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EFCOG Leading Indicator initiative

- **Purpose**
  - provide a general framework for developing leading indicators that can be applicable across the broad DOE portfolio
  - improve understanding and lessen confusion
  - share best practices within the community
  - help managers by providing tools to optimize their operations
Leading Indicators - Guiding Principles

- indicators must help us ask better questions
- indicators must have a logical connection to mission outcome(s)
- indicators should be objective and easy to interpret
- measure only where there is a commitment to analyze the results
- analyze results only if there is a commitment to take action
- maintain a focus on the vital few
Outcomes

- Eleven month, multi-lab/multi-facility effort
- EFCOG Guidance Document provides:
  - conceptual foundation
  - process guidelines (roadmaps)
  - indicator development techniques and templates (toolkit)
  - use and refinement guidelines

Guide available at:
http://www.efcog.org/wg/ca/index.htm
Contractor Assurance Initiatives

- A solid foundation is in place
  - Engaged in development of DOE-SC updated contractor assurance model
  - Contributed to several NNSA Corporate CAS Validation efforts
  - Identified several best practices
    - Deployed staff model
    - Performance communication center
    - Human performance factors within causal analysis
  - Authored two white papers
    - Common elements of a Contractor Assurance System
    - A model for CAS self-assessment
Contractor Assurance Reviews

• Experiences, to-date, from the Office of Science Assurance Peer Review and NNSA affirmation processes
  - Assurance systems solidly in place, with improvement agendas
  - Process discipline allows success to be repeated

• Underlying maturation themes from reviews
  - Effectiveness (performance and impact)
  - Efficiency (streamlining where possible)
  - Sustainability (system stands test of time)
  - Self assessment value/integration
  - Socialize/Enhance (or Flow Down) CAS into organization to enhance maturity
  - Evidence of CAS integration with management systems exists but needs to be further strengthened
It’s about leadership…

“But the blowout occurred in large part because the companies diffused knowledge, responsibility for, and ownership of safety among themselves and among groups of people. The people onshore and on the rig had a false sense of security. They did not recognize the need for individual leadership in addressing the multiple anomalies and uncertainties that they observed. Instead, they relied on many ambiguous — dotted line relationships within and between the companies and personnel involved.

To prevent an incident at Macondo from ever happening again, it will not be enough merely to add regulatory personnel. Just putting more inspectors on the Deepwater Horizon would not have prevented this blowout. Nor will it be enough to issue new prescriptive regulations or write more voluminous safety manuals. Adding a new — ‘don’t do this either’ rule after every accident ensures staying behind the curve.

What the men and women who worked on Macondo lacked—and what every drilling operation requires—was a culture of leadership responsibility. In hostile offshore environments, individuals must take personal ownership of safety issues with a single-minded determination to ask questions and pursue advice until they are certain they get it right.”
There are new challenges ahead...

- Realities
  - a changing fiscal environment is on the horizon

- There are opportunities for Assurance Systems to support a new improvement agenda:
  - streamlining processes
  - alignment of authorities and accountabilities
  - risk-informed decision making processes
  - optimizing oversight activities
Next steps for CAWG -- refining and optimizing

- Identify best practices for development of corrective action plans, effectiveness reviews and sustainability of improvements

- Continue to advance approaches for development of an integrated, risk-informed assessment schedule