE-STD-1063-2011 sections 5.4.3 and 5.4.11]
  - g. How are lessons learned from facility events disseminated to Facility Representatives? [ DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5.4.11 ]
  - h. How are applicable lessons learned from facility events at other DOE facilities sought and disseminated to Facility Representatives? [ DOE-STD-1063-2011 section 5.7.4 ]