



NEVADA NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE INVESTIGATIONS

QMP-06-03

Revision 0

DOCUMENT REVIEW/APPROVAL

UNCONTROLLED

B502210095 841130
PDR WASTE
WM-11 PDR

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

DOCUMENT REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Originated by: QASC

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

Effective date: 12/10/84

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

UNCONTROLLED

[Signature] 10-16-84
QASC QA Manager

1.0 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this procedure is to define the responsibilities and methods to provide control for the review and/or approval of documents that are submitted to WMPO by Participating Organizations and NTS Support Contractors.

2.0 APPLICABILITY

This procedure is applicable to the review and approval of all of the documents that are defined in the NNWSI Project Quality Assurance Plan which are submitted to WMPO by the Participating Organizations and NTS Support Contractors.

3.0 DEFINITIONS

3.1 NNWSI Project Quality Assurance Plan. Refer to NNWSI-SOP-02-01 Appendix A for definitions.

4.0 RESPONSIBILITIES

4.1 It is the responsibility of the WMPO staff and QASC to follow this procedure in the review of documents as specified herein.

5.0 PROCEDURE

5.1 Document Review.

5.1.1 It shall be mandatory that the documents listed in Exhibit 02 receive a review in accordance with this procedure. As a minimum, the review of these documents shall be by the reviewers identified in Exhibit 02. Other WMPO staff may be requested to review the document at the discretion of the requestor/approver.

5.1.1.1 Documents not listed in Exhibit 02 may be reviewed in accordance with this procedure at the discretion of the review requestor. Some examples of documents to which this procedure may be applied are comments to the Code of Federal Regulations, Regulatory Guides, etc.

5.1.1.2 The requestor shall complete Part I of the Document Review Sheet (DRS) (see exhibit 01) designating those who will review the document. The requestor then shall forward the DRS and the document to the reviewers.

5.1.2 Upon receipt of a DRS, the reviewer shall perform the requested review of the specified documents.

5.1.2.1 Documents are reviewed primarily for technical adequacy and compliance with QA requirements. As a minimum, the review shall be based on the considerations listed in the Document Review Checklist (DRC) (see Exhibit 03) and also may be based on other criteria unique to the subject. If additional expertise would enhance confidence in the review, other WMPD staff should be consulted.

5.1.2.2 The reviewers shall document their review and comments on the Part II of the DRS. Completed DRSs shall be returned to the review requestor. If the document is acceptable with no comments, the reviewer shall indicate this by placing NA in Part II of the DRS.

5.2 Resolution of Reviewers' Comments

5.2.1 The requestor shall evaluate each reviewer's comments and document the evaluation on Part III of the DRS. The evaluation shall state the rationale for acceptance or rejection of the reviewer's comments. When the reviewer also has responsibility for approval of the document, all comments shall be resolved to the reviewers' satisfaction.

5.2.2 The requestor shall generate a summary letter that indicates either the approval or the return of the document for change with comments. The comments shall include the rationale behind each comment and any supportive back-up information that would add credibility to the comments. The summary shall be returned to the organization that submitted the document for action, if required. A copy of both the summary and the completed DRS(s) shall be sent to the WMPD QA File.

5.3 Peer Review

5.3.1 Technical work that can have a significant effect on program objectives should have a peer review. This procedure can be used as an initial screening of technical documents for possible peer review based on QMP-03-01. QMP-03-01 also provides further guidelines to assist in determining whether or not a peer review should be initiated.

5.3.2 Peer Review shall be initiated by the WMPD Branch Chiefs. When peer review of documents is conducted in accordance with QMP-03-01, this procedure need not be followed.

6.0 REFERENCES

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

6.2 QMP-03-01, Peer Review Procedure.

DOCUMENT REVIEW SHEET

Part I

Document Title: _____ I.D. No.: _____

Organization Submitting Document: _____

Review Requested By: _____
(WMPD Staff)

To Be Reviewed By: _____ Date Sent _____ Date Required _____

(in accordance with QMP-06-03 Checklist)

Part II Comments:

(Continue on additional sheets if necessary and attach them to this form):

Signature of Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Part III Resolution of Comments:

(Rationale for acceptance or rejection of comments.)

All Actions Completed: _____ Date: _____
Review Requestor

DOCUMENTS REQUIRING REVIEW

<u>Documents</u>	<u>Reviewers</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">o NNWSI QAPo WMPO QAPPo NNWSI SOPso QMPs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">QAD Director PQMQAD QASC Director PQMQAD Director PQMQAD QASC Director PQM
Participating Organization & NTS Support Contractor	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">o QAPPso QA implementing procedureso Documentation of quality levels assigned to an activityo Special process procedures (Level I)o Test procedures (Level I)o NCR dispositions (Level I & II)o Records listo Test plans (Level I)o Design drawings, specifications, and criteria (Level I & II)o Peer review reportso Site Characterization Plan o Safety Analysis Directives	<ul style="list-style-type: none">QASC PQMQASC PQM QASC Branch Chief PQMQASC Branch Chief PQM NTSO* Branch Chief QASCBranch Chief DirectorDirector Branch ChiefPQM QASCDirector Branch ChiefPQM

* For NTS Support Contractor design documents only.

Note: Underscored reviewers also have approval responsibility.

DOCUMENT REVIEW CHECKLIST

1.0 Technical Concerns:

- o Approach is correct.
- o Assumptions and limitations are stated adequately.
- o Speculative statements are identified clearly.
- o Figures, tables, and maps are appropriate and useful.
- o Data support interpretations and conclusions.
- o Reasoning by which interpretations and conclusions are reached is given adequately and clearly.
- o Technical discussions are sound.
- o Conclusions are valid and meet the work objective.
- o The document is suitable and appropriate for its intended use.
- o The report has been prepared under a suitable QA program. It may be desirable to request documentation from the support contractor specific to the checks performed on the document.
- o QA input is sufficient.
- o Tables, figures, mathematical calculations and results are correct.
- o All locations in text are shown on maps and are described adequately.

2.0 Editorial Concerns:

- o Title clearly indicates the subject.
- o The purpose of the document is discussed clearly and fully.
- o The document is organized well.
- o The document is written clearly, is correct grammatically and has correct sentence structure, word usage, and spelling.
- o A clear, understandable abstract is included.

3.0 Engineering Drawings:

- o Drawings and specifications shall define all essential design variables necessary to comply with the codes, and applicable standards. The reviewer shall ensure that the drawings fulfill all requirements.
- o The following are examples of items to be checked on drawings:
 - a. All major or critical drawing characteristics.
 - b. The drawings are consistent with the technical specifications.
 - c. All special requirements, such as NDE requirements, special processes, and definition of selected materials, including size, grade, special testing requirements, and hold-and-witness points.
 - d. The drawings shall define all essential design variables necessary to comply with the design requirements.
 - e. All drawings shall be of the latest design requirements and shall be reflected accurately on the drawing.
 - f. The drawings shall define all special requirements such as environmental conditions for air, water, etc.