



U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Office of Executive Director for Operations

OEDO Procedure

NEW

Office Procedure No.:	OEDO Procedure - 0940
Procedure Title:	Guidance for Identifying, Evaluating, and Implementing a Center of Expertise
Effective Date:	
Revision No.:	Revision 0
Approved By:	Robert J. Lewis, AO/OEDO
Date Approved:	April 28, 2016
Branch Assigned Ownership:	

Summary of Changes:

Training/Special Instructions:	None
ADAMS Accession No.:	ML16105A178

OEDO PROCEDURE - 0940

Revision 0

Guidance for Identifying, Evaluating, and Implementing a Center of Expertise

1. PURPOSE

This procedure describes the process to identify and evaluate the benefits, risks, and costs of possible Centers of Expertise (COE), and the basic steps to implement a new COE. When a decision to establish a COE has been made, this procedure also provides a change process to define and document necessary activities to be managed during the transition to ensure effective, long-term, and sustainable results. The staff should use this procedure to establish safeguards to ensure transparency for those with pending matters before the agency and continued line management accountability for meeting agency performance metrics.

If an existing COE is considering expanding, this procedure should be used as a guide to ensure clear communications with affected and supported organizations and to ensure that the new responsibilities are incorporated into the existing COE documentation.

2. BACKGROUND

A COE is defined as an organization (e.g., office, division, branch, or team) that provides agencywide centralized services, leadership, best practices, processes, support, mentoring, training, and knowledge management for a specific focus area in accordance with established priorities.¹ This arrangement centralizes the management and support of a specific focus area in one part of the agency. An organization may provide some or most of the functions and benefits of a COE at a level other than agencywide (e.g., the organization may serve several offices or business lines but not all offices or business lines). For the purposes of this procedure they are referred to as limited-scope COEs. This procedure is applicable to the identification, evaluation, and implementation of agencywide and limited-scope COEs.

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) previously created COEs to centralize and streamline activities in specific focus areas while continuing to support the agency's mission. COEs present opportunities to improve organizational effectiveness and streamline activities. Establishment of COEs that support multiple offices and business lines, if optimally resourced, can result in increased effectiveness and efficiency, support the needs of all involved offices, and help ensure that the NRC continues to carry out its mission in the near and long term. This approach may result in offices needing fewer

¹ This definition of a COE is documented in SECY-15-0143, "Project Aim and Centers of Expertise." (Agencywide Document Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML15292A258).

additional resources in their areas of technical or programmatic responsibility. The formation of a COE may eliminate duplication of effort in related offices, increase consistency, and ensure critical skills are cultivated and maintained. The degree to which the benefits can be realized is dependent on the specific circumstances and organizations involved. As such, it is important that the advantages and disadvantages of establishing a COE be carefully evaluated. The change process from pre- and post-implementation of a new COE should be managed and timed in such a manner so as not to disrupt existing business.

3. BASIC STEPS

3.1 Considerations for Identifying a Potential Center of Expertise

This section provides guidance for identifying a potential COE before the initiation and establishment stages described in Sections 3.2 and 3.3 of this procedure, respectively. This section and Appendix A should be used to develop the basis for proposing to pursue a COE. Formal documentation of the bases for proposing a new COE is not required at this stage; however, enough detail should be documented to assist decision-makers in deciding if pursuing a COE and developing the more detailed business case and associated COE documentation is appropriate. Any staff may propose a potential COE to his/her management.

