

## Initiation, drafting, approval, issue, review and withdrawal of procedures, guidance and TAG/TIG documents

**BMM/DBP/001**

**Target Audience:**  
ND Staff

|                                |                                |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Date issued:</b> 2007-05-14 | <b>OG Status:</b> Fully open   |
| <b>Review date:</b> 2010-05-14 | <b>Author Unit/Section:</b> ND |

**Purpose & Scope**  
**Policy**  
**Responsibilities**  
**Definitions**  
**Procedures**  
**Associated Documents**  
**Appendix 1**  
**Appendix 2**  
**Appendix 3**

## **1 Purpose & Scope**

1.1 This procedure describes the processes involved in the initiation, drafting, approval, issue, review and withdrawal of **all** documents that form part of ND's Business Management System (BMS).

1.2 This procedure is applicable throughout the Directorate and applies to all individuals who are responsible for initiating, writing, peer reviewing, approving and administering BMS documentation.

## **2 Policy**

2.1 As part of its commitment to quality management ND allocates resource to maintaining a proportionate, reliable and robust documented management system to secure consistent control of all its activities - the BMS.

2.2 The BMS adheres to the principles of HSC's Enforcement Policy Statement. Technical Assessment Guides (TAGs) and Technical Inspection Guides (TIGs) provide guidance on the interpretation and application of the ND Safety Assessment Principles (SAPs), Licence Conditions and other standards relevant to the regulation of nuclear industry duty holders. The SAPs and TAGs are owned by the Corporate Assessment Liaison Meeting (CALM). The TIGs are owned by Inspection Coordination Group (ICG).

2.3 All BMS documents will be issued in a controlled manner to ensure all staff have access to the current version of the 'live' system by electronic means on the HSE intranet. Only the electronic documents when viewed on the intranet are the controlled versions of the ND BMS.

2.4 As far as is practicable, no ND BMS document will repeat, overlap with, duplicate or contradict HSE policies and procedures.

## **3 Responsibilities**

3.1 Key Business Activity (KBA) **Process Owners** or those with delegated authority should:

- a. on behalf of the ND Management Board (MB), lead and coordinate the initiation, maintenance and development of the procedures of an allocated KBA to ensure the

BMS remains relevant and up to date, (See Appendix 2 of the BMM for further information on process owner allocations). In particular:

- i. **CALM**, through its Chair, is responsible for ensuring that the **SAPs** are maintained in an up-to-date state and the suite of TAGs supporting them Nuclear Topic Leaders, (**NTLs**), to have delegated authority for the maintenance of TAGs in their topic area.
  - ii. **ICG**, through its Chair, is responsible for ensuring that the suite of **TIGs** is complete, consistent and kept up-to-date.
- b. provide advice and support to authors in carrying out their responsibilities
  - c. assist the author in the identification of staff that will act as peer reviewer(s) (which will usually include a manager)
  - d. decide if a document does not require a peer review. This should only occur when minor revisions of an existing BMS document have been made
  - e. provide advice to the Business System Administrator (BSA) in identifying who should take over the role of author when responsibilities change
  - f. in cases where an author is not available to respond within 3 weeks to a Process Improvement Feedback Form PIFF1 delegate this to a new author or other respondee to reply within 3 weeks
  - g. assist in the resolution of any contentious issues arising from peer review, and which may involve the appropriate NTL, ICG, and CALM
  - h. authorise a 'one-off' extension to the 'life' of a BMS document by no more than 3 months to allow the completion of a review, notifying the BSA of this decision, or support a request for a second extension
  - i. withdraw a BMS document within scope of the owner's KBA when it is no longer relevant
  - j. follow the process set out in paragraph 5 of this BMS procedure.

3.2 The appropriate **Head of Division / Unit, NTL or chair of ICG or CALM** will provide advice to the BSA when identifying Authors to re-draft a BMS document (as required).

