

From: *NSIR* Michael Johnson *NSIR*
 To: *NSIR* See, Conchita; Tracy, Glenn - *NSIR*
 Date: Mon, Dec 10, 2001 1:58 PM
 Subject: Re: NEED YOUR AGREEMENT ON ROP FRAMEWORK

Glenn,

Sorry to have missed you. The meeting with OCIO to make final plans is tomorrow. A change at this point will impact our ability to get any of the assessment web page back up.

Can you help me understand VY relative to thinking provided below?

Propose we proceed as planned absent clear/pressing concern regarding information that points to existing vulnerabilities, i.e., uncorrected weaknesses and vulnerabilities. . . (consistent with draft guidance on release of information to the public).

NSIR
release

>>> Glenn Tracy 12/10/01 12:15PM >>> *NSIR*
Mike:

I know we are both busier than hec'. I have not focused at all on this but see a potential issue with PI's here. I would vote to keep security off of the web site altogether based upon what has transpired as of late regarding VY, etc. Thus, I don't think we want any PI's an security, historical or otherwise. We can discuss this further. Glenn

>>> Michael Johnson 12/10/01 07:28AM >>> *NSIR*
Thanks Conchita. Looks good to go!

>>> Conchita See 12/08/01 07:33AM >>> *NSIR*
Hi Mike, the changes, that applied to Physical Protection inspection findings, are implemented on the internal web site. Please review them prior to the scheduled 12/17 release to the public site and let me know of any changes.

Oconee greater than green inspection finding for 2q 2001 has been replaced by the text provided by Ron. All the url to inspection reports were also removed. The url below is for the inspection finding summary page, please click on Oconee's and other green findings under the Physical Protection column to view the changes.

Thanks, Conchita

>>> Michael Johnson 11/27/01 12:46PM >>> *NSIR*
Know you're busy. Wanted to run by you, for your agreement, my plans regarding the external web ROP pages.

Would like to get the entire ROP back up asap. With respect to the safeguards cornerstone would include the following:

(1) Safeguards PIs would be displayed as they were previously. The Security equipment performance index simply provides a historical perspective on the licensee's ability to maintain equipment (compensatory actions are taken when the equipment becomes unavailable, therefore no safeguards vulnerability exists). The other indicators (PSP performance and FFD/PRP performance) count the number of reportable failures by the licensee to properly implement the regulatory requirements. While these give a historical perspective regarding the effectiveness of the licensee's programmatic efforts to implement 10 CFR 73.56 & 57 and 10 CFR Part 26, the specific deficiencies were recognized, reported, and corrected by the licensee.

PP-10

(2) The green inspection findings would remain on the web. Would disable the link to the inspection reports as a conservative precaution for pre-9/11 findings (as an alternative to screening each IR using post 9/11 sensitivities to ensure they are ok). Future inspection reports would contain the links. These issues are of very low significance.

(3) Inspection findings that are greater than green would be shown only as grey. Although the difference in color could be seen as an indicator that a problem existed, compensatory action to address the deficiency would have been taken. The PIM would contain a note that indicates that details are documented in an inspection report and are considered to be safeguards information and that corrective/compensatory actions were completed prior to the inspection team leaving the site (or whatever). Obviously no link would be provided to the inspection report.

Can you support this approach?

CC: Coe, Doug; Frahm, Ronald; Madison, Alan; Pascarelli, Robert; Reckley, William; Satorius, Mark