The first step in proposing a new COE is to assess the considerations in this section and Appendix A to clearly outline whether centralizing functions into a COE will provide significant advantages to the agency that outweigh the risks and costs associated with centralization. Decision-makers should consider whether centralization continues to ensure that the agency's mission is met with a low risk of negative side effects, while also saving resources, and enhancing organizational agility and efficiency. Once the proposal is developed, hold an alignment meeting with the Executive Director for Operations (EDO) to obtain approval to move to the initiation and establishment stages described in Sections 3.2 and 3.3 of this procedure.

a. Identify a Potential COE

COEs may be proposed for a variety of reasons. These may include one or more of the following: 1) maintaining critical skills, 2) combining groups with limited resources, 3) normalizing workload, 4) providing standardization, 5) providing consistency, 6) combining groups with common functions or technical expertise, or 7) creating groups that work with common regulatory requirements. In addition, factors external to the agency may influence the decision to consider a COE.

b. Business Case

Assessment of whether to create a new COE should include a business case that provides an abbreviated discussion of how work in the area has been completed, and a more thorough discussion of the advantages of creating the new COE. The bases for creating a new COE may include such items as alignment with the NRC's strategic plan to enable the agency to meet its objectives, adaptation to program change, changes to the reporting structure based on operating experience, and creation of increases in efficiency and effectiveness. If the proposed COE involves increased risks and/or costs, the business case should provide justification, including benefits and advantages to the NRC and its stakeholders, such as positive results, improved services, and estimates of savings at a later date. In addition, an evaluation of the factors in Appendix A should be presented to management for consideration and approval before continuing to the initiation stage described in Section 3.2. Example business cases are provided in Appendix B.

c. Benefits, Risks, and Costs of COEs

The decision to form a COE should be based on a business case where the risks and costs are low or are greatly outweighed by the benefits.

Efficiencies in the short term are generally not significant. Additionally, there are costs associated with establishing COEs. These costs may include activities such as establishing and documenting roles and responsibilities and the standardization of procedures, work management tools, and prioritization schemes as well as the expense of physical moves to co-locate people. However, additional efficiencies and increased capacities may be realized in the long term to increase the payback on the investment in setting up the COEs.

Some potential benefits, risks, and costs of COEs are identified below.

Benefits	Risks and Costs
Consistency: Similar processes/products and common language for all business lines; easier to identify disparate processes and functions across business lines; inconsistencies between the frameworks that do not have a good basis could be discovered and aligned.	Not as tailored: Not as tailored to the unique needs of each business line and potential for longer reaction time for changes.
Consolidation: Expertise and information is kept in one location; people know where to go for this function.	Less nimble: Potentially harder to make changes to a centralized program that has more formalized programs and procedures if the COE is not structured to enable it to adjust and make needed changes.
Efficiency: Processes become more repeatable; redundancies are reduced; easier to document lessons learned. Shorter turnaround times based on enhanced learning and collaboration, centralized performance of duties.	Doesn't build local capacity: Doesn't develop skills within each business line to solve the functional problems of each business line; business line becomes dependent on the COE.

Benefits	Risks and Costs
Stature: Can speak with one voice closer to, or at the top of the organization, if appropriately addressed before initiation of the COE.	Relevancy: By residing within one office, may become stove-piped and out of touch with needs of other partners, unless a broader partner-focused approach is taken.
Alignment: Decisions more likely to be aligned with the overall agency mission and strategic goals.	Resistance: COE groups may resist tailoring process to each business line, and changes in culture. Partners may resist the COE and circumvent the formation of the COE by working directly with a contractor.
Leverage: Easier to leverage personnel if they report centrally. Increased ability to respond to changing work and workload.	Bureaucracy and inertia: More difficult to change the COE's role in the agency if the agency changes its strategy.
Human Capital: Easier to manage knowledge and develop new staff; personnel who were not fully utilized in offices with a lower need for the skill can be fully utilized in a COE serving multiple business lines.	Work Planning: Difficulty planning work using different work planning tools for each business line.
Trust: Consistent experiences and products can enhance the trust in the organization, if appropriately addressed before initiation of the COE.	Prioritization: Difficulty creating and executing a consolidated, agreed upon work prioritization scheme that addresses needs of multiple business lines and the agency.
Autonomy and Empowerment: Takes more ownership over developing an effective function or process.	Programmatic Diversity: Regulatory programs may be too dissimilar to achieve desired agility, efficiency, responsiveness, and effectiveness.
Focus: Facilitates focus of the lead organization on broader project issues and response to external factors.	Interfaces: COEs would require more organizational interfaces, which may challenge the efficiency of operations.
	Authority: Less clarity on who owns and makes decisions in the functional area. This may be mitigated if clear direction is given before initiation of the COE.

3.2 Initiating a Center of Expertise

Once the EDO has approved the proposal to initiate a COE, the following actions should be taken to ensure a smooth transition to and long-term operation of the COE.

a. Implementation Team

Affected Office Directors identify an implementation team including the current managers, supervisors, and staff from the affected organizations that will be involved in forming the COE. The implementation team identifies all stakeholders, solicits input, and works to obtain agreement from stakeholders on all COE infrastructure items (referenced in Section 3.3 below). The implementation team is responsible for creating all of the applicable COE documentation and transition plans.

b. Management Direction

NRC management appoints a Senior Executive Service (SES)-level champion for the implementation team. The champion provides strategic guidance to the implementation team, promoting an environment of empowerment, agility, continuous development of critical skills, and partner focus. This manager ensures upper management is informed of and aligned with the COE implementation.

The SES champion should coordinate organizational changes associated with the formation of a COE with the Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer (OCHCO) so that personnel management implications can be addressed. In addition, the SES champion should consult with the Chief of the Policy, Labor Employee Relations Branch or his/her designee to ensure that notification is provided to the appropriate employee representative, when appropriate.

Additional champions or senior management oversight may be necessary in setting up COEs in areas in which there are unique challenges associated with their formation (e.g., a large number of staff in multiple offices or significant cultural differences between the groups being combined).

3.3. Establishing a COE

The following documents comprise the typical package that will be used for the approval process to communicate the details of establishing the new COE. The implementation team shall complete the COE documentation and transition plans BEFORE the COE is created.

a. Memorandum of Creation

The memorandum of creation provides a high level summary of the proposed COE and should transmit the analysis and justification, which are detailed in the business case, the charter, transition plan, and the communication plan. The memorandum is initiated by the Office Directors of the work groups being combined into the COE and is reviewed and approved by the EDO.

The memorandum includes the elements described in Management Directive (MD) 9.1. An example of a Memorandum of Creation is included in Appendix B.²

The memorandum transmits the following documents that provide the analysis and justification for the COE:

² The example Memorandum of Creation was issued before the initial issuance of this procedure. It does not contain all of the required elements identified in this procedure.

1. Business Case The business case is a formal documentation of the analysis completed in Section 3.1. It should also identify how the identified efficiencies will be measured and reported.
2. Charter The charter outlines the mission, vision, scope, organizational structure, reporting structure, and responsibilities of the COE. It includes the information discussed below; however, the level of detail may be tailored to the needs of the COE. The charter may be supported by more detailed documents such as rules of engagement, program plans, and prioritization schemes. Example charters, rules of engagement, and program plans are included in Appendix B to this procedure.³
 - *COE Name:* An official name for the COE.
 - *Mission and Vision:* The mission and vision of the COE are defined as clearly and succinctly as possible. The mission and vision sections identify the purpose of the COE, its goals, and how they will be achieved.
 - *Lead Office:* The lead office is the office that will house the COE. When choosing a lead office, consider the proportion of current and future workload and current and future staffing levels within each business line that the COE will support. Also consider key interfaces within each business line.
 - *Background:* This is a background statement summarizing the basis for forming the COE. This section includes a summary of the business case that describes how the COE aligns with the NRC's strategic plan and enables the agency to better meet its objectives.
 - *Scope of COE:* The scope provides the objectives of the COE. The scope includes a description of the specific functional areas included in the COE and identifies the COE's partners and how they will be supported. The scope also identifies responsibilities that will be shed or transferred to other organizations.
 - *Organizational Structure:* This section describes the organizational structure of the COE. This will include whether the COE will be a team, branch, or division and should be informed by the staffing levels needed to meet the COE's mission. The proposed structure should follow existing organizational and position management policies of the agency. If the COE will

³ The examples in Appendix B were issued before the initial issuance of this procedure. They may not contain all of the required elements identified in this procedure.

support multiple business lines, describe the reporting responsibilities and key interfaces within each business line.

