

IMPORTANT NOTICE: The current official version of this document is available via the Sandia National Laboratories OSTI On-line Documents web site. A printed copy of this document may not be the version currently in effect

**SANDIA NATIONAL LABORATORIES
QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM
for the
OFFICE of CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT**

QAP 6-1

DOCUMENT REVIEW

Revision 1

Effective Date: 05/20/2004

Author: Original Signed by Martha J. Mitchell Date: 05/18/04

Concurrence: Original Signed by Jose A. Archuleta Date: 05/18/04
QA Reviewer

Approval: Original Signed by S. Andrew Orrell Date: 05/20/04
SNL OSTI Project Lead

Change History

Revision	Description	Effective Date
0	This is the initial version of this document.	05/04/2004
1	Administrative changes resulting from Audit OQA –FS-04-07	05/20/2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1.0 PURPOSE AND SCOPE	4
2.0 IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS	4
2.1 DOCUMENT PREPARATION	4
2.2 IDENTIFYING THE REVIEWERS	4
2.3 CONDUCTING THE REVIEW	5
2.4 DOCUMENTING THE REVIEW	5
2.5 COMMENT RESOLUTION	5
2.6 REFERENCES	6
3.0 RECORDS.....	6
4.0 APPENDICES.....	6
APPENDIX A	7

1.0 Purpose and Scope

This procedure prescribes the Sandia National Laboratories (SNL) Office of Science and Technology and International (OSTI) Program process for reviewing documents. It establishes requirements for:

- conducting all types of reviews, including independent technical, quality assurance, and management reviews, and
- documenting the resolution of comments using the Document Review and Comment (DRC) form, Form QAP 6-1-1.

The requirements in this procedure apply to the review process for:

1. Controlled documents which must be processed through OSTI Document Control, i.e., documents which prescribe processes, specify requirements, or establish designs important to the OSTI Program.
2. Technical information documents which must be processed through the OSTI Technical Report Coordinator, i.e., documents requiring SAND numbers: abstracts, conference papers, journal articles, presentation materials and reports.
3. Technical information documents which are processed by author, i.e., Data reports and Scientific Notebooks.

Acronyms and definitions for terms used in this procedure may be found in the OSTI Glossary.

2.0 Implementation

2.1 Document Preparation

Prior to submitting the document for review, the author/Sandia contact shall ensure that it has been written according to the procedure which specifies the requirements for that document type (e.g. procedures are written in compliance with QAP 5-1 Implementing Procedures and planning documents are written in compliance with QAP 20-1 Planning Documents). Journal articles, conference papers, presentation materials and SAND report requirements are contained in the SNL *Guide to Preparing SAND Reports*. The current version is available online with a direct link at (<http://infoserve.sandia.gov/electronic/sandsearch.html>).

2.2 Identifying the Reviewers

The author of the document, or the Sandia contact for contractor prepared documents, shall select individuals to review the document based on the required reviews specified in the governing procedure for the document type. For the purposes of this procedure, the author or Sandia contact who initiates the review process is the Review Requester. The Review Requester can delegate an appropriate individual to respond to comments of the reviewer. This delegation is implied and does not need to be documented.

The review requester shall ensure that those individuals selected to review a document are qualified to perform the specified type of review. The review requester shall ensure that at least one of the reviewers of any controlled document is in an organization or technical discipline affected by the document. The originator of the document shall not be a reviewer of the document.

Note: Technical reviews shall be performed by someone who is independent. In order for an individual to qualify as an independent technical reviewer, the individual shall not have performed,

contributed to, or directed the work being reviewed, and the individual must not stand to either gain or be adversely affected by the results of the work, or the success of the reviewed document.

Changes/revisions to the document shall be reviewed and approved by the same organizations (e.g., functional areas) that performed the review/approval of the original document except as allowed by the following note.

Note: Editorial changes to the document require only QA review and approval, and approval by the author. For revisions that consist only of editorial changes to Design Plans, and Test Plans, the author shall include an explanatory note in the Change History identifying the revision as being an editorial change only. "Editorial changes" are defined in the OSTI Glossary which includes the list of types of changes that are 'editorial' in nature.

2.3 Conducting the Review

The review requester shall provide the reviewer an electronic or hard copy of the document to be reviewed, and if required by the procedure, a DRC form with items 1-6 completed.

Minimum criteria for document review are included on form QAP 6-1-1 (DRC). The review requester may provide additional criteria as deemed appropriate to the DRC form (see item 5) or as a memo (e.g., requirements from QAP 20-2 for review of scientific notebooks).

