Nuclear
Quality
Management
Leadership

Nuclear Employee Concerns Evaluation Program Evaluation Guidelines

NECE-GUID-002 R01

Approved: 6/18/12

Chair, Nuclear Quality Management Leadership

Foreword

The Nuclear Quality Management Leadership (NQML) forum consists of utility quality assurance management decision-makers to sponsor and promote activities that support effective quality management within the nuclear industry. The NQML optimizes the interface with other industry organizations to bring consistent and complimentary focus to the current issues challenging our business. The NQML has partnered with the Nuclear Energy Institute (as defined within sub-process LP002 of the NEI Standard Nuclear Performance model) to further promote the advancement of effective independent oversight of Nuclear Power operations.

In 2007, the NQML agreed to establish a program for measuring the effectiveness of Employee Concerns Programs (ECP) across the industry to apply consistently high standards of performance for the ECP process. A subcommittee was responsible for the identification and development of good practices pertaining to successful ECP oversight and implementation of ECP Programs. The subcommittee was charged with the development of specific performance objectives and attributes associated with a leading ECP and the development of industry peer evaluation guideline.

NECE-GUID-001 "*Nuclear Employee Concerns Evaluation Program Performance Objectives and Attributes*" describes specific criteria to assist nuclear utilities and facilities in developing, improving, and evaluating their ECP functions. The performance objectives are broad in scope and each objective lists several criteria to provide the breadth and depth of the objective. NECE-GUID-002, "*Nuclear Employee Concerns Evaluation Program Evaluation Guidelines*" establishes a uniform method for evaluating the effectiveness of each member's ECP Program.

Acknowledgement

This document consolidates the efforts of many nuclear industry professionals actively involved in Employee Concerns Program activities. The document reflects the industry's experience in evaluating Employee Concerns Program activities as well as good practices that support excellence in nuclear operations. The document was prepared under the sponsorship of the NQML. Specifically, the NQML wishes to thank the Employee Concerns Program Subcommittee for the development of this document.

NUCLEAR QUALITY MANAGEMENT LEADERSHIP (NQML)

NQML STEERING COMMITTEE

Jeff DeFebo
PSEG Nuclear
NQML Chairperson

Tom Tankersley
Entergy
NQML Vice Chairperson

Ed Dutton
Arizona Public Service
NQML Nuclear Industry Evaluation Program Chairperson

Open
Advisor to the Chair

Jim Burkhead
Exelon
Nuclear Oversight Conference Chairperson

Darlene Stimart
Xcel Energy
Nuclear Procurement Issues Committee Chairperson

Al Ashton
Bruce Power
NQML Secretary

Dennis Petersen
Pacific Gas & Electric
NQML Training and Education Chairperson

Nuclear Energy Institute Representative

Mark Harvey

NQML – EMPLOYEE CONCERNS PROGRAM (ECP) SUBCOMMITTEE

Mike Headrick
PSEG Nuclear

Dutch Chancey
First Energy

Bob Speek
Exelon Corp

Kirk Pedersen
Exelon Corp

Rick Burnside
Pacific Gas & Electric

NUCLEAR QUALITY MANAGEMENT LEADERSHIP

NUCLEAR EMPLOYEE CONCERNS EVALUATION PROGRAM EVALUATION GUIDELINES

NECE-GUID-002 R01

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 Introduction 1

2.0 Purpose 1

3.0 Program 1
- **3.1 General Conditions** 1
- **3.2 Team Qualifications and Duties** 2
- **3.3 Evaluated Member Management Responsibilities** 4
- **3.4 Evaluation Schedule** 4
- **3.5 Reporting Evaluation Results** 5

4.0 References 6

5.0 Revision History 6

Appendix A Definitions 7

NUCLEAR QUALITY MANAGEMENT LEADERSHIP

NUCLEAR EMPLOYEE CONCERNS EVALUATION PROGRAM EVALUATION GUIDELINES

NECE-GUID-002 R01

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This guideline establishes a uniform practice regarding evaluating the effectiveness of implementation of each member's ECP, either via self-assessments or independent assessments.

This guideline assesses member's ECP using the criteria established in NECE-GUID-001, "*Nuclear Employee Concerns Evaluation Program Performance Objectives and Attributes.*" The NECEP can be used to provide an independent method for members to evaluate their organization's ECP performance to the industry guidance established in the reference documents listed in NECE-GUID-001. During the NECEP, evaluators perform interviews of site personnel and review site documents.

2.0 PURPOSE

2.1 The purpose of NECEP is to provide a consistent, structured method to evaluate member's ECP. These guidelines provide management with a process for the performance of a self-assessment/independent assessment of the adequacy/effectiveness of implementation of their ECP. Utilities may customize the requirements where appropriate to conform to their specific ECP requirements.

3.0 PROGRAM

3.1 General Conditions

3.1.1 The scope of NECEP is to evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of the evaluated member's ECP.

3.1.2 NECEP assessment Teams typically consist of a Team Leader, team members, and a site peer. The number of team members should be commensurate with the evaluation scope (typically five).

3.1.3 When this evaluation is being performed as a self-assessment, the procedures governing the site/utility self-assessment processes direct the actual performance of the self-assessment and the Performance Objectives and Attributes can form the basis for the scope of the self-assessment. The remainder of this guideline pertains only to independent assessments.

3.2 Team Qualifications and Duties

3.2.1 Team Leader

3.2.1.1 The Team Leader will be a management-level individual (e.g., Director, Manager, or Supervisor level personnel). The Team Leader will have the requisite skill and/or experience to interface successfully with the management of the evaluated utility. The Team Leader should have appropriate experience, an appreciation for sensitive management issues and an awareness of ECP requirements. In addition it is recommended that the Team Leader have participated in, or led similar or large scope evaluations.

3.2.1.2 Basic Duties/Accountabilities:

a) Review qualifications and approve the composition of the evaluation team, including industry peers, observers, or consultants.

b) Review previous utility performed self-assessments and/or independent assessments to identify particular areas of focus for the team.

c) Assign scope items to team members to prepare portions of the evaluation checklist based on expertise. Monitor the team's preparation progress.

d) Develop the detailed evaluation schedule.

e) Provide the required information to the host utility for in processing team members.

f) Provide orientation for the evaluation team.

g) Make evaluation team assignments, including evaluation areas and responsibilities for completing sections of the final report.

h) Coordinate activities during the evaluation. Ensure effective communications within the team.

i) Meet daily with the evaluation team to review their observations, perceptions, and conclusions. Team meetings are intended to promote coordination, cooperation, and sharing of information regarding issues and experience gained during the evaluation process. The Team Leader shall coordinate the identification and evaluation of potential findings.

j) Work with the Evaluation Team. Coordinate planning and preparation to ensure an effective evaluation. This includes arranging logistics for the evaluation team.

k) Arranging for and conducting Entrance and Exit meetings. Organizing the evaluation results for the facilitation of the Exit meeting.

l) Developing and approving the final report, in conjunction with the team members.

3.2.2 Team Members

3.2.2.1 Team Members will be industry peers who are experienced in the assigned scope area.

3.2.2.2 Basic Duties/Accountabilities:

a) Perform pre-evaluation reviews of documents provided in order to:
- Familiarize themselves with the evaluated members site organization and processes
- Determine potential vulnerabilities to focus on in assigned areas

b) Assist the Team Leader in developing evaluation focus areas.

c) Perform evaluation in assigned area(s) through interviews and/or document reviews.

d) During the evaluation, each evaluator meets as needed with the Team Leader to discuss the details of the evaluation, including fact and data gathered, as well as conclusions and insights made based on this information. The purpose is to ensure accuracy and understanding of the information gathered.

e) Work with the other evaluation team members to reach final conclusions.

f) Provide input to the final report and related documentation, as required by the Team Leader.

3.2.3 Site Peer Team Member

3.2.3.1 A Site Peer Team Member is an individual from the evaluated member's ECP organization who brings expertise and experience to the evaluation team based on an in-depth knowledge of the evaluated members processes

and site organization.

3.2.3.2 Basic Duties/Accountabilities:

a) Establishing logistics, including site access for all team members, a meeting area, basic office supplies, and communications equipment, and providing necessary documents for team review prior to and during the on-site evaluation. Consideration should be given for the confidential nature of the material and interviews.

b) Facilitating the development and issuance of evaluation scope and plan.

c) Facilitating communication between evaluation team members and plant staff, including Entrance and Exit meetings, and scheduling interviews.

d) Participating in team meetings, contributing needed information and challenging issues to ensure they are accurately characterized.

3.3 Evaluated Member Management Responsibilities

a) Ensuring appropriate line organization support for the NECEP.

b) Approving the NECEP plan prior to the teams arrival on site.

c) Ensuring NECEP issues are appropriately entered into evaluated member's corrective action program and conducting appropriate follow-up as required by their ECP.

d) Approving evaluation team composition, including Industry Peers, observers and consultants.

3.4 Evaluation Schedule

3.4.1 At least ninety (90) days prior to the evaluation the Team Leader shall contact the evaluated member to establish a point of contact to arrange for planning, coordinating and scheduling of the evaluation. The dates shall be mutually agreed upon between the two parties.

3.4.2 At least ninety (90) days prior to the evaluation the evaluated utility will provide a report of the most recent utility performed self-assessment of their ECP performance (i.e., past 2-4 years) to the evaluation Team Leader.

3.4.3 At least sixty (60) days prior to the evaluation the scope (including the specific attributes to be evaluated) shall be finalized and approved.

3.4.4 At least forty-five (45) days prior to the evaluation the Team Leader will have contacted and finalized the team composition.

3.4.5 At least thirty (30) days prior to the evaluation the scope and the plan shall be finalized and approved.

3.4.6 At least thirty (30) days prior to the evaluation the evaluated member will provide the necessary documentation to the team. Recommend this include appropriate site procedures, site layout, current organization charts, etc. Distribution of the information via a CD is recommended. Confidential information will not be distributed, and should be reviewed at the site where the assessment is performed.

3.4.7 The evaluation team will coordinate prior to the scheduled evaluation to discuss the evaluation and to finalize their preparation prior to the scheduled entrance meeting. The evaluated member should participate to provide the team with logistics of initial arrival at the station.

3.4.8 The evaluation team should meet with the evaluated station in an entrance meeting to introduce evaluation team members, meet counterparts, discuss the evaluation sequence and plans for the exit meeting, and to confirm channels of communications.

3.4.9 Evaluations will normally require five (5) days onsite for each assigned evaluation team member.

3.4.10 Daily de-briefs should be held with the evaluation team to review their observations, perceptions, and conclusions. In addition, a pre-exit debrief may be conducted at the discretion of the Team Leader and the evaluated member management.

3.4.11 An exit meeting should be held with the management of the evaluated utility, including both the line and the ECP organizations, to present the evaluation results.

3.4.12 Within fifteen (15) days of the exit, the Team Leader should provide a draft report to the Evaluation Team Members and to the evaluated member for review and feedback.

3.4.13 Within thirty (30) days of the exit, the Team Leader will prepare a cover letter and approve the final NECEP Report documenting the evaluation results, and provide a copy to appropriate line management of the evaluated member.

3.5 Reporting Evaluation Results

3.5.1 Typically the evaluation results are documented in the evaluated members report

format. As a minimum, the following will be included:

3.5.1.1 Description of the evaluation scope.

3.5.1.2 Identification of the evaluators.

3.5.1.3 A summary of the evaluation results, including a statement regarding the effectiveness of the objectives and attributes that were evaluated.

3.5.1.4 Description of each identified issue (*see Appendix A, Definitions*) to assure that the evaluated member can effectively carry out corrective action. It is the responsibility of the evaluated member to prioritize each issue and include them in their corrective action process when appropriate.

3.5.1.5 Recommendations for correcting identified issues or improving the program as appropriate.

4.0 REFERENCES

This document takes its authority from:

NQML-CHAR-001, NQML Charter

This document is implemented by:

NECE-GUID-001, Nuclear Employee Concerns Evaluation Program Performance Objectives and Attributes

5.0 REVISION HISTORY

R01 – 06/18/12 – New document numbering system.
- References and Revision History Sections added.

R00 – 07/31/08 – Initial Issue

APPENDIX A

DEFINITIONS

The following definitions should be utilized to assist with the classification of evaluation results into appropriate categories.

DEFICIENCIES (D)

A condition or concern that does not meet specific requirements of procedures, policies, management expectations, or accepted industry standards. These should be tracked via the station's Corrective Action Program or other appropriate tracking method.

RECOMMENDATIONS (R)

A suggestion identified during the assessment to enhance the assessed area and improve performance. Recommendations are not corrective actions to address standards deficiencies. These may be tracked via the station's Corrective Action Program or other appropriate tracking method.

STRENGTH (S)

Strengths are those items identified as having sufficient interest and value to be shared with the industry. When reporting strengths, list only those items that others would want to benchmark against. These may be tracked via the station's Corrective Action Program or other appropriate tracking method.