

# **Official Transcript of Proceedings**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**Title:** Commission Meeting: Briefing on Status of  
OCIO Programs, Performance, and Plans

**Docket Number:** (not applicable)

**Location:** Rockville, Maryland

**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2001

**Work Order No.:** NONE

**Pages 1-89**

**NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.  
Court Reporters and Transcribers  
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005**

(202) 234-4433

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2 + + + + +

3 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

4 + + + + +

5 COMMISSION MEETING

6 + + + + +

7 BRIEFING ON STATUS OF OCIO PROGRAMS,

8 PERFORMANCE, AND PLANS

9 + + + + +

10 WEDNESDAY,

11 JANUARY 31, 2001

12 + + + + +

13  
14 The Commission met in the Commissioners  
15 Conference Room, 1F16, in One White Flint North,  
16 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, at 9:30  
17 a.m., Richard A. Meserve, Chairman, presiding.

18 PRESENT:

19	RICHARD A. MESERVE	Chairman
20	NILS J. DIAZ	Commissioner
21	GRETA J. DICUS	Commissioner
22	EDWARD McGAFFIGAN, JR.	Commissioner
23	JEFFREY S. MERRIFIELD	Commissioner

24  
25  
**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(9:27 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: The Commission meets today to hear from the Office of the Chief Information Officer on the status of NRC's information technology and information management activities and programs.

This is an annual briefing intended to keep the Commission apprised of new developments, future plans, and anticipated challenges in providing information technology services to the agency and our external stakeholders.

As the use of information technology in government has grown exponentially in the last decade, so, too, have the challenges that need to be addressed and resolved. Critical assessments of information technology programs have increasingly focused on cost effectiveness, applicability of individual applications to the end user, and the relationship of IT programs and activities to the accomplishment of organizational mission.

Questions in these areas recently were addressed by Congress, General Accounting Office, and by the Commission itself, often in response to feedback provided by agency employees and the general public. To address such questions, the NRC, and in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 particular the staff of the Office of the Chief  
2 Information Officer, have worked hard since our last  
3 meeting to address concerns and improve agency  
4 programs.

5 This meeting is intended as a means for  
6 the Commission to exercise its oversight  
7 responsibility for information technology. It  
8 reflects the fundamental importance of IT to the  
9 achievement of our mission.

10 The Commission looks forward to the  
11 meeting this morning.

12 I will turn the meeting now over to Dr.  
13 William Travers, and to Mr. Stuart Reiter, the NRC's  
14 Acting Chief Information Officer.

15 DR. TRAVERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and  
16 good morning to you and the Commission. As you've  
17 indicated, we are here today, and we're pleased to be  
18 here to give you a briefing on the status of the  
19 programs of the Office of the Chief Information  
20 Officer.

21 I would like to point out briefly that, in  
22 accordance with Commission direction, the Office of  
23 the CIO is now a member of the EDO management team,  
24 and I'm certainly happy to welcome both Stu and his  
25 staff to our team.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           In the last few weeks, we presented the  
2           annual briefings for the reactor, the materials, in  
3           the waste arena, and we're happy to continue today  
4           with the CIO programs. Those programs provide cross-  
5           cutting support to each of the arenas that we've  
6           already talked about, and they particularly support  
7           our strategic goals that deal with effectiveness,  
8           efficiency, and public confidence.

9           So as we have done, we're here to  
10          highlight for you the achievements of the CIO in the  
11          past fiscal year, the ongoing and planned staff  
12          initiatives, and the key agency challenges that we  
13          face in the upcoming fiscal year and during this  
14          fiscal year as well.

15          With me at the table, as you've indicated,  
16          Chairman, is Stu Reiter, our Acting CIO; Moe Levin,  
17          who is the Director of the Applications Development  
18          Division; Francine Goldberg, who is the Acting  
19          Director of the Information Management Division; Lynn  
20          Scattolini, who is detailed temporarily to focus on  
21          the ADAMS Program; Jesse Cloud -- I'm sorry -- Jim  
22          Schaeffer, who is our Information Technology  
23          Infrastructure Division Director; and Jesse Cloud, who  
24          is the Planning and Architecture Branch Chief.

25          And with that, I'll turn it over to Stu.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. REITER: Thank you, Bill.

2 And good morning, Chairman, and  
3 Commissioners.

4 On behalf of the OCIO, let me say that we  
5 look forward to working even more closely with the  
6 offices of the EDO under the new organizational  
7 alignment.

8 With your permission, and for the sake of  
9 time, I would like to go through the presentation  
10 material that we have prepared, and then we'll be  
11 happy to answer any of your questions.

12 Next slide, please.

13 In February of last year, the Commission  
14 issued a staff requirements memorandum providing  
15 guidance to our office. Additional guidance was  
16 provided as part of the Commission's response to the  
17 2002 budget request in August of last year. Several  
18 of the topics covered by the SRMs are shown on this  
19 slide.

20 I am out of sync. Excuse me. The agenda  
21 slide, please. Yes, thank you. Sorry.

22 This slide is the agenda for the  
23 presentation.

24 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: The technology will  
25 foul you up every time.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (Laughter.)

2 MR. REITER: Yes, right. Particularly if  
3 the pages get out of order.

4 And what we want to cover with you today  
5 is feedback on the Commission guidance that we  
6 received during the course of the year, and then using  
7 the framework presented in our annual report, which we  
8 just recently issued, discuss our applications and  
9 information management programs, infrastructure and  
10 planning, security and compliance programs.

11 In so doing, we will highlight areas where  
12 we believe significant efficiency and/or effectiveness  
13 gains have been achieved. And then finally we'll  
14 touch on what we view as some significant challenge  
15 areas for us.

16 Now I'll take the next slide.

17 In February of last year, the Commission  
18 issued a staff requirements memorandum providing  
19 guidance for the office, and then additional guidance  
20 was provided on -- from the Commission in response to  
21 our 2002 budget request. And that was in August of  
22 this last year.

23 Several of the topics covered by the SRMs  
24 shown on the slide include providing periodic updates  
25 to the Commission on significant activities, improving

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 communications and coordination with stakeholders,  
2 defining, assessing, and closing the gap on staff IT  
3 skills. I will touch on these three items now and  
4 discuss follow-on actions to other Commission guidance  
5 that we received as part of our programs discussion.

6 We have focused on improving  
7 communications in several ways with the Commission by  
8 providing you with quarterly updates on significant  
9 program milestones and issues through periodic  
10 meetings that I have had with you individually and  
11 through topical updates with yourselves or your staffs  
12 on specific topics, such as web redesign, or, more  
13 recently, wireless computing.

14 And I would also include here your  
15 participation in our all-hands meetings as a way of  
16 improving communications with the Commission.

17 With internal stakeholders, we have  
18 improved communications by further formalizing the  
19 procedures we follow in making changes to the  
20 infrastructure. We have introduced procedures that  
21 result in all changes to our infrastructure being  
22 merged into monthly action items -- what we are  
23 calling consolidation points.

24 Scheduling is coordinated with affected  
25 offices and regions to minimize the impact of system

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 upgrades and avoid surprises. We continue to work  
2 closely with the Information Technology Business  
3 Council, and we are pleased this year to have the  
4 EDO's office identify a member to the Council.

5 We have also published our second annual  
6 report to further communicate -- for further  
7 communications between our offices and other NRC  
8 offices. The annual report primarily discusses our  
9 internal program activities but also provides a  
10 discussion of significant office-sponsored  
11 initiatives.

12 We look for opportunities to engage with  
13 our external stakeholders. This past year we provided  
14 presentations on electronic information exchange in  
15 ADAMS at the Regulatory Information Conference and at  
16 NURMR's annual conference, and we also participated in  
17 a panel discussion on electronic information exchange,  
18 more commonly termed EIE, at NEI's licensing workshop.

19 We believe in each of these cases our  
20 stakeholders went away with a better understanding of  
21 our plans and we with a better understanding of  
22 stakeholder concerns and issues.

23 We also make selective use of surveys and  
24 have done so recently to determine how the closing of  
25 the LPDRs, the local public document rooms, have been

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 affected -- have affected stakeholders and plan to  
2 survey customer satisfactions with our FOIA program in  
3 the near future. And we have engaged stakeholders in  
4 the web redesign initiative through useability tests,  
5 interviews, and focus groups.

6 As I will discuss shortly, ADAMS has been  
7 a challenging implementation for us. The public  
8 document room is the primary contact for ADAMS with  
9 the public, but our technical staff and management  
10 have been in contact with stakeholders to better  
11 understand issues and to offer one-on-one assistance  
12 when appropriate.

13 Working with the Office of Human  
14 Resources, we conducted an agency-wide IT basic skills  
15 assessment. We identified IT basic skills to focus  
16 groups with NRC office representatives and conducted  
17 an agency-wide survey to determine the level of basic  
18 IT skill in the agency. In June, the assessment was  
19 completed, and we provided the findings to the Human  
20 Resources for followup.

21 The services provided by OCIO are  
22 significant ablers for achieving agency performance  
23 goals. We use our performance plan goals and measures  
24 to demonstrate our progress. Last year, the goals we  
25 had for our infrastructure were met with 99.5 percent

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 availability of our key infrastructure services.

2 Our application development goals were met  
3 with our smooth transition into year 2000 of mission  
4 critical application systems. This year, the ADAMS  
5 assessment action plan, with its milestones, replaced  
6 our earlier information management goals.

7 Next slide, please.

8 I will now discuss programs associated  
9 with our Applications and Information Management  
10 Divisions. But first, I want to recognize the work  
11 done by our staff in the Information Management  
12 Division in supporting day-to-day agency needs with  
13 regard to printing, web publishing, editing, and  
14 records management, and also acknowledge the fine job  
15 done by the staff of the public document room in  
16 smoothly and efficiently carrying out the relocation  
17 of the PDR from downtown to White Flint -- a move that  
18 will save the agenda several hundred thousand dollars  
19 annually in outside expense.

20 The Year 2K remediation program was  
21 completed in early February 1999, but the real  
22 effectiveness of the efforts were not known until we  
23 actually entered the new year, which we did quietly.  
24 This validated the A we earned on our reportcard, and  
25 a second place ranking in the Y2K program for all

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 federal agencies. We did not encounter any Y2K issues  
2 during the course of the year.

3 ADAMS is a major program begun three years  
4 ago to provide the agency with a modern document  
5 management system. In November '99, ADAMS replaced  
6 NUDOCS as the mechanism to process and distribute  
7 documents and the PDR's bibliographical retrieval  
8 system as the mechanism to announce the release of new  
9 agency records to the public.

10 ADAMS provided improvement to those  
11 systems by processing documents in days rather than  
12 weeks, and in making the image rather than just a  
13 description of documents available to users to view  
14 and download locally at no charge.

15 NRC currently adds about 2,000 new  
16 documents to ADAMS per week. The system averages  
17 about 285 current internal users and about 270 public  
18 sessions per day. Support is provided staff users  
19 through the ADAMS Support Center, which fulfilled  
20 about 5,500 requests for assistance from the NRC staff  
21 from February through November 2000. Support is also  
22 provided to the public through the public document  
23 room and other OCIO staff.

24 ADAMS has been an ambitious and difficult  
25 program to implement for both OCIO and the user

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 community. It is more than just delivering software.  
2 It is the use of that software in NRC's business  
3 environment by NRC users which has involved  
4 adjustments to the way in which we do business.  
5 Neither OCIO nor the offices fully understood or  
6 adequately addressed the change -- the change  
7 management issues related to making the transition to  
8 the new target environment.