When asked, the review requester/delegate shall provide additional background information or data to the reviewer.

2.4 Documenting the Review

- Use of the DRC is optional for individuals whose signatures are incorporated in the document.
- Use of the DRC is mandatory for reviewers who are not signatories.

Note: SNL SAND reports require completed DRCs from all technical, QA, and management reviewers. If the report has references, a Reference Review may be required, and is entered on Line 5 of the DRC Form.

There are two choices for documenting review comments using the DRC form:

- document comments on the DRC (electronically or in reproducible ink) or
- clearly mark comments on copies of pages of the document, and attach these marked-up pages to the DRC form. If this option is taken, the DRC shall reference the marked-up pages that are attached. All comments marked on attached pages shall be clear, legible, and in reproducible ink.

2.5 Comment Resolution

The author/Sandia contact has ultimate responsibility for the content of the document.

The review requester/delegate shall evaluate comments made by the reviewer(s), document acceptance/rejection of the comments on the DRC form, and return the form to the reviewer(s).

When comment resolution is complete, the reviewer(s) shall sign the DRC form in the concurrence field (DRC item 10), and return the DRC and copy of the document to the review requester/delegate. If comments cannot be resolved, resolution shall be determined by the next level of management.

Comments shall be resolved before the document is approved.

2.6 References

Document Management Guide to Preparing SAND Reports (most current edition)

3.0 Records

The following QA records, generated through implementation of this procedure, shall be prepared and submitted to OCRWM and a copy to the SNL Records Center in accordance with QAP 17-1 (Records).

QA Record

- DRC forms (if generated)
 - Review drafts/attachments (as applicable when review comments are contained in draft document)
 - Final document
-

4.0 Appendices

Appendix A: Form QAP 6-1-1, Document Review and Comment (DRC)



Appendix A

OSTI Document Review and Comment (DRC)

Form Number:
QAP 6-1-1
Page 1 of _____

REVIEW REQUESTER (e.g., author/Sandia contact)

Complete items 1-6.

Provide the DRC and review document to the reviewer.

REVIEWER:

Review the document applying the criteria specified below and complete items 7 and 8.

Return DRC to review requester.

REVIEW REQUESTER

If there are comments requiring response, prepare response to each comment on following page(s), complete item 9, and return to reviewer.

REVIEWER:

Review responses to comments. Indicate acceptance or rejection on the DRC and complete item 10.

1.Document Title _____ 2. Rev. # (if applicable) _____

3. Document Description: (e.g. abstract, procedure, SAND report) _____

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>4. Type of Review & Criteria</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Technical (Technical adequacy, content, completeness)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Are objectives clearly stated and funded? -Is the technical activity clearly described? -Are equations/calculations accurate? -Does logic lead to reasonable conclusions? -Are the conclusions from the data supported by data presented? -Data/tables/figures are they clearly understood? Are legends complete? <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other type of review (please specify or leave blank if not applicable) _____</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> QA (Compliance and completeness)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Are applicable QA requirements adequately cited/ incorporated and met (content, reviews)? - <u>Has the technical review been performed by someone who is "independent"?</u>
<u>(see QAP 6-1, Section 2.2)</u> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> Management(Completeness and correctness)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Is report consistent with policy? -Is there consensus with other program documents? -Does the document meet applicable criteria? |
|---|--|--|

5. Additional criteria (if applicable) _____ 6. Review Requester _____ Date: _____
(Printed Name)

7. Review Prepared by: _____
Reviewer's Printed Name Reviewer's Signature Org. Date

8. No comments Mandatory Comments; record on following pages.

(This section to be left blank if there are no comments requiring a response)

9. Response to comments prepared by: _____
Review Requester's/Delegate's Printed Name Review Requester's/Delegate's Signature Org. Date

10. Response Concurrence: _____
Reviewer's Signature Date

OSTI Document Review and Comment (DRC)

Form Number:
QAP 6-1-1
Page ____ **of** ____

Type of Review Technical QA Management Other

Document Title _____ Rev. # _____

Reviewer's Comments (Enter "LAST COMMENT" in row below last entry)				Review Requester's/Delegate's response			Reviewer's Response	
Comment#	*	Location	Comment	Accept	Reject		Accept	Reject

* Mark Y (Yes) for comments requiring a response from the Review Requester/Delegate.
 Mark N (No) for comments not requiring a response from the Review Requester/Delegate.