



Department of Energy

Yucca Mountain Project Office
P. O. Box 98608
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8608

WBS 1.2.9.3
QA

TO: K. Hooks

NOV 06 1990

Thomas E. Blejwas
Technical Project Officer
for Yucca Mountain Project
Sandia National Laboratories
P.O. Box 5800
Organization 6310
Albuquerque, NM 87185

ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSES TO STANDARD DEFICIENCY REPORT (SDR) 571, REVISION 0,
RESULTING FROM YUCCA MOUNTAIN PROJECT OFFICE (PROJECT OFFICE) QUALITY ASSURANCE
(QA) AUDIT 90-04 OF SANDIA NATIONAL LABORATORIES (SNL)

The Project Office QA staff has evaluated and accepted your response to SDR 571,
Revision 0, generated as a result of Project Office QA Audit 90-04 of SNL.
The SDRs will be closed after verification of satisfactory completion of the
specified corrective actions. Copies of the SDRs are enclosed for your
information.

Verification of completion of your corrective action will be performed after the
effective dates that were provided. Any extension to these due dates must be
requested in writing with appropriate justification prior to the due date.
Please send copies of the extension request to Nita J. Brogan, Science
Applications International Corporation, 101 Convention Center Drive,
Las Vegas, Nevada 89109.

If you have any questions, please contact Catherine E. Hampton at (702) 794-7973
or FTS 544-7973, or Charles C. Warren at (702) 794-7248 or FTS 544-7248 of the
Yucca Mountain Project QA staff.

James Blaylock
Donald G. Horton, Director
Quality Assurance
Yucca Mountain Project Office

QA:CEH-709

Enclosure:
SDR 571, Revision 0

cc w/encl:
R. R. Richards, SNL, 6319, Albuquerque, NM
S. W. Zimmerman, NWPO, Carson City, NV
K. R. Hooks, NRC, Washington, DC
N. J. Brogan, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-08

cc w/o encl:
J. W. Gilray, NRC, Las Vegas, NV
J. H. Hines, OQD, AL

*102.7
WM-11
N403 1/1*

YMPO STANDARD DEFICIENCY REPORT

N-QA-038
4/89

Completed by Originating QA Organization	1 Date <u>8-24-90</u>		2 Severity Level <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3		Page 1 of 2	
	3 Discovered During Audit 90-04		3a Identified By C. Warren		4 SDR No. 571 Rev. 0	
	5 Organization SNL		6 Person(s) Contacted F. Schelling/R. Sandoval		7 Response Due Date is 20 Working Days from Date of Transmittal	
	8 Requirement (Audit Checklist Reference, if Applicable) 1. SNL-NWRT-QAPP, Revision E, Section 2.8.1 states the following: "Management assessments are to be conducted at least annually for determining the effectiveness of the system and management controls"					
Completed by Organization in Block 5	9 Deficiency 1. Contrary to requirement No. 1 stated above, SNL-NWRT-DOP 2-8, Revision A requires that a management assessment of the QA Program be initiated at least once during each fiscal year. This makes it possible					
	10 Recommended Action(s): <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Remedial <input type="checkbox"/> Investigative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corrective Identify the remedial action(s) to be taken to correct the deficiencies noted in block 9. Identify the cause of the condition and the planned					
	11 QAE/Lead Auditor/Date <u>C. Warren 9-4-90</u>		12 Division Manager/Date <u>N/A</u>		13 Project Quality Mgr./Date <u>[Signature] 9/5/90</u>	
Completed by Organization in Block 5	14 Remedial/Investigative Action(s) 1. DOP 2-8 has been revised to call specifically for management assessments to be performed annually. 2. It is unclear to SNL how the auditor concluded that the FY89 and FY90 Management Assessments did not address effectiveness of implementation of the QA Program. The cover memo for the FY89 Management Assessment, reference 1 below, signed (Continued)					
	15 Effective Date <u>Complete</u>					
	16 Cause of the Condition & Corrective Action to Prevent Recurrence 1. DOP 2-8 was written to call for assessments at least once each fiscal year in the good faith belief that such a frequency fulfilled the "annual" requirement and to provide each assessment with a clear identity (e.g., "FY88"). See block 14, number 1. 2. None required.					
	17 Effective Date <u>Complete</u>					
Comp. by Orig. QA Org.	18 Signature/Date <u>Thomas E. Bleywas / 10/12/90</u>					
	19 Response Accepted		QAE/Lead Auditor/Date <u>C. Warren 10-22-90</u>		Division Manager/Date <u>N/A</u>	
	20 Corrective Action Verif. Satisfactory		QAE/Lead Auditor/Date		Division Manager/Date	
	21 Remarks <u>Response Ltr 10/12/90 - Bleywas to Norton</u>				Project Quality Mgr./Date <u>[Signature]</u>	
Comp. by Orig. QA Org.	22 QA CLOSURE		QAE/Lead Auditor/Date		Division Manager/Date	
					PQM/Date	

ENCLOSURE

YMPO STANDARD DEFICIENCY REPORT
CONTINUATION SHEET

N-QA-038
2/89

SDR No. 571

Page 2 of 2

8 Requirement (continued)

that are established to achieve and assure quality...".

2. SNL-NWRT-DOP 2-8, Revision A, Section 4.2 requires the designated management assessment team to perform the following action: "As a minimum, address the effectiveness of implementation of the QA Program, and whether personnel are trained in regards to the QA Requirements of the Program."

9 Deficiency (continued)

to exceed the annual requirement of the QAPP.

2. Contrary to requirement No. 2 stated above, a review of SNL management assessments for fiscal years 1989 and 1990 indicated that they did not address effectiveness of implementation of the QA Program.

10 Recommended Actions (continued)

action to prevent recurrence.

Block 14 Remedial Actions (Continued):

by the TPO, states, "I have reviewed...the effectiveness of the Department QA...programs as assessed in Attachment 1." Attachment 1 of reference 1 states that, "The assessment examines...the effectiveness of implementation of the QA Program..." It goes on to explain that it does so by addressing ten topics that were key aspects of the QA program at the time of the assessment.

In reference 2, a memo providing the TPO with detailed input for Management Assessment in FY90, the writer states that "The Assessment must examine...the effectiveness of implementation of the QA Program." Examination of the contents of reference 2 illustrates that the writer thoroughly examined various aspects of the QA Program and its effectiveness, including, "an attempt to pinpoint specific areas when the QA Program, as implemented has been (or could be) improved," (page 2) and, "identification of areas in which Project activities or requirements result in actual or perceived decrease in the quality of our work," (Page 3). Finally there is a long portion, starting on page 5 which addresses, "Does the QA Program, as implemented, contribute to work that could be described as 'high-quality'?"

Finally, in reference 3, the TPO made his management assessment of the FY90 effort, stating that he had, "reviewed...the evaluation of the effectiveness of the Department 6310 QA Program," and specified a number of actions to be taken.

References:

1. SNL Memo, Hunter to File; subject: "Evaluation of Management Assessment for FY89"; dated August 9, 1990.
2. SNL Memo, Nimick to Hunter; subject: "Management Assessment, FY90"; dated July 26, 1990.
3. SNL Memo, Hunter to Distribution; subject: "Analysis of Management Assessment for FY90"; dated August 7, 1990.