

ORIGINAL

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Agency: Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Title: LSS Advisory Review Panel Meeting

Docket No.

LOCATION: Bethesda, Maryland

DATE: Thursday, June 7, 1990

PAGES: 1 - 88

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

1612 K St. N.W., Suite 300

Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 293-3950

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

3
4 LSS ADVISORY REVIEW PANEL MEETING

5
6 Public Hearing Room
7 4350 East-West Highway
8 Bethesda, Maryland

9
10 Thursday, June 7, 1990

11
12 The panel met, pursuant to notice, at 9:25
13 o'clock, a.m., John Hoyle, presiding.
14

15 MEMBERS PRESENT:

16 Stuart Treby
17 Marilee Rood
18 Felix Killar
19 Daniel Graser
20 Barbara Cerny
21 Liza Vibert
22 Dennis Bechtel
23 Elgie Holstein
24 Philip Altomare
25 Kirk Balcom (by phone)

1 **ALSO PRESENT:**

2

3 **Elizabeth Shelburne**

4 **Lloyd Donnelly**

5 **Dona M. Mennella**

6 **Steven Scott**

7 **Lynn Scattolini**

8 **Reporter: Dean A. Robinson**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MR. HOYLE: Good morning, ladies and gentleman.
3 This is the third meeting of the LSS Advisory Review Panel.
4 We do have, as near as I can tell, a quorum present, even
5 though we don't have a representative of the State of
6 Nevada. We had wanted him to be present because he was
7 Chairman of the Subcommittee which worked on the header
8 formats for us. We were prepared for teleconferencing with
9 those outside of town, but we had no takers this morning.

10 The first thing I want to do is go quickly around
11 the table so that those in the audience will know who is up
12 at the table and who they are representing. So, I will
13 start with myself. I am John Hoyle, representing the
14 Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

15 MR. TREBY: Stuart Treby, NRC, Office of General
16 Counsel.

17 MS. SHELBURNE: Betsy Shelburne of the office of
18 the LSS administrator.

19 MR. KILLAR: Felix Killar representing the U.S.
20 Council for Energy Awareness.

21 MR. GRASER: Dan Graser, representing the
22 Department of Energy.

23 MS. CERNY: Barbara Cerny, representing the
24 Department of Energy.

25 MS. VIBERT: Liza Vibert, representing Clark

1 County, Nevada.

2 MR. BECHTEL: Dennis Bechtel, representing Clark
3 County, Nevada.

4 MR. HOLSTEIN: ^{Elgie}~~Lee~~ Holstein, representing Nye
5 County, Nevada.

6 MS. ROOD: Marilee Rood, Administrator.

7 MR. HOYLE: Okay. Thank you very much.

8 Let me remind everyone to sign the attendance list
9 that we have so we can make a record of that. We do have a
10 transcript of today's meeting for the first time. We had
11 talked earlier about having minutes and how quickly we could
12 get them out, and the usefulness of the minutes versus a
13 transcript. We agreed the last time to try a transcript for
14 this meeting. I will get it out as soon as it's available
15 to me.

16 The first administrative matter I want to bring up
17 is the approval of our March 20 meeting. I had forwarded
18 that to the members on April 23, so I would open the floor
19 to any comments, changes, alterations to the minutes. Are
20 there any?

21 [No response.]

22 MR. HOYLE: Not hearing any, I consider the
23 minutes approved at this time. Thank you.

24 The next item and our primary item on the agenda
25 is to discuss the header format that we agreed at the last

1 meeting to look at because it was becoming a critical path
2 item for getting on with the design of the LSS.

3 We established a working group made up of
4 representatives of the State of Nevada, the Nuclear
5 Regulatory Commission and DOE, and had asked the LSS
6 administrator to assign a person to the working group, and
7 he assigned Betsy Shelburne, who is at the table with us.

8 The Subcommittee met a couple of times, I think,
9 and came up with recommendations for the full Committee
10 which we have before us now.

11 I'm going to ask Betsy Shelburne, in Kirk's
12 absence, to walk us through what the Subcommittee did, how
13 it conducted itself and arrived at the recommendations that
14 it did. So, Betsy, please. Thank you for doing this on
15 very short notice -- like five minutes. I greatly
16 appreciate the work of all of those who served on the
17 Subcommittee, and I know the full panel agrees with me,
18 Betsy.

19 MS. SHELBURNE: Okay. Basically, as John said,
20 the Subcommittee was made up of Kirk Balcom, representing
21 the State of Nevada, Donna Mennella, who is in the audience,
22 Eileen Tana and myself of the Office of the Administrator.
23 We met, as John said, several times in an iterative process,
24 starting with, as the report indicates, the list of header
25 elements which was discussed May 17, 1990⁸⁸. This was a list

1 of elements that was devised by another subcommittee of the
2 committee, that is of the Advisory Committee on the
3 negotiated rule.

4 We started with this list and also factored in
5 experience that was gained from the prototype, the ^{SATIC}~~SV01D~~
6 prototype for the indexing of the sample of records. So,
7 those two became the starting point.

8 Then, we tried to be systematic to go through the
9 files. We went through thinking about these elements, as I
10 tried to characterize in the last meeting of the Committee,
11 the issue of what should be picked up, and what, from the
12 point of view, would be of interest to the users, what could
13 be picked up based on the fact that you're looking at a
14 document, and we addressed the issue of who should pick it
15 up. That is basically the format of the report.

16 We came up with 28 files and divided those into
17 the sections that you see starting on page one of the report
18 and following on page two. I think it might be helpful to
19 go through how this list differs from this May 17, 1988
20 list, and it does not differ greatly.

21 Basically, we did not come up with any additional
22 fields, though exactly what the fields should contain was
23 discussed, and there may be certain differences based on
24 someone's reading of the field in the May '88 list versus
25 the fields in the appendix in our report. I am really not

1 prepared to go through a detailed difference here.