9 As a result, the agency is still on a  
10 learning curve, making adjustments to the program as  
11 OCIO works to improve the stability and availability  
12 of the ADAMS production environment.

13 The ADAMS steering group, composed of the  
14 assistant to the EDO, deputy office directors of  
15 program offices and OGC, and the secretary of the  
16 Commission, have been instrumental in setting the  
17 direction of the program and focusing on issues  
18 relating to standardization of work processes, roles  
19 and responsibilities, communications, and change  
20 management issues.

21 It is clear that improvements that come  
22 through execution of activities in the ADAMS action  
23 plan must be a collegial effort between OCIO and ADAMS  
24 customers with buy-in from agency management.

25 We are making progress in implementing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 elements of the ADAMS action plan related to reducing  
2 the burden on NRC staff of entering their documents  
3 into the system and improving the integrity of the  
4 database. While we are making progress, we are  
5 proceeding cautiously.

6 We also have initiatives underway to  
7 improve ADAMS functionality, performance, and  
8 reliability. The most immediate improvements are  
9 included in the next release of ADAMS with deployments  
10 scheduled for the March/April timeframe of this year.  
11 The release includes software enhancements requested  
12 by both staff and the public.

13 We are also evaluating the feasibility of  
14 prototyping a web-based interface for the public which  
15 operates similarly to search engines found on the web.  
16 We will determine whether we can use this approach in  
17 the next several months, and, if so, invite public  
18 participation in this prototyping effort.

19 Further improvements in system  
20 availability, stability, and performance will be  
21 delivered in fiscal year 2000 when we complete  
22 migration to the current release of our COTS product,  
23 which will also position to further integrate ADAMS  
24 with the NRC web environment.

25 We are also contracting --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: You said fiscal year  
2 2000?

3 MR. REITER: And two.

4 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Two. Okay.

5 MR. REITER: I'm sorry.

6 We are also contracting for an independent  
7 assessment of NRC's longer term document processing  
8 needs to determine if we are on an appropriate path to  
9 establish an electronic document management  
10 environment for those needs. We expect this study to  
11 be complete in late March, and we will use its  
12 findings to inform future investments in ADAMS. And  
13 at the same time we are in the process of completing  
14 an ADAMS lessons learned analysis.

15 Let me now turn to our initiatives with  
16 electronic information exchange or EIE. The  
17 capability for an electronic information exchange was  
18 implemented last year to allow our licensees to  
19 securely send regulatory information to the NRC  
20 electronically in a legally defensible manner, and we  
21 completed a digital signature pilot program with the  
22 Fermi, Calvert Cliffs, and Grand Gulf nuclear  
23 powerplants.

24 In coordination with the Offices of  
25 Nuclear Reactor Regulations and the General Counsel,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 NRC recently issued a regulatory issue summary that  
2 grants a blanket exception to allow for the electronic  
3 submittal of Part 50 documents via the web using the  
4 EIE system.

5 We are working closely with OGC on a  
6 rulemaking to allow all material licensees to submit  
7 documents via EIE as well. We plan to submit the rule  
8 for Commission consideration in the third quarter of  
9 this fiscal year.

10 We are also working with ASLBP to design  
11 a pilot program to more fully define the requirements  
12 for receiving documents electronically in support of  
13 adjudicatory matters.

14 In a November 1999 staff requirements  
15 memorandum, the Commission directed the staff to  
16 improve our external web site and to identify and  
17 implement web site objectives that support the  
18 agency's strategic plan to solicit the views of  
19 stakeholders and to make the site easier to navigate.  
20 Last year, we undertook a number of initiatives to  
21 respond to this guidance and improve the external web  
22 site.

23 We contracted with web useability experts  
24 who involved agency stakeholders and focus groups to  
25 assess how well NRC's current web site followed best

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 practices, considered human factors, and was  
2 accessible to individuals with disabilities. The  
3 staff also compared our web site with other highly-  
4 rated government sites.

5 A prototype for the resigned site has been  
6 developed. This year, we are planning to give  
7 stakeholders an opportunity to provide additional  
8 input on the prototype, and we will fully populate the  
9 prototype with information from the public site when  
10 we employ the redesign site later this year. When the  
11 prototype reaches maturity, we will brief the  
12 Commission on it and seek your input prior to its  
13 deployment.

14 In another area where we disseminate  
15 information to the public, we continue to meet our  
16 FOIA processing goals, and we recently learned that  
17 GAO, in a preliminary report to Congress, found that  
18 NRC is one of only a handful of agencies that  
19 satisfied all of GAO's 14 review criteria for  
20 completeness of FOIA information on their public web  
21 sites.

22 In addition, to ensure that we continue to  
23 maintain a strong FOIA program, we are preparing a  
24 questionnaire that will be sent to a sample of FOIA  
25 requesters to measure their satisfaction with our FOIA

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 process.

2 On a related note, you are aware that NRC  
3 must receive a clearance from OMB before requesting  
4 stakeholder feedback on its programs. We have been  
5 successful in obtaining OMB approval for an expedited  
6 review process that will reduce the clearance period  
7 from four and a half months to 30 days for clearances  
8 for customer satisfaction surveys, and we have used  
9 this new process successfully on three occasions to  
10 date.

11 Next slide, please.

12 This slide identifies programs associated  
13 with our infrastructure initiatives. In June, we  
14 contracted with the consulting firm KPMG to perform an  
15 IT infrastructure health assessment to compare the  
16 costs and performance of NRC's infrastructure with  
17 industry benchmarks and best practices.

18 The KPMG assessment found that overall  
19 NRC's infrastructure spending is comparable to peers,  
20 but cited areas which can be improved. KPMG also  
21 noted that even though NRC users expect a higher level  
22 of service than peer groups, overall customer  
23 satisfaction with IT services being provided is very  
24 high and the staff continues to improve the customer  
25 service function.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           The assessment identified several  
2 opportunities for service and cost improvements which  
3 included help desk consolidation and moving to a  
4 scheduled desktop refresh cycle. KPMG also identified  
5 other best practices, world-class organizations, and  
6 compared how NRC performed against those practices.

7           One of these practices is the use of  
8 three- to five-year forward business systems plans to  
9 guide investment decisions and information technology.  
10 And I will return to this topic a bit later in our  
11 discussion.

12           NRC's production system, such as the  
13 reactor program system, electronic mail, external web,  
14 and ADAMS, are linked to the performance goals of both  
15 NRC offices and the agency. These production systems  
16 play a vital role in reaching NRC's strategic goals.  
17 Demand on the infrastructure has increased  
18 significantly over the last six years as the agency  
19 has expanded the use of information technology systems  
20 and capabilities in its business processes.

21           The agency has enhanced office automation  
22 capabilities, improved access to the network, and  
23 increased support for agency-wide business  
24 applications. More than \$16 million has been invested  
25 over the last six years to upgrade and improve the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 agency's desktop systems, service, and networks.

2 Last year, we developed a centralized  
3 customer service function by consolidating several  
4 help functions to provide a single point of entry for  
5 all requests for assistance. Great emphasis was  
6 placed on timely and efficient response to customers.  
7 Metrics were introduced across all operations to more  
8 effectively manage and track systems and support  
9 performance.

10 In a customer satisfaction survey  
11 completed last year, we achieved a 90 percent customer  
12 satisfaction rating.

13 We are continuing to leverage industry  
14 best practices to improve our service and operational  
15 effectiveness. Some planned near-term actions are  
16 moving to performance-based contracting for services,  
17 moving to a regularly-scheduled equipment and software  
18 refresh cycle, and the improved use of warranties for  
19 obtaining maintenance services.

20 And to further increase availability of  
21 systems and ensure continued operation of existing  
22 systems and applications, we are consolidating and  
23 expanding our applications test facilities.

24 FTS2001 deals with our migration to  
25 agency-wide voice and data services from the current

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 supplier, AT&T, to MCI Worldcom. Voice services  
2 include long distance, domestic, and international  
3 services. Data services include our network  
4 connection to the regions and connections between the  
5 regions and resident sites, including the direct  
6 access lines to plants used by the Incident Response  
7 Center.

8 Last year, we completed our voice -- we  
9 completed migration of our voice lines. The GSA/MCI  
10 schedule called for completion of our data services as  
11 well, but that did not happen. We are continuing to  
12 work on this transaction -- on this transition and are  
13 starting to see some progress on the data side.

14 We also worked with IRO to ensure that  
15 there was no interruption in service for the lines  
16 needed by the Emergency Response Center. We will  
17 continue to work with GSA/MCI and expect migration of  
18 data services to be completed early this year. In the  
19 interim, bridging contracts are in place that will  
20 ensure the continuity of our data services for staff.  
21 When complete, the transition to FTS2001 will reduce  
22 our annual communications expense by about a million  
23 dollars.

24 Last year, we completed a study to  
25 determine if there is a business need to migrate from

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the current Corel Office Automation Suite, which  
2 includes WordPerfect, to another office automation  
3 suite, such as Microsoft Office. The study was in  
4 response to the increased market share of Microsoft  
5 and our need to exchange documents with stakeholders  
6 who often use the Microsoft Office products.

7 From the study, we determined that a  
8 migration would be very costly and disruptive and  
9 inadequate benefits -- with inadequate benefits to  
10 offset an estimated cost in excess of \$5 million.

11 We will continue to monitor agency  
12 requirements and industry shifts in this area.

13 Next slide, please.

14 I will now discuss the programs associated  
15 with our planning, security, and compliance  
16 activities. Public confidence is increased by making  
17 NRC information publicly available on the internet and  
18 increasing public access. The NRC has been exploring  
19 cost effective ways to use the internet to increase  
20 access from remote locations.

21 Last year, we started a pilot program to  
22 broadcast Commission hearings, such as we are doing  
23 today, on the internet and archive them for one year  
24 for public access. This year Admin and SECY, with our  
25 support, will evaluate the costs and benefits of this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 program, so that the Commission may decide whether it  
2 merits continuation.

3 We are moving to a web-based computing  
4 paradigm. Industry is moving in that direction, and  
5 the public and staff have clearly stated their  
6 preference for receiving NRC information through a web  
7 browser interface.

8 Last year, a web architecture study was  
9 initiated, which is being completed now. The need for  
10 the architecture is to provide the agency a road map  
11 to guide future investments as we migrate to a web-  
12 based computing model. The architecture will help us  
13 to ensure use of proven technology, protect  
14 investments in existing technologies, identify  
15 security issues, and minimize staff resource impact.

16 The architecture effort has used an  
17 outside consultant and is being guided by -- and is  
18 being guided -- excuse me -- and is being guided  
19 internally through a senior-level staff steering  
20 group. In addition to the above, the architecture  
21 effort will provide guidance on standards and tools to  
22 use, deploying ADAMS via the web, deploying Starfire  
23 via the web, and identifying support issues. After  
24 the architecture design is completed, follow-on  
25 programs will be proposed.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Cyber attacks and computer hacking are  
2 increasing risks to the NRC. Over the past calendar  
3 year, several major incidents of cyber attacks, such  
4 as denial of service attacks, occurred. Several  
5 agencies reported penetration, and on one occasion the  
6 EPA web site was temporarily shut down.

7           Last year, the NRC took specific actions  
8 to maintain a high level of security for agency  
9 computer systems. An independent security study was  
10 completed of the NRC wide area network. The study  
11 included a test and evaluation of current NRC security  
12 controls and detection mechanisms, which showed that  
13 current protection adequately protects the NRC network  
14 from outside intrusions.

