DESIGN REVIEW DOCUMENTATION – RESULTS

Title: **NCSX Document & Records Plan**   **WP#:** _____ _____ (ENG-032)

Type of Review: X Peer   ☐ CDR   ☐ PDR   ☐ FDR

Cog Individual: **Robert Simmons**   Date of Review: **March 14, 2003**

Review Board Members:	Invited attendees :	Other
Attendees:		
Chairperson J. Malsbury	Larry Dudek	Frank Malinowski
Hutch Neilson	Tom Brown	
Bob Simmons	Brad Nelson (ORNL)	
	Tony DeMeo	
Regulatory Compliance		

Items Reviewed:	Sat.	Unsat.	Comments
Appropriate requirements identified	X	☐	_____
Development plans and schedules	X	☐	_____
Regulatory compliance including USQD and NEPA	X	☐	_____
Disposition of CHITS from previous reviews	☐	☐	N/A
Cost objectives	☐	☐	N/A
Other review objectives addressed	X	☐	_____
(Attachment 4 of ENG-033)			

SUM ARY OF RESULTS:

Only one CHIT identified that specifically addresses the NCSX Document and Record Plan (NCSX-PLAN-DOC).   Other four (4) CHITs address NCSX data management issues and the NCSX Data Management Plan (NCSX-PLAN-DMP) – these issues are being addressed prior to holding a peer review for the NCSX Data Management Plan.

Disposition: [check one]

☐   **Acceptable**

X   **Acceptable pending resolution of concerns** - CHITS identified above must be resolved prior to

installation/issue of Plan/Procedure

☐   **Incomplete** - Additional design work is required prior to another design review.

Chairperson Signature:

Distribution: Review Board Memb ers, NCSX Engineering Web Page, Cognizant Design Engineer, System Engineer(s), Attendees, QA, ES&H

PPPL DESIGN REVIEW CHIT

WP # _____ (ENG-032)

CHIT **# 1**

COMPONENT/SUBSYSTEM/SYSTEM <u>NCSX Document & Records Plan</u> COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER <u>R. Simmons</u> DATE OF REVIEW <u>March 14, 2003</u>	**X** PEER ☐ CDR ☐ PDR ☐ FDR

SUBJECT: (CHECK AS APPLICABLE)

☐ REQUIREMENTS   ☐ HARDWARE   ☐ SAFETY
☐ ANALYSIS   ☐ CONFIGURATION   ☐ COST/SCHEDULE
☐ PERFORMANCE   ☐ RELIABILITY /MAINTAINABILITY   ☐ QUALITY

COMMENT/CONCERN/RECOMMENDATION

Technical documentation (e.g., requirements, NEPA documentation, technical data for outside agencies, etc.) should be kept for the lifetime of the project (i.e., through decommissioning and dismantlement) which is usually more than 10 years.

ORIGINATOR <u>H. Neilson</u>

NAME/ORGANIZATION   NCSX PROJECT

REVIEW BOARD COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION
(Address technical, cost, and schedule impacts as appropriate. If CHIT is not adopted, provide technical reaso
do not simply state "out-of-scope or N/A" without explaining.)

X CONCUR
0 DISAGREE
0 OTHER   CHAIRPERSON <u>J. Malsbury</u> DATE: <u>March 14, 2003</u>

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER'S RESPONSE/DISPOSITION:

(1) Work with T. DeMeo (PPPL RIDS authority) to confirm that Table 4-1 from Plan correctly excerpts pertinent requirements from GEN-023.
(2) Work with NCSX Project Engineering Manager and Project Manager to determine whether Project wants to impose stricter requirements (e.g., until decommissioning and dismantlement vs. 10 years).

SIGNATURE <u>R. Simmons</u> DATE: March 14, 2003

RESPONSIBLE RLM REVIEW
0   APPROVE COG DISPOSITION
0   DISAPPROVE COG DISPOSITION   SIGNATURE _____ DATE: _____

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER CLOSE-OUT
Sign when action required by disposition is complete.

SIGNATURE _____ DATE: _____

CHITs That Will be Addresses as Part of NCSX Data Management Plan Peer Review

PPPL DESIGN REVIEW CHIT	WP # _____ (ENG-032) CHIT # **DMP-1**

COMPONENT/SUBSYSTEM/SYSTEM NCSX Document & Records Plan COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER R. Simmons DATE OF REVIEW March 14, 2003	**X** PEER ☐ CDR ☐ PDR ☐ FDR

SUBJECT: (CHECK AS APPLICABLE)

☐ REQUIREMENTS ☐ HARDWARE ☐ SAFETY
☐ ANALYSIS ☐ CONFIGURATION ☐ COST/SCHEDULE
☐ PERFORMANCE ☐ RELIABILITY /MAINTAINABILITY ☐ QUALITY

COMMENT/CONCERN/RECOMMENDATION

Suggest that we scan some portion of non-electronic documents (e.g. first page or two) and store as info-only copy on web for reference.

ORIGINATOR   B. Nelson / ORNL

NAME/ORGANIZATION

REVIEW BOARD COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION
(Address technical, cost, and schedule impacts as appropriate. If CHIT is not adopted, provide technical reaso do not simply state "out-of-scope or N/A" without explaining.)
Agree, but may be physical constraints that will preclude scanning all vendor documents.

X CONCUR
0 DISAGREE
0 OTHER   CHAIRPERSON J. Malsbury DATE: March 14, 2003

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER'S RESPONSE/DISPOSITION:

This a good idea and will be considered for NCSX data management.

SIGNATURE R. Simmons DATE: March 14, 2003

RESPONSIBLE RLM REVIEW
0   APPROVE COG DISPOSITION
0   DISAPPROVE COG DISPOSITION   SIGNATURE _____ DATE:_____

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER CLOSE-OUT
Sign when action required by disposition is complete.
                                SIGNATURE _____ DATE:_____

PPPL DESIGN REVIEW CHIT

WP # _____ (ENG-032)

CHIT # **DMP-2**

COMPONENT/SUBSYSTEM/SYSTEM NCSX Document & Records Plan

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER R. Simmons DATE OF REVIEW March 14, 2003

X	PEER
☐	CDR
☐	PDR
☐	FDR

SUBJECT: (CHECK AS APPLICABLE)

☐ REQUIREMENTS   ☐ HARDWARE   ☐ SAFETY
☐ ANALYSIS   ☐ CONFIGURATION   ☐ COST/SCHEDULE
☐ PERFORMANCE   ☐ RELIABILITY/MAINTAINABILITY   ☐ QUALITY

COMMENT/CONCERN/RECOMMENDATION

Suggest a statement in the plan that any changes to critical records software, e.g. Pro-E, Pro-Intralink, Adobe Acrobat,etc. will require conversion of affected records to a format that is compatible with the new software.

ORIGINATOR   B. Nelson / ORNL

NAME/ORGANIZATION

REVIEW BOARD COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION
(Address technical, cost, and schedule impacts as appropriate. If CHIT is not adopted, provide technical reaso
do not simply state "out-of-scope or N/A" without explaining.)

X CONCUR
0 DISAGREE
0 OTHER   CHAIRPERSON   J. Malsbury DATE: March 14, 2003

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER'S RESPONSE/DISPOSITION:

Agree. This will need to be addressed in the DMP as a philosophy and intent. Will require specific conversion approach.

SIGNATURE   R. Simmons   DATE: March 14, 2003

RESPONSIBLE RLM REVIEW

0   APPROVE COG DISPOSITION
0   DISAPPROVE COG DISPOSITION   SIGNATURE _____ DATE:_____

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER CLOSE-OUT
Sign when action required by disposition is complete.

SIGNATURE _____ DATE: _____

PPPL DESIGN REVIEW CHIT

WP # _____ (ENG-032)

CHIT **# DMP-3**

COMPONENT/SUBSYSTEM/SYSTEM NCSX Document & Records Plan

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER R. Simmons DATE OF REVIEW March 14, 2003

X PEER
☐ CDR
☐ PDR
☐ FDR

SUBJECT: (CHECK AS APPLICABLE)

☐ REQUIREMENTS
☐ ANALYSIS
☐ PERFORMANCE

☐ HARDWARE
☐ CONFIGURATION
☐ RELIABILITY /MAINTAINABILITY

☐ SAFETY
☐ COST/SCHEDULE
☐ QUALITY

COMMENT/CONCERN/RECOMMENDATION

With electronic filing system, what ensures that there is adequate long term records retention? Will NCSX

Engineering Web site and FTP servers be maintained forever (after NCSX fabrication project completed)?

ORIGINATOR Tom Brown

NAME/ORGANIZATION

REVIEW BOARD COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION
(Address technical, cost, and schedule impacts as appropriate. If CHIT is not adopted, provide technical reaso
do not simply state "out-of-scope or N/A" without explaining.)

X CONCUR
0 DISAGREE
0 OTHER   CHAIRPERSON J. Malsbury DATE: March 14, 2003

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER'S RESPONSE/DISPOSITION:
There needs to be a lab commitment to maintain and archive electronic records throughout
the life of the NCSX Project. The NCSX Project will work with the Head, Engineering and
Infrastructure to establish a lab-wide policy and procedure for properly identifying and
maintaining electronic records.

SIGNATURE R. Simmons DATE: March 14, 2003

RESPONSIBLE RLM REVIEW

0   APPROVE COG DISPOSITION
0   DISAPPROVE COG DISPOSITION   SIGNATURE _____ DATE: _____

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER CLOSE-OUT
Sign when action required by disposition is complete.

SIGNATURE _____ DATE: _____

PPPL DESIGN REVIEW CHIT

WP # _____ (ENG-032)

CHIT **# DMP-4**

COMPONENT/SUBSYSTEM/SYSTEM NCSX Document & Records Plan	**X** PEER
	☐ CDR
COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER R. Simmons DATE OF REVIEW March 14, 2003	☐ PDR
	☐ FDR

SUBJECT: (CHECK AS APPLICABLE)

☐ REQUIREMENTS   ☐ HARDWARE   ☐ SAFETY
☐ ANALYSIS   ☐ CONFIGURATION   ☐ COST/SCHEDULE
☐ PERFORMANCE   ☐ RELIABILITY/MAINTAINABILITY   ☐ QUALITY

COMMENT/CONCERN/RECOMMENDATION

Need to assure that electronic files are appropriately archived. TSM backup is not an archival program.

ORIGINATOR J. Malsbury

NAME/ORGANIZATION   QA

REVIEW BOARD COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION
(Address technical, cost, and schedule impacts as appropriate. If CHIT is not adopted, provide technical reaso
do not simply state "out-of-scope or N/A" without explaining.)

X CONCUR
0 DISAGREE
0 OTHER   CHAIRPERSON J. Malsbury DATE: March 14, 2003

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER'S RESPONSE/DISPOSITION:

Need to address by NCSX Project in discussions with the Computer Division.

SIGNATURE R. Simmons DATE: March 14, 2003

RESPONSIBLE RLM REVIEW

0   APPROVE COG DISPOSITION
0   DISAPPROVE COG DISPOSITION   SIGNATURE _____ DATE:_____

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER CLOSE-OUT
Sign when action required by disposition is complete.

SIGNATURE _____ DATE: _____