

# Emergency Management Accreditation Program Update

*Robert Gee (Y-12 BWXT);*

*Scott Hawks (Y-12 Site Office);*

*John Mitchell (Knowledge System Solutions);*

*and*

*David Freshwater &*

*William Froh (NA-41)*

*2007 EMI SIG Meeting*

*May 7, 2007*



Emergency Management  
Accreditation Program Update

**Agenda**

Introduction – Dave Freshwater

Pilot Assessor Training – John Mitchell

Accreditation Assessment

Y-12 Perspective – Robert Gee

YSO Perspective – Scott Hawks

Team Leader Perspective – Bill Froh

Next Steps – Dave Freshwater

## Emergency Management Accreditation Program Update

- Introduction
  - EMG on the Program circulated for informal comment to all emergency management points of contact
    - Did not include training program description
    - Limited comments
    - Changes made, but not finalized until after pilot
  - Performance Evaluation Program Administrator (PEPA) appointed
  - Finalizing Peer Review Board Membership
    - 3 contractors
    - 2 Federal employees

# Emergency Management Accreditation Program Update

- Y-12, and YSO, have done tremendous work
  - Came up with the concept of Accreditation
  - Put effort into the program to reach high standards
  - Went through a rigorous assessment
- The assessment overall points to successful accreditation for Y-12's Emergency Management Program

## Emergency Management Accreditation Program Update

- Pilot Assessor Training
  - Oak Ridge, April 16-17, 2007
- Goals of Pilot Training
  - Prepare Assessors
  - Reinforce key evaluation skills
  - Gather input and lessons-learned
- Attendees
  - Assessors pre-qualified by experience within DOE system
  - Other participants – prospective assessors from future assessment teams

## Emergency Management Accreditation Program Update

- Development process
  - Review coursework already developed
    - ERA-400 – EOTA Classroom Course on Evaluation Methodology
    - EMAP materials
  - Incorporate applicable guidance from EMG
    - New draft Emergency Readiness Assurance Guide
  - Design course modules addressing use of the EMA Evaluation Guide (Draft EMG, Section 3)
    - Practical training using sample problems
    - Goal is to ensure assessors approach accreditation in the same ways

## Emergency Management Accreditation Program Update

- Lessons Learned
  - Capture what worked and what didn't work so well
    - Made some adjustments during the course
    - Requested feedback from the training pilot sessions
    - Requested additional feedback after the pilot assessment
  - Document what is needed for ongoing training program
    - Re-visit pre-qualification criteria
    - Address training needs identified from pilot feedback
    - Develop training program plan and formalize coursework

## Emergency Management Accreditation Program Update

- Y-12 Perspective
  - Timeline of Events
    - May 06 – Y-12 volunteered for pilot
    - Oct 06-Nov 06 – Matrix completed
    - Dec 06 – Internal validation of matrix
    - Feb 07 – Submittal of matrix to NA-41
    - April 07 – Accreditation Review



# Emergency Management Accreditation Program Update

- Y-12 Perspective (cont.)
  - Accreditation Matrix
    - Prepared over a 6-week period
    - Seven staff members, ~200 hours
    - Total cost ~\$14,000
    - Comprehensive, documented self-assessment

## Emergency Management Accreditation Program Update

- Y-12 Perspective (cont.)
  - Accreditation Review
    - Seven day on-site review
    - Eight team members plus team leader
    - Programmatic review plus performance evaluation
    - Comprehensive review of all program elements
    - Expert based review vs. criteria based review

## Emergency Management Accreditation Program Update

- **YSO Perspective:**  
**General Considerations**

---

- Still need the answer to the “Big Question”:  
What does accreditation do for the site?
- Integration with HSS will be vital to longevity of the program.
- What is the Return on Investment (ROI)?

**Costs include:**

- **Travel/Lodging/Per Diem for the team members;**
- **Contractor costs for logistics related to team support;**
- **Contractor and Site Office staff time spent to generate Accreditation Matrix and support the Review Team;**
- **Contractor and Site Office staff resources to correct issues and complete the accreditation process.**

## Emergency Management Accreditation Program Update

- YSO Perspective:

### **General Considerations (*continued*)**

---

- The accreditation process uses unique issue identifiers:
  - Major Non-conformance
  - Minor Non-conformance
  - Concerns
  - Observations

*These can be a source of confusion to site management, and consideration should be given to using more familiar terminology.*

## Emergency Management Accreditation Program Update

- YSO Perspective:

### General Considerations (*continued*)

---

- Duration and sequence of review:
  - **2 weeks is a good duration to allow for thorough review.**
  - **Plan on conducting the exercise portion early in the review to allow for follow up of exercise observations during the program element reviews.**
- If needed, conduct the Accreditation Assessors Training course outside of the time allotted for the site review.
- Administrative support would be a help for report generation.
- Consider pre-visit scoping meeting to set schedule and agenda.