15           This year, staff training will continue.  
16 We will continue our participation in government-wide  
17 computer security protection initiatives, maintain an  
18 ongoing vigilance and monitoring initiatives of NRC  
19 computers and networks, and assess any additional  
20 needs stemming from the web architecture study.

21           The next two programs deal with some  
22 significant recontracting efforts that we are  
23 currently going through. The infrastructure services  
24 and support contract deals with contracting for  
25 infrastructure services. The current operations,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 maintenance, and support of the NRC's IT  
2 infrastructure is outsourced through several  
3 contracts.

4 The largest of these contracts, Next  
5 Generation Network, covers about 75 percent of these  
6 services and expires in April 2001. We are developing  
7 the ISSC, which translates to infrastructure,  
8 services, and support contract, to replace these  
9 contracts.

10 Requirements for the ISSC were developed  
11 through interviews with senior management,  
12 headquarters staff, and regional staff, and reflect  
13 recommendations from the KPMG study. The new ISSC  
14 contracting approach moves the agency to a seat  
15 management approach in which the agency pays the  
16 contractor to meet predefined service levels for a  
17 fixed price, rather than work on a best effort, cost  
18 plus basis. Transition to the ISSC will start in the  
19 second quarter of this fiscal year.

20 The NRC has been fulfilling its  
21 requirements for contractor-supported software  
22 services and document processing services through its  
23 CISSCO contract awarded in 1996. The current CISSCO  
24 contract expires in August of 2001. CISSCO II will  
25 replace the CISSCO contract and provide contracting

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 services for software development, maintenance, and  
2 operations, document processing operations, process  
3 improvement initiatives often associated with the  
4 Government Performance and Results Act, and IT  
5 security services.

6 Under CISSCO II, individual orders for  
7 services will be competed among a group of preselected  
8 contractors. The order will then be placed with the  
9 contract offering the best value to the NRC. This new  
10 contracting approach addresses concerns raised earlier  
11 by IG and GAO studies. Transition to CISSCO II will  
12 start in the second quarter of this fiscal year also.

13 As a federal Commission, NRC must comply  
14 with all applicable federal laws and directives. We  
15 are committed to leading the agency into compliance  
16 with information technology and information management  
17 regulations and directives.

18 Last year, we responded to legislative  
19 requirements associated with the Klinger-Cohen Act,  
20 Government Paperwork Elimination Act, and Section 508  
21 of the Rehabilitation Act, and participated with  
22 program offices in complying with Presidential  
23 Decision Directive 63, which deals with critical  
24 infrastructure, and Presidential Decision Directive  
25 67, which deals with continuity of operations.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Next slide, please.

2 There are several challenges that we will  
3 be facing this coming year. At this time, I would  
4 like to touch on four of these. Where in the past  
5 most of our core systems were run from off-site  
6 locations such as NIH, today we are providing the  
7 support for many of these core systems in-house. As  
8 more and more of our agency-wide systems move onto in-  
9 house platforms, we will continue to be challenged to  
10 provide the availability and reliability of production  
11 operations that staff will require.

12 As we outsource for support services and  
13 use commercially-available software products, we need  
14 to continue to focus on building relationships with  
15 key product and service providers to ensure that our  
16 senior management are aware of NRC priorities and are  
17 engaged in bringing needed resources to resolve any  
18 performance-related issues that we may encounter.

19 In partnership with program and support  
20 offices, we will continue to focus on our oversight  
21 role, and in the near term to obtain good terms and  
22 conditions for the key agency contracts that are up  
23 for recompetete and on minimizing the transition issues.

24 ADAMS is a large and intricate system  
25 serving the needs of a diverse group of stakeholders

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and satisfying a range of regulatory and operational  
2 requirements. The ADAMS action plan identifies 10  
3 challenge areas with associated activities and  
4 timelines to bring about improvements to the ADAMS  
5 program.

6 The action plan focuses on reducing the  
7 burden of NRC staff in implementing an electronic  
8 management system and accelerating the benefits of  
9 having electronic records available in a centralized  
10 repository for staff and the public use.

11 Although work has not been executed at the  
12 pace initially identified in the action plan, progress  
13 is being made in several substantive challenge areas,  
14 in accordance with the ADAMS steering group direction.  
15 For example, we have recently completed a two-month  
16 pilot of a new agency approach to submit NRC-generated  
17 documents to OCIO for further processing into ADAMS,  
18 and will shortly be implementing this approach at  
19 headquarters.

20 OCIO is strongly committed to working with  
21 the agency to complete all elements of the ADAMS  
22 action plan.

23 I mentioned earlier that KPMG, in their  
24 infrastructure health assessment, encouraged the  
25 creation of use of business systems plans to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 rationalize and guide investments and information  
2 technology. Business systems plans tie information  
3 technology needs to organizational business plans and  
4 can provide valuable guidance for both tactical and  
5 strategic investment decisions regarding information  
6 technology.

7 Business systems planning ties nicely to  
8 our PBPM initiative by asking the question of, how can  
9 information technology be used to support our office's  
10 business goals? Developing a business system's plan  
11 will typically require executive sponsorship be  
12 carried out by affected offices and supported by the  
13 OCIO.

14 We have and will continue to encourage  
15 offices to assess their need for a business systems  
16 plan. Currently, some of our offices have such plans  
17 in place. Others are in a startup mode, and others  
18 may need to refresh previous work or consider the need  
19 for such plans.

20 This concludes our prepared remarks, and  
21 I will now turn it back to Bill.

22 DR. TRAVERS: Thanks, Stu.

23 Mr. Chairman, that completes the staff's  
24 presentation this morning.

25 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Good. I'd like to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 thank you. That was certainly a lightning tour  
2 through a diverse range of activities. Appreciate  
3 that.

4 I'm sure that all of us have many  
5 questions. Let me turn first to Commissioner  
6 McGaffigan.

7 COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: Let me talk to  
8 you a bit about ADAMS, and one of the questions I  
9 have -- I've talked to you privately about this --  
10 but, clearly, ADAMS has cost us more and delivered  
11 less than we originally expected in the CPIC analyses.  
12 And yet when we have to report things to OMB, you  
13 know, information technology system is in trouble or  
14 something, it manages never to hit a threshold.

15 I think it's a matter of maybe the OMB  
16 reporting requirement not being right, because it  
17 strikes me that ADAMS should have hit a threshold,  
18 given how -- you know, how much the offices -- I mean,  
19 there are costs that -- cost savings that were  
20 projected in the CPIC analysis that just weren't --  
21 weren't realized.

22 In fact, there were tremendous costs on  
23 the staff as they tried to -- tried to implement ADAMS  
24 -- costs for external stakeholders, frustration of  
25 external stakeholders, if you put all of the, you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 know, hours that they put in to try to figure out how  
2 to -- how to access ADAMS, and that isn't captured.

3 So how does -- I mean, I know we're trying  
4 to fix ADAMS, and we're hoping to someday have a web-  
5 based ADAMS, and all that, but how -- how can a system  
6 as troubled as ADAMS was not breach these OMB  
7 thresholds? And have we done anything to -- to advise  
8 OMB how to better -- better draft their threshold, so  
9 that they capture troubled systems like ADAMS in other  
10 agencies?

11 MR. REITER: Well, the response to the OMB  
12 requirement, the 300(b) requirement, that we complied  
13 with lays out how OMB requests the agency to provide  
14 information, and what characteristics of an  
15 application -- the cost, for example -- to provide.  
16 And our submission to OMB followed those guidelines,  
17 and it did not take into account some of the cost  
18 considerations that you've mentioned.

19 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: And OMB doesn't.  
20 I'm just suggesting at some point we've -- we probably  
21 should tell OMB that you need to look at this sort of  
22 thing because it -- because there are hidden costs in  
23 some of these information technology -- when the CIO  
24 Council gets together and you talk about, you know,  
25 whether programs are succeeding or failing, I'm not

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sure the OMB guidelines are the right guidelines to  
2 use is all I'm saying.

3 MR. REITER: Yes. There are -- in the  
4 private sector there are different capabilities and  
5 different procedures that I'm familiar with. And  
6 there are capabilities, for example, to more exactly  
7 track individual costs, resources, human resources,  
8 that are associated with development or user training  
9 of systems.

10 And we don't have that kind of accounting  
11 or reporting capability. So in terms of the 300(b),  
12 I'm not aware that there have been any discussions at  
13 that CIO Council, but this is certainly something that  
14 can be brought up.

15 You touch on the other question of the  
16 savings for ADAMS, and your observations are correct  
17 that the ADAMS CPIC did identify significant savings  
18 that would be achieved through work avoidance on the  
19 staff. And what we've seen today is extra effort on  
20 the staff in order to deal with it, and the savings  
21 not being available at this time. And this is one of  
22 the reasons, of course, why we did the ADAMS  
23 assessment and the resulting action plan, to work with  
24 offices to identify the steps that are needed.

25 COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: The other --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that's good enough for that. In looking at the CPIC  
2 analysis, I mean, you're doing this lessons learned  
3 study on ADAMS. When does the CPIC analysis have to  
4 be redone? What is the threshold? I mean, not just  
5 for this, but there are various other systems that  
6 we've put in place that are less famous than ADAMS, or  
7 infamous, that, again, didn't turn out anywhere near  
8 what the CPIC analysis suggested, at least to a lay  
9 person.

10 And what is the -- when you're in the  
11 midst of something, what is the trigger for saying,  
12 "Gosh, this just isn't -- doesn't look like it's  
13 turning out right. We sold it -- we sold our  
14 customers X, and we're going to deliver Y," and Y is  
15 a small shadow of X, and it's time to redo CPIC?

16 MR. REITER: The procedures -- the CPIC  
17 analysis at project initiation -- the CPIC represents  
18 the business case, and the decision was made to go  
19 forward with the project, be it ADAMS or Starfire or  
20 any other project that follows.

21 The management directive then -- once that  
22 approval is achieved, you're into the controlled phase  
23 that's defined in the management directive, and I  
24 think it's Management Directive 2.2. And the control  
25 phase, for internal NRC purposes, says that if the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 project is going to exceed costs by five percent, then  
2 it has to come back for review and discussion. And  
3 depending on the size of the project, it will go to  
4 the CIO or it will go to -- what we've had in place up  
5 to now has been the Executive Council -- for review.

6 And in the situation of both ADAMS and  
7 Starfire, that has happened. And in the case of  
8 Starfire, for example, they had some particular, as  
9 you're aware, issues with software delivery. And they  
10 had to recast the scope and objectives of that  
11 project, and that's consistent with the kinds of  
12 actions that would be taken in the controlled phase.

13 So it's a management directive that really  
14 provides guidance to the sponsoring office as how to  
15 proceed as the program actually goes to its  
16 development.

17 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: I'm trying to  
18 recall a document. I didn't bring it with me. But  
19 the registration program, the software for the  
20 registration program for generally licensed devices,  
21 that ended up costing a fair amount of money, right?  
22 Did it come in on budget, or over budget, or -- or --  
23 if you remember. Maybe that's not fair to ask you.  
24 Maybe that's an NMSS item that you support. But I  
25 know you had to do a CPIC analysis on it.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. REITER: Yes. We've worked with NMSS  
2 on GLTS, and Moe can help contribute on this. The  
3 development of GLTS, as we got into the test phase for  
4 GLTS, the -- it was determined that the product was  
5 not compliant with our requirements. The product, as  
6 delivered from the contractor, was not compliant with  
7 our requirements.

