

QUALITY COUNCIL TASK PLANNING DOCUMENT

Action Number: TPD-2012.03

Action Title: Quality Assurance Functions and Staffing

Action Statement: Establish a working group of federal DOE quality assurance professionals to (a) develop guidance which could be used to assist DOE managers in understanding the functions, roles, responsibilities, and interfaces that QA professionals should be fulfilling for their organizations (b) to gather benchmark data regarding QA staffing levels for various types of facilities and organizations (e.g., nuclear facility operations, new nuclear facility construction, complex non-nuclear facility operations, etc.), and (c) recommend minimum staffing levels to fulfill these functions. This information is intended to serve as an aid to federal managers when determining necessary staffing levels.

Action Description: The working group will review DOE quality assurance requirements and appropriate national/international consensus standards to establish a listing of federal DOE QA functions and interfaces. DOE Requirements documents include 10 CFR 830 Subpart A, DOE O 414.1D, DOE G 414.1-2B, DOE G 414.1-1B, DOE G 414.1-4, DOE-STD-1150, DOE-STD-1172. Appropriate national/international consensus standards currently cited in the DOE QA Directive include ASME NQA-1-2008 with the NQA-1a-2009 addenda *Quality Assurance Requirements for Nuclear Facility Applications*, ANSI/ISO/ASQ Q9001-2008 *Quality Management System Requirements*, and ANSI/ASQ Z 1.13-1999 *Quality Guidelines for Research*. Upon development of the list of federal DOE QA functions, the working group will use their decades of professional experience to identify corresponding staffing requirements necessary to carry out those functions.

The working group will also collect benchmark information regarding QA/QC staffing levels for various types of facilities and operations, such as nuclear facility operations, new nuclear facility construction projects, and complex non-nuclear facility operations. The benchmark information will be collected from other government agencies, such as DoD, NRC and EPA, and industry entities such as utilities and engineering/construction companies. A critical aspect of this effort will be the development of the questionnaire used to gather the benchmark information.

Numerous considerations will have to be factored into the work of the task team as this effort proceeds, including:

- Taking into account the fact that a significant percentage of persons tasked with QA functions only do QA part time.
- Some people who are clearly doing quality-related functions may not identify themselves as part of QA (e.g., procurement quality; design control; training; records; metrology; welding control; receipt inspectors may be viewed as part of warehouse staff or part of purchasing; facility representatives that conduct quality-related oversight; software development and testing; etc.). These must be included.
- Must recognize the difference between quality assurance (QA), quality engineering (QE), and quality control (QC) functions.
- QA and QC people do not all reside in a central QA division; many reside in line groups.
- Report the QA/QE/QC population in terms of percentage of the overall workforce.
- Differentiate between nuclear and non-nuclear work and other high-risk work.
- Efforts being pursued within EM and/or NNSA that may parallel this task.

Action Deliverable:

The output of the TPD team will be a technical paper, which will address the federal positions of QA Engineers, QA Specialists, and QA points-of-contact, present the benchmark information regarding QA staffing levels for the various types of facilities, and recommend a minimum staffing levels' model that could apply to the site/organization based on industry/government best practices. The benchmark information from non-DOE related entities will have to be annotated to call out the fact that they operate under different QA requirements than DOE. This technical paper will provide federal managers with an understanding of the roles, functions, responsibilities and interfaces of QA professionals to give them a factual basis for their QA staffing level decisions. This technical paper may also serve as a starting point for a future companion effort of developing a QA staffing maturity model, should the Quality Council choose to undertake such an effort in the future.

Action Completion Date:

November 2013

Sub-Action Milestones:

	Sub-Action Description	Interim Due Date / Assigned to
1.	Circulate draft TPD to Task Team members for review & comment	March 2, 2012 / Adachi
2.	Conduct bi-monthly conference calls of the Task Team members to discuss progress	March, May, July, Sept., Nov. 2012, Jan., March, May, July, Sept., Nov. 2013
3.	Incorporate comments of Task Team into draft TPD	March 28, 2012 / Adachi
4.	Submit final draft TPD to the Quality Council Chair for distribution, review, and approval of the Quality Council members	April 18, 2012 / Adachi
5.	Assign the requirements documents, listed in the Action Description above, to a subset of the Task Team members for review to locate/identify the federal DOE QA functions and necessary interfaces.	May, 2012 / entire Task Team
6.	QA functions subteam compiles the listing of federal DOE QA functions.	June 30, 2012 / functions subteam
7.	Brainstorm among QA Functions subteam members to assign staffing requirements to the federal DOE QA functions.	July 30, 2012 / functions subteam
8.	Assign development of benchmarking questionnaire to a subset of the Task Team Members.	March, 2012 / entire Task Team
9.	Benchmark subteam develops questionnaire to be used to collect QA/QC staffing benchmark information.	July 30, 2012 / benchmark subteam
10.	Benchmark subteam develops list of types of facilities/operations for which information will be sought, and the organizations to whom questionnaire will be sent, and obtains corresponding contact information.	July 30, 2012 / benchmark subteam
11.	Benchmark subteam sends out questionnaires.	July 30, 2012 / benchmark subteam
12.	Benchmark subteam compiles and analyzes benchmark information received.	October 30, 2012 / benchmark subteam
13.	Document above results in a draft DOE Quality Council technical paper.	January 30, 2013 / entire Task Team
14.	Provide draft technical paper to Quality Council Chair for distribution, review, and comment of the Quality Council members.	February 28, 2013 / Adachi

15.	Task Team incorporates Quality Council comments.	April 30, 2013 / entire Task Team
16.	Final draft technical paper provided to Quality Council Chair for distribution and review.	May 30, 2013 / Adachi
17.	Quality Council members vote to approve or disapprove the Task team's technical paper	tbd
18.	Approved paper is published.	tbd

Task Team Members:

- John Adachi, Lead
- Colette Broussard
- Ruben Sanchez
- Jeff Martus
- Larry Adkinson
- Rick DuBose
- Bob Toro

Action Resources: Conference calls

TPD Approval:



 Colette Broussard, Quality Council Chair

5/17/12

 Date

Date Deliverable(s) Approved/Council Chair Initial: (If more than one deliverable is prepared, provide the date each deliverable was approved. Council Chair initials are required to reflect deliverable was approved.)

- | | | |
|-------------|----|------------------------|
| Deliverable | 1. | Task report |
| | 2. | Interim Status Reports |

Task Completion/Approval: (Signature is obtained after all deliverables are complete)

TPD Team Lead

Date

Deliverable(s) Distributed:

_____ Website

_____ Other

If other, description: