



QMS Core

Rolf Keitel, Chair
Ken Buckley
Don Dale
Remy Dawson
Phil Jones

QMS Leaders

Pierre Bricault
Ken Buckley
Iouri Bylinski
Don Dale
Barry Davids
Remy Dawson
John Drozdoff
Greg Hackman
Andy Hurst
Phil Jones
Rolf Keitel
Shane Koscielniak
Amiya Mitra
Colin Morton
Roman Ruegg
James Somerville

Editor
Ken Buckley

Associate Editor
Tim Meyer

Design/Production
Mindy Hapke
Niki Martin

We want to hear from you
on this issue.

qualitytimes@triumf.ca

TRIUMF
4004 Wesbrook Mall,
Vancouver, BC
V6T 2A3

Tel. 604 222-1047
Fax. 604 222-1074

Printed in Canada
2009

Thoughts about change

Ever thought about why you like some changes but really resist others?

I think the difference is choice. If you get to choose the change you are more likely to accept and possibly even enjoy it, whereas if it is dictated by external circumstances, you can get frustrated and annoyed.

When the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) notified TRIUMF that a quality-assurance program was required, some at TRIUMF felt that we were being forced to change how we operated. In the article below, Phil describes how we eventually understood the need to move forward --to change how we think about our work-- and how we got to where we are today. We firmly believe that a Quality Management System (QMS) will improve TRIUMF. The QM Leaders are changing how we operate and we are here to help you change. We believe there is a need to change in order to meet the demands being placed on TRIUMF and to ensure the quality of our work in the future. In our QMS we have defined *what* needs to be done but not *how*. We want you to choose the "*how*" so that it best meets your needs. You specify the "*how*" in your group manual which will be a topic in the next issue of Quality Times. *by Ken Buckley*

A Winding Path to QA

The CNSC first notified TRIUMF that it had to implement a quality assurance program in 2000.

TRIUMF did not accept that there was a problem and felt this was an unnecessary burden. Discussions with the CNSC continued.

Over the next few years TRIUMF retained the services of a consultant and began writing a Quality Manual and a set of TRIUMF Standard Operating Procedures (TSOPs) that aimed to explain how the facility functioned. A QA Manager was also appointed during this time. The Quality Manual and TSOPs were submitted to the CNSC and revisions followed based on their comments.

In 2005 the CNSC came to audit the TRIUMF quality assurance program. The audit team quickly realized that the program was not sufficiently implemented. They abandoned the audit and refocused their efforts on promoting the quality process with TRIUMF staff. In June of that year TRIUMF appeared before the CNSC for a routine mid-term licensing hearing. At that time the Chair of the Commission accused TRIUMF of being dismissive of the QA Program and not taking the process seriously.

A second audit of the TRIUMF QA Program took place in 2006. The audit report contained seven directives (to correct violations of federal regulations) and seven action notices (to correct violations of our own stated policies) and concluded that the program did not meet regulatory requirements.

In April of 2007, Director Shotter instituted a QA Implementation Panel to address the CNSC directives and action notices. At the beginning of his term, Director Lockyer reiterated that TRIUMF needed to make quality management an intrinsic part of our culture, not only to meet legal requirements but to maintain the high level of performance while simultaneously expanding the laboratory. The QA Implementation Panel overhauled the TSOPs to make them applicable site wide and general enough that each group would have flexibility in defining their own methods of implementation. The Implementation Panel members have taken on being Quality Management Leaders, using their knowledge of the requirements of the QMS, to assist all groups on site in implementation. The QM Leaders have been working with groups that carry out significant design, manufacturing, or operational activities, through Beneficial Assessments.

The CNSC has scheduled an audit of the TRIUMF Quality Management System for the week of March 9th, 2009. The Implementation Core has met with Division Heads and suggested certain priorities for the near future (both pre- and post-



audit). Your Division Head or Group Leader may assign tasks to you related to these efforts. Prior to the audit please review the new Quality Manual and TSOPs available on Docushare (documents.triumf.ca). We recognize that you will not make significant changes to your mode of operating in the next 2 weeks but please identify the required documents and records as defined in the TSOPs and think about how your group documentation might coincide with those.

If you would like further assistance, or have more questions, please contact the QA Manager (Phil Jones), or any of the QM Leaders. *by Phil Jones*

Beneficial Assessments

"A great opportunity to focus the mind" was how Jane Richards summed up her experience with a Beneficial Assessment of the ISAC controls group.



Jane Richards, ISAC Controls Group

The QM Leaders have conducted various assessments of a dozen groups since the end of November 2008. The multi-purpose assessments serve to kick start group leaders on their way to bigger and better things. The process makes them aware of expectations and helps to determine where they are with respect to the requirements of our new TRIUMF Standard Operating Procedures. They are also a mechanism to help our QM Leaders get familiar with the implementation of our new TSOPs. Quality Times recently sat down with group leaders John Drozdoff (Safety Systems) and Jane Richards (ISAC Controls) to discuss these assessments.

QT was not surprised to learn that both found the process useful but John noted that he learned more about applying the QMS by leading an assessment than he did in preparing for his own group assessment. *"Being assessed you don't know what questions you are going to be asked and with the short notice before the assessment you can't really prepare anything. It is whatever you have in place. As an assessor you have to decide what questions you are going to ask to get*

good information back quickly. ... You have to know more than they do."

As discussion moved around topics such as how long an assessment took (~2hrs) and whether groups had a chance to correct or comment on the assessment report (yes) Jane made the point that QMS must be incorporated into everybody's normal daily work flow and doing that has great side benefits such as being able to look up records for who did what, when, and why. *"If we want to be able to go on vacation... that knowledge capture is useful."*

John and Jane agreed that QMS *"can't be a hindrance to getting the work done"* referring to our daily operational efforts. QT replied that this is part of the goal of doing these assessments. Tools need to be developed to allow people to fulfill the requirements of our QMS and we need to better understand what groups are already doing in order to specify the most useful tools. *by Ken Buckley*



John Drozdoff, Safety Systems Group

Each group would have flexibility in defining their own methods of implementation