2 Just quickly looking at the May 17th document, we
3 have the actual title of any document and other fields for
4 the description of the document, a short description if the
5 document was not titled. We decided to change that into one
6 field on the understanding that people didn't want to search
7 two fields, and may or may not know whether it had a formal
8 title, or whether it was just a description. That was
9 taking two fields and making them one.

10 The other thing that immediately comes to mind on
11 the May 17th, '88 list -- there was an errata date field
12 that we, after discussion, determined really if a document
13 was an errata, that would have to be captured in its
14 relationship to the document it was changing. Really, what
15 the date of that document would be would be captured in the
16 document data. That was eliminated as a field.

17 There was, in the original list, something called
18 a "contract number field," and after discussion, it was
19 decided that it should really be just one field that
20 captured the alpha numeric things that people would call it
21 by. So, that collapsed into one field.

22 Another field on the May 17, '88 list was
23 something called "Site of Activity." This had been proposed
24 with the idea -- during that time frame, there were several
25 sites under consideration, and the fact, based on the result

1 of the prototype, was that this field was felt not to be
2 useful. If the subject of the document was a particular
3 site or section of the site, that could be captured either i
4 the descriptors, or somehow captured elsewhere. So, that
5 was eliminated.

6 There are fields that may be different in the May
7 17 list and out list, but the content is essentially the
8 same. I want to see if there is anything else.

9 [Pause.]

10 MS. SHELBURNE: There was a field called meeting
11 date on the 1988 list. We expanded that to a field called
12 event date. We wanted to pick up documents about meetings
13 that happened on a certain date. From my experience, that
14 is an essential field. People may know of the meeting but
15 not know the date of the minutes in the public document
16 room, but we felt there were other events, audits,
17 conferences, and so we broaden that so that if a document
18 was clearly about something, that the searcher might want to
19 have access to based on that, they knew the timeframe. We
20 picked that up. Let me see what else.

21 [Pause.]

22 MS. SHELBURNE: The original recipient field in
23 the 1988 list included the capture of copyees. We decided
24 to separate that out, so you can see as an addressee, in our
25 recommendation, and a separate field for copyee, an

1 organization where it can be identified on the document.

2 That is basically a quick review without going
3 into a lot of detail. I think there are distinctions to be
4 made about individual fields. As you will note in the
5 report, we kept bumping up against things that did not
6 really relate to the specific fields, whether or not we
7 wanted to capture or felt we should recommend the capture of
8 an element of information.

9 The report does go through those. We tried to
10 characterize some of the issues that we felt should be drawn
11 to the attention of the ARP, whether or not they have to be
12 resolved before we can determine that these are the elements
13 of information that the Committee wants to recommend. We
14 didn't want to ignore them in the report, so we laid them
15 out for discussion.

16 I would like to hear a discussion on each issue,
17 but I don't know how you want to do that.

18 MR. HOYLE: Well, why don't you just mention the
19 issues and you can comment about what you think the central
20 point of that issue is.

21 MS. SHELBURNE: Okay. Starting on page 2 of the
22 report, the first issue related to the acknowledgement that
23 multiple participants may submit the same document during
24 the backlog sort of becomes a question of what is relevant
25 and falls within the topical guidelines. It is not only the

1 document authored by that participant. But either because
2 they have included that in a package, of course, of what has
3 been authored by someone else or because they feel a totally
4 separate study or document is relevant. We had to
5 acknowledge there would be the same document submitted and
6 header submitted for the same document.

7 According to the understanding of the design, we
8 would not need to actually store the text or image of a
9 document multiple times, so long as we determined it was an
10 exact match. But the header information might be different.
11 We wanted to raise the issue of how to handle that. So,
12 that is the first issue.

13 In the discussion on characterization of the
14 fields, whether or not they were multi-value, whether or not
15 there should be some format control for ease of indexing,
16 and more importantly, consistency in retrieval. We talked
17 about editing, quality control, the ability of the capture
18 station, in reviewing the submitted information from the
19 bibliographic information headers to determine what should
20 be done by the LSSA capture station staff in the quality
21 control and correction of editions, I mean, the correction
22 of information and how to notify or whether we needed to
23 notify the participants that we had corrected something.

24 MR. HOLSTEIN: Should we ask questions along the
25 way or wait?

1 MR. HOYLE: I would like to wait until the end.

2 MS. SHELBURNE: Issue No. 3 was the issue of
3 abstracts. There was a lot of discussion on the benefit
4 versus the cost of abstracts, and we did not feel that we
5 could make a hard recommendation on the need for abstracts
6 versus the costs of abstracts. So, we felt like that was a
7 point of discussion that needed to be discussed with the
8 numbers.

9 We did make a recommendation which was basically
10 we did not feel in the working group that the cost of
11 abstracting every piece of document, given we did have a
12 full text system, was justified. There are arguments that
13 some types of documents do benefit from an abstract and the
14 pros and cons of that, who should do it, what type of
15 abstracts, is really a larger matter that we felt
16 uncomfortable making a recommendation on given the timeframe
17 and the resources we have.

18 The fourth issue was that there are relevant
19 documentary materials which cannot be stored in full text.
20 It can be stored in image only: handwritten materials,
21 maps. There are sets of information which cannot be stored
22 even in image. These have been characterized as technical
23 data, graphic oriented material. There are header fields
24 and elements of information, access points, which are
25 different than in the describing of the document, the number

1 of pages and certain things.

2 We limited our discussion and recommendation to
3 document material only in the Office of the LSSA
4 Administrator and further information needs to be gathered
5 relating to the idea of accessing information about this
6 material. So we acknowledged in the report that we did not
7 try to finalize the recommendation on that, and that there
8 may be field within the header report that we recommended
9 that would be applicable for the sponsoring agency. But we
10 wanted to acknowledge they had not gone through that aspect
11 in detail.