8 Working with NMSS we had many discussions  
9 with the contractor to understand why and then what  
10 the corrective actions would be. And a result of that  
11 -- there was an adjustment to the delivery plan for  
12 GLTS. A contractor agreed to absorb a significant  
13 amount of costs to effect the corrective action, and  
14 it was also determined to some extent there were some  
15 what we would say requirements creep that NRC  
16 absorbed.

17 And I also believe that NMSS notified, as  
18 per our procedures, that there would be -- there would  
19 be some overage over the original CPIC amount. But I  
20 think the experience with GLTS illustrates the need  
21 for oversight of our contractors to pick up issues  
22 early on and then to make sure that program offices  
23 ourselves work with the contractors to come up with  
24 what would be a satisfactory resolution of these  
25 issues to the NRC.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Moe, would you add anything to that?

2 MR. LEVIN: No, that's pretty much --

3 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: I don't want to  
4 take -- one last question. I'm just trying to figure  
5 out how to do IT planning. Everybody says it's a  
6 problem -- GAO, our IG. You know, as I said when I --  
7 at your all-hands meeting, both of those organizations  
8 regard IT institutions across government, including  
9 your own, as target-rich environments for audits.

10 But has any CPIC analysis ever come in too  
11 high? Or are we always surprised -- you do a CPIC  
12 analysis, and whether it's GLTS, Starfire, ADAMS, you  
13 name it, has there ever been a CPIC analysis in the  
14 history of the agency where the actual deliverable  
15 came in low, and we got more than we thought we were  
16 going to get?

17 MR. REITER: Let me ask Jesse Cloud to  
18 comment on that.

19 MR. CLOUD: Let me respond to that.  
20 Through the history of the CPIC process, which has  
21 been in the agency for three years, approximately 10  
22 percent of the investment proposals have been  
23 withdrawn when the cost estimates have been improved  
24 through additional scrutiny.

25 We've learned that the benefits simply

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 don't justify the cost that'll be required. So  
2 that's --

3 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Once we're into  
4 a program, once it's past CPIC, we say we're going to  
5 do it, how often -- it strikes me -- I used to tell  
6 this to under secretaries of defense when they used to  
7 call on Senator Bingaman, that, you know, anything  
8 your IT people tell you multiply it by a fudge factor.  
9 And I'm not sure whether it's two or three or  
10 something, but they never deliver what they say  
11 they're going to deliver.

12 John Beattie was the Under Secretary of  
13 Defense for Acquisition. I remember telling him that  
14 in 1989, and I proved to be a prophet. I know nothing  
15 about your business, except that I know, whether it's  
16 the Pentagon or here, things get overpromised and  
17 underdelivered and undercosted.

18 I mean, if people always getting mid-year  
19 reviews or needing reprogrammings, or whatever, in the  
20 IT area. And I -- and it just strikes me there's  
21 something wrong with the planning process, where we  
22 just have to put in a wedge, given the uncertainties  
23 in IT development are something that, you know, you go  
24 through the analysis, you do it, everything you need  
25 -- I don't know what the wedge is, 25, 33, 45 percent

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 more money, and 15 months extra time to actually, you  
2 know -- to get a realistic --

3 MR. REITER: I'll give some feedback, but  
4 I see Moe is -- would like to --

5 MR. LEVIN: Yes. It's been my experience  
6 here, we have had many systems, many projects, that  
7 have actually come in on or under budget. Some of  
8 them may have not gone through CPIC, but they've all  
9 had one characteristic that the systems we've had or  
10 the projects we've had that have been in trouble  
11 didn't have, and that is they were well-known  
12 requirements up front.

13 We were rewriting systems that already  
14 existed. We were doing Y2K, which is about 100  
15 systems which we brought in well ahead of schedule and  
16 under budget. But in each of those cases when we  
17 rewrite or were fixing -- fixing, we knew it wasn't  
18 new technology, and we knew the requirements.

19 In almost every case where we have  
20 misjudged on the CPIC it has been because we were  
21 entering uncharted territory. And that comes along  
22 with -- with that.

23 COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: Okay.

24 MR. CLOUD: Getting back to your question,  
25 a number of projects under CPIC have come in at budget

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 level. Probably the largest one is the reactor  
2 program system at NRR.

3 I think a big part of that is that the  
4 project has been highly modularized with deliverables  
5 coming throughout -- at a regular pace throughout the  
6 years instead of waiting until the very end to do one  
7 large lump of deliverables, and they have been very  
8 successful in managing their project to the benefits  
9 and to the schedule and to the cost.

10 MR. REITER: I think the -- I think the  
11 lessons learned in general on delivering information  
12 technology projects are well-known and have been  
13 discussed and have been documented. And one of the  
14 major issues is the execution of those lessons learned  
15 in any given project. And one of the key ingredients  
16 for executing those lessons learned is having  
17 effective project management and senior management  
18 support.

19 Often projects find themselves with  
20 unrealistic timeframes to be accomplished because of  
21 some constraint that they don't have any control of,  
22 and this can create a problem. But project management  
23 is always a key factor in bringing any of these  
24 programs in.

25 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: All well known.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I hope we can avoid them.

2 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Commissioner  
3 Merrifield?

4 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Thank you very  
5 much, Mr. Chairman.

6 I've got both some questions and some  
7 comments. I'll start off with some of -- some of the  
8 latter.

9 First, as was mentioned in Dr. Travers'  
10 opening statement, the Commission has recently made a  
11 change in the management structure of where the CIO  
12 falls in our management system. Speaking only for  
13 myself, I think that was something that I felt -- I  
14 agree with the recommendations of the EDO and the  
15 other Commissioners that we should make that change.

16 But I think it's important that the CIO --  
17 members of the CIO who are here today, at least from  
18 my standpoint, recognize that in no way denigrates  
19 from the significant importance that we have on CIO  
20 functions here in the agency, nor does it denigrate  
21 from the important tasks that have been undertaken and  
22 the excellence which we have achieved in many of the  
23 functions we have that fall within the CIO.

24 From my own perspective, I think the  
25 ability of the EDO and the CIO to integrate more

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 closely many of these cross-cutting activities will in  
2 effect enhance many of the ways in which the CIO  
3 efforts can penetrate far into the reaches of our --  
4 of our community here at the NRC. So I did want to,  
5 for my own part, make that statement.

6           Following up on a couple of things that  
7 Commissioner McGaffigan stated, you -- he talked a  
8 little bit about the general license tracking system  
9 that was initiated as a result of efforts by  
10 Commissioner Dicus and others.

11           I have to say, I would recommend to my --  
12 my fellow Commissioners, if you get the opportunity to  
13 go over to White Flint Two and get a demonstration, I  
14 did recently, and I think, although there were some  
15 contracting issues associated with it, I think the end  
16 product that has been developed as a result of the  
17 cooperatives efforts with NMSS or CIO is a good  
18 product for us to have, and something that we should  
19 really focus on.

20           The other comment of Commissioner  
21 McGaffigan I would -- I would play off of is the  
22 budgetary concern. Having litigated government  
23 contracts previously, not only is it a case of some of  
24 the IT systems, but I think government-wide any time  
25 you're involved with cutting-edge technology there are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 issues of attention between promises that are made,  
2 ability to keep those, and costs.

3 And so I -- you know, for my own part, I  
4 recognize there are some difficulties for the CIO's  
5 office, and those we should certainly be mindful of.

6 We talked a little bit about ADAMS --  
7 Commissioner McGaffigan did -- and I think there is  
8 sort of the internal versus the external concerns. I  
9 know even as of last week I had had discussions with  
10 stakeholders who remain concerned that the combination  
11 of the change to the ADAMS system, in concert with our  
12 decision to close our public documents room, was, in  
13 the eyes of some stakeholders, shutting some of the  
14 public out.

15 That's very important. That perception  
16 out there I think is difficult and certainly goes  
17 against our desire to increase public conference. And  
18 so I'm wondering if you could briefly go over some of  
19 the efforts that you're making or think you should be  
20 making to reach out outside of the agency to try to  
21 enhance that loss of public credibility that has  
22 occurred over the course of the last year or so.

23 MR. REITER: Well, there are two things  
24 that come to mind. One, we are -- we are also  
25 concerned about that. And as I mentioned, we've

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 recently gone out and tried to get some feedback from  
2 the local public document rooms on their experiences.  
3 And I'll ask Fran to comment on that.

4           There was a decision made some time back  
5 as to how we would provide public access to ADAMS, and  
6 a particular technology path was chosen, and that has  
7 not worked that well for us at all. And this is the  
8 -- using CITRIX, because that technology presents a  
9 Windows-based application. And over time people have  
10 become very, very comfortable with the web interface,  
11 and that's what they want to work with.

12           And this other technology also had some  
13 download requirements, so things that really were not  
14 -- not at all conducive to our external stakeholders,  
15 except in certain cases where people are regular users  
16 of ADAMS, and they've had the drive, the incentive to  
17 overcome that learning hurdle and can work with the  
18 system. But other users have just been turned away  
19 from it.

20           To compensate for that, we're looking at  
21 this web interface capability, which we'd like to  
22 bring on board as quickly as we can, but we need to be  
23 able to get over some technology hurdles on that. And  
24 if we can do that, then we think we can make very big  
25 gains in turning around the public's view of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 interaction with the environment by providing a  
2 different interface for them to work with, which would  
3 make it much simpler.

4 In terms of the feedback that we've  
5 gotten, and what we might do to outreach, what we have  
6 done for outreach, let me ask Fran to --

7 MS. GOLDBERG: We, as Stu mentioned, are  
8 very much concerned with serving the public and making  
9 sure that service is good and that they're satisfied.  
10 We have recently undertaken a kind of informal survey  
11 of the LPDRs. As you know, at the end of FY99, the  
12 LPDR program, as sponsored by NRC, was ended.

13 And of the 73 former LPDRs that held our  
14 comprehensive microfiche collections, 54 elected to  
15 retain them and the other 19 collections were moved  
16 into libraries of the Government Printing Office,  
17 Federal Depository License Program. So all of the  
18 records are still out there and available in these  
19 libraries.

20 Our feeling in terms of ending the LPDR  
21 program -- that is, stopping the sending of microfiche  
22 -- was really as a result of, of course, switching  
23 over to ADAMS. And our intentions were the best; we  
24 felt that Adams would make our information much more  
25 readily available to people throughout the country.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           They wouldn't have to go to the local  
2 LPDRs. They'd be able to download, view, print,  
3 copies of documents at no cost from their local  
4 library or their place of work or their homes and  
5 schools and many other places. So that was our  
6 intention in changing the LPDR program and moving to  
7 the ADAMS environment.

8           We recently surveyed, as Stu mentioned,  
9 both the libraries that retained the collections and  
10 the libraries that gave up the collections. And of  
11 the 92 libraries polled, we got a 49 response -- 49  
12 percent response rate. Forty-five of them responded.

13           Four of the libraries have installed ADAMS  
14 in the library. There were three complaints -- a  
15 total of three complaints over the past year, which is  
16 a low number we feel. And they dealt with the ease of  
17 use of ADAMS. Twelve of the 45 libraries -- only 12  
18 of them had any requests for NRC documents during the  
19 past year.

20           The libraries that don't have ADAMS stated  
21 that they preferred to refer their patrons to the PDR  
22 for assistance with ADAMS, or to the web site where  
23 many of our documents are currently available. So we  
24 feel that the level of usage is about what it was. It  
25 wasn't much higher than this prior to the change.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And we feel that the complaint rate is --  
2           you know, obviously, we'd like to have no complaints,  
3           but there's not a high level of complaints out there.

