



Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

February 15, 2001

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

FROM: *TL Wyka*
Theodore Wyka
Director, Safety Management Implementation Team

SUBJECT: Corrective Action Tracking System

Please review the attached process for evaluating potential additions to the corrective action tracking system (CATS). The proposed CATS Addition Process is designed to prevent dilution of the system's original purpose and effectiveness in providing visibility for a specific set of safety items of interest to the Office of the Secretary. The process was developed by the Corrective Action Management Team and concurred with by the SMIT Management Team.

As a little background, the corrective action tracking system was established in response to Board recommendation 98-1, which deals with the need for a systematic process for disposition and resolution of the findings of the Department's internal, independent oversight organization. This has been managed as part of the Department's integrated safety management program. The CATS web-based database is used to create, edit, and view DOE-wide summaries of the status of actions taken in response to identified safety issues. A review of the corrective action management process indicated that there is a potential to dilute the tracking system unless a uniform process is established for adding new issues (beyond those identified by independent oversight) into the system.

Recommend that the attached CATS Addition Process be used as interim guidance until it can be documented in the next revision of the Integrated Safety Management System Guide (DOE G 450.4). Please call if you have any questions.



Distribution:

S. Cary, EH-1
R. Erickson, DP-3
A. Haspel, EE-1
M. Johnson, SC-3
B. Knipp, NE-2.2
J. Lerch, FE-1
M. Oldham, EM-3
M. Whitaker, S-3.1

CC:

E. Livingston, S-1
C. Billups, SC-80
H. Himpler, EM-5
R. Jones, EH-52
L. Miller, NE-40
E. Morrow, DP-40
S. Petersen, EH-23
D. Stadler, EH-2
G. Staffo, EE-3.2
C. Zamuda, FE-7

Assessment Report Evaluation Process

Purpose:

To establish a uniform process for use of the Department of Energy (DOE) Corrective Action Tracking System (CATS) for tracking and reporting findings and corrective actions of assessment activities to closure.

Background:

The DOE Order 414.1A, Quality Assurance, outlines the DOE corrective action process and responsibilities for addressing safety issues identified in assessment reports prepared by the Office of Oversight (EH-2) and the Office of Independent Oversight and Performance Assurance (OA-1). The DOE Order requires DOE elements to address safety issues in Corrective Action Plans (CAPs), and track and report implementation of corrective actions in CATS. These CAPs are to provide root cause(s) for the deficiency, and actions to remedy and preclude recurrence, as well as the responsible manager, deliverable(s), and due dates for the corrective actions.

The CATS web-based database is used to create, edit, and view DOE-wide tracking of the status of actions taken in response to identified safety issues. Access to CATS and guidance for use of CATS can be obtained at <http://tis.eh.doe.gov/portal/ism/cats.htm>.

Assessment reports using the CATS for tracking and reporting findings and corrective actions are:

Required by DOE Order 414.1A -

- Office of Oversight (EH-2) assessments
- Type A Accident Investigations
- Office of Independent Oversight and Performance Assurance (OA-1) Emergency Management assessments

Required by the Deputy Secretary -

- High Efficiency Particulate Air (HEPA) line management self-assessments
- Nuclear Criticality Safety line management self-assessments

Guidelines to identify, correct, and track safety issues (identified deficiencies) for these line management self-assessments required by the Deputy Secretary were adapted from DOE Order 414.1A.

The DOE Corrective Action Management (CAM) Team is the cross-organizational working group of headquarters and field office representatives chartered to coordinate line management efforts to implement the DOE corrective action process and CATS changes. The CAM sponsor is the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Oversight (EH-2).

Criteria for Use of CATS to Track and Report Corrective Actions:

Senior management interest in, and impact upon the Department are the most important considerations in determining whether additional types of assessments findings and

corrective actions should be tracked and reported DOE-wide using CATS. This includes assessments warranting the attention of PSOs (Deputy Administrators for National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) organizations) and Office of the Secretary in their implementation status and timely resolution.

Requests for additional types of assessments/issues to be tracked and reported using CATS will be submitted in writing to the applicable PSO (or Deputy Administrator for NNSA) for recommended approval and then forwarded to the CAM Sponsor for processing. The CAM Sponsor will provide the recommended issue to the other PSOs/NNSA Deputy Administrators for review/concurrence. The CAM Sponsor will resolve comments with the applicable PSOs/NNSA Deputy Administrators, and then submit the issue to the Office of the Secretary for approval.

The request should address each of the following issues:

A. Identify candidate assessment/report, the reason for inclusion, and the sponsor requesting the action. Identify purpose of the assessment/report and the auditing/assessing organization's roles and responsibilities.

B. Describe the benefits and impact the assessment has on the Department. This should include how it will affect the following:

- Public and Worker Safety & Health
- The Environment
- Compliance with Laws and Agreements
- The Scope of the impact (multi-site, multi-program, DOE-wide)
- Congressional/Stakeholder Interest
- Public Perception
- Security
- Critical Management Systems (such as ISM).

C. Describe why the current process for correcting, tracking, and reporting the candidate assessment/report is inadequate. Describe why using CATS for the corrective action management process is necessary to address the situation. This should include a comparison of the two processes and explanation of significant differences between the two. The attached questionnaire provides examples of types of inquiry for consideration in conducting the comparison of the two processes. Confirm the CAM process and CATS database user fields are suitable for the candidate case or determine where CATS or process modifications may be needed, and determine costs associated with making any necessary changes.

D. Describe the potential impact of adding the candidate assessment/report to CATS. This includes volume of assessments/reports, specific modifications to CATS that would be required, estimated man-hour resource and budgetary costs for this addition, and how these costs will be incurred.

E. Verify that the safety issues/quality problems to be entered in CATS are suitable for release and full public access.

Corrective Action Process Expansion Questionnaire

Part I. Assessment Information & Issue Identification

- Who authorizes the review and who accepts the output?
- Who is the target organization and how broad is the scope? Multiple organizations/PSOs?
- What are the target organization's options regarding acceptance of the report?
- What is the duration allowed for CAP development?
- Are CAPs developed consistent with DOE O 414.1A, Attachment 2? Is there additional information required in the CAP? (See Part II below.)
- Is full public access acceptable?
- Is all information unclassified?

Part II. Action Plan Development

- Do actions involve more than one organization? At what level(s) does implementation of corrective actions need to occur?
- Who has ultimate approval authority for the action plan?
- Is there any additional (other than the target organization) input in the development of the action plan?
- Is there a third party reviewer - a regulator, stakeholder, or oversight body that is required or should review and comment on the action plan? What are the possible outcomes of that review? What are the target organization(s) options in response to the third party review?
- Who tracks status of actions?
- Who performs initial closure of actions?
- Who performs verification of closure and assesses effectiveness of actions taken?

Once these questions are answered, the fields in the CATS needs to be reviewed to ensure they capture the type of information relevant and useful to the Assessment/Issue Owner as well as the owner of the action plans.