- *Roles and Responsibilities:* This section includes the assignment of specific functional roles to parts of the COE, delegations of authority, review and signature authorities, and a description of how the COE and the organizations it supports will work to ensure effective communication and interfaces. The roles and responsibilities of the COE as a whole and the specific roles and responsibilities of key COE members, partners, and overseeing management are included. For routine work, the COE will function like any other work unit of the same level within the office that has the lead for an assigned activity. The business line owner retains final authority for work priorities, scope of work, and how work will be budgeted within its business line. This section also documents how work will be prioritized across business lines, who has the final authority to set integrated work priorities, and how differences in work scope or prioritization will be resolved. To ensure accountability, business line owners are responsible for ensuring that agency performance metrics within their business line are met. In addition, the COE management, through the Office Director of the COE lead office, are responsible for ensuring that COE work is completed in a manner that supports meeting the agency performance metrics within each supported business line.

3. Transition Plan The transition plan identifies the infrastructure and personnel needed to support the establishment of the COE and documents the timeline to complete each item. The transition plan includes:

- *Identification of infrastructure needs:* Infrastructure needs are delineated and include aspects such as information technology infrastructure, new tools, technology, space considerations, work planning tools, procedures, other organizational support functions, and guidance documents such as the rules of engagement, prioritization scheme, and office instructions.
- *Personnel development/training needs:* Personnel training and qualification are evaluated as part of the transition plan, including updates to qualification programs to include key areas for all supported business lines. Identification of staffing levels within the COE and the need for training or hiring staff to fulfill those positions are included.
- *Timeline for implementation:* Timelines are presented for a phased implementation to include communication, coordination, staff identification, and budget transfers. A reasonable implementation timeline would span approximately 6 months,

depending on the complexity of the COE, and ideally begin at the start of a new fiscal year.

- *Organizational Impacts:* Impacts on the departing and receiving organizations, including considerations for organizational culture impacts should be considered, (e.g., should consider using the best practices and infrastructure of all organizations being combined). The transition plan considers organizational impacts such as the preservation and reorganization of relevant records, interfaces with other offices, communication and reporting methodologies, and budgetary functions. Document the organizational impacts in accordance with MD 9.1 and the items below.
 - i. *Position Descriptions:* Coordinate with OCHCO to determine the need for creation of new or revised position descriptions and align on the appropriate timeframe for providing any new or revised position descriptions for COE positions to OCHCO, as applicable.
 - ii. *Process for Reorganization.* The process for reorganization should be discussed with OCHCO, as well as the Program Management, Policy Development, and Analysis Divisions of each organization combining to form the COE. OCHCO will advise offices and facilitate interaction with National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU), as appropriate.
4. Communications Plan The communication plan identifies how the agency will communicate with internal and external stakeholders about the formation and implementation of the COE. The communication plan is started well in advance of the implementation of the COE and can be refined over time. At a minimum, it includes a background section, key messages, targeted audience, communication team, communication tools, and a timeline. It may also contain optional elements such as potential challenges and a questions and answers section. The communications section of the internal Web site contains additional information on communication plans.
(<http://www.internal.nrc.gov/communications/plans/guidance.html>). The complexity of the COE will dictate the type of communication plan needed.

b. Supporting Documents

The information listed below may be included in the charter or detailed in separate documents that support the charter, as necessary. In some

cases, existing program documents such as inspection manual chapters or MDs may be sufficient, in which case they should be referenced in the charter. The creation of these supporting documents and the level of detail within them is tailored to the needs of the COE. If the principles are not included or referenced in the charter, the rules of engagement are transmitted with the memorandum of creation. The program plan does not need to be transmitted with the memorandum of creation.