## Emergency Management Accreditation Program Update

- **YSO Perspective:  
Specific for the Y-12 Pilot**

---

- Some personnel familiar with other accreditation programs, both on the Review Team and at the site, stated the On-site Review “felt like” an OA inspection as opposed to an accreditation review. Need to consider this feedback to ensure the activity achieves its intended goal.
- Another “Big Question”:  
What will be the impact of accreditation as it relates to the HS-63 inspection at Y-12 (Fall 2007)? For a quality comparison, the HS-63 visit should be conducted as if no accreditation process is involved.

## Emergency Management Accreditation Program Update

- Team Leader Perspective
  - Philosophy- Accreditation=Excellence, continuous improvement, collaborative process, value-added, credible
  - Map- Get documents to the team members before the site visit so they can map out a strategy
  - Steer- Must be able to absorb and interpret what each team member is saying, and then guide the team to the finish line
  - Drive home- Keep hammering that all findings must be tied to a specific requirement, avoid the “gotcha” reflex, and be clear about deadlines for submitting paperwork

## Emergency Management Accreditation Program Update

- **Next Steps**
  - Complete Y-12 Accreditation Actions
    - Finalize Y-12 Report
      - Factual accuracy review
    - Y-12 Remedial Action Plan to YSO 30-days after report
    - Y-12 completes remedial actions within 60-days of Remedial Action Plan approval
    - YSO validates remedial actions; PEPA verifies
    - Recommendation to the Peer Review Board



# Emergency Management Accreditation Program Update

- Next Steps
  - HS-63 Oversight Evaluation of Y-12

## Emergency Management Accreditation Program Update

- Next Steps

- Formalize Assessor Training Program

- Incorporate lessons learned from pilot
- Describe program in EMG chapter
- Develop training program with EOTA

- Finalize the EM Accreditation Program EMG

- Incorporate lessons learned from the pilot
- Submit EMG for formal comment in the Departmental Directive System

## Pilot Accreditation Summary

- The Y-12 Emergency Management Program can achieve accreditation
  - Findings of the assessment team show a program that exceeds the norm
  - Issues noted are not serious

## Pilot Accreditation Summary

- Numerous lessons learned
  - Process will work, but can be improved
  - Change the way the assessment team is trained
    - Length is probably right
    - Change focus in some areas
  - Change aspects of how the assessment team operates

## Summary

- Accreditation is an EMI SIG idea
  - There is no driving requirement
- There will have to be a benefit seen by the contractor
  - Issue has been known since idea proposed
  - Could not be resolved before a tangible program was in place
  - DOE P 226.1 states “Higher hazard or risk activities (e.g., facilities with a higher nuclear material attractiveness level) and less mature programs will be assessed more frequently and/or in more depth.”
  - Accreditation demonstrates that a mature, self-critical program exists

## Summary (continued)

- Program Philosophy
  - Accreditation does not equal compliance
    - Goes beyond compliance
    - Accreditation strives for excellence
  - Accreditation should not be easy
  - Facilities that make the effort and are self-critical should be accredited
    - No “fixed” percentages

Questions

# Contact Information

*Robert Gee*

*Y-12 BWXT*

*(865) 576-5707*

[geerf@y12.doe.gov](mailto:geerf@y12.doe.gov)

*Scott Hawks*

*Y-12 Site Office*

*(865) 241-7209*

[hawkssa1@yso.doe.gov](mailto:hawkssa1@yso.doe.gov)

*John Mitchell*

*Knowledge Systems Solutions*

*(540) 384-7377*

[k4iq@worldnet.att.net](mailto:k4iq@worldnet.att.net)

*William Froh*

*NA-41*

*(202) 586-2406*

[William.froh@nnsa.doe.gov](mailto:William.froh@nnsa.doe.gov)

*David Freshwater*

*NA-41*

*202-586-7220*

[david.freshwater@hq.doe.gov](mailto:david.freshwater@hq.doe.gov)