12 The last issue related to our acknowledgement that
13 we are not perfect and that there may be fields in the life
14 of this system, elements of information that warrant the
15 development of a separate field and that it, after
16 discussion here and review by the LSS Administrator, and the
17 setting of the bibliographic header and the full header over
18 time, as we characterized these documents, there may be
19 field that we need to add.

20 Obviously, if we do that, it would be with a lot
21 of deliberation, and the fact that you had to say if you
22 search this field, it will only be for documents captured of
23 this type. That is an issue with these kinds of systems
24 that would be a point of discussion. That is basically it
25 without getting into a lot of detail about those issues.

1 The rest of the report and Appendix A is the list
2 of the names of the fields and our determination as to
3 whether they should be multivalued. Our feeling as to
4 whether they should be control authority -- a controlled
5 authority being a specific list of acceptable entries in
6 that field.

7 The next column relates to format control and the
8 development of the indexing rules. We will specify the
9 format of the entry.

10 And the last column was the acknowledgement that
11 the header is the structured field record about the ability
12 to go through, and the example I always give is the
13 descriptor's field. It is a controlled authority, but if
14 someone wants to go through and say give me a set of records
15 where the word "core" was either the first word, the last
16 word or somewhere apart of the descriptor phrase without
17 having to know if it's the first or the last word or its
18 position, that the ability to search that field, as you do
19 in a full text system, would allow you to do what is called
20 words in context search. Most packages allow you to do
21 that. We felt we ought to acknowledge that some people
22 might want to do that.

23 Appendix B is a description of each field. It is
24 divided into those that are recommended to be committed to
25 the participants and those that are either optional for the

1 participants and those that will be picked up by the LSS
2 administrator.

3 Now, one of the things we kept coming back to, if
4 you say oh, my God, 26 elements, there are many elements
5 that are not likely to be many document types.

6 So, obviously, if there was no report number, no
7 event date, we know that is not going to be captured,
8 period. It will always say "if applicable."

9 That's it.

10 MR. HOYLE: Okay. Betsy, I thank you. And also,
11 Donna Menella and Eileen Tana, I want to thank them for
12 their participation.

13 MS. SHELBURNE: Also, if there is anything that
14 you would like to add, or characterize as to what we did or
15 modify something or have left out something, I wish you
16 would chime in.

17 MS. CERNY: Can I just say, I think you recall did
18 a good job.

19 MS. SHELBURNE: Yes. You can say that.

20 Thank you.

21 If you would like the others up here with me,
22 please feel free to chime in.

23 One of the things about my participation in the
24 group is that I was very sensitive to the fact that I was
25 nota member of the Advisory Review Panel. If you remember,

1 at my presentation to the last meeting, I was the brilliant
2 one who had the idea of having a working group with the idea
3 that this would be a small group of people who are
4 experienced users, experienced with the headaches of
5 capturing, and wanted to get together to try and make our
6 best recommendations.

7 When there were issues in the report and there
8 were some problems, I tried to give my best advice. It was
9 not a lot of voting in the group. It was just laid out for
10 discussion. And the group had a strong recommendation of
11 the elements. And this is a good list. If there are things
12 missing, we would like to hear about it. But it is a strong
13 recommendation from the working group, prospective of
14 potential users, and also the level of effort on searched
15 capture.

16 MR. HOYLE: I appreciate you making that point
17 clear, that you are a member of the Administrator's office
18 and are not part, or a member of the panel, and therefore
19 could not be a full-fledged member of the subcommittee. But
20 I appreciate your efforts greatly.

21 Let me mention two things. And then Dan had a
22 point to make, and we will get to that. Otherwise, what I
23 think I will kind of do is go around the table. Since Mr.
24 Holstein first indicated he had a point, we will start with
25 him and then go around.

1 But Betsy mentioned two documents, which I will
2 make a part of the draft bibliographic header field Revision
3 3, which is a starting point for this subgroup dated May 17,
4 1988, and then the recent letter from Kirk ^BMalcolm of May
5 28, 1990, which has recommendations of the working group.

6 MR. GRASER: It was just a quick point. I counted
7 29 fields by actually going through the list. So I think we
8 should clarify that.

9 There are 29?

10 MS. SHELBURNE: By the time we got through, we
11 were lucky -- well, they were fun meetings.

12 MR. GRASER: The record should reflect there are
13 29 and we should go by the list as they are listed out.

14 MS. SHELBURNE: Kirk stands corrected.

15 MR. HOYLE: There are several ways we could do
16 this. One is to just go page by page, item by item, and see
17 whether we have agreement or if there is discussion on a
18 point.

19 The Department of Energy has sent me a letter with
20 their thoughts and comments, and we need to discuss those
21 items. But let's see how this goes.

22 Mr. Holstein.

23 MR. HOLSTEIN: Thank you very much. I just have
24 one very brief question to clarify my understanding of the
25 first recommendation, multiple submissions for same

1 document.

2 I gather from, rather than trying to make choices
3 among several different submissions of subjective
4 information, that you would go ahead, but that you would
5 identify them by participant's number, and that those
6 numbers would be -- and this is the part I want to clarify -
7 - the number will all be listed in sequence.

8 Will it be easy to ascertain which submission goes
9 with which numbers?

10 MS. SHELBURNE: We discussed that a lot.

11 Our feeling was that -- Let me just preface this
12 by one comment: that based on my now speaking for the
13 Administrator's office -- excuse me. If something is
14 different, clearly wrong, a different date or just a
15 different format of the contract number, I don't think we
16 would just sort of list that one right after the other.

17 What we are talking about here is for those
18 documents that may be described differently for additional
19 terms that are there, our recommendation is you would still
20 have one header, so people wouldn't have to get two headers
21 and wonder if it was a different document or a duplicate,
22 point to the same image, point to the same text.