1. *Rules of Engagement:* Senior managers for the COE and all of its partners must document and agree on rules of engagement. The COE's partners include the offices that the COE supports and with which it routinely engages. The rules of engagement are a description of the high-level principles and ground rules for the COE. It is usually 1-2 pages long and may address areas such as: work prioritization, integration of work planning tools, reporting structures, and decision-making processes. It may also address how emergent work will be handled, how late filed information from applicants/licensees will be prioritized, how those supported by the COE will communicate the scope of work and resource necessary to complete the work, and how the COE will communicate the status and schedules for work. Lastly, it may include meeting invitations to staff level and management meetings in supporting offices, and relationships with other internal and external stakeholders.
2. *Program Plan:* The plan should include the details that support the charter and rules of engagement. This would include information such as work prioritization schemes, types of work products, communication tools, standard templates, and how the COE and those it supports will communicate on work priorities, schedule, and any challenges. It should also include the performance assessment measures that will be used in the self-assessment to measure the COE's effectiveness.

3.4 Stakeholder Interactions

a. Routine Stakeholder Meetings

The COE supervisor is responsible for ensuring appropriate stakeholder interactions. Routine briefings for the management in each supported office are scheduled to ensure there continues to be a shared understanding of key issues and an agreement on priorities, milestones, schedules, and deliverables. The COE establishes a process for evaluation of partner needs and translation of these needs into requirements of the COE.

The COE supervisor should attend routine meetings held within each supported office, such as executive team/leadership team meetings, program meetings, and project performance meetings.

b. Inter-Office Management Alignment

As necessary, the COE supervisor should initiate routine joint meetings with all supported leadership teams to discuss and align priorities and competing resources within the COE.

3.5 Self-Assessment

a. Assessment Process

Each COE shall assess successes and lessons learned from implementation within one year of their implementation and document the results in a memorandum to the EDO. The COE should consider additional periodic self-assessments to verify continued effectiveness. The assessment should be a formal process and be used to determine if the pre-established objectives described in the business case were accomplished and whether the COE met the performance metrics defined in the program plan.

The senior manager overseeing the COE establishes the time at which a self-assessment will be conducted, assigns an individual to lead the self-assessment, establishes the criteria for conducting the assessment, including duration, parameters to be assessed, and team size.

b. Recommendations/Actions

The assessment report describes the success of the COE in fulfilling the objectives established at its initiation, as well as recommendations for any areas where the objectives have not been fulfilled. The draft assessment is shared with the senior manager overseeing the COE and the senior managers of each organization the COE supports to align on the recommendations and corrective actions. The final report should be documented in a memorandum submitted to the EDO.

c. Followup

1. Approved recommendations from the report are tracked and monitored to ensure followup and completion.
2. Appropriate durations for completion are established for each action.
3. Closeout of the actions are documented. Once all actions are completed, a final closeout letter is forwarded to the senior manager having oversight of the COE.

4. RESPONSIBILITIES AND AUTHORITIES

Executive Director for Operations

Refer to MD 9.1 for more details. The EDO approves creation of COEs.

Assistant for Operations

The Assistant for Operations maintains this procedure.

Office Directors

Refer to MD 9.1 for more details. Additionally, Office Directors may identify and initiate COEs as needed to ensure effectiveness and efficiency of office operations. Office Directors may fulfill the role of the SES Champion. In smaller offices with a limited number of SES, the Office Director may delegate a non-SES supervisor as the COE Champion. To ensure accountability, business line owners are responsible for ensuring that agency performance metrics within their business line are met. In addition, the COE management, through the Office Director of the COE lead office, are responsible for ensuring that COE work is completed in a manner that supports meeting the agency performance metrics within each supported business line.

Division Directors

Division directors may identify COEs as needed to ensure effectiveness and efficiency of office operations. Division Directors execute the guidance in this procedure to implement new COEs. Division Directors fulfill the role of the SES Champion.

Branch Chiefs

Branch chiefs may identify COEs as needed to ensure effectiveness and efficiency of office operations. Branch Chiefs execute the guidance in this procedure to implement new COEs.

Staff

Staff may identify COEs as needed to ensure effectiveness and efficiency of office operations. Staff execute the guidance in this procedure to implement new COEs.