3.3 **Authors** will follow the process set out in paragraph 5 and follow the drafting guidance in Appendix 1 of this procedure, which includes seeking and taking account of comments from the Defence Nuclear Safety Regulator (**DNSR**) and where appropriate the environment agencies. Authors must also make sure appropriate records are kept when comments are received on SAPs, TIGs and TAGs and how the comments have been resolved.

3.4 **Peer Reviewer(s)** will, within **3 weeks** (or other timescale agreed with the author) complete a review in line with the procedure in paragraph 5, and in the case of a TAG take account of the guidelines in Appendix 3.

3.5 **Line Managers** provide advice and support to authors in carrying out their responsibilities.

3.6 **Authorised Signatories** should check the clarity, integrity and robustness of a document, and confirm that this procedure has been followed. Where authorised signatories are **not** satisfied with a document they should refer it to the author for further work. When satisfied with the document they should sign the 'Document Control Record' and the 'master' copy of the BMS document and record the outcome of the check.

3.7 Authorised signatories for the approval of procedures are as follows:

- i. Chief Inspector for the Business Management Manual and any procedures laying down the hierarchy of the Health and Safety Management responsibilities;
- ii. Chief Inspector or Business System Manager (BSM) for DBPs;
- iii. Appropriate Process Owner for KBA procedures or NTLs where they have delegated authority;
- iv. Chair of Calm for SAPs, TAGs and associated documents; and,
- v. Chair of ICG for TIGs and associated documents.

3.8 Members of ICG, CALM, and NTLs if requested, should consider any issue arising from production, review and production and review of a document and advise upon the appropriate course of action or document content, notifying the author and owner of the outcome.

3.9 **All ND Staff:**

- a. Have a responsibility to report any omission, fault, inconsistency or difficulty they may have with a procedure, guidance document or flowchart information, to the document author/owner and the BMS using the Form PIFF1 attached. PIFF forms should be sent in the first instance to the BSA. Inspectors should also alert the NTL where there are concerns over the adequacy of TAGs or ICG for TIGs.
- b. Should ensure that the documentation they use or refer to is the current version accessible from the intranet.
- c. Should report comments they receive on any document from stakeholders using PIFF forms.

3.10 **The BSA** will follow the procedures in section 5 and ensures that:

- a. new documents do not unnecessarily duplicate procedures or guidance documents in the BMS,
- b. for all documents a new record is created or an existing record is updated with the required document details,

- c. all documents in the system are current, including those on the intranet and those copies accessible on the HSE FOI website,
- d. before adding a new document to the system a completed document control form is available as a record that the document has been prepared in compliance with this procedure,
- e. when a document is added to the system a global message is sent to all staff announcing the publication of the new document and including the summary provided by the author,
- f. all obsolete documents withdrawn from the system are moved from the live system and archived in line with HSE policy,
- g. all obsolete 'master' documentation is maintained as a historical record in electronic format copy and recorded on the Electronic Document Record Management (EDRM).. The immediate previous versions of obsolete documents are also held in hard copy,
- h. the appropriate person (usually the KBA process owner or author) is notified of any BMS document that requires or has been identified as requiring review,
- i. if, following a review, an early revision of a document is found to be unwarranted, the reasons for this decision are recorded for use in subsequent reviews,
- j. an up to date list of BMS document authors / owners is maintained,
- k. withdrawal of a document from the system is authorised only by the KBA process owner and the reasons for the withdrawal are recorded,
- l. withdrawal of any BMS document is notified to all staff by a global message,
- m. following a review all relevant records are updated.

## 4. Definitions

4.1 **BMS** refers to ND's organisational structure, responsibilities, policies, procedures, processes and performance monitoring systems for ensuring it pursues its Mission effectively, efficiently and economically with due accountability.

4.2 **Document Control**, the process that affords control over System Documentation, to ensure that staff have the latest version of current system documents available to them.

4.3 **System Documentation** means all documents that support the BMS.

4.4 **NTL** has the meaning set out in the Business Management Manual, (BMM), Annex 6

4.5 **CALM** has the meaning in BMM Annex 7b.

4.6 **ICG** has the meaning in BMM Annex 7a.

