NCSX Peer Review Date:

Resolution of NCSX Quality Assurance Plan Peer Review Chits, conducted on 11/1/02, has been successfully completed and all CHITs closed out.

	Concur: R.T. Simmons, Peer Review Cha
t Enginee	er's Response/Disposition/Closeout:
	Judy Malsbury, QA
view:	

	WP #	(ENG-032)		
PPPL DESIGN REVIEW CHIT	CHIT # <u>1</u>			
COMPONENT/SUBSYSTEM/SYSTEM NCSX QA Plan		⊠ PEER		
COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER <u>Judy Malsbury</u> DATE OF REVIEW <u>1</u>	1/1/02	☐ CDR ☐ PDR ☐ FDR		
SUBJECT: (CHECK AS APPLICABLE)				
□ REQUIREMENTS □ HARDWARE □ ANALYSIS □ CONFIGURATION □ PERFORMANCE □ RELIABILITY/MAINTAINABILITY	☐ SAFET☐ COST/☐ QUALI	SCHEDULE		
COMMENT/CONCERN/RECOMMENDATION				
How will PPPL Design Work meet or exceed requirements of ENG-032? Issue is application of WP form in design process. Rich is worried about audit findings, etc reinventing the wheel.				
ORIGINATOR Neilson				
NAME/ORGANI	ZATION <u>NCSX</u>			
REVIEW BOARD COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION (Address technical, cost, and schedule impacts as appropriate. If CHIT is not adopted, provide technical reason - do not simply state "out-of-scope or N/A" without explaining.)				
Hutch to review ENG-032 for applicability to design.				
☐ CONCUR ☐ DISAGREE ☑ OTHER CHAIRPERSON R. T. Simr	mons DATE: 11/	/1/02		
COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER'S RESPONSE/DISPOSITION:				
ENG-032, in the Applicability section, states the following: "It {the Work Planning Form} is not directly applicable to work performed during the conceptual or design phases," However, NCSX plans to incorporate the key issues identified by the WP form in the Systems Engineering Management Plan and Confirmation Management Process. No changes to the QA Plan are required.				
SIGNATURE Judy Malsbur	y DATE: <u>2/25/</u>	<u>03</u>		
RESPONSIBLE RLM REVIEW				
☑ APPROVE COG DISPOSITION☐ DISAPPROVE COG DISPOSITIONSIGNATURE Wayne Reier	sen DATE: <u>2/2</u>	6/03		
COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER CLOSE-OUT Sign when action required by disposition is complete.				
SIGNATURE Judy Malsbur	y DATE: <u>2/26/</u>	<u>03</u>		

	WP #	(ENG-032)			
PPPL DESIGN REVIEW CHIT	CHIT # <u>2</u>				
COMPONENT/SUBSYSTEM/SYSTEM NCSX QA Plan		⊠ PEER			
COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER <u>Judy Malsbury</u> DATE OF REVIEW _	11/1/02	☐ CDR ☐ PDR ☐ FDR			
SUBJECT: (CHECK AS APPLICABLE)					
□ REQUIREMENTS □ HARDWARE □ ANALYSIS □ CONFIGURATION □ PERFORMANCE □ RELIABILITY/MAINTAINABILITY		SCHEDULE			
COMMENT/CONCERN/RECOMMENDATION					
Engineering standards - need a side-by-side review of PPPL/ORNL Engineering Standards. Need closure with PPPL and ORNL participants.					
ORIGINATOR Reiersen					
NAME/ORGANIZATION NCSX					
REVIEW BOARD COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION (Address technical, cost, and schedule impacts as appropriate. If CHIT is not adopted, provide technical reason - do not simply state "out-of-scope or N/A" without explaining.)					
Review ORNL and PPPL Standards and Procedures.					
□ CONCUR □ DISAGREE □ OTHER	mons DATE: 11/	1/02			
COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER'S RESPONSE/DISPOSITION:	<u> </u>	.,,,,			
Review performed by Bob Simmons and Brad Nelson. No ORNL standards or procedures were identified that appeared advantageous to adopt for NCSX.					
SIGNATURE Judy Malsbu	<u>Iry</u> DATE: <u>2/25/0</u>	<u>)3</u>			
RESPONSIBLE RLM REVIEW					
□ APPROVE COG DISPOSITION□ DISAPPROVE COG DISPOSITIONSIGNATURE W. Reierser	DATE: <u>2/27/03</u>				
COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER CLOSE-OUT					
Sign when action required by disposition is complete.					
SIGNATURE <u>Judy Malsbu</u>	<u>iry</u> date: <u>2/28/0</u>	<u>ು</u>			

	WP #	(ENG-032)			
PPPL DESIGN REVIEW CHIT	CHIT # <u>3</u>				
COMPONENT/SUBSYSTEM/SYSTEM NCSX QA Plan		□ PEER □ CDR			
COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER <u>Judy Malsbury</u> DATE OF REVIEW <u>1</u>	1/1/02	□ PDR □ FDR			
SUBJECT: (CHECK AS APPLICABLE)		•			
□ REQUIREMENTS □ HARDWARE □ ANALYSIS □ CONFIGURATION □ PERFORMANCE □ RELIABILITY/MAINTAINABILITY	☐ SAFET ☐ COST/S ☑ QUALIT	SCHEDULE			
COMMENT/CONCERN/RECOMMENDATION					
ORNL procedures are being expanded from calibration to the more general "field procedures." No field work is planned now. If ORNL field work does become needed, adequate time to ensure review will be needed.					
ORIGINATOR	R <u>Malinowski</u>				
NAME/ORGANIZATION <u>QA</u>					
REVIEW BOARD COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION (Address technical, cost, and schedule impacts as appropriate. If CHIT is not adopted, provide technical reason - do not simply state "out-of-scope or N/A" without explaining.)					
CONCUR □ DISAGREE □ OTHER		1/00			
CONTANT DESIGN ENGINEER'S RESPONSE/DISPOSITION:	<u>nons</u> DATE: <u>11/</u>	1/02			
COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER'S RESPONSE/DISPOSITION: Project management agreed to provide advanced notice, if needed.					
SIGNATURE Judy Malsbur	y DATE: <u>11/1/0</u>	<u>)2</u>			
RESPONSIBLE RLM REVIEW					
☑ APPROVE COG DISPOSITION☐ DISAPPROVE COG DISPOSITION☐ SIGNATURE Wayne Reiers	sen DATE: <u>2/28</u>	<u>3/03</u>			
COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER CLOSE-OUT					
Sign when action required by disposition is complete. SIGNATURE Judy Malsbur	y DATE: 2/26/0	13			
Olorwitional <u>oddy Malobali</u>	, Dille <u>2,20</u> 10	<u>. </u>			