

THE NATIONAL BOARD OF BOILER AND PRESSURE VESSEL INSPECTORS
REVIEWERS/SURVEYORS/AUDITORS EVALUATION

Initial Qualification

Maintenance

Date(s) of Review: _____

Name of Team Leader being evaluated: _____

Name and Location of Company:

List the ASME Designator(s)/NB Certificate being reviewed:

S – Satisfactory (meets requirements of conduct document), N – Needs Improvement, N/A – Not Applicable

S N N/A **Preparation**

1. Did the Team Leader;
 - a. Obtain the pertinent information from National Board Staff and Applicant prior to the review?
 - b. Arrive at the scheduled meeting place on time or notify Team Members of delay when appropriate?
 - c. Present a professional appearance?
2. Was the Team Leader Prepared with appropriate reference material?

Notes:

Manual Review

1. Did the Team Leader remind those present of the rules of confidentiality attached to the deliberations?
2. Was the review of the Manual sufficient to determine that all the controls and requirements specified by the applicable Code and/or Standard are adequately described for the scope of work being requested?
3. Was the manual sufficient to determine if the Program description is auditable?
4. Did the recommendations avoid imposing personal stylistic preferences on the Manual as corrections?
5. Were the recommended changes substantiated by a requirement of the applicable Code?

Notes:

Entrance Meeting

1. Was executive/senior management encouraged to participate?
2. Were proper introductions of the Review Team and Applicants Staff made?
3. Was the receipt of the Due Process and Confidentially Policies Verified and the Polices explained?
4. Was the manner in which the review would be conducted covered?
5. Was the scope of the accreditation verified and agreed upon?
6. Were the facilities safety rules discussed?
7. Was an adequate tour of the applicants' facilities requested and provided?
8. Did the team leader explain how recommendations and code deficiencies would be handled?
9. Were there any significant changes, as a result of the Team review of ASME/Applicant's submitted documents needing Senior management's response discussed by the Team Leader?

Notes:

THE NATIONAL BOARD OF BOILER AND PRESSURE VESSEL INSPECTORS
REVIEWERS/SURVEYORS/AUDITORS EVALUATION

S – Satisfactory (meets requirements of conduct document), N – Needs Improvement, N/A – Not Applicable

S N N/A Implementation

1. Did Team Leader reveal the Teams assignments and ensure the Applicant had personnel to support the team?
2. Were the corrective actions from the previous review verified?
3. Were significant manual comments discussed with management?
4. Were recommended changes to the manual discussed and agreed upon with the applicant?
5. Were manual revisions made during the review verified to assure adequate Code requirements have been incorporated?
6. Was the program, including documents shown as exhibits or samples, were in fact being implemented?
7. Were past records reviewed?
8. Were in process inspections conducted by the team?
9. Were all applicable QA manual sections verified?

Notes:

Team Findings and Recommendations

1. Was a private meeting held to identify findings and develop the Teams recommendations?
2. Were only authorized persons in attendance?
3. Did the Team Leader remind all present of the confidentiality attached to the deliberations?
4. Did the Team Leader coordinate the findings of the Team Members?
5. Did the Team Leader ensure the findings reflected the consensus of the Team?
6. Were dissenting Members provided the opportunity to prepare a Minority Report?
7. Was the official Team Report reviewed with the Team and the required signatures obtained?

Notes:

Exit Meeting

1. Was an Exit Meeting held with the Applicant?
2. Was executive/senior management encouraged to participate?
3. Was the Applicant reminded of the Due Process and Confidentiality policies and explain:
 - a. That they may submit a written statement.
 - b. That the Teams recommendation is not final.
 - c. That ASME and the National Board would notify them of the results.
 - d. The process for obtaining extensions of the certificate expiration date.
 - e. The procedure for an AIA 30 day follow up.
4. Was an oral report presented to the Applicant including the Teams recommendation and a summary of findings observed during the survey or review?
5. Were the relevant procedures for resolving deficiencies and reporting corrective actions explained?
6. Was the Applicant provided the opportunity to ask questions?
7. Was a written report provided to the Applicant?

Notes:

THE NATIONAL BOARD OF BOILER AND PRESSURE VESSEL INSPECTORS
REVIEWERS/SURVEYORS/AUDITORS EVALUATION

S – Satisfactory (meets requirements of conduct document), N – Needs Improvement, N/A – Not Applicable

S N N/A Rules of Decorum

1. Did the Team Leader speak for the Team in all official contacts with the Applicants management?
2. Was the Team Leaders performance of his/her duties and conduct professional?
 - a. Adequate leadership in the conduct of the review
 - b. Appearance
 - c. Attitude
 - d. Respect of others
 - e. Tact
 - f. Sound Judgement
 - g. Effective communication skills (oral and written)
 - h. Control conflicts with the audit team and Applicant
 - i. Makes decisions objectively
 - j. Void of misconduct, extreme or inappropriate behavior
 - k. Has adequate Code knowledge

Notes:

Report

1. Did the Team Leader prepare a report of the review/survey using forms prescribed by ASME/National Board Staff?
2. Were the reporting conditions and findings accurately, clearly, and completely written with appropriate supporting Code references?
3. Did the report include all information necessary for the CBPVCA/National Board to make an informed decision regarding the issuance of the Certificates?

Notes:

General Comments

Evaluation Performed by:

Evaluators Signature

Date

Printed Name

By signing below the Team Leader acknowledges that the results of this evaluation were discussed with them, and they understand the content of this evaluation.

Team Leader's Signature

Date

Printed Name

Team Leader's Comments: