April 29, 2016

Efficiency Bulletin: 16-11
Training Cumulative Impact Strategies

Reduce low-value administrative burdens to produce efficiency gains in training.

Addressees: Chief nuclear officers, NEI APCs and INPO APCs

Issue: TRN-3.0, Cumulative Impact Strategies

Background

- This bulletin will address three of the eight cumulative impact items—TQ-1, Instructor Admin duties; TQ-6, Subject Matter Expert Qualifications; and TQ-7, Training Corrective Action Review Boards—from the INPO Report “Training Cumulative Impact Report,” dated January 2016. These items were evaluated by fleet/alliance training directors as items that could be eliminated without detailed guidance. The remaining five items in the INPO report will require additional work to align on common implementation methods.

Summary of Efficiency Opportunity

- Desired end-state—Streamlined training administrative activities to reduce distractions from training and to limit the amount of time it takes instructors to start a class. Reduce administrative burdens associated with subject-matter expert (SME) qualifications. Reduce administrative burdens associated with Training Corrective Action Review Boards (TCARBs).

- Value proposition (vision of excellence)—Improve the quality and efficiency of training by eliminating low-value administrative burdens accumulated from years of incremental internal and external responses to individual training-related performance issues.

- Why it is important?—This effort will save line and training resources that can be used for other tasks or duties. This can save an average of 30 contact hours each year per instructor and has the potential to
reduce formal classroom time by four to six hours per person per year.

**Relevant Standards**

- ACAD 02-001, The Objectives and Criteria for Accreditation of Training in the Nuclear Power Industry (INPO)
- Training Cumulative Impact Report, distributed January 2016 (INPO)

**Guidance**

- The administrative items established at the different fleets/sites are a product of perceived expectations by both internal and external stakeholders. The Training Cumulative Impact Report details the options for addressing these three items, such that they can be eliminated to gain efficiencies. The fleet and alliance training directors agreed that no additional guidance other than what was in the Training Cumulative Impact Report is needed to address these items. There are no industry standards that require formal lengthy kick-offs for training, formal subject matter expert qualification processes, or an extra review board for corrective action program activities. Each station should consider its current performance level, schedule of activities, and priorities to determine the best course of action.

**Recommend Industry Actions**

- Each fleet/site reviews its process requirements and revises them accordingly to eliminate administrative burden described in the Training Cumulative Impact Report, sections TQ-1, TQ-6 and TQ-7.

**Change Management Considerations**

**Company Actions**

- Each station to develop a change management plan at their site.
- Sites communicate the change and rationale to station personnel.

**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: Marios Kafantaris, 856-339-2215, marios.kafantaris@pseg.com
- INPO contact: Rusty Shoemaker, 770-644-8960. ShoemakerEM@INPO.org
- NEI contact: Elizabeth McAndrew-Benavides, 202-739-8143, emb@nei.org
- On the web: www.nei.org/bulletin1611

---

**Key to Color Codes:**

Red: NSIAC initiative – full participation required for viability
Blue: Action expected at all sites, but is not needed for broad industry viability
Green: Utility discretion to implement, consistent with its business environment
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