23 Only where the description was different, the
24 title description, did we feel it was important to attribute
25 the describing of it to the different submitters. If

1 additional terms were added, we didn't feel like we needed
2 to put a Code Number 1 in a system like this, because we
3 didn't think that would be a problem.

4 If it needed to be done, we would do it. But only
5 where the textual description and the title description
6 field was different did we feel that some code or acronym or
7 whatever related to it, maybe the submitter's acquisition
8 number, that would be attributed. We would just merge the
9 information and assume it was right according to the catalog
10 numbers and that the submitter's acquisition number field
11 would add that additional tack-on so the two submitters
12 contributed to this header, but you wouldn't know if the key
13 terms or something like that, which one was which.

14 Does that answer your question?

15 MS. CERNY: I agree, there is going to probably be
16 a lot of multiple submissions. But I also think, in many
17 cases, it is going to be very hard. The very issue you
18 brought up here, you might have different titles, different
19 descriptors. And in an automated environment, by doing
20 matching to titles, descriptions, et cetera, I think it is
21 very difficult to pick up that they are duplicates, except
22 in very complex search cases.

23 How are you going to find out they are duplicates?
24 To, from, a certain number of fields will match. But if you
25 have titles, et cetera, the duplicates will throw that out

1 and say that isn't a duplicate.

2 I think there is more to this than just the issue
3 of whether you are going to capture both of those titles.

4 MS. SHELBURNE: I think this was based on the
5 assumption, gee, when you put it in, you said it might be a
6 duplicate, but after review, you determined it was not a
7 duplicate. Looking at the image of the information, the
8 text of the information, to say this is not the exact same
9 document DOE had, it is as an attachment to a piece of their
10 own document. There was an additional description. It was
11 the point at which you determined that it was not a
12 duplicate that we had this issue.

13 If there was some question as to whether or not it
14 was the same document, then the header would be separate,
15 would point to a different document. There would be two
16 different citations on the assumption that people would not
17 duplicate.

18 Am I characterizing this right?

19 MS. CERNY: But you really get into an issue then
20 of how much manual work are you going to do in this system
21 and how much you want to automate at the expense of having
22 some duplication, just because it is too expensive, and at
23 what point is it worth doing the manual checking that you
24 are talking about.

25 MR. TREBY: I was wondering if we could maybe set

1 up some specific samples instead of talking in the abstract,
2 and get at this issue of how much manual checking we are
3 going to do ahead of time.

4 I can foresee three different situations where you
5 might have -- there may be more, but at least three came to
6 mine -- where you might have duplicate documents with
7 different headers.

8 One would be where, for some reason, the document
9 is developed by the initiator and submitted with a header,
10 or for some reason or another, an organization submits that
11 same document, but their own header.

12 A second situation would be where the issuer
13 develops a document and submits it with its header and
14 another organization has some sort of a different document
15 about this particular issue, say, an enclosure, or in some
16 way or other it is a cover letter they are sending to
17 somebody else. They had that with the enclosure for some
18 reason. And the issuing document is also enclosed so they
19 have a header for it.

20 I guess a third situation would be a document not
21 developed by any of the participants but by some outside
22 organization and one or more participants believes that it
23 is an important document that needs to be in the LSS, and
24 they submit it each with their own headers.

25 Taking those three situations, I guess I am

1 interested in what the process would be.

2 In the first situation, when you have a
3 participant who is actually the originating organization and
4 they submit a header, and a second organization submits that
5 same document with their own header, I would think that the
6 header of the originating organization perhaps sends the
7 document, that second document back to them, indicating that
8 the document has already been submitted by the originating
9 organization.

10 MS. SHELBURNE: This is a stand-alone entry?

11 MR. TREBY: Right. Would you agree that is what
12 would happen?

13 MR. GRASER: Not quite. In the system design,
14 what would happen is that the second attempt to enter the
15 document would define that the document has already been
16 entered. A straightforward case.

17 There is no question as to the fact this document
18 is the same as this document [indicating].

19 The second attempt to enter that document would
20 find that the document is a duplicate. The second document
21 submitted would not simply be sent back to the submitter
22 stating that the document had been submitted. This relates
23 to the fact the system will be annotated with the fact that
24 the second party attempted to submit the document, the date
25 the document was submitted; and we will keep track of the

1 fact that, you know, the document was submitted along with a
2 duplicate, and it won't be seen, but in the record, for the
3 first submission, will be appended a notation that that
4 document was attempted to be submitted a second time by a
5 second party.

6 So it is not really just a question of saying oh,
7 we have already got it here. It comes back. We would be
8 keeping track of every subsequent attempt of submitting that
9 document.

10 When someone comes back and attempts to submit
11 40,000 documents but only 38,000 got into the system, we
12 will be able to say oh, yes, we have 2,000 documents
13 identified as already being in the system.

14 It is not quite as simple as saying no, the
15 document is in there, it comes back.

16 MR. HOYLE: That is part of the system as you
17 envision it?

18 MS. SHELBURNE: Your representation is that would
19 be captured on the third section of the administrative
20 tracking, which may or may not be part of the header, but
21 would be retrievable?

22 MR. GRASER: For database administrators, there
23 will be a complete audit trail of who submitted it to them
24 and so forth. It will be in the duplicate check file.

25 MS. SHELBURNE: Would it be given a submitter's

1 acquisition number?

2 MR. GRASER: I am not certain about that level of
3 detail. Whatever it is going to take to identify, yes, we
4 would keep that information.

5 MS. SHELBURNE: This is the subject for the three
6 categories. If the header information is different from one
7 to the other, the second submission, once it is deemed to be
8 a duplicate, you would not look further to see if the header
9 information is different?

10 MR. GRASER: That is a legitimate issue that
11 Barbara was raising. If one document gets into the system,
12 and that is a complete title that is essentially different
13 from the created title, that the second capture station
14 might attempt to assign to it, depending on the way it is
15 collected. As to the title field, there may be a less
16 probability that document even being identified as a
17 duplicate if the created titles are so substantially
18 different.