4           We do feel that there continue to be  
5           concerns, as you mentioned, Commissioner, by the  
6           public overall. And much of the focus, in general,  
7           seems to be about the firewall issue, which we're  
8           planning to address through this -- a new pilot  
9           project that would give web access to the public.

10           We note that usage is actually up quite  
11           remarkably in the past several weeks. It may be the  
12           California energy crisis, but we've had in one case  
13           500 user sessions. And we had been averaging between  
14           200 and 300, so -- and yesterday I think we had 418.  
15           So usage is up, and people are using the system  
16           despite some -- some problems.

17           MR. REITER: Let me also say that the --  
18           we have gotten a number of compliments from outside  
19           stakeholders thanking the PDR staff for the help that  
20           they've provided and working with them.

21           And I recall last year when we talked  
22           about ADAMS and the challenges that we were going to  
23           be facing with ADAMS, I think I made the comment that  
24           we're not making house calls yet. Well, this year  
25           we've offered to make house calls.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: I think that  
2 kind of -- that level of outreach is important,  
3 because it's hard -- I recognize that some of the  
4 statistics you've given, it's hard for me to determine  
5 yet whether the comments I'm getting are the tip of  
6 the iceberg or the iceberg. And I just -- I sort of  
7 leave that one out there.

8                   Our web site redesign -- I had a couple of  
9 specific comments. At what point do you anticipate  
10 that we will actually be able to roll this thing out?  
11 I mean, what is the dateline for that? And what are  
12 your big picture goals, however small they may be, in  
13 terms of -- of that redesign?

14                   MR. REITER: Fran, do you want to --

15                   MS. GOLDBERG: Yes.

16                   MR. REITER: -- on Phase 1 and Phase 2.

17                   MS. GOLDBERG: Given no major surprises in  
18 our planning, we expect to roll this out during the  
19 fourth quarter of this fiscal year this summer. Our  
20 major goals are really to enhance the ability of the  
21 public to do -- to participate in the regulatory  
22 process, to provide them with the information they  
23 need to do that, to be responsive to the information  
24 that they would like to see on the web site as opposed  
25 to what we've been comfortable putting there, or

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 what's been easy to put there.

2 So we are taking very seriously the input  
3 from the stakeholders and trying to be responsive to  
4 their concerns and their requests for information.

5 We have a Steering Committee that's been  
6 set up to help us with this, and they have been just  
7 a tremendous help, as has been the working group  
8 that's been formed.

9 Another goal that we have is to enhance  
10 the ability of stakeholders to do business  
11 electronically with the agency, both through the EIE  
12 programs which will, of course, have the web as an  
13 entry point, and also for things like contracting,  
14 submitting job applications, giving a boost to our  
15 employment recruiting programs through an effective  
16 web site that gives people a good idea of what they  
17 can expect when they come to the NRC.

18 So those are some of the goals that we  
19 have. We want to improve the navigability, the ease  
20 of navigation, of the web site. We want to make it  
21 easier to use for people, make it very transparent,  
22 how to find things, not getting lost, a few clicks to  
23 get to information, top-down organization, logical, an  
24 appealing design that is inviting particularly to new  
25 users who want to look at our web site. Those are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 some of the goals.

2 MR. REITER: In terms of the question that  
3 you asked about vision, I'd point out that we very  
4 much rely on the steering group and the agency to  
5 provide -- because we view the web as really the  
6 agency's web site. We are facilitators and help get  
7 it there.

8 In terms of the web, and through the whole  
9 process to date, there were lots of requirements and  
10 requests that surfaced for what the web might do for  
11 us. And we were also up against the sense that while  
12 we need to get something out there, from just a  
13 project point of view and a project management point  
14 of view, we broke the program into two phase.

15 Phase 1 is now scheduled for fourth  
16 quarter this fiscal year, and then Phase 2 will follow  
17 that.

18 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: I have had an  
19 opportunity, thanks to Fran, to take a look at the  
20 Phase 1 demo, and I was -- I was very pleased with  
21 what I saw at least.

22 The final question for this round, I have  
23 -- there has been an increasing use of personal  
24 digital assistant devices, Palm Pilots, here at the  
25 agency. This is -- I know that there is some

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 development of trying to see if there's a methodology  
2 for getting this technology in the hands of some of  
3 our inspectors, whether they be resident inspectors or  
4 other inspectors, for use in various facilities, so  
5 that they can do some of their inspection activities  
6 on that and download it back into the system on their  
7 way back.

8           It strikes me that in many of the areas  
9 the CIO's office is the driving force towards many of  
10 our IT solutions. This may be one of those cases  
11 where the IT -- maybe do a little bit of catch up --  
12 I get the sense that some of the regions are very  
13 aggressive in their attempts to get out there and  
14 utilize these devices for a variety of applications.

15           I'm wondering if you could touch a little  
16 bit on -- in terms of where you are and where you see  
17 us going in that regard.

18           MR. REITER: Well, I think you may be  
19 right in this case of us being a little bit in a catch  
20 up mode. And it's not that this has not been on our  
21 radar screen. It's just that we've had other issues  
22 that we've actually talked about around this table  
23 that have taken our attention.

24           But Moe has been involved, and one of the  
25 things that we wanted to get started off earlier was

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to get engaged with the regions and the offices in  
2 terms of opportunities for wireless computing.

3 Moe, do you want to touch on some of --

4 MR. LEVIN: Yes. We had planned, if  
5 things had worked out, by now to have had a focus  
6 group meeting with the regions, representatives from  
7 all of the regions, to discuss the potentials for the  
8 technology.

9 There was a matter of resources and  
10 competing priorities. We still plan to do that, plan  
11 to do that soon if we can, but it all boiled down to  
12 resources. So we actually started this a year ago,  
13 our mobile computing focus group efforts. It's just  
14 been resources.

15 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: There may be --  
16 and I appreciate the issue of resources. There may be  
17 others in the agency who on their own, without the  
18 knowledge of either you or us, may also have some  
19 expertise in this area. So you may want to do that.  
20 Cast as broad a net as you can, because a lot of ideas  
21 may come of it.

22 Mr. Chairman, that's -- I may have  
23 additional questions later on, but I don't want to --

24 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Thank you.

25 I know in the ADAMS context the intention

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and objective is to use the action plan as a vehicle  
2 for addressing the concerns, and that there are a  
3 series of steps that you envision. I'm curious as --  
4 the extent to which as people have grown more  
5 experienced or more familiar with ADAMS in its present  
6 incarnation, whether you're seeing that the -- that  
7 some of the initial employee concerns are diminishing,  
8 and whether some of the concerns you're hearing from  
9 outside are diminishing.

10 MR. REITER: Let me ask Lynn to initially  
11 respond to that.

12 MS. SCATTOLINI: Well, in some respects,  
13 the picture has changed and that's natural, because  
14 people have become more familiar with the system. At  
15 the time the action plan was developed, we were only  
16 two months into ADAMS being the official recordkeeping  
17 system. And for many of the offices they had just  
18 begun to interact with the system. So they were just  
19 becoming familiar with the software.

20 What we have found for the secretaries, in  
21 particular, that have invested the time to learn the  
22 software, that many of them feel very comfortable  
23 entering documents into ADAMS. We particularly got  
24 that feedback from the NRR secretaries, and they were  
25 early adopters and users of the system.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           There, of course, still are concerns with  
2 regard to the amount of time that it takes to enter  
3 documents into ADAMS, but I'm just talking about the  
4 process itself. It doesn't seem that daunting to  
5 people anymore.

6           In terms of search and retrieval, I see  
7 people -- we're just at the tip of the iceberg. There  
8 has been so much focus on getting information into the  
9 system that people are just now beginning to focus on  
10 getting information out of the system. And we're  
11 still in the formative stages of the staff doing that.

12           So I think there is still -- there are  
13 many issues in that area, and the issues range from  
14 the unfamiliarity of the staff with how to effectively  
15 formulate search strategies, unfamiliarity with how  
16 the data is structured itself, both of which can lead  
17 to not very successful search results, and then the  
18 integrity of the data in the system, which needs to be  
19 improved.

20           But these are all issues that can and will  
21 be addressed.

22           CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Let me say that I think  
23 that -- that we all envisioned that the action plan  
24 would be a living document, in the sense that there's  
25 sort of a moving target we have here.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And I think that as the concerns of  
2 agencies' employees change, and external stakeholders  
3 change, with growing familiarity with a system, we  
4 ought to make sure that the focus of our efforts on  
5 the action plan are ones that address the issues that  
6 remain, and that matters that have become less  
7 significant over time are not given the priority they  
8 might initially have had.

9           I'd like to follow up. You made this --  
10 you discussed the KPMG study, and in one of the -- one  
11 of the recommendations that struck my eye was that the  
12 -- the recommendation to change the refresh program  
13 from the -- which I take to mean the replacement of  
14 equipment and --

15           MR. REITER: Right.

16           CHAIRMAN MESERVE: -- because I know  
17 there's unique terminology that's in this area. To go  
18 from a -- sort of a 15 percent rate that we have to  
19 something that's on the order of 25 to 33 percent  
20 rate.

21           The basis for that comparison, as I  
22 understood it, was with industry, in that that was the  
23 benchmark against which they assessed our program.  
24 I'm curious of a couple of things -- how we stand  
25 against other federal agencies with regard to our

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 upgrading of equipment, whether you see the need for  
2 us to increase the refresh rate. I mean, the fact  
3 that we don't do it as fast as others ought not to be  
4 the determinant factor. It ought to be whether we get  
5 it -- there are gains in efficiency that justify the  
6 cost.

7 And, if so, are we going to see a budget  
8 increment that you will be recommending to us in this  
9 area?

10 MR. REITER: I'll give you some initial  
11 reactions to it, and then I'll ask Jim to give some  
12 feedback also.

13 I don't have specific data on other  
14 agencies, but I believe KPMG indicated, both within  
15 the private and the federal sector, that people were  
16 going to a prescheduled refresh rate as compared to a  
17 "fix it when it's broken" type of situation.

18 In going to a refresh rate, the business  
19 incentive is -- it's -- it rests on a business case,  
20 although the business case may be difficult to  
21 develop. And it relates to, you know, the amount of  
22 time that you need to allocate your people resources  
23 to repair equipment that's a little bit older, or  
24 difficulty in getting parts for older equipment, and  
25 things like this.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Jim, can you --

2 MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes. We've actually been  
3 out and talked with a number of agencies, and  
4 basically have found that some agencies are  
5 recognizing the problems with having outdated  
6 desktops. And a lot of them are introducing two- to  
7 three-year refresh rates.

8 Now, we've looked in the NRC at three to  
9 four, what would best meet our needs? And what -- we  
10 also found, and KPMG indicated, is that about 80  
11 percent of the life-cycle costs for the desktop is  
12 really the services, the support services associated  
13 with maintaining those desktops. And when you start  
14 keeping machines around for more than three years,  
15 they find that your support costs increase.

16 So, and from a budget impact, the concept  
17 is you replace the machines more frequently, and then  
18 they break less and your support costs are lower.  
19 That's one of the things we're looking at now in terms  
20 of the ISSC contract.

21 Our hope is that we can introduce a -- you  
22 know, a three-year refresh rate and offset those  
23 increased hardware costs by lower service costs. And  
24 a number of agencies -- NASA has introduced that, and  
25 they've seen a lot of the benefits. ATF and Peace

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Corps have had -- you know, brought these programs on  
2 board and have seen very good results. So that's our  
3 hope as well.

4 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: On the FTS2001, when do  
5 you anticipate that the new contractor will be  
6 providing all of the services that were promised?