5. REFERENCES

[MD 9.1](#), "Organization Management." (ADAMS Accession No. ML041400108.)

SECY-15-0143, "Project Aim, and Centers of Expertise." (ADAMS Accession No. ML15292A258.)

SECY-15-0143: Enclosure 1, "Summary of Lessons Learned." (ADAMS Accession No. ML15292A411.)

Project AIM Working Group Report, "Summary of Evaluated Areas for Centers of Expertise" (ADAMS Accession No. ML15334A192.)

Staff Requirements Memorandum SECY-15-0143 – Project AIM and Centers of Expertise. (ADAMS Accession No. ML16053A500.)

6. APPENDICES

Appendix A - Considerations for Proposing a Center of Expertise (COE)
Appendix B - Examples of Center of Expertise (COE) Documentation

7. EFFECTIVE DATE

April 28, 2016

Appendix A - Considerations for Proposing a Center of Expertise (COE)

Based on lessons learned and interviews with management and staff in current COEs and matrixed organizations, as well as lessons learned from the Transforming Assets into Business Solutions initiative and the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS)/Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs merger, this section contains questions that can be used to develop the business case for proposing a COE.

Current State

- What is the current organizational structure? Who makes decisions? How many staff are currently working on these issues?
- What functions and activities are the current organizations responsible for performing?
- Who are the partners (e.g., Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Office of New Reactors, NMSS, and Regions) of the current organizations? What are the partner requirements in the affected process/area and what concerns would partners have if a COE were to be formed? What about external stakeholders?
- What are the current and future challenges faced by each organization if the status quo remains? For example, the current degree of alignment between business lines on issues might be considered in making a decision on whether a COE should be created. In addition, more consideration should be given to moving organizations whose functions do not align with the office's or business line's functions where it currently resides.
- Are there any environmental factors, such as planned agency reorganizations, or known changes in the industry (e.g., increased number of decommissioning plants) that would affect the timing of creating a COE or the future state of a COE? For example, are there any planned near or mid-term actions such as mergers or reorganizations that would dissolve or eliminate the need for the new COE?
- What is the current workload in the area? Is it increasing, decreasing, steady, or sporadic? Is the workload at a critical juncture (e.g., in the midst of licensing hearings)? If the workload in an organization is sporadic, it may be beneficial to consolidate the organization's function with another similar organization to maintain critical skills by ensuring steady workload. On the other hand, if the organization currently has a high workload or high-priority work, this should be considered in determining the appropriate timing of the initiation of the COE.

Future State

- What are the goals of creating the COE? If it is to meet a short-term need to complete a high priority project, a COE is not likely the appropriate approach and decision makers should consider creating other organizational structures, such as a short term project directorate instead. If the goal is to meet a long-term need for professional expertise, a COE may be the appropriate approach.
- How will the proposed COE align with the NRC's strategic plan and enable the agency to better meet its objectives?
- What efficiency (i.e., timeliness) and effectiveness (i.e., quality) gains would result from the COE?
- What is the impact to the remaining organization? How will the creation of a COE affect the remaining organization's ability to meet its goals and metrics?

- For the organizations being combined into the COE, is there sufficient compatibility in the applicable regulations, standards, and processes? If very different, how will this challenge be overcome and at what cost? There is significant advantage to combining programs that have the same goals or perspectives and rely on the same regulations. These may be more process-oriented areas such as rulemaking or technical areas that use the same standards and regulations such as environmental reviews. Combining organizations that are technically related, but use different standards and regulations, may be more challenging, but should not be ruled out since there could be long-term gains through standardization of analytical methods, regulations, standards, and processes, where appropriate.
- What is the appropriate balance between staff, contractors, and U.S. Department of Energy laboratories as well as other outside laboratory or academic institutions?
- How will the COE avoid "stove-piping," the restriction of information within the organization that inhibits or prevents cross-organizational communication?
- What opportunities and challenges will be addressed through the consolidation? With respect to opportunities, creation of a COE may permit more access to senior personnel for knowledge management and on-the-job training. Centralizing an area of expertise can result in a more partner-focused approach, and the needs of partners should be a key consideration. Some challenges include:
 - Management structure differences. The size of the organization that would result from the consolidation of functions must be considered carefully to understand the potential challenges for span of control and personnel/process management. For example, if additional layers of management would be needed, then the anticipated efficiency gains may be reduced.
 - Cultural or infrastructure differences. Cultural differences between the organizations being merged may create conflict if not managed properly. Significant leadership and change management may be required for organizations with different cultures. Differences in infrastructure, such as guidance and work planning tools, also need to be identified and addressed before a COE is created. The time and resources needed to address such issues should be considered in making a decision whether to implement a COE.
 - Work Prioritization. There may be difficulty creating a consolidated, agreed upon work prioritization scheme that addresses the needs of multiple business lines. Regular coordination and communication will be needed to agree upon priorities and how to resolve conflicts.