19 This is where it begins to go back to the question
20 of what kind of procedures and standards can be put in place
21 for this title field for the descriptor to ensure there is
22 as much consistency as possible.

23 Very often, in litigation support data bases,
24 where there is no title and someone creates a title, there
25 is a standard procedure for how you go about creating a

1 title, like making the first line of the paragraph the one
2 or use the words from the first line to summarize what the
3 document is, so there is some consistency.

4 But whatever procedure is followed, about the only
5 way to be sure that it is a duplicate would be some sort of
6 a standard in place, especially in the title field, where it
7 is a created title.

8 That is an issue, yes. And that is a problem.
9 The problem, with attempting to put two documents in from
10 totally different environments, with two differently created
11 titles.

12 MR. KILLAR: Can I bring up a different question
13 with copies? Is someone was to enter an document that would
14 get kicked out because the header or the description is the
15 same, it would never be entered in?

16 MS. CERNY: My answer to that is, no, it will not
17 be considered a second document because it is my definition
18 not to duplicate.

19 MR. KILLAR: Your software will not be kicking out
20 the header? It looks at the actual pages?

21 MS. CERNY: Marginalia is one of the issues in
22 order to kick it out because it is a duplicate. A duplicate
23 is an exact duplicate.

24 MR. HOLSTEIN: Would they have the same title?

25 MS. CERNY: But marginalia is what makes it

1 different.

2 MR. KILLAR: In which case, the first thing that
3 should be checked out is the marginalia?

4 MS. SHELBURNE: There are two issues in this one
5 that I see. If it is just another version of a document
6 that happens to be unattributed to markings, notes, that we
7 don't know who they are from, they just look different, we
8 assume this has all gone through the participant's dup check
9 and concluded that this is the best copy they are submitting
10 because they want to submit the document.

11 Let's say this, as an example, is the best copy
12 the submitter would find that is legible, here attaching a
13 report which happens to be different from this, B.S.
14 comments, which stands for Betsy Shelburne, by the way.
15 They are submitted and they describe the contents of the
16 document. That is a characterization of that document.
17 When it came in if there was already a clean copy, if it is
18 a different document, it has the same date and there is
19 another copy with marginalia, that is one kind of situation.

20 The other situation is where a copy of my comments
21 comes in. The header would say the author is Betsy
22 Shelburne. The description is comments on Kirk Balcom's
23 report. These are really two different headers and access
24 points. So you have two situations. The situation where it
25 looks like a duplicate except that there are unattributed

1 marginalia and, I guess, well, for the two copies, point to
2 the two versions, the issue is where it is being submitted,
3 because it is my comment on something and that is another
4 situation, because it would have a different header, and
5 hopefully we can figure out what the date of my comments
6 were and that kind of stuff.

7 Does that answer your question?

8 MR. KILLAR: I understand the duplication. Going
9 back to the header section itself, we have agreed there
10 would only be one heading. How do you come up with
11 agreement of what the header is? What you have suggested is
12 that subsequent submitters just let it go. These people
13 have submitted it and there may be something in it that they
14 want to appear in the abstract or some other items added to
15 the header that will not be picked up.

16 Is there an arbitrator who comes up and who says,
17 what do you have in the header section that you feel
18 comfortable with? Would that be the LSS Administrator or
19 someone else? The Administrator looks at that, sends it
20 back to the original submitter, and gets agreement that,
21 yes, this will not detract from what he originally submitted
22 as his header? That is my suggestion. That is a reasonable
23 way to get the header and make the people who submit
24 multiple documents conform it.

25 MS. CERNY: But the real issue retrievability and

1 this is a full text system and you have all of these other
2 fields. How much, in fact, is that created title going to
3 influence the retrievability of these documents?

4 MR. KILLAR: I agree. If you just limit it to the
5 discussion of the created title. We haven't got down to the
6 other part, and I have some concern about the discussion of
7 the abstract and people doing the searches of abstracts.

8 MS. CERNY: We will have to come up with standards
9 on how you do this. I really think this is the issue. I
10 think the issue is that there is a lot involved and that has
11 to do with the system design and with capture standards,
12 indexing standards, et cetera. We can just sit here and
13 talk about all this, but in fact, that is what we have to
14 do.

15 MR. KILLAR: I agree with that.

16 MS. CERNY: That is what should be put in place
17 and presented. Will these standards work? This is a very
18 good start to filter, but we will not sit here and get
19 closure.

20 MR. HOYLE: No, we are not. That is a good time
21 to comment on issues versus do you think we get to closure
22 on some of the fields in here, and maybe hold out on those
23 that have issues attached to them and talk about the issues
24 in subsequent meetings, papers, or however else we are going
25 to deal with those, because many of these are properly

1 issues for this panel, maybe all of them. Some of them the
2 panel may not be able to get to or too interested in because
3 you need guidance, but there might be closure and that you
4 want to get going on. So the question is, how much time do
5 we want to spend talking about issues versus trying to get
6 closure on some of the fields that we can get closure on?

7 MS. SHELBURNE: Can I just do one thing?

8 MR. HOYLE: Let me take the mystery out of the
9 note passing. Kirk Balcom had an emergency at home. He is
10 available this morning, but only available by phone after
11 10:30 if we need him.

12 MS. SHELBURNE: I agree with what you say. I want
13 to go back, Stuart, to your characterization of when are we
14 going to discuss people needing to go away thinking about it
15 in this three-tier issue or the different situations getting
16 an idea on how to handle that, because it is a note in the
17 margin by one organization about this idea of multiple
18 participants create problems.

19 MS. CERNY: My experience with duplicate software
20 is we spent about two years tuning this thing, and you
21 really error on the side of putting them in because you
22 don't want to miss them. And you do have duplicates.