7 MR. REITER: The date that we're looking  
8 at now is April.

9 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: That's for everything.

10 MR. REITER: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: What sort of  
12 incremental cost have we incurred as a result of the  
13 fact the contractor was unable to provide the services  
14 in the time when it was promised?

15 MR. REITER: That's the cost of that  
16 bridging, the incremental cost on the bridging  
17 contract.

18 MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes. We're right now  
19 looking -- depending on how close we may meet the  
20 April date, we're looking at about \$400-, \$600,000 of  
21 additional costs. They roll the costs back to January  
22 I guess of '99 where, you know, we don't take  
23 advantage of certain discounts they provided.

24 In addition, there's also a transition  
25 fee, an \$8 million transition fee that they're

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 allocating against the agencies that still are using  
2 the bridge services. So right now we're estimating  
3 about \$400- to \$600,000.

4 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: And do we have any  
5 opportunity to recover that cost from the contractor  
6 for failing to meet their commitment?

7 MR. SCHAEFFER: We have brought this issue  
8 up with GSA, and they're having discussions with the  
9 contractor. And, you know, they understand that, you  
10 know, we want some recovery on this, but we haven't  
11 gotten any feedback from that on that yet, but we are  
12 pursuing that.

13 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Okay. Commissioner  
14 Dicus?

15 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Thank you.

16 The concern that has been raised, and that  
17 you mentioned on the length of time it takes to put  
18 documents into the system, is that going to improve  
19 over time? Is there a way to improve -- to make it  
20 less burdensome? Because it goes back to, you know,  
21 it's a cost in resources and time, people who are  
22 having to do it. It goes back to something  
23 Commissioner McGaffigan was talking about --

24 MS. SCATTOLINI: Yes.

25 COMMISSIONER DICUS: -- hidden costs in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the system.

2 MS. SCATTOLINI: The solution to this is  
3 the new approach to processing NRC-generated  
4 documents, which has the staff doing a minimal profile  
5 if the document is in electronic form, and the  
6 contractor completing the profile and doing the rest  
7 of the work. And if the portion of the document is in  
8 paper form, the contractor does all of the work.

9 So, in effect, the work is shifting, or a  
10 portion of the work is shifting, from the NRC staff to  
11 the contractor.

12 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay. So, in fact,  
13 this document profiling is improving, and the process  
14 is improving.

15 MS. SCATTOLINI: It will take less time on  
16 the part of the staff and -- but at the same time,  
17 because it will be done by a small cadre of people, we  
18 will be able to improve data integrity.

19 COMMISSIONER DICUS: So what about --

20 MS. SCATTOLINI: Which, in turn, will  
21 affect search results.

22 COMMISSIONER DICUS: What about the  
23 contractor costs, then? If contractors are doing  
24 this.

25 MS. SCATTOLINI: Correct. What is the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 question?

2 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Well, the question  
3 is, what are the costs of the contractors? What is it  
4 costing us to have contractors do this?

5 MS. SCATTOLINI: It costs -- it costs the  
6 Document Processing Center about \$27 to process a  
7 document that's in paper form and \$16 to process a  
8 document in electronic form. And this is -- of  
9 course, we've had the Document Processing Center in  
10 place for the past 22 years.

11 I mean, they were the contractor group  
12 that processed documents under NUDOCS, so this is  
13 simply a continuation of their activities. And for  
14 incoming documents to the agency, they did the  
15 processing under ADAMS, as they did under NUDOCS.

16 COMMISSIONER DICUS: But if we didn't have  
17 a time-consuming issue with the documents being  
18 entered in the system so that the administrative  
19 staffs, secretarial staffs, could do it, there was to  
20 be a savings there, wasn't there?

21 MS. SCATTOLINI: Well -- and so we don't  
22 have that savings now. Either that or I'm not  
23 understanding.

24 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay.

25 MS. SCATTOLINI: The savings was not ever

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in entering documents into the system. No matter how  
2 good the system performance is, it still takes time to  
3 index a document. If you don't index it, you don't  
4 have the information to retrieve it. That was never  
5 a savings of ADAMS.

6 The savings in ADAMS was the time that the  
7 -- the staff would save in having the documents in  
8 electronic form in a repository, so they could use  
9 them to cut and paste, and they could view them at  
10 their desktop rather than have to go to the file  
11 center and other locations to identify them.

12 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay. I'll leave  
13 from this for the time being, but I don't have a real  
14 comfort level with it. I think at this point let me  
15 go to the GLTS change a little bit. I know we had  
16 problems with it. I haven't had the demonstration.  
17 But where are we now? I mean, is it being -- is it  
18 usable? Are we working using it?

19 MR. REITER: Yes. Moe can give us the  
20 most up-to-the-minute update on it.

21 MR. LEVIN: We have been using it for some  
22 time --

23 COMMISSIONER DICUS: -- my heart.

24 MR. REITER: We know that.

25 MR. LEVIN: For some time we have been

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 entering data into the system in preparation to I  
2 guess issuing registrations. We just went through the  
3 acceptance testing on the latest release, which is our  
4 production -- full production release, which will  
5 allow registrations.

6 The testing was very good. Unless there  
7 are some unforeseen problems, we expect to have the  
8 final product delivered and accepted by the end of  
9 next week. So far, everything is looking promising.  
10 It looks like we're on schedule. If there's --

11 COMMISSIONER DICUS: No one is shaking  
12 their head no.

13 MR. LEVIN: No. I was looking to see  
14 if --

15 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay. Let me go to  
16 -- back to the PDR now. When we relocated our PDR out  
17 here to White Flint, I know there were some concerns  
18 raised at the time it wasn't as convenient to use.  
19 Are those concerns still being voiced, or have they  
20 pretty well gone away?

21 I know we had the -- we've had the work  
22 with the LPDRs. But I'm talking about when we moved  
23 from downtown here.

24 MS. GOLDBERG: We haven't seen any  
25 significant changes, I don't believe, in the usage.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We're certainly getting more phone calls, more e-  
2 mails, than we did. But that was really more a matter  
3 of the changeover from the old environment to ADAMS  
4 where more people are accessing these documents from  
5 their own computers, and then just calling in --

6 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay.

7 MS. GOLDBERG: -- rather than visiting the  
8 LPDR to pick up paper copies or look at the  
9 microfiche. So it's a different environment. It's a  
10 little bit hard to compare.

11 But we did switch over from having all of  
12 the paper correction on site to having retrieval --  
13 off-site storage and retrieval of the documents. And  
14 that service is being used, but, of course, there are  
15 fewer and fewer -- there is more of a focus at any  
16 time in the last 18 months worth of documents, which  
17 more and more is, of course, the documents that are in  
18 ADAMS. So we would expect the usage of the paper  
19 correction to go down.

20 So it's a little bit hard to completely  
21 assess it, but we -- I don't believe we have had any  
22 level of complaints that I'm aware of.

23 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay. That's good.  
24 One final question if I could. I know you recently  
25 surveyed managers about what their needs might be in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 IT in FY2003. Given changes that can occur fairly  
2 rapidly in IT technology, as I understand it, what  
3 ways -- are you being proactive?

4 When you learn of a new potential  
5 application that might be of use to manager -- to an  
6 office to -- something that we need in the agency, are  
7 you proactively looking at these things and going out  
8 to our managers and saying, "Look at this. This might  
9 be useful to you"? So tell me a little bit about  
10 that.

11 MR. REITER: Yes. And this relates to  
12 Commissioner Merrifield's question on I think wireless  
13 technology. And, yes, we view ourselves -- there are  
14 two parts to the answer to the question. A new  
15 technology such as wireless technology shows up -- we  
16 certainly view our role as understanding the  
17 technology and if we think there's potential working  
18 with the agency, the ITBC, and the offices to be  
19 proactive in trying to bring the offices up to  
20 awareness of the technology and work to explore with  
21 them what the opportunities might be.

22 In the particular case on wireless  
23 technology, we've just found ourselves a little bit on  
24 the short side of resources to do that. That's where  
25 a specific technology might come into play, but then

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there's the more general question of how do we -- or  
2 how does the Commission have a comfort level that the  
3 investments in information technology are being best  
4 made by any office or organization, whatever?

5 And this is where you get into the more  
6 formal systems-type planning activities where you try  
7 -- and this is -- some of the offices I mentioned have  
8 done this and others are looking to start it -- based  
9 on your business goals, as to how effectively are my  
10 current core systems or technologies helping me  
11 achieve my goals? And then, what do I need to do?  
12 And move forward from there.

13 So those are the two tracks. Take a look  
14 at it broader -- more broadly -- and then look at  
15 specific opportunities that various technologies might  
16 bring to you.

17 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Commissioner Diaz?

19 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: Thank you, Mr.  
20 Chairman. I'll use the advantage of batting cleanup  
21 in here. A lot of my questions have been answered.

22 I do share my fellow Commissioners'  
23 appreciation of the efforts of the CIO to try to  
24 improve the way we handle information, as well as the  
25 concerns that have been expressed that I guess

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 everybody is very aware of.

2 I think there is an important need to both  
3 solidify our gains, create stability in the way that  
4 we use information technology, without falling behind  
5 in many of them. I think the issue of stability right  
6 now is probably more important than additional gains  
7 at the present time. And, of course, that's  
8 underscored by ADAMS.

9 Having said that, let me take a quick  
10 look, being an engineer, and not being used to four  
11 significant figures --

12 (Laughter.)

13 -- to deal with your output measures. You  
14 only have three output measures. It's kind of hard  
15 for me to say what is what, and my crystal ball  
16 doesn't tell me all of this. I might suggest that for  
17 the future we might break some of this down in some  
18 specific and more distinguishable -- and I wouldn't  
19 mind if you used just two significant figures, because  
20 I don't know how you can measure 99.55.

21 You might have a digital clock that tells  
22 you the computers were up 99.55 percent of the time.  
23 I can assure you that my computer has not been up  
24 99.55 percent of the time, because every time I get in  
25 there every once in a while somebody tells me the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 computer system is out of service, it's going to be  
2 down until the weekend, etcetera, etcetera.

3 But having said that -- yes, sir?

4 COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: You just got a  
5 lemon, that's all.

6 (Laughter.)

7 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: I understand. I agree  
8 with Commissioner McGaffigan.

9 MS. GOLDBERG: You need to refresh.

10 (Laughter.)

11 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: Absolutely.  
12 Absolutely.

13 (Laughter.)

14 Keeping on that point, and realizing that,  
15 you know, we cannot measure the capability of a  
16 system, okay, with that -- I'm going to ask you, you  
17 know, four questions. And, of course, the piece de  
18 resistance is ADAMS, of course. You don't let me, you  
19 know, forget ADAMS, right, Mr. Reiter?

20 Let me ask the first question. When do  
21 you think that the 90 percent of the capability that  
22 ADAMS was supposed to provide will be fully  
23 functional? 90 percent? Not 99. When would it be  
24 here so that, you know, the capabilities? I'm not  
25 saying the people are using it. What are the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 capabilities?

2 MR. REITER: Well, the question -- the --  
3 if you look at -- it depends what you mean by  
4 "capabilities." If we go back to the --

5 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: Capability for the  
6 system to perform its functions as intended, a phrase  
7 that the NRC uses quite frequently.

8 MR. REITER: Okay. Then, that brings us  
9 back to the CPIC analysis and some of the  
10 functionality that was associated with ADAMS as part  
11 of the CPIC analysis. And some of that functionality  
12 we have not implemented. So, for example, workflow  
13 analysis and other things.

