

BNL CAS Observer Mtg

The BNL review included eleven observers:

Adam Cohen (PPPL)
Julie Carruthers (DOE SC-2)
Donna Spencer (DOE Berkeley Site Office)
Leif Dietrich (DOE Princeton Site Office)
Mark Bollinger (DOE Fermi Site Office)
Paul Kearns (ANL)
Craig Ferguson (SLAC)
Bob Grant (Fermi)
Michelle Terry (UChicago)
Bill Rainey (JLab)
Elizabeth Lawson (JSA)

The feedback below represents input from the observer team as a whole on improvements to the process for future reviews, and thoughts for single-purpose Labs and how the CAS reviews might change.

1. Some of the ORNL comments were incorporated, but several were not and were witnessed again during this review. In particular,
 - a. Observers are a potentially important and knowledgeable source of feedback, and it's not clear that resource is being used most effectively. The Peer Review team did ask for some input, but perhaps the agenda should include planned out-briefs and "data-dumps."
 - b. The agenda was very light on interviews that verify the process described in the presentations and on observing activities, such as regularly scheduled meetings, that demonstrate the implementation of the CAS.
2. Observers:
 - a. While the primary reason for the Observers is so they can watch the process and learn for a future review, the Observers could help cover some aspects of such a review (e.g., goes out and "kicks the tires" around the Lab).
 - b. Observer time and separate room worked well. Probably don't need as much time for Observers at beginning, but should have some time together with Peer Team to do intros.
3. Lines of inquiry
 - a. Focus on the H Clause – tailor the lines to specifically address the H-clause and then the agenda can focus on plenary sessions that answer certain portions, interviews that address others.
 - b. The review seems to be focused on CAS process, but not as much on value, impact, and effectiveness of CAS. There should be some focus on how well the system is utilized from the top management to the workers.
 - c. No real LOI focused on how info and oversight flows from DOE program offices. Some of this was mentioned by BNL, but not really a focus. What

is being heard and directed from the SC-2 organization that might affect certain parts of the organization.

- d. No real LOI on other stakeholders (WFO sponsors, other regulators, etc.)
 - e. Clarify the roles and responsibilities, and illustrate that what can only be done by the parent vs. the site vs. the Lab.
4. Agenda
- a. Develop some standard agenda/guidance for future reviews. Sites can tailor from there, but start with what works well.
 - b. Build in 15 to 30 minutes between break-outs for “team time” or “team/observer data dumps”
5. End state? Supposing all Labs are found to be good – then what? Now that we have data from 40% of the SC Labs, this question warrants discussion.

Observations on Single-purpose Reviews

1. A smaller Lab may be able to host a shorter review, but not much. The 1st day, afternoon start with overview of the Lab and tour works well. The close-out in the morning of day 3 would also work well, leaving day 2 to be interviews, other presentations, break-outs, observations, and team writing time.
2. The smaller Labs will likely not demonstrate as much “formal” process and brochures, although the Labs will very likely have the same components in some fashion.