## 5 Procedures

### Creating new and reviewing existing documents

The attached diagram summarises the procedures for handling BMS documents from initiation to withdrawal. The following text amplifies the diagram.

5.1 KBA **process owners** including **CALM, ICG or NTLs** initiate the creation of new or the review of existing BMS documents by appointing an author and writing a specification for the document. In the case of a review of an existing document the **BSA** will alert the KBA process owner/author of the need for review 12 weeks before the review date. **Nuclear Topic Leaders (NTLs)** with delegated authority for a suite of TAGs should annually review the adequacy of the guidance in their topic area. **NTLs** with responsibilities for **TAGs** in their specialist area should make a proposal to CALM if the NTLs believe changes to TAGs are needed. Hence, any proposals for change to a TAG must be directed to the appropriate NTL. If CALM agrees to the revision, the NTL is responsible for managing the change in accordance with this procedure. It is for CALM to agree on the appropriate resources and timescale to carry out the necessary review and revision.

Note: The need for new documents or reviews may be triggered by one or a combination of:

- i. suggestions from any member of staff;
- ii. the outcomes of an audit or case review,
- iii. feedback provided by staff using the PIFF1 or any other written means,
- iv. the BSM or a member of their team,
- v. the Process Owner arising from a 3 yearly review of the KBA,
- vi. changes in legal requirements or legislation, or HSE or ND Policy,
- vii. a document being within 12 weeks of its recorded Review Date,
- viii. the document author or owner,
- ix. an NTL's annual review of guidance within their topic area, and
- x. comments received from stakeholders.

5.2 The **author** consults the BSA to obtain a new document number or new issue number, if a review is to be undertaken of an existing document. The BSA records details of the new document or the review.

5.3 The **author** consults and follows the relevant drafting guidance:

- Appendix 1 is relevant to Guidance documents and Procedures;
- Appendix 2 is relevant to the layout of TAGs and TIGs;
- Appendix 3 is relevant to the style of TAGs and TIGs.

5.4 The **author** ensures:

- any draft, review or redraft document deals only with ND activities and does not so far as is practicable repeat, overlap with, duplicate or contradict HSE policies and procedures;
- outstanding issues from previous PIFFs are actioned as part of a redraft;
- the document meets the business need and represents the collective view of document users to secure widespread acceptance and use of the document;
- the document is assessed and marked in respect of its Open Government status in compliance with FOIA procedures.

5.5 **Authors** arrange peer review for all new documents and for review or redraft documents where there is significant change from the original. They consult the KBA process owner where necessary to identify the need for and selecting a peer reviewer.

5.6 **Authors of TAGs** in drafting TAGs also consult:

- the NTL, to determine the peer reviewers for the TAG. The reviewers should include one suitably experienced inspector from each relevant Division and representatives from MOD and environmental regulators. Where a Division does not have a specialist in the relevant topic area they should still be consulted and given opportunity to comment,
- additional relevant peer reviewers where the topic of a TAG impinges on other related disciplines,
- their Unit heads where they are not the NTL for the topic of the TAG.

5.7 **Authors of TIGs** in drafting TIGs also consult:

- ICG , to determine the peer reviewers for the TIG. The reviewers should include one suitably experienced inspector from each relevant Division and representatives from MOD and environmental regulators. Where a Division does not have a specialist in the relevant topic area they should still be consulted and given opportunity to comment,
- additional relevant peer reviewers where the topic of a TIG impinges on other related disciplines.

5.8 **All peer reviewers** should consider the overall adequacy and suitability of the document including:

- the adequacy of scope, clarity, applicability, consistency with current practice and practicality of application,
- the technical or legal content (if appropriate), including any relevant HSC/HSE policy and guidance and decisions made about disclosure markings under the

Freedom of Information,

- technical accuracy and consistency with the licence conditions and SAPs if it is a TIG or a TAG;

and make any constructive suggestions to improve its usefulness

5.9 The **author** addresses any issues raised by the peer review with the reviewer(s) and resolves any issues of concern. Where there is an issue that cannot be resolved, the author must consult the KBA Process Owner.