Financial and Human Resources

- What will be the resource needs to support creating the COE? Considerations include:
 - The budget in both full time equivalents and contract dollars that would be available for the COE.
 - Additional budget that may be required by the COE due to the need to maintain critical skills and address emerging issues.
 - Training and qualification.
 - Resources required to establish the infrastructure necessary and implement the organizational change.
 - o Staff relocations, equipment moves, etc.
 - o Enhancements to facilitate communication, coordination, and collaboration with partners and among COE staff.

- New or revised work planning tools.
- New or revised procedures and guidance documents.
- New or revised training and qualification plans.

APPENDIX B: Example Center of Expertise (COE) Documentation

The documents in this appendix were issued before the initial issuance of this procedure. They may not contain all of the required elements identified in this procedure. They are provided for reference only.

Business Cases

The Project AIM Working Group Report, "Summary of Evaluated Areas for Centers of Expertise" (Agencywide Document Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML15334A192), contains example assessments of potential COEs which could be used to support a business case.

Memorandum of Creation

The memorandum of creation for the four COEs created in 2012, "Centers of Expertise for Allegations, Operating Experience/Construction Experience, Electrical Engineering, and Vendor Inspection" (ADAMS Accession No. ML12031A191), documents the implementation of four agency COEs.

Charters

Charter for the Vendor Inspection COE. (ADAMS Accession No. ML12045A064).

Charter for the Allegations COE. (ADAMS Accession No. ML12045A102).

Charter for the Electrical Engineering COE. (ADAMS Accession No. ML12045A091).

Rules of Engagement

The Office of New Reactors' Rules of Engagement, "Living our Mission: An Enhanced Approach to New Reactor Reviews," is located at <http://nroweb1.nrc.gov/NRO/message-from-glenn/docs/Living-Our-Mission.pdf>.

Program Plans

Vendor Inspection Program Plan (ADAMS Accession No. ML16075A461). The most recent version of the Vendor Inspection Program Plan and associated annual self-assessments are available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reactors/new-reactors/oversight/quality-assurance/vendor-insp/vendor-insp-prog-plan.html>.

Self-Assessments

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Vendor Inspection Center of Expertise Self-Assessment (ADAMS Accession No. ML15327A164). The most recent version of the Vendor Inspection Program Plan and associated annual self-assessments are available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reactors/new-reactors/oversight/quality-assurance/vendor-insp/vendor-insp-prog-plan.html>.

One Year Self-Assessment of NRR's COE for Allegations (ADAMS Accession No. ML13182A235).

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Electrical Engineering Center of Expertise Self-Assessment (ADAMS Accession No. ML13112A702).

One Year Self-Assessment of NRR's COE for Allegations (ADAMS Accession No. ML13182A235).

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Electrical Engineering Center of Expertise Self-Assessment (ADAMS Accession No. ML13112A702).

ADAMS Accession No.: Pkg: ML16105A122, Note: ML16105A128, Encl: ML16105A178

OFFICE	EDO/ETA	EDO/AO
NAME	Scrane	Rlewis
DATE	04/ 14 /16	04/ /16

OFFICE RECORD COPY