14 If we just push that aside for a minute,  
15 and if we look at what is being implemented -- the  
16 document management and search capabilities, and this  
17 is largely what the bulk of the ADAMS action plan is  
18 focusing on to address those capabilities and get them  
19 up to a satisfactory level of performance.

20 And that relates to both what we have to  
21 do from the business process point of view and  
22 introducing some of the newer product releases that we  
23 have. Then we're looking at a 12- to 18-month kind of  
24 timeframe. I hope on the shorter side of that.

25 On the other part of the question, which

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is, you know, the capabilities that were put on the  
2 side as we went through this implementation, that gets  
3 to the directional study that we're about.

4 I can't give you a timeline on that, but  
5 what we want to do with the directional study is have  
6 independent expertise come in and take a look at what  
7 the agency -- we baseline the agency needs for  
8 document processing and give it some guidance on how  
9 to move --

10 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: But I am -- I believe  
11 I need -- maybe the rest of the Commission is far more  
12 up to date than I am -- but I need to know where is  
13 this map? You have to have a map, and I need to know  
14 what has been, you know, put aside. You know, I mean,  
15 I know your report contains, you know, words to this  
16 effect, but I really cannot, you know, go through  
17 pages and pages.

18 I think a summary of where we are -- okay?  
19 Are we, you know, obtaining 90 percent on the document  
20 handling capability? Are we getting, you know, the --  
21 and when do we get to 99 percent? Which was the next  
22 question. If we -- you know, if we are really  
23 intended to be at this level of performance that  
24 appear to be your targets, which I think, you know,  
25 nobody can get you to the last two significant

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 figures, but maybe we want to ensure that 90 percent  
2 of the capabilities are there.

3 We want to make sure that we know when  
4 we're going to get to 99 percent of all the  
5 capabilities that were intended to be in ADAMS. And  
6 I think it's an important thing for us to know which  
7 ones are coming in what sequence and what to expect,  
8 because there are questions about this system.

9 We are relying on this system for the  
10 major change in the way that we conduct our business.  
11 And I think we need to know when is that going to  
12 happen and how is it going to happen.

13 MR. REITER: I would think an appropriate  
14 timeframe for us to give you that kind of feedback  
15 would be in the second quarter of this calendar year  
16 when we will have completed the independent  
17 assessment, and then we can -- I think we can be in a  
18 better position to put a fuller picture together for  
19 you.

20 In effect, it would be an update of the  
21 timeline. The Chairman is correct when he says that  
22 the action plan is a living document, but it's  
23 worthwhile to take snapshots at every point in time.  
24 And that would be an appropriate --

25 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: It's the second quote.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I'm going to hold you to it, because I really want to  
2 see this thing finalized. You know, we keep going  
3 through it, and there is a time at which we need to  
4 finalize the planning, the strategy, and know where we  
5 are.

6 This is a related question. It has been  
7 addressed already, but I'd like to put some  
8 engineering numbers in there. Okay? And it's a  
9 question that affects the office of the EDO as well as  
10 the CIO and all of us. When is 90 percent of the NRC  
11 staff going to be efficiently and effectively using  
12 the capabilities of ADAMS?

13 I mean, that is a very key question. And  
14 if we're not getting it, what do we need to get in  
15 there? Do we need to go back and retrain? Do we need  
16 to go back and give, you know, rousing speeches in  
17 every office? What is it that we need to do to get 90  
18 percent? Not 99.5; 90 percent of our people to be  
19 able to use ADAMS effectively.

20 And I'll tell you what -- why I ask this  
21 question. It's because ADAMS has become a distraction  
22 in this place. Rather than being something that we  
23 actively embrace and use, it has become a distraction.  
24 People blame things on ADAMS, and I don't think we  
25 should be making or continuing to have ADAMS as a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 distraction. ADAMS should be a cornerstone of the way  
2 we handle information, and that means people have to  
3 buy-in on it.

4 If ADAMS is going to work, which is the  
5 first question, then how are we going to ensure that  
6 90 percent of our people are capable of using this  
7 system?

8 MR. REITER: I'll give you some of my  
9 views on that, and ask Lynn to share her views on it.  
10 I think -- again, I think that the -- I think the  
11 answers to your questions in terms of the things that  
12 need to get done are contained within the ADAMS action  
13 plan.

14 I think the action plan -- in addition to  
15 the action plan, what's even more important is the  
16 ADAMS steering group that's associated with the action  
17 plan, because that's really putting senior level  
18 agency management together to focus on just the  
19 issues, the two issues that you've raised. And there  
20 are two parts to it.

21 We have to move the environment so that --  
22 and Lynn touched on this. We have to move the  
23 environment so we can get documents into the system  
24 effectively, and that we can get documents into the  
25 system where we have confidence that they are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 correctly represented to the system for document  
2 integrity and retrieval-type purposes.

3 And I think we're closing in on that, and  
4 we're going to start making some of the transitions of  
5 how documents are put into the system over the next  
6 several months.

7 Then, we need to start focusing on the  
8 search and retrieval capabilities, and that is going  
9 to be an education process. And that's something that  
10 we can work, but it's also something that we're going  
11 to need to very much partner with the offices, because  
12 it's going to say, "Let's start using this. We may  
13 have to go to some additional training efforts to  
14 refresh people on what they may have, you know, gone  
15 through training last year or two years ago."

16 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: There are always many  
17 answers. Okay? I have one question, you know, and I  
18 expect that you will work with the EDO and supply to  
19 the Commission a simple question. When is 90 percent  
20 of the staff in the NRC going to use the capabilities  
21 of ADAMS efficiently and effectively? And that, sir,  
22 is a direct question that I intend to get an answer  
23 for.

24 And with that, Mr. Chairman, I am finished  
25 with my questions.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Thank you.

2 We have a few more minutes. Let me --  
3 we'll just have a quick round of follow-up questions.

4 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: In response to  
5 one of the questions that the Chairman asked about the  
6 KPMG study and 33 percent refresh rate, and all that,  
7 the contract that Mr. Reiter mentioned, the  
8 infrastructure services and support contract, does  
9 that have a refresh number in it?

10 You said you are going to seat management.  
11 It's a contract you're about to let. It'll be in  
12 place, I think you said, April or something. But does  
13 that -- if you're going to a seat management approach,  
14 does that include the computer at the seat?

15 MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes. One of the concepts  
16 that's behind that is today we sort of do a best  
17 effort and available funding. With the seat concept,  
18 what you do is basically buy a seat, which will  
19 include a workstation, a certain level of service, and  
20 a certain refresh rate.

21 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: So what refresh  
22 rate is in the contract?

23 MR. SCHAEFFER: Well, right now, we're in  
24 the process of starting the acquisition. What we will  
25 do is we will put in there options for a three-year

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and a four-year refresh rate to look at what the costs  
2 are. And based on the cost and the budget and all of  
3 that, we would look to proceed, you know, based on  
4 what the agency requirements would be.

5 COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: So we could be  
6 at 33 percent fairly quickly?

7 MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes.

8 COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: A question about  
9 ADAMS search capabilities and all of that. There  
10 clearly are documents that have been entered into  
11 ADAMS that just say "letter" or something like that,  
12 and they're almost impossible to find. At least  
13 that's what people tell us, at least initially.

14 My question is, is there a quality control  
15 mechanism where if somebody has just put "letter" or  
16 something and not much else in any of these fields,  
17 and it's in there, somebody goes in and says, "Oops.  
18 This has to be redone," and where is the quality  
19 control to find those documents that perhaps were not  
20 perfectly entered?

21 MS. SCATTOLINI: Well, for the documents  
22 that -- incoming documents to the agency that are  
23 being entered by the document process --

24 COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: But those are  
25 probably in good shape.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. SCATTOLINI: Those are in good shape,  
2 because they do --

3 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: The ones we  
4 generate.

5 MS. SCATTOLINI: Right. The ones that we  
6 generate, there is really a multi-prong approach, and  
7 there is -- and let me see if I can describe it to  
8 you. With the new release that's coming down the  
9 road, it has a couple of features that are really  
10 going to help us in this regard.

11 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: I'm just asking  
12 about historically. If we have a bunch of sort of  
13 not-so-hot document profiles in there at the current  
14 time -- I forget what the number was, it's 2,500 a day  
15 or some -- somebody was saying, for putting documents  
16 into the thing -- let's say, you know, we're -- we put  
17 10,000 documents in that no one is ever going to find  
18 unless somebody goes back and redoes the profile.

19 Is there any mechanism for finding those  
20 10,000 documents which might be -- I'm just pulling  
21 that out of the air, but is there a mechanism to go  
22 back and get those properly entered? Or is that  
23 almost impossible?

24 MS. SCATTOLINI: No, it's not impossible.  
25 The new software that we have provides us -- what's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 being delivered provides us with some tools to be able  
2 to do that.

3 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: To go back and  
4 look at the --

5 MS. SCATTOLINI: To go back and look at  
6 it.

7 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: So that's part  
8 of the update -- that's part of the ADAMS Get Well  
9 Program?

10 MS. SCATTOLINI: Yes.

11 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Okay.

12 MS. SCATTOLINI: You could put it that  
13 way.

14 MR. REITER: There is an effort underway  
15 now, and it's been underway, to go back and look at  
16 the documents that are in the system and clean up data  
17 associated with that. The new software release that  
18 we're going to be getting is going to make available  
19 to the offices the full text search capability. So  
20 without any information about parameters, you'll have  
21 that additional search capability for documents.

22 COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: Okay. And then,  
23 finally -- this is partly my answer to Commissioner  
24 Diaz. I think you're not going to get 90 percent of  
25 the staff to effectively and efficiently use it until

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it's -- it's web-based, until you get this out, you  
2 know, whatever the -- where it's as easy to use as any  
3 other program on your desk or -- when it's that easy,  
4 then people will use it. When it's difficult --

5 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: I'll take in between  
6 numbers.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MR. REITER: Can we negotiate it?

9 (Laughter.)

10 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Commissioner  
11 Merrifield?

12 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Thank you, Mr.  
13 Chairman. I have just two brief issues.

14 One, I appreciate the inquiries of  
15 Commissioner Diaz. I think he's been asking a variety  
16 of questions on ADAMS, but I think he sort of  
17 succinctly went at the heart of where some of -- what  
18 we're coming from.

19 I do have a follow up, though, along the  
20 lines where Commissioner Dicus was going, because it  
21 was unclear to me -- and this goes to -- to Lynn  
22 Scattolini. You mentioned that there's a cost  
23 associated with individual documents being entered by  
24 the Document Processing Center.

25 Now, originally, we thought that the vast

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 bulk of that task was going to be undertaken by the  
2 staff. They would be able to do that, and we would  
3 not have to rely on the Document Processing Center to  
4 undertake that. Subsequently, the recommendation was  
5 made by the CIO's office that we take that -- that  
6 requirement from the staff and we give it back to the  
7 Document Processing Center.

8 Presumably, that was not planned for from  
9 a budgeting context, and so there was an additional  
10 cost associated with it. What is that cost overall?  
11 You said --

12 MR. REITER: I didn't hear --

13 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: The additional budget  
14 allocation was \$300,000.

15 MR. REITER: That's the number I recall  
16 from last year.

17 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: But I don't know that  
18 that's what it is.

19 MS. SCATTOLINI: No, it's -- it's actually  
20 more than that, because we had built money in our  
21 budget to begin to do QA of staff-generated profiles  
22 in order to address the data integrity issue. And  
23 that was already in our budget, so the \$300,000 was an  
24 incremental number, not the complete cost.