5.10 **Authors of TAGs and TIGs shall** maintain a robust audit trail of the development of the TAG or TIG on a suitable file, (See Table 1 for the current list of registered files for TAGs), including: who were consulted and when, (using the cover sheet in Figure 1); their response, how each comment has been addressed and sentenced with reasons for acceptance, rejection or other response.

5.11 **Authors of TAGs** should secure agreement of the relevant **NTL** at the end of drafting. The NTL checks the TAG against the information given in Appendices 2 and 3. They also take into consideration the development of the document, as evidenced on the file, to satisfy themselves that the proper procedure has been followed and adequate account taken of reviewers' comments.

5.12 **Authors of TIGs** should secure agreement of a delegated member of ICG at the end of drafting. The ICG member checks the TIG against relevant parts of Appendices 2 and 3. They also take into consideration the development of the document, as evidenced on the file, to satisfy themselves that the proper procedure has been followed and adequate account taken of reviewers' comments.

5.13 When the draft is complete the **author** sends the electronic version to the BSA who then issues the Document Control Record.

5.14 The **author** seeks the assent of the authorised signatory (defined at 3.6). The authorised signatory considers the document's content for clarity, technical content (if appropriate), consistency with current practice, any other criteria they identify as appropriate and provide comments to the author for revision as necessary. (Should there be an issue that cannot be resolved between the author and signatory then the author should consult with the KBA Process Owner. If this does not resolve the issue it will then be considered by the appropriate NTL, ICG, CALM or, if necessary, senior managers and a decision made).

5.15 The **author** secures formal authorisation from the authorised signatory, and the peer reviewer (or reviewers in the case of TAGs), where appropriate using the Document Control Record. The authorised signatory also signs the hard copy original of the document on the outcome of their review.

5.16 The **author** sends the completed hard copy original of the document and the Document Control Record to the **BSA**. The author also drafts a global message to accompany the launch. The note should in the case of first issue identify the scope;

purpose and key points of the procedure or in the case of a revised document identify the key changes in the revised procedure.

5.17 **Authors of SAPs, TAGs and, taking account of security issues, TIGs** should alert interested stakeholders to the publication of the TAG or TIG and invite comment, (usually within a 2 month period). Any comments should be recorded, sentenced and actioned using the BMS process above.

5.18 The **BSA** secures the approval of the BSM on the Document Control Form and before issue.

5.19 Before issuing a document the **BSA**:

- i. ensures that each BMS Document has a unique identifier and issue number;
- ii. ensures details of the document have been entered into the system;
- iii. a Document Control Record for the document exists and is fully completed.

5.20 When a BMS document is issued the **BSA** ensures:

- i. a copy is posted on the ND BMS intranet site;
- ii. a hard copy of the document is filed and a hard and electronic copy of any preceding document is also archived;
- iii. a global message is sent to all staff announcing the launch of the new document on the intranet and including the summary note prepared by the author.

5.21 The **BSA** alerts the author, (or the KBA process owner where the author cannot be ascertained or is not available), 12 weeks before a document has reached its review date.

5.22 At the direction of the KBA process owner the **BSA** extends the 'life' of a document due for review for a further 3 months.

5.23 At the direction of the KBA process owner the **BSA** will withdraw a document and ensure it is correctly archived in hard copy and electronic format.

### **Proposing Changes and Improvements**

5.24 All proposals for change or improvement to any BMS document should be initiated via the PIFF system.

### **Responding to PIFFs**

5.25 The **BSA** logs PIFFs and sends a copy to the author or the KBA process owner if the author cannot be determined or is not available. The KBA process owner then nominates a new author or someone else to respond to the PIFF.

5.25 The **author or nominated respondee** is responsible for replying to a PIFF within 3 weeks. Where immediate action is required the author or respondee actions this or refers the matter back to the KBA process owner for action. In other cases where action can wait

then the PIFF response is returned to the BSA. The author/respondee is also responsible for placing a copy of the PIFF on the appropriate file where it refers to technical guidance

## **6 Associated Documents**

### 6.1 The Business Management Manual

#### **Appendix 1**

#### **General Points for Consideration when drafting Procedures / Guidance Documents**

- 1 The document Author must at all times pay careful attention to the use of the terms 'shall', 'will', 'must', 'should' and 'may' when drafting a BMS document. Usage of the words 'shall', 'will', and 'must' are requirements, actions or outputs which are mandatory and therefore must be legal requirements. 'Should' gives good practice, whilst 'may' is open to interpretation and judgement.
- 2 The '**Purpose and Scope**' heading will, in the first paragraph of each procedure or guidance document, clearly state its purpose and scope.
- 3 The '**Policy**' section must, where there is a matter of policy relating to a procedure, include this section.
- 4 '**Responsibilities**', where responsibilities or decisions are clearly identified in a written procedure, the posts within ND that have the authority / duty to discharge those responsibilities or make decisions shall be listed in this section.
- 5 '**Definitions**', this section shall be used to define:
  - i. all terms that have the potential to be misunderstood,
  - ii. terms that are unique to the procedure,
  - iii. the clarification of a term to ensure a common understanding, and
  - iv. where the use of acronyms could lead to a misunderstanding or confusion, they shall be fully defined (not merely expanded into full text)
  - v. wherever possible definitions in the law, licence conditions and SAPs should be used.
- 6 The '**Procedure**' section will detail each stage of the process in a clear 'step by step' manner and contain sufficient detail for the task to be carried out by staff that have an appropriate level of training, knowledge and experience of the process. Additionally, a flowchart may be used to illustrate or supplement a procedure from start to finish. However, only those symbols shown in Annex 1 shall be utilised in the production of procedural flowcharts.

- 7 **‘Associated documents’** are any ND or HSE procedures, policies, guidance, forms, charts, etc. relevant or referred to in the document. They should be recorded under this section heading. A BMS document should not repeat, duplicate, overlap with or contradict an HSE procedure.

## Appendix 2

### Layout for TAGs and TIGs

- 1 TAGs and TIGs have the normal BMS document format (Arial 12pt font, first page heading, footer etc). Each TAG has a number of the type T/AST/nnn. Each TIG has a number of the type T/INS/mm.
- 2 Long documents should include a table of contents, as shown in the following example. This should not be done if only the main headings described below are used (i.e. no sub-headings). The table of contents should show headings, sub-headings etc, suitably indented, but not heading numbers or page numbers. See examples below.

#### Example Layout for a TAG

|  |           |              |  |
|--|-----------|--------------|--|
| <b>Contents</b>  |           |              |  |
| Purpose and scope  |           |              |  |
| Relationship to licence and other relevant legislation                           |           |              |  |
| Relationship to SAPs, WENRA Reference Levels and IAEA safety standards addressed |           |              |  |
| Advice to inspectors   |           |              |  |
|  | Heading 1 |              |  |
|  | Heading 2 |              |  |
|  |           | Subheading 1 |  |
|  |           | Subheading 2 |  |
|  | Heading 3 |              |  |
| Appendix 1. Title of appendix 1  |           |              |  |
| References   |           |              |  |
| Table 1. Title of table 1  |           |              |  |
| Figure 1. Title of figure 1  |           |              |  |

#### Example Layout for a TIG

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| <b>Contents</b> |  |
| 1.              | Purpose and scope                      |
| 2.              | Licence Condition                      |
| 3.              | Purpose of Licence Condition           |
| 4.              | Guidance on arrangements for LC xx     |
| 5.              | Guidance on Inspection of Arrangements |

6. Guidance on Inspection of Implementation of Arrangements

7. Other sources of information

- 3 Only the following four **main section headings** are to be used for TAGs. These are: (1) Purpose and scope, (2) Relationship to licence and other relevant legislation, (3) Relationship to SAPs, WENRA Reference Levels (RLs) and IAEA Safety Standards (SSs) addressed and (4) Advice to inspectors. The issues to be included each of these headings are described below.

