



NEVADA NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE INVESTIGATIONS

QMP-03-01

Revision 0

PEER REVIEW

UNCONTROLLED

B502210085 841130
PDR WASTE PDR
WM-11

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
NEVADA OPERATIONS OFFICE**

PEER REVIEW

Originated by: QASC

Approved by/date: *[Signature]*
WMPO Director 10/29/84

Effective date: 12/10/84

[Signature]
DOE/NV QAD Director 11-19-84

[Signature] 10-26-84
QASC QA Manager

UNCONTROLLED

1.0 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this procedure is to define the responsibility and methods that will provide a uniform approach into conducting NNWSI project peer reviews.

2.0 APPLICABILITY

2.1 Peer reviews should be conducted or directed by WMPD when there is a unique application of an established or standard practice. They shall be used also when the work exceeds the state of the art and when new or unusual experimental techniques are used by a contractor.

2.2 Peer reviews are made on technical documents submitted by the Participating Organizations and NTS Support Contractors as products of their technical work. These documents include technical procedures, project reports, research reports, test plans and results, designs, specifications, and drawings.

3.0 DEFINITIONS

3.1 Peer Review: A peer review is a verification process over and above the normal independent technical design review to assure that the activity conducted by a Participating Organization or NTS Support Contractor is technically adequate and that it will satisfy requirements established to meet the NNWSI Project objectives.

3.2 See Appendix A, Definitions, of NNWSI-SOP-02-01 for general definitions used in conjunction with the NNWSI Project.

4.0 RESPONSIBILITIES

4.1 It is the responsibility of the WMPD Branch Chiefs to initiate and either to, conduct peer reviews, or to have peer reviews conducted in accordance with this procedure.

4.2 The Director, WMPO, is responsible for ensuring that peer reviews are conducted by the respective Branch Chiefs and for approving all peer review reports.

5.0 PROCEDURE

5.1 Initiating a Peer Review: Technical documents received from Participating Organizations and NTS Support Contractors either through normal distribution or by request from WMPO shall be reviewed in the following manner.

5.1.1 The responsible Branch Chief shall determine if a technical document requires a peer review based on the criteria given in Paragraph 2.1 of this procedure or on other appropriate requirements. In some cases, peer reviews may be required by licensing requirements, agreements between DOE and other governmental bodies, and regulations governing the NNWSI Project.

5.1.1.1 When the criteria of Paragraph 2.1 have been met, the technical document shall receive a peer review in accordance with this procedure.

5.1.1.2 When the criteria of Paragraph 2.1 are not met, the technical document shall be reviewed in accordance with QMP-06-01.

5.1.2 The reviewer(s) selected by the Branch Chief shall be independent of the contractor whose work is being reviewed and shall be professionally qualified to judge the technical document to be reviewed. Organizations from which peer reviews are obtained may include other Participating Organizations and NTS Support Contractors, universities, State and Federal agencies, national laboratories, consulting firms, and other DOE organizations.

5.1.3 The Branch Chief shall select the reviewers and make the necessary arrangements for their participation in the peer review.

5.1.4 The Branch Chief shall notify the originator that a peer review will be conducted on their document and instruct them to provide the reviewer(s) with appropriate information as requested.

5.2 Conducting a Peer Review: The peer review shall be conducted either by separate review or by a joint review meeting. The WMPO shall assure that the following steps are taken to conduct the peer review.

5.2.1 The Branch Chief shall decide the type of peer review to be used, i.e. separate or joint. This decision should be based on timing based upon the urgency for completion, availability of reviewers for a joint review meeting, and the complexity of the subject. The review of a highly complex technical subject could be expedited and the quality of the review could be enhanced by a joint review in which the reviewers interact directly.

5.2.2 A notification letter shall be prepared by the Branch Chief. The letter should contain sufficient information for the reviewers to determine what will be required of them. If a meeting is to be conducted, the time and place of a meeting should be included, as should the subject under review, the purpose of the review, and how the recommendations and comments are to be submitted. An outline that indicates the way in which recommendations and comments are to be handled should also be included.

5.2.3 The Branch Chief shall send the document that is to be reviewed along with the notification letter to the reviewers. This should be done even if a joint review is planned so that the reviewers will have sufficient time to study the document before the review meeting. A copy of the notification letter shall be sent to WMPO QA files.

5.2.4 If there is to be a review meeting, the Branch Chief shall designate a chairman to conduct the review. The chairman shall make the necessary arrangements, prepare an agenda, conduct the meeting, and take the minutes of the proceedings. The outcome of the meeting should reflect a consensus of the reviewers' recommendations and comments. Minority comments or disagreements should also be included. The chairman shall prepare and send a peer review summary letter to the document originator from the Director, WMPO, that indicates the recommendations and comments. He shall forward the summary letter along with any additional comments to WMPO for concurrence by the Branch Chief and for approval by the Director, WMPO.

5.2.5 If there is to be no review meeting the WMPD Branch Chief shall collect the recommendations and comments from the reviewer(s). He shall assign an individual who will prepare a summary letter for concurrence by the Branch Chief and approval by the Director, WMPD.

5.2.6 The WMPD Branch Chief shall submit the peer review summary letter to the organization that originated the document for disposition that will include the recommendations and comments from the reviewer(s) and that will request a response by a given date. The organization may either respond by agreeing with the recommendations and comments and stating the actions to be taken, may respond with alternates and subsequent actions to be taken based on the alternates, or may respond by disagreeing with the recommendations and comments.

5.2.7 When the response has been received from the organization, the Branch chief shall resolve, if possible, the differences between the organization and the reviewers. If that is not possible the Director, WMPD, may take unilateral action to resolve a dispute. All disputes must be resolved and the resolution actions shall be documented.

5.2.8 The Branch Chief shall monitor actions agreed upon by the organization to assure that all actions are completed.

5.3 Peer Review Documentation

5.3.1 A peer review process shall be documented by preparing and issuing a formal report. The report should either include or reference the details of the review such as the date, the names of reviewers, their affiliations and qualifications, the meeting place, the meeting minutes (if a meeting is used), the organization documents reviewed, the notification letter, the recommendations and comments from the reviewers, the summary letter, and the disposition of responses from reviewers including rebuttals from the organization. The report should be treated as a formal WMPD document that has the approval of the Director, WMPD.

5.3.2 The Branch Chief shall send a copy of the peer review report to the reviewers, to the affected organizations, and to WMPD QA files.

5.4 Change Control

5.4.1 The QA Document Clerk shall maintain a log of the documents which have received a peer review. The log shall indicate, as a minimum, the revision level of the document, and the date which the peer review was completed.

5.4.2 Changes to documents which had originally received a peer review shall also receive peer reviews.

6.0 REFERENCES

6.1 NVO-196-17, NNWSI Project Quality Assurance Plan

6.2 NVO-196-18, WMPD Quality Assurance Program Plan

6.3 NNWSI-SOP-02-01, QAPP Requirements

6.4 QMP-06-01, Document Review and Approval

AT THIS TIME
THERE ARE NO QMPs
THAT WOULD AFFECT
THIS SECTION

AT THIS TIME
THERE ARE NO QMPs
THAT WOULD AFFECT
THIS SECTION