YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUALITY ASSURANCE DIVISION

QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE REPORT

OF

SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION

SURVEILLANCE REPORT NO. YMP-SR-92-003

CONDUCTED ON FEBRUARY 24-25, 1992

ACTIVITY SURVEILLED:

PROCUREMENT

Prepared by: _____ Date: 02-19-92

Richard L. Maudlin
Quality Assurance Specialist

Approved by: _____ Date: 3/3/92

Donald G. Horton
Director
Office of Quality Assurance

1.0   INTRODUCTION

This report contains the results of a Yucca Mountain Quality Assurance Division (YMQAD) Surveillance No. YMP-SR-92-003 of Science Applications International Corporation/ Technical and Management Support Services (SAIC/T&MSS) conducted at Las Vegas, Nevada, from February 24 through February 25, 1992.

2.0   PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this surveillance was to determine the effectiveness of implementation of the SAIC/T&MSS procedure for the control of procurement as it relates to computer software. The scope of the surveillance covered the review of selected procurement packages. Aspects of the process to be evaluated included linking procurements to Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) numbers and evaluation of selected non-Quality Assurance (QA) software procurements.

During this surveillance, implementation of selected aspect of Standard Procedure (SP) 1.28, Revision 5, "Control of Purchased Items and Services," were verified for compliance.

3.0   SURVEILLANCE PERSONNEL

This surveillance was conducted by the following personnel:

Richard L. Maudlin, QA Specialist, MAC Technical Services/YMQAD (Surveillance Team Leader)

4.0   SUMMARY OF SURVEILLANCE RESULTS

The implementing procedure listed in Section 2.0 of this report, along with some general questions related to the procurement process, were the source of questions used to conduct this surveillance. Checklists along with a copy of the approved procedure referenced in Section 2.0 were used to determine compliance. No Corrective Action Requests (CARs) were generated as a result of this surveillance. The following results were obtained during this surveillance:

SP 1.28, R5 "Control of Purchased Items and Services"

Section 5.0, Paragraph 5.1, describes the process for initiation of a Purchase Requisition (PR). Subparagraph 5.1.1 (I) requires that the end usage (work package and grading package number) be identified in the "USE" block of the PR. A sample of three procurement packages, two non-QA, and one QA-Commercial Grade, were selected for the procurement of software/software services. The packages selected were as follows:

PO Number	Supplier	Date	WBS Number	Status
39-930005	Odessa Engineering	2/14/92	1.2.5.4.2	QA C/G
39-920021	Risk Engineering	5/08/91	1.2.1.4.1	Non-QA
39-920662	Activity Proj Mgt Ser	1/08/92	1.2.9.2	Non-QA

The results reflected that all PRs made reference to a WBS number which was tied back to a grading package. The classifications (i.e.; QA or Non-QA) were found to be correct. In regards to Purchase Order (PO) 39-0005 which was designated as QA-Commercial Grade, questions arose as to the purchase being commercial grade in that Software Requirements Specifications were included in the procurement package. Through investigation and a phone call to the supplier (Odessa Engineering), it was determined that the Software Requirements Specifications were not a part of the procurement package received by the supplier. The software being provided was off-the-shelf and was being supplied without modification as per the manufacturer's catalog part number. A concern arose then as to what the purpose was for the Software Requirements Specifications, if the software was an off-the-shelf item. It was pointed out to the surveillance evaluator that the Software Requirements Specifications were going to be used to perform baseline testing of the software when received. It was pointed out that the software was acceptable for use as designed; however, it would be tested to determine how close it came to the parameters of the user once received.

In the exit meeting for the surveillance, held on February 25, 1992, the condition regarding the Software Requirements Specifications was brought out. It was determined that a potential concern exists, in that the procurement documentation package did not support itself in how these specifications were to be used. A recommendation was made by the SAIC/T&MSS QA Manager that some sort of documented indicator should be included in the package to denote as to when Software Requirements Specification were a part of the procurement package and when they were not.

The results of the evaluation indicated compliance for those areas of the procedure reviewed and that the determinations made regarding QA status, were correct for those procurement packages reviewed.

5.0 PERSONNEL CONTACTED DURING THE SURVEILLANCE

James B. Harper, QA Manager, SAIC/T&MSS
Fred Lofftus, Quality Engineer, SAIC/T&MSS
Kent B. Johnson, Deputy QA Manager, SAIC/T&MSS
Robert Rinderman, Lead Quality Engineer, SAIC/T&MSS
Alison E. Keyes, Purchasing Supervisor, SAIC/T&MSS
William W. Clarke, Buyer, SAIC/T&MSS
Robert S. Bostian, APM, SAIC/T&MSS
Grover H. Prowell, Scientist, SAIC/T&MSS
Harry E. Leake, Division Manager Systems/Software Dev., SAIC/T&MSS

6.0   <u>SYNOPSIS OF DEFICIENCY DOCUMENTS/OBSERVATIONS</u>

None

7.0   <u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>

None

8.0   <u>REQUIRED ACTIONS</u>

None