### **Purpose and scope**

- 4 State the purpose and scope of the assessment guide, and make any introductory remarks in this section. Include the following statement:

“This TAG contains guidance to advise and inform ND staff in the exercise of their regulatory judgement. Comments on this guide, and suggestions for future revisions, should be recorded on the appropriate file”.

### **Relationship to licence and other relevant legislation**

- 5 This section makes the link between the TAGs and the legislation that provides the legal basis for nuclear regulation. State the relevant licence conditions by number and title, e.g. LC 14 - Safety documentation, and explain how they underpin the particular subject being addressed. Make the same links to regulations, ACOPs etc.

### **Relationship to SAPs, WENRA Reference Levels (RLs) and IAEA Safety Standards (SSs) addressed**

- 6 State the principal SAPs the TAG provides additional guidance on. Also reference other SAPs drawn on. Include an explanation as to why additional guidance is needed over and above that contained in the SAPs.
- 7 Demonstrate how the SAPs and TAGs together are the same as or equivalent to the relevant Western Nuclear Regulators Association (WENRA) RLs (for civil nuclear power stations only). (TIGs may need to make this link in some instances.)
- 8 State how the relevant SSs have been addressed. This does not mean that all the information in the standards has to appear in the TAGs. Only those that address a significant safety outcome need to be considered. TAGs should reflect permissioning and not be prescriptive. Care must be taken to ensure TAGs and TIGs could not be construed as ACOPs.

### **Advice to inspectors**

- 9 Be concise and to the point. In lengthy documents, divide this section into a number of sub-headings.

## Heading & Paragraph Style etc

- 10 Heading & Paragraph Style and numbering should follow the BMS document format, as follows:

### **1. Main heading**

Numbering of paragraphs of text or sub-headings follows the hierarchy below, with each level being indented by ½ inch.

For example:

- 1.1 Text or sub-heading
  - 1) Text or sub-heading
    - i) Text or sub-heading
      - a) Text.

- 11 As the example shows, only the **Main headings** are in bold, the rest are in normal text. Note that only the first word (and any names etc, as in normal sentences) of main and sub- headings has an initial capital letter. You can use unnumbered sub-headings, in bold, if this aids document layout and clarity.
- 12 Any supplementary information (such as additional technical detail) can be included as appendices immediately following the Advice to Assessors section. Insert a page break before each appendix. The heading of the appendix is like this:

### **Appendix 1 Title of appendix 1**

- 13 The heading / paragraph style and numbering of appendices follows that of the main sections except the first level in the hierarchy is numbered thus: A1.1 (the lower levels are unchanged).
- 14 At the end of the TAG or TIG, list the references and include any tables and figures. These should cover any appendices as well as the main sections. For example:

### **References**

- 1 Reference 1

- 15 The references should be labelled in the body of the document like this: <sup>[1]</sup>. The headings for any tables and figures follow the example given above for appendices except they should be centred on the page. Include page breaks before the reference list, tables and figures as appropriate.

- 16 As the document will be placed on the intranet, do not underline text for emphasis, use bold instead. When quoting verbatim from other sources such as the SAPs use italics.

