February 1, 2016

Efficiency Bulletin: 16-01
Eliminate Administrative Changes to Preventive Maintenance Work Orders

Planners continually spend time revising preventive maintenance (PM) tasks to add administrative steps driven by internal and external stakeholders and programs. Repetitive task PM work orders should not be revised to add administrative steps.

**Addressees:** Chief nuclear officers, NEI and INPO APCs

**Issue:** WM-P-03, Eliminate Administrative Changes to Preventive Maintenance Work Orders

**Summary of Efficiency Opportunity**

- Desired end-state—Preventive maintenance work orders for repetitive tasks are issued ready-to-go, with no further need for planning or revision based on administrative matters.

- Value proposition (vision of excellence)—Preventive maintenance work orders and support documents, such as clearance orders, radiation work permits, materials requests, etc., would be automatically generated and require minimal administrative effort. This initiative will save work preparation administrative burden. Efficiency, safety and reliability all are advanced when unnecessary administrative burden is reduced.

- Why it is important?—The resources saved by avoiding continual changes to incorporate administrative steps into preventive maintenance work orders will allow a greater emphasis on improving corrective work orders on critical and important equipment.

- Industry benchmark values—The technical details, quality and accuracy of preventive maintenance work orders is maintained to current standards.
The measure of effectiveness (METRIC) is assessed by: Reduction in planner hours allotted to current planning of PM work orders, compared to current baseline number of planner hours allotted to PM planning at the time this bulletin is implemented. Eliminate “technical planning” person-hours from the metric as these types of changes are allowed and encouraged (Template revisions and frequency changes as a result of feedback).

**Relevant Standards**

- Performance Objectives and Criteria (INPO) WM.1, Work activities are managed during both on-line and outage periods to support safe and reliable operation.

**Relevant Regulatory Requirement**

- No reduction in regulatory compliance.

**Guidance**

- INPO guidance issued in November 2013, “Industry Cumulative Impact Short-Term Actions.” WM-2 in this document discusses the need for short-term frequency PMs to be automatically generated to a ready-to-work status once the detailed model task planning is completed.

**Recommend Industry Actions**


**Change Management Considerations**

*Industry Activities*

- Industry webinar to provide background for initiative, INPO discussion and provide an open forum to clarify expectations and ask questions.

- Discuss at regional WM meetings and routine industry conference calls.

- Update and discuss during the Summer 2016 WM manager meeting.

*Company Actions*

- Obtain an understanding of how many (percentage) preventive maintenance work orders are modified or re-planned during the T-week planning process to incorporate administrative changes, enhancements and references (non-technical changes).

- Limit preventive maintenance changes only to those required to improve the technical content.
Guiderails

- Ensure that a feedback process for preventive maintenance work orders exists and serves the need to improve the technical content of preventive maintenance work orders.

Report Your Site’s Results
Please report your company’s implementation of this improvement opportunity, including the date of completion. Send this information, along with your company point of contact, to EfficiencyBulletin@NEI.org.

Industry Contacts
- Industry Champion for this Issue: Dale Shaw, 610-765-5813, dale.shaw@exeloncorp.com
  EPRI Contact: Rich Pepin, 704-595-2889, rpepin@epri.com
- INPO Contact: Pete Arthur, 770-644-8385, arthurpj@inpo.org
- NEI Contact: Jim Riley, 202-739-8137, jhr@nei.org
- On the web: www.nei.org/bulletin1601
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