23 I think it will take soe working through. As you
24 say, this is far more complex than just one organization.

25 Could we vote on accepting the fields, the 29 of

1 them, as looking at those fields like this one, where we
2 feel we have to go back to the drawing board for one reason
3 or another?

4 MR. HOYLE: I am ready to do something like that
5 unless there should be other discussion that would keep us
6 from doing that, one by one, or as a group?

7 MS. CERNY: The 29, do we all agree that these
8 are the fields? That would be a big start. And then, one
9 by one, in those with which people have some problems. As
10 we have laid it out in the letter, we have certain problems
11 with certain ones. And then we can go back and consider
12 those. But at least get the bulk of those out of the way.

13 MR. HOYLE: One of those, the NRC feels, is an
14 unnecessary one, for instance, and I take it this is, one of
15 the 29 is whether or not there should be an abstract for
16 documents that will be in full text in the system.

17 MS. CERNY: That is an issue.

18 MR. HOYLE: If we already agreed that is an
19 optional field to both participants and the administrator,
20 and so long as we can go back and take it back out, if in
21 discussing the issue it should come out, fine, that is
22 agreed upon. And then I am willing to agree to the 29
23 fields.

24 MR. KILLAR: We are not.

25 MR. HOYLE: We are not?

1 MR. KILLAR: We question the copy organization as
2 a field.

3 MR. HOYLE: We also have some concern about the
4 numbers of entries that could be in there because the NRC,
5 we send copies to a large number of people.

6 MR. KILLAR: There is a NUREG out, and there is a
7 list in Part B.

8 MR. HOYLE: Is there in the design some limit on
9 the number of copyees, up to two?

10 MR. GRASER: It depends on the software.

11 MR. KILLAR: I guess I am going back to
12 fundamentally what is the point of the fields. The question
13 is, what is the point of the fields in the first place, what
14 is the value of having the copyee and the copying
15 organization?

16 MS. CERNY: I think that, if I remember
17 correctly, the State of Nevada was concerned in negotiations
18 and they were very interested. However, they are not here.

19 MS. SHELBURNE: I know.

20 MS. CERNY: Don't you recall that?

21 MR. KILLAR: My answer to that, though, is with
22 the full text system, once they see the document, they can
23 see who the copyees are to the document.

24 Why they want to do a search of the header as to
25 copyees is beyond me. I would think they would do a search

1 of headers and find out who the letter went to and not the
2 copyees.

3 MS. CERNY: You will have to talk to them about
4 that.

5 MR. KILLAR: So we are down to 27.

6 MR. HOYLE: I would like to get Nevada's viewpoint
7 on that.

8 Do you feel as strongly about addressees and
9 copyees?

10 MR. KILLAR: No. I think that is appropriate.

11 MR. GRASER: I think the discussion is moving
12 towards a very similar sort of realization that there may be
13 some situations and some categories of documents where it is
14 very important to know who the copyees are and the copy
15 organizations, and whether it is a publication with a very
16 wide distribution, which is a very good example of that.

17 There may be examples of documents where it is not
18 appropriate to use that field. And that is something that
19 could be controlled in the capture system environment when
20 we get to procedures which are being put into place by the
21 LSS Administrator.

22 On the other hand, there may be some fields where
23 it provides another user with a point of access and they do
24 want to have access by that field, and for that type of
25 information, and for a certain category of document.

1 I see our discussion moving towards a realization
2 that there may be one field where some subsequent paper or
3 study needs to be done to make a recommendation. Okay, it
4 won't be used wholesale. But that doesn't mean the field
5 should be stricken.

6 MS. SHELBURNE: Let me bring up something to focus
7 the discussion. And this is a "for example."

8 When we are talking about fields, if you all are
9 going to be doing any recommendations or voting, I would
10 point to looking at Appendix B, not just the list of the
11 fields, because there is a description of what we felt the
12 short title of the field was going to be. In talking about
13 this, there should be a common understanding of what that
14 field should be.

15 I would note that cotypees are useful for
16 correspondence only, names of all the persons to whom a copy
17 of the document was sent, as listed on the unit.

18 I would also like to point to the fact that it is
19 recommended that is a field that is going to be picked up by
20 the capture station personnel. Therefore, it has to be
21 listed on the elements. It is not something where you would
22 go off and ask everybody where you had copies to.

23 MR. KILLAR: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission
24 sent out a NUREG, part of which covers letter lists, which
25 is a listing of all of those who are receiving the document,

1 so you would have three pages of copies.

2 MS. SHELBURNE: Well, that is as to
3 correspondence.

4 MR. KILLAR: The letter is correspondence, even if
5 it is a transmittal letter.

6 MS. CERNY: If Mel Murphy were here, he would
7 have a lot of discussion about this. He would say, it is
8 correspondence having to do with some policy decision, and
9 he wants to know about it, and that was the idea behind
10 copyee.

11 And so this really is a limited category of
12 information in which a document is useful. And probably
13 Nevada who really wanted it, would agree with the NUREG on
14 transmittal letters.

15 MR. HOYLE: Let me suggest we try after 10:30 to
16 get hold of Kirk to see if he can speak to that.

17 Meanwhile, I will entertain a vote on the list,
18 reserving, for the moment at least, on copyee.

19 ~~MS. VIDERT~~ MR. BECHTEL: I have one question on the list, if I
20 may.

21 Would there be any benefit in having maybe a
22 description of the item that took place? You have down
23 here, "event." Whether that might be something that would
24 enable you to trace something, but also, if you were trying
25 to find out if you had an area of concern, or something

1 being able to include that information as a mandatory item?
2 I just don't see that here.

3 MR. HOYLE: Can you speak to that?

4 MS. SHELBURNE: I am going to ask Donna. This was
5 originally a field called site of activity. I can remember
6 us discussing that. I will turn to Donna on why we decided
7 to take it out.

8 MS. MENNELLA: It was very difficult to determine
9 on all cases of site activity what happened, from just a
10 reading of the document. It turns out most of the activity
11 was Yucca Mountain, during the year of tests.