## **Appendix 3**

### **Guidelines for the authors of TAGs and TIGs**

- 1 Keep in mind that TAGs and TIGs provide additional guidance to ND staff on the interpretation and application of the licence conditions and SAPs and other relevant standards. They are also part of the demonstration on how ND meets the WENRA RLs and how ND links its guidance to that contained in IAEA safety standards. Remember the TAGs and TIGs are not academic or technical monographs (such information can be obtained from text books and other documents): they provide regulatory advice to ND staff that already possesses much of the expertise they require.
- 2 Although intended primarily for ND staff, where not closed under Freedom of Information legislation, TAGs and TIGs will be published on HSE's Website, and therefore allow external stakeholders the opportunity to provide comments and it is important that they are written with this in mind. Avoid statements that could be misunderstood out of context and misused. Avoid being prescriptive unless there is a legal reason for doing so or unless staff must act in a certain way to meet HSC policy or HSE requirements.
- 3 If the TAGs and TIGs give the impression of being prescriptive, licensees may subconsciously become blinkered in their safety analyses and produce safety cases solely designed to satisfy NII inspectors, rather than to meet their legal duties.
- 4 If the TAGs and TIGs contain inappropriate restrictions on how an inspector can assess documentation, this might undermine unnecessarily ND flexibility and interfere with sampling, judgement and discretion. The guides need therefore to strike the right balance between retaining the non-prescriptive, goal-setting nature of the SAPs whilst avoiding vagueness and blandness. To this end, actively look for consensus within ND and be prepared to find common views. Remember the TAGs and TIGs represent ND's position and not an individual's view.
- 5 Give general guidance on points to look for when deciding whether the SAPs and licence conditions have been met and in particular whether the safety case is adequate. Be concise and focus on essentials. For example, consider providing a list of points to consider. Give broad-based advice. Cover the range of nuclear installation types for which guidance is appropriate. Give guidance on the assessment of old plant if this differs from that appropriate to new or newer facilities or plant.
- 6 Additional detail, if helpful and advice on technical points should be placed in appendices.

- 7 Separate, general guidance is available for the assessment procedure. TAGs should therefore keep to their technical area. Not all SAPs require detailed interpretation. If particular SAPs and their associated text are self-explanatory, do not provide unnecessary advice and superfluous interpretation.
- 8 The TAGs (and the associated files, see note on '**Purpose and scope**' section in Appendix 1) can contribute to the maintenance and development of the SAPs. So, for example, identify points for a future SAPs revision and provide clarification of SAPs that prove to be difficult to use in practice.

**Table 1 (See paragraph 5.10)**

**Registry files for the Technical Assessment Guides**

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| TRIM REF. 1.9.3.141 | Project management, generic issues  |
| TRIM REF. 1.9.3.142 | Probabilistic safety analysis, fault and hazard analysis, transient analysis, risk and ALARP/CBA criteria |
| TRIM REF. 1.9.3.143 | Chemistry/chemical/process engineering<br>Waste and decommissioning                                       |
| TRIM REF. 1.9.3.144 | Radiological protection, shielding, criticality   |
| TRIM REF. 1.9.3.145 | Control, instrumentation and electrical systems   |
| TRIM REF. 1.9.3.146 | Reactor physics, fuel and core performance  |
| TRIM REF. 1.9.3.147 | General assessment guide / Fundamental Principles   |
| TRIM REF. 1.9.3.148 | Structural integrity  |
| TRIM REF. 1.9.3.149 | Civil/structural engineering and external hazards   |
| TRIM REF. 1.9.3.150 | Management of safety, quality assurance and human factors   |
| TRIM REF. 1.9.3.151 | Mechanical engineering, graphite, thermo hydraulics and internal hazards                                  |
| TRIM REF. 1.9.3.152 | Siting  |

**Figure 1 – See Paragraph 5.10**

**Front cover sheet for draft TAGs and TIGs**

|  |
|--|
| <p>HEALTH &amp; SAFETY EXECUTIVE<br/>         HM NUCLEAR DIRECTORATE<br/> <b>DRAFT</b></p> |
|--|

**TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT GUIDE T/AST/nnn OR  
 TECHNICAL INSPECTION GUIDE T/INS/mmm (delete as appropriate)**

**TITLE:**

**ISSUE:** NNN

**REVISION:** n **Date:** dd Month yyyy

**Authorisation**

**Signature**

**Date**

Reviewer  
 (NTL or inspection Unit  
 Head)

Signature

Date

Approved  
 from CALM or ICG or  
 other

Signature

Date

Author: Name  
 (Unit nn)

.....

.....

Accepted by: Name  
 (NTL)

.....

.....

**DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY**

| <b>Revision</b> | <b>Date</b> | <b>Change/ reasons</b>                         |
|-----------------|-------------|--|
| 0               |             | First Draft for peer review                    |
| 1               |             | Revised following review by Name 1, Name 2 etc |
| 2               |             |  |
| Etc.            |             |  |

**Document Control Record Form**

**Nuclear Directorate  
Initiation, Drafting, Approval, Issue, Review And Withdrawal Of Procedures And  
Guidance Documents**

**BMS DOCUMENT CONTROL RECORD**

**This form should be used for the final checking of all documents before issue onto the ND BMS**

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Document reference</b> | Enter number and name of document here. |
|---------------------------|---|

**Part 1.** To be completed by Business System Administrator, (BSA).

| <b>Responsibilities</b>  | <b>Task Completed<br/>(Sign off &amp; date)</b> | <b>Notes</b>                        |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Step 1.</b> Allocate BMS Ref. no provided via. Check that no duplicate document exists. |   | e.g. BMS Ref –T/AST/005 – Issue 002 |

**Part 2.** Steps **2 to 6** to be completed by Document Author & Peer Review Team where appropriate. Steps 2 to 4 may be repeated until an agreed draft has been prepared

| <b>Responsibilities</b>   | <b>Task Completed<br/>(Sign off &amp; date)</b> | <b>OK/<br/>Not OK</b> | <b>Notes</b>   |
|---|---|-----------------------|--|
| <b>Step 2. * Author</b> to prepare document and flowchart (if appropriate)  | <b>Author</b>                                   |                       | Consider doc. content for clarity, technical content, and consistency with current practice, identify appropriate associated documents, etc. |
| <b>Step 3. ****</b> Peer review the document within the team. (Unit/CALM/ICG/Project Team etc.)   | <b>Peer Reviewer</b>                            |                       |  |
| <b>Step 4. ****</b> Peer review the document with other appropriate ND staff who are likely to use the document, - <b>including admin staff where procedure includes admin processes/tasks.</b> | <b>Peer Reviewer</b>                            |                       | Consult Band 4 admin group for all procedures which have an admin content  |

|  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Step 5. If Peer Review is unnecessary, please state reason here and request Business Systems Manager's approval.</b>  |  |  | Only applicable to minor amendments or editorial changes where main content remains unchanged |
| <b>Step 6.</b> Author prepares a note for the global launch identifying: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For <b>new</b> documents - a summary of the new document, or</li> <li>• For a <b>revised</b> document - a summary of the key changes.</li> </ul> |  |  | Applicable to <b>ALL</b> documents  |

**Part 3.** To be completed Authorised Signatory:

| <b>Responsibilities</b>   | <b>Task Completed (Sign &amp; date)</b> | <b>Notes or further actions</b>  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Step 7 **</b> Check of the integrity and robustness of the document by process owner – authorised signatory. |   | (CI to sign BMM, Business System Manager to sign DBPs, head of CALM and ICG to sign AST and INS procedures respectively, except where delegated to NTLs. |

**Part 4.** To be completed by Business System Manager:

| <b>Responsibilities</b>  | <b>Task Completed (Sign off &amp; date)</b> | <b>Comments</b> |
|--|---|-----------------|
| <b>Step 8.</b> The attached BMS document has been produced in accordance with the Directorate Business Procedures. |   |                 |

**Part 5.** To be completed by the Business System Administrator, (BSA).

| <b>BSA Responsibilities</b>   | <b>Task Completed (Sign off &amp; date)</b> | <b>Comments</b>   |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Step 9.</b> Check the document is in the appropriate BMS style / format & prepare document for transfer to HSE Intranet. |   | Apply style, embed tables, and remove tabs & frames. Mark up hyperlinks |
| <b>Step 10.</b> Arrange external Independent review of the document, if required.   |   | To consider consistency & links with ISO 9000 & liP                     |



**ND BMS DBP 001**

**Summary Flow Chart for Initiation, Drafting, Approval, Issue, Review and Withdrawal of BMS Documents**

**Responsibilities**

KBA Process Owner (or NTL)

KBA Process Owner (or NTL)

Author

BSA

Author

Peer reviewer within 3 weeks

Author

KBA process owner (or NTL) and peer reviewer

Author

BSA

NSD Staff

BSA on direction of KBA process owner (or NTL).

