SELF-ASSESSMENT REPORT

This template should be used to document the results of an internal assessment. Many fields have online help which can be viewed by pressing F1 while the cursor is positioned on the field of interest.

Assessment information

Start date >	01/31/2011	End date >	02/14/2011	Assessed organization >	CD
Title >	Suspect/Counterfeit Items Assessment				
Motivation >					
Category >	Scheduled	Frequency >	Annual	Type >	Tripartite self-assessment

Assessment team

	Name	Fermi ID#	Organization	Title
Lead >	Amy Pavnica	10683N	CD	Senior Safety Officer
Participant >	Rafael Coll	11932N	ES&H	ES&H S/CI Coordinator
Participant >	Berline Short	8544V	FSO DOE	
Participant >				
Participant >				
Participant >				

Assessment narrative report

Background and Planning

The assessment began on Jan. 31, 2011, with an opening meeting involving the ES&H Tripartite Assessment Team, OQBP, the CD Division Head, CD Senior Management and CD Department Heads. In the meeting, the scope of the tripartite was explained and the interviewees were identified. Interviews were conducted alongside OQBP, who was also conducting an S/C I Assessment in parallel with the tripartite audit, but focusing on quality assurance issues (separate report). The goal of the tripartite assessment was to understand the extent of implementation of the S/C I Program in departments that might work with legacy equipment that has been shelved for a period of time or receive pre-fabricated equipment from universities.

Employees Interviewed

The following is the list of people interviewed from the ES&H Tripartite Team:

Gustavo Cancelo – Future Programs and Experiments, Electronic Systems Engineering
Alan Prosser - Future Programs and Experiments, Electronic Systems Engineering, Detector Instrumentation
Dave Coder – Lab and Scientific Core Services, Network and Virtual Services
Vince Pavlicek - Future Programs and Experiments, Electronic Systems Engineering, Division S/C I Coordinator
Adam Walters – Scientific Computing Facilities, Facility Operations
Chuck Andrews - Lab and Scientific Core Services, Network and Virtual Services

Narrative

Along with questions asked from the OQBP Team, questions from the ES&H Team focused on legacy equipment, Pro-Card purchases and equipment received from other institutions. Specific questions included,

- How is the decision made to pull legacy equipment off of the shelf?
- If an item looks suspicious or if equipment fails, what actions should the employee take?
- Does management have a formal system of controls in place for assurance that all items procured meet the requirements for their intended use?
- Are Pro-Card purchases inspected? If so, how?

Legacy equipment is pulled from the PREP pool. It was stated that the decision to reuse equipment from the pool is based on the consensus of many; otherwise it is excessed or disposed off. Previously used equipment is not used to maintain the computer rooms.

There is no evidence to show a consistent program in place for handling suspicious or failed equipment, and not everyone interviewed knew who the S/C I Coordinator was. The Detector Instrumentation group, which designs and orders printed circuit boards (PCBs) and flex boards, will visually inspect the boards upon receipt to verify the design requirements. Any issues found are communicated to the vendor. Network Services will register the serial number of material and test the equipment. If the device fails, it is sent back to the vendor. The Facilities Operations group has a graded approach when inspecting and testing equipment. Rented generators will be given a 10 to 15 minute test run before actual use. During this time, the meters in the building are checked for phase rotation, and the cable connections are checked, as well. A written procedure exists for this.

All of the individuals interviewed stated that they only buy from reputable dealers. This is a good practice, but is not full protection against the vulnerability of buying and using S/CI. Even reputable dealers can be fooled if the dealer does not have an S/CI program in place. A process is needed where equipment is inspected once it is received. Verbiage in purchasing contracts is in place which requires the manufacturer or dealer to have an S/C I Program. While this gives some measure of protection, it cannot be solely relied upon, as the program may not be sufficient. Procard purchases do not have even this layer of protection.

Conclusion:

To keep from duplicating effort, recommendations and findings can be found in the OQBP Report. Findings from that report will be entered into frESHTRK.

FINDINGS

Space is provided below for 19 findings. If you have more than 19 findings, you will need to start a new document from the template. [In such instances, each should be saved as a separate document that can later be combined into a complete self-assessment report.]

*Findings should be limited to **substantive issues** that are clearly worthy of being addressed. They should be worded as "**statements of fact**" rather than instructions and should define a clear endpoint to be addressed. Observations, recommendations, suggestions, noteworthy practices, best management practices, and lessons learned that are clearly not "findings" should be included in the review description.*

Finding #1 Date found > Citation >
Found within organization > Location >
Title >
Description >
Hazard severity > Pick Mishap probability > Pick Type > Pick

Finding #2 Date found > Citation >
Found within organization > Location >
Title >
Description >
Hazard severity > Pick Mishap probability > Pick Type > Pick

Finding #3 Date found > Citation >
Found within organization > Location >
Title >
Description >
Hazard severity > Pick Mishap probability > Pick Type > Pick

Finding #4 Date found > Citation >
Found within organization > Location >
Title >
Description >
Hazard severity > Pick Mishap probability > Pick Type > Pick

Finding #5 Date found > Citation >
Found within organization > Location >
Title >
Description >
Hazard severity > Pick Mishap probability > Pick Type > Pick

Finding #6 Date found > Citation >
Found within organization > Location >
Title >
Description >
Hazard severity > Pick Mishap probability > Pick Type > Pick

Finding #7 Date found > Citation >
Found within organization > Location >
Title >
Description >
Hazard severity > Pick Mishap probability > Pick Type > Pick

Finding #8 Date found > Citation >
Found within organization > Location >
Title >
Description >
Hazard severity > Pick Mishap probability > Pick Type > Pick

Finding #9 Date found > Citation >
Found within organization > Location >
Title >
Description >
Hazard severity > Pick Mishap probability > Pick Type > Pick

Finding #10 Date found > Citation >
Found within organization > Location >
Title >
Description >
Hazard severity > Pick Mishap probability > Pick Type > Pick

Finding #11 Date found > Citation >
Found within organization > Location >
Title >
Description >
Hazard severity > Pick Mishap probability > Pick Type > Pick

Finding #12 Date found > Citation >
Found within organization > Location >
Title >
Description >
Hazard severity > Pick Mishap probability > Pick Type > Pick

Finding #13 Date found > Citation >
Found within organization > Location >
Title >
Description >
Hazard severity > Pick Mishap probability > Pick Type > Pick

Finding #14 Date found > Citation >
Found within organization > Location >
Title >
Description >
Hazard severity > Pick Mishap probability > Pick Type > Pick

Finding #15 Date found > Citation >
Found within organization > Location >
Title >
Description >
Hazard severity > Pick Mishap probability > Pick Type > Pick

Finding #16 Date found > Citation >
Found within organization > Location >
Title >
Description >
Hazard severity > Pick Mishap probability > Pick Type > Pick

Finding #17 Date found > Citation >
Found within organization > Location >
Title >
Description >
Hazard severity > Pick Mishap probability > Pick Type > Pick

Finding #18 Date found > Citation >
Found within organization > Location >
Title >
Description >
Hazard severity > Pick Mishap probability > Pick Type > Pick

Finding #19 Date found > Citation >
Found within organization > Location >
Title >
Description >
Hazard severity > Pick Mishap probability > Pick Type > Pick