12 When we put in "Yucca Mountain" they got almost
13 the entire data base. Therefore, it was not felt that it
14 was not worthwhile.

15 The other problem was the tendency to catalog all
16 the information you want to store in this descriptive field,
17 so we ended up merging those two fields. So it is not that
18 the site was lost in the field. It is just that it appears
19 in a different field. It does not have its own field.

20 ~~MS. VIDERT:~~ MR. BECHTEL:
21 I can see cases where it wouldn't be
22 applicable and I can see a benefit, if you were trying to
23 look at information about the particular bore hole where you
24 wanted to key it if you used geographic coordinates.

24 I don't know.

25 MS. SHELBURNE: Wouldn't it be in the full text if

1 the document was available?

2 ~~MS. VIBERT:~~ ^{MR. BECHTEL:} I guess maybe would be to go with an
3 abstract and then you would be able to pick that up from
4 other information.

5 MR. GRASER: Or in the title.

6 MR. KILLAR: It might be in the title.

7 ~~MS. VIBERT:~~ ^{MR. BECHTEL:} But maybe not. I don't know.

8 MR. TREBY: I guess I have one question before we
9 vote.

10 MR. HOYLE: Let's remove that. I don't really
11 hear a consensus on adding an item called location, but
12 maybe we could somehow or other urge that title be used to
13 describe location.

14 ~~MS. VIBERT:~~ ^{MR. BECHTEL:} Maybe in the standards of how you
15 describe it.

16 MR. HOYLE: We haven't really seen the standards
17 and details about how titles should be arrived at.

18 MR. HOLSTEIN: I would like to comment on this
19 briefly. I'm not sure. I think it would take some more
20 analysis as to whether or not the system, as it's currently
21 designed, would give user access to the sort of geographic
22 specific data that Dennis is describing.

23 On the other hand, I'm not sure -- I remain to be
24 convinced that the possibility or the likelihood of bringing
25 down on yourself, mountains of data by using a simple term

1 such as Yucca Mountain, is sufficient reason for knocking
2 out a particular code. Frankly, I think that problem is
3 going to occur in virtually any use of a full text retrieval
4 system, if you don't use sufficiently narrow search terms.

5 If you were to use that problem as a criterion for
6 knocking out some of these items or for determining what
7 items should be on the list, it seems to me you will end up
8 in trouble. Yucca Mountain isn't the only one that I can
9 imagine you bringing down unusable mountains of data with.
10 I am not sure the answer we heard was sufficient, leaving
11 aside whether you could achieve the same results through
12 some other system.

13 MR. HOYLE: Any further comments on that?

14 [No response.]

15 MR. HOYLE: I think we do need some at some point
16 the details of what should go into titles and what should go
17 into the event descriptor and what should be in some of
18 these other items like descriptors. Would there be an
19 opportunity to put the location information in the
20 descriptor?

21 MR. BALCOM: The thesaurus will contain geographic
22 terms and the description will contain geographic
23 information.

24 I think in the prototype we had bore holes.

25 VOICE: Every bore hole we know is included as a

1 descriptor.

MR. BECHTEL:

2 ~~MS. VIBERT~~: I think the only question I have is
3 the field optional at least in describing this.

4 MS. MENNELLA: Which field?

5 MS. VIBERT: The descriptor.

6 MS. MENNELLA: No, that is optional.

7 MS. SHELBURNE: It is up to the submitter. If
8 they don't do it, the recommendation is that the capture
9 station's staff would attempt to index the document.

10 MR. KILLAR: I think, rather than voting on this
11 list, I think we need to have the subcommittee to go back
12 and try to provide some more detail as to what would go
13 under each of these headers and possibly work with Barbara
14 as to what would be the standards or what you call the
15 procedures to fill out these headers.

16 That way, it would give people a more comfortable
17 feeling that their material is going to be included or the
18 material is not going to be included.

19 MR. HOYLE: Well, it is back to the chicken and
20 egg situation. That's what you're saying we have here.

21 When there is a sequence of events, would there be
22 detailed instructions or procedures prepared for
23 participants?

24 Is it appropriate as Felix suggests, to see that
25 type of detail before we decide on what the header units

1 are?

2 Would DOE answer that?

3 MS. CERNY: I'm happy with the header unit as they
4 are with some tuning, and I will go into that when we get to
5 abstracts of documents. A lot of thought has gone into
6 this, based upon the prototype and based upon knowledge of
7 other systems.

8 I really see us belaboring this when I am hopeful
9 that we can -- there are good reasons for picking what has
10 been picked and I would just as soon move on and fine tune
11 those fields we need standards for.

12 MR. KILLAR: I am suggesting we don't need to go
13 over all of them, but just like ^{copyee} ~~Copy-E~~, or organization.

14 MS. CERNY: When I suggest this has been narrowed
15 to this set of fields and there are good reasons for having
16 picked it, as Dona just explained why we no longer have a
17 location field, I think we should accept this and go on, say
18 in which way is a field under question. Do you need your
19 standards set up?

20 I suggest that we move this thing on.

21 MR. HOYLE: We need to move on; it's 10:30. We
22 have decided that there are some things to be decided or are
23 we going to put everything off until the issues category?

24 Stew might have a further comment on how we may
25 proceed.

1 MR. TREBY: I think that we should reach some sort
2 of resolution as to the group of headers. My only question
3 is whether we should vote and whether we should vote on the
4 list first and hear the modifications or hear the
5 modifications and then vote. I understand that we can talk
6 to Kirk who is the representative of Nevada shortly, and we
7 can hear his comments on ^{copyee} ~~copy~~ and stuff, if that is still
8 an issue as to whether or not that should be a field of not.

