APPENDIX A

Westinghouse Electric Corporation
Computer and Instrumentation Division
Docket No. 99900280/82-01

NOTICE OF NONCONFORMANCE

Based on the results of an NRC inspection conducted on December 6-9, 1982, it appears that certain of your activities were not conducted in accordance with NRC requirements as indicated below:

Criterion V of Appendix B to 10 CFR Part 50 states: "Activities affecting quality shall be prescribed by documented instructions, procedures, or drawings, of a type appropriate to the circumstances and shall be accomplished in accordance with these instructions, procedures, or drawings. Instructions, procedures, or drawings shall include appropriate quantitative or qualitative acceptance criteria for determining that important activities have been satisfactorily accomplished."

Nonconformances with these requirements are as follows:

A. Section 4.0 in Quality Assurance Procedures and Standards (QAPS) No. 209 states, in part, "The Quality Control inspector will identify and disposition all discrepant materials. All reworkable materials will be identified and controlled per an Error Correction Tag." Subparagraph 5.2.4 states, "Dispose of scrap material in the locked scrap material barrel and file the yellow MDR [Material Disposition Report] copy."

Section 7.0 in QAPS No. 215 states, in part, "The person finding a discrepancy in workmanship or operation fills out an EC Tag . . . when more than one item is included on an EC Tag, individual pieces must have a small manilla tag affixed referencing the EC Tag number."

Contrary to the above:

1. Five completed pressure transmitters were observed in the inspection area with Material Disposition Reports attached and identified as scrap material. None of the items had an Error Correction Tag attached.

2. A locked barrel had not been provided for scrap disposal.

3. Fifteen discrepant component parts for pressure transmitters were observed in an inspection area that had not been tagged with manilla tags.

B. Paragraph 18.1 in Section 18, Revision 2, of the Computer and Instrumentation Division (C&ID) Quality Control Program states, in part, "A documented program of planned internal audits is carried out to verify compliance with the Quality Control Program . . . ."

Paragraph 18.2 states, in part, "The audits are performed in accordance with written checklists by members of Quality Control who have no direct responsibilities in the areas being audited . . . additionally personnel selected for quality auditing assignments will have experience or training commensurate with the scope, complexity, or special nature of the activities to be audited . . . The Quality Control Manager is responsible for ensuring that those persons selected for quality assurance auditing assignments are qualified . . . ."

Paragraph 18.3 states, "Implementation of the actions necessary to correct deficiencies revealed by the audit is the responsibility of the functional department audited. These areas are periodically re-audited until the recommended corrective action measures are implemented and effective."

Contrary to the above:

1. C&ID did not have a documented program of planned internal audits to verify compliance with the Quality Control Program.

2. Auditors were performing audits of areas in which they had direct responsibility.

3. Documentation was not available which would confirm that auditors had either sufficient experience or had received commensurate training.

C. Paragraph 7.5, "Periodic Supplier Audits," in Section 7, Revision 3, of the C&ID Quality Control Program states, "Quality Control will establish a program for the audit of quality control programs of suppliers for which specific quality program requirements have been identified. Findings and recommendations are reported to suppliers by Quality Control. Corrective action is required as appropriate. Follow-up audits are performed when necessary to assure adequate quality."

Contrary to the above, C&ID had not established a program for the periodic audit of approved suppliers, as evidenced by the absence of any documented frequency requirements and the identification by the inspector that 70 percent of Type 1 (Critical) vendors had not been resurveyed in over 5 years.