25 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: It didn't sound

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 right, given the large number of documents we  
2 processed, and the numbers you talked about -- \$16  
3 versus \$25. If you -- if you could provide a more  
4 detailed analysis of what that additional cost --  
5 unplanned cost was relative to the Document Processing  
6 Center, I certainly think that would be helpful for my  
7 planning purposes.

8 The final point is regarding  
9 videostreaming. We have been undertaking that as a  
10 pilot over the past year. I guess I've got a question  
11 and a comment. One is, at what -- the question is, at  
12 what point are you going to be coming in with a  
13 recommendation on -- for us as to whether or not we  
14 should continue that program? What are you going to  
15 be using as your standards for judging how we have  
16 been doing so far?

17 And the other one is, have you thought at  
18 all about, as an alternative or in addition, the use  
19 of -- of radiostreaming? Just the voice portions of  
20 various meetings of the Commission or the staff, and  
21 adding that capability. I know that's a lesser costly  
22 application, and it might be useful for some areas  
23 where we are not currently videostreaming.

24 MR. REITER: The pilot program -- SECY Net  
25 -- is really -- has more of an overseeing view of it.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We're not considering -- we haven't considered anyway  
2 -- just radiostreaming, but we have -- we are looking  
3 into the possibility of providing just an archive  
4 retrieval service, so that the live broadcast won't be  
5 telecast but you'd be able to come in and pull up  
6 meetings that have been saved on video.

7 MS. VIETTI-COOK: The pilot ends in the  
8 end of March, and then we're going to put together all  
9 of the data. And we'll use the data as to how many  
10 people actually looked at the system. We have it  
11 broken down as to whether they are people outside the  
12 NRC or inside the NRC, you know, what the cost of  
13 continuing the program is as it is currently, both  
14 live and archived. We're looking at costs of doing it  
15 -- just archiving, which is substantially less.

16 And, you know, we also asked a question  
17 about people's interests, whether they, you know, had  
18 no interest, you know, slightly interested, you know,  
19 how interested people are in both live and archived  
20 meetings that we'll be using. And we've also received  
21 some e-mail feedback where they've actually typed in  
22 comments. So we'll be using all of that information  
23 to put together a recommendation.

24 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Will that  
25 recommendation be made in such a way that the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Commission can make its decision and we not have -- if  
2 we choose to continue it not as a pilot but as a full-  
3 blown program, so that there's not any break in the  
4 actual utilization of the services?

5 MS. VIETTI-COOK: There's going to be a  
6 break.

7 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: The pilot ends  
8 and --

9 MS. VIETTI-COOK: Yes. There will be a  
10 break.

11 COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: There will be a  
12 break. Okay.

13 I would say one last comment on  
14 videostreaming. There have been -- and this is -- and  
15 this really falls on your data collection. There have  
16 been at least two occasions that I have encountered  
17 where we have participated in meetings, and by the  
18 time I got up to my office, off the elevator, I had  
19 already received e-mails from people commenting on  
20 things that had been said in the meeting.

21 So there are people out there who look at  
22 these things very carefully. The volume of users  
23 might not necessarily be indicative of the value that  
24 some of those particular stakeholders have on having  
25 the opportunity to participate at distances in excess

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of 1,000 miles, which both of these individuals were  
2 in -- in that distance.

3 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Thank you.

5 I just have a few sort of nits I'd like to  
6 follow up on. On your annual report, page 20 of it,  
7 you have an important section that deals with  
8 compliance with federal laws. And I'm little puzzled  
9 with one of the responses that you assert, and I hope  
10 correctly, that for fiscal year 2000 you were "fully  
11 compliant with Klinger-Cohen." And then go on to say  
12 for fiscal year 2001 you hope to improve compliance.

13 (Laughter.)

14 And the question is, are we falling short?  
15 Do we anticipate falling short in 2001? And what do  
16 we need to do that we aren't doing?

17 MR. CLOUD: May I take that question?

18 MR. REITER: Yes. Jesse, go ahead.

19 MR. CLOUD: The sense we mentioned in  
20 there -- there have been a number of studies of how  
21 agencies are complying with Klinger-Cohen that have  
22 been in the trade press. Klinger-Cohen has a number  
23 of requirements. We meet each of the requirements,  
24 but we could do so better. More could be done.

25 Specifically, going back to some of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Commissioner McGaffigan's comments on the CPIC  
2 process, one thing that many of the studies have found  
3 is that while most agencies have a CPIC process, and  
4 most agencies are doing a very good job of selecting  
5 which investments to fund, many agencies haven't done  
6 as much as the law had hoped for in the beginning in  
7 terms of being able to manage the projects and ensure  
8 that they come in on time and on budget, so that we  
9 have hopes to improve in that area.

10 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: All right. Thank you.

11 Another question -- let me say that, by  
12 way of preamble, that one of the challenges I think  
13 all of us find in this area is that sometimes the uses  
14 of language is not necessarily natural -- usage of  
15 language. And it's always -- refresh rate being an  
16 example.

17 One of the areas that was mentioned this  
18 morning, something we're trying to do which I think is  
19 similarly a little bit puzzling, is that you talk  
20 about this -- who this contract -- the ISSC contract,  
21 which we're going to move to "seat management" -- that  
22 sounds like something my tailor would worry about.

23 (Laughter.)

24 MR. CLOUD: You shouldn't touch that one.

25 (Laughter.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   CHAIRMAN MESERVE: What does that mean?  
2                   What are we doing?

3                   MR. REITER: Well, the concept behind the  
4                   seat management is to try to get a -- if you look at  
5                   your desktop, the PC that's sitting on your desktop or  
6                   credenza, that PC is an asset. It's connected to some  
7                   local area network. It's connected to wide area  
8                   networks. It's connected to server devices. All of  
9                   those connections and all of those devices require  
10                  some level of support and maintenance and care and  
11                  feeding.

12                  Under the current contracting approach  
13                  that we use, each piece is dealt with on a separate  
14                  kind of basis. On the seat management type of  
15                  approach, we say, "Well, this -- I want the service.  
16                  I'm not interested in hearing about the PC or hearing  
17                  about my local area network connections. The service  
18                  I want is that if I need a new PC I want it available  
19                  in two days. If something is wrong with my PC and if  
20                  I need it repaired, I want that repair done in four  
21                  hours. And I don't care if the repair is associated  
22                  with the PC or if it's associated with a piece of  
23                  network equipment that's someplace behind the PC." So  
24                  that's the idea -- that's the concept behind seat  
25                  management.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Okay. Thanks.

2 MR. REITER: And you pay for the service  
3 on fixed price.

4 Jim, would you add anything to that?

5 MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes. Just a couple of  
6 things. It's really no different I guess than the  
7 services we have today in terms of supporting the  
8 desktop and the infrastructure. But what it is, it's  
9 a different approach of packaging how you pay for the  
10 services. And the advantage to that, it lets us  
11 incorporate a lot of the recommendations.

12 We had a lot of recommendations in the  
13 Anderson study, in terms of managed service delivery,  
14 and also in KPMG. And what this approach allows us to  
15 do, it allows us to incorporate a lot of those in  
16 terms of performance-based contracting and managed  
17 service delivery, and hopefully improve in terms of  
18 refresh rate and things like that.

19 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Thank you.

20 Commissioner Dicus?

21 COMMISSIONER DICUS: I want to follow up  
22 on a comment that you made on software that's on its  
23 way here to help with search of documents. Did I hear  
24 that right? We don't have it yet?

25 Getting it, or recognizing the need for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it, was this something that was done like an  
2 afterthought, because we realized there were some  
3 maybe difficulties in searching for documents? Or was  
4 it planned all along? And if it was planned all  
5 along, why are we this late in having it when we  
6 already have documents in the system?

7 MR. REITER: The full text search  
8 capability was part of the product, and when we  
9 started ADAMS up that -- that capability of the  
10 product was working. Several months after we turned  
11 it on as the official recordkeeping system, it stopped  
12 functioning properly because we hit a -- we detected  
13 a problem that was a recurring problem, and that's  
14 when we shut it off.

15 The correction to that problem is what's  
16 coming now in the next release, which is in the April  
17 -- February/April time that we'll be deploying it.

18 COMMISSIONER DICUS: Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Commissioner Diaz?

20 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: Just one quick  
21 question. A regulatory issue summary said that people  
22 will be able to submit Part 50 documents, you know,  
23 using the web or CD. How far behind is -- are we with  
24 NMSS or other submittals?

25 MR. REITER: Moe, do you have a --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. LEVIN: We are working with NMSS. Our  
2 plan is to -- like I said, we're working with OGC to  
3 try and get a direct final rule issued sometime maybe  
4 this summer, late summer. And that would allow all  
5 materials licensees -- virtually all licensees except  
6 -- the only thing it wouldn't cover right now is  
7 anything that's dealing with adjudicatory matters and  
8 proceeding type matters.

9 And we're doing a pilot -- we're going to  
10 do a pilot to work out some procedures that have to be  
11 resolved, and issues that have to be resolved, before  
12 we can let them be covered by EIE also.

13 So everything -- hopefully, by the end of  
14 this fiscal year, we will be in a position where --  
15 and it's voluntary -- that virtually all licensees  
16 could submit.

17 COMMISSIONER DIAZ: All right. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Let me suggest on the  
19 adjudicatory matters that there is now a fair amount  
20 of experience with regard to electronic submissions in  
21 federal courts. And there's a lot -- they've been  
22 doing this, so that this is not going to be virgin  
23 territory for us.

24 MR. LEVIN: Yes. And that's one of the  
25 things that has changed, why we want a pilot, because

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a lot of others have learned a lot of things, and we  
2 want to build on what they've learned.

3 MR. BURNS: One thing I might add on that.  
4 In effect, in -- on an informal basis, most of our  
5 adjudications at the Licensing Board level or the  
6 presiding officer level are exchanging documents,  
7 briefs and filings, electronically. But, in effect,  
8 it's an informal thing. The record -- the record  
9 copies, in order to satisfy current service  
10 requirements and things, are -- are still filed in  
11 paper.

12 But basically, what the judges have done  
13 is said, "Exchange these things electronically to keep  
14 things moving," and this would just, in effect, seal  
15 it in terms of having the official document exchange  
16 electronic.

17 CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Okay. Good. Thank you  
18 very much. It's been a very informative briefing.

19 Let me just say that you have had many  
20 hard questions that have been presented to you with a  
21 particular focus on ADAMS, and that obviously reflects  
22 an area in which the Commission has -- no, you, have  
23 concerns about making sure that we achieve our  
24 objectives for that system.

25 But I wouldn't want to have you leave the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 meeting without an acknowledgement that all of us  
2 recognize that the activities of the Office of CIO are  
3 central to the mission of this agency. You have a  
4 very hard job. And I think the concern about ADAMS  
5 reflects the fact that when something falls short  
6 people -- it really affects how their lives proceed,  
7 and we all get worried about it.

8           And you hear about concerns, but you don't  
9 often hear about your successes. And that's  
10 unfortunate. But I think we all recognize that you  
11 have many systems that are central to the functioning  
12 of this agency, that are working well. In fact,  
13 they're performing superbly.

14           We very much appreciate your overall  
15 efforts, and I wouldn't want to have you leave the  
16 meeting with a sense that in some sense that you're --  
17 you're not fulfilling your obligations. We are very  
18 pleased with your efforts and hope that you'll  
19 continue.

20           With that, we stand adjourned.

21           (Whereupon, at 11:14 a.m., the  
22 proceedings in the foregoing matter were  
23 adjourned.)

24

25

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701