9 The only question is as to standards for that
10 particular field.

11 MS. SHELBURNE: I just want to go back to Appendix
12 B, if people would like to alter the description of fields
13 to say such things under descriptors to give some
14 recommendation for the purpose and focus and any specific
15 indexes concept or philosophy, if that could be done. It's
16 not only a list of fields, but the wording of some of the
17 descriptions, the site or the location -- if there is a
18 recommendation that descriptor should be something else,
19 fine.

20 I'm not trying to put words in as to what they
21 should say in this report. You keep talking about the list,
22 but it is the issue of the definition; that detailed indices
23 will be developed from.

24 MR. HOYLE: Let me proceed by using pages 1 and 2
25 of the document we got from the subcommittee, plus

1 Appendix B, page 1. Let's take the first 5 items and see
2 what issues jump out. So we have participant accession
3 number, submitter center, submitter paper count,
4 title/description, and then author. And then, Mr. Treby, I
5 have one minor point I would like to raise, and that is, at
6 the very beginning where it says "Bibliographic Header" and
7 then in parentheses "required to be supplied by
8 participants," I guess I would suggest we might add, after
9 "required," "if applicable."

10 MR. TREBY: Picking up on what Betsy said, not all
11 of the fields are applicable. I assume we are referring to
12 all the fields. It is a small point, but I don't think we
13 want to leave the impression that everyone of these fields
14 are required to be filled out if they are not obviously ones
15 that can be filled out.

16 MR. HOYLE: As you say, Betsy made that point.
17 What we are suggesting is that it be put in the appropriate
18 in describing the headers to be supplied by participants.
19 All right, let's look at the description of the
20 title/description in the Appendix B. I will read it. "A
21 brief description given to a unit -- "

22 MR. KILLAR: Excuse me, do we really need to go
23 into this much detail?

24 MR. HOYLE: All right, the answer is no. Do we
25 have approval of the first 5 items?

1 Okay, approval.

2 Next, author organization, addressee, addressee
3 organization, document date, document/report number.

4 Approved.

5 Document condition, edition/version, event date,
6 code, protected status, related documents.

7 MS. VIBERT: Maybe we should put location in
8 there; maybe descriptor is fine.

9 MR. KILLAR: I have a question under the
10 edition/version, and the question is, that it says free
11 text. The question is, is it appropriate now to talk about
12 this, whether this should be free text searchable or not? I
13 have no problem with the header, I just have a question
14 about free text.

15 MS. CERNY: Let's do the headers.

16 MR. KILLAR: Okay.

17 MR. HOYLE: Special class, abstract/summary for
18 non-documents. Okay, we have approved the fields.

19 ~~MS. VIBERT:~~ ^{MR. BECHTEL!} I have a question about protected
20 status. What exactly does that mean?

21 MR. HOYLE: Who could describe protected status as
22 a header field? Betsy, before you run out, could you tell
23 us more about protected status as a field?

24 MS. SHELBURNE: Okay. It's my understanding the
25 bibliographic headers would have to be submitted for those

1 documents for which participants claim a privilege.

2 MR. BALCOM: I am catching about 90 percent of the
3 conversation.

4 MS. SHELBURNE: Very probably because I was
5 walking across the room.

6 MR. BALCOM: I am glad to join. I guess I would
7 have to use this conference call after all.

8 MR. HOYLE: Yes. Thanks for joining us. So far
9 what we have done is rapped a bit and we have approved just
10 about all of the fields of the bibliographic header to be
11 supplied by participants. We are now talking about one of
12 those, the protected status field. Betsy is describing what
13 that entails.

14 MR. BALCOM: I heard Betsy start to talk about
15 that.

16 MS. SHELBURNE: As I said, it is my understanding
17 that there is a requirement for those documents which
18 participants claim a privilege -- I would like anyone to
19 chime in on this one -- that headers must be submitted, and
20 there was the case -- the field in which someone would
21 designate the privilege they were invoking.

22 MR. BALCOM: Right, privilege, or I think the rule
23 states exemption. It's in one of the rule sections.

24 MR. HOYLE: Okay. The description of this field
25 is "a coded field indicating the type or types of privileges

1 or exceptions claimed for the underlying document upon which
2 the header is based." Perhaps the word "exceptions" should
3 be "exemptions."

4 MR. BALCOM: Whatever the rule is, we used the
5 wording in the rule which is "exceptions."

6 MR. HOYLE: Yes. Eileen's head is giving me a
7 yes, "exceptions." Steve Scott has raised his hand.

8 MR. SCOTT: Another issue, if that one is closed,
9 is that we might have the instructions to say, "if
10 applicable," correct?

11 MR. HOYLE: Yes.

12 MR. SCOTT: That creates inconsistencies that we
13 have with the descriptions in here. For example, document
14 date. That is not consistent with a description now. It
15 indicates that the document will be created regardless of
16 whether or not it's applicable.

17 MS. SHELBURNE: Are we switching fields here now?

18 MR. HOYLE: Steve is going back up to a field
19 "document date" and he has a comment on that. He says the
20 document on which the unit was published is created if it
21 doesn't -- well, that the information in the unit will be
22 used to determine a likely date. I don't feel that is a
23 problem.

24 MR. SCOTT: If there is no date, it is not
25 applicable or are we saying one is always applicable because

1 one will be created?

2 MR. HOYLE: I guess I am prepared to say, as far
3 as date is concerned, there should always be something in
4 that field.

5 MR. SCOTT: The same holds true for author and
6 addressee, organization?

7 MR. HOYLE: Yes.

8 MS. MENNELLA: This difference was if it is
9 applicable and whether it is available. Certain fields will
10 be filled on information that is available. Other fields it
11 is based on applicable information.

12 For example, if you have a report, the addressee
13 is applicable, because the report does not have an
14 addressee. Am I making sense? Everything has a date
15 whether or not the date is available in the document format.
16 It is available, but not applicable.

17 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

18 MR. HOYLE: Okay. If we approve special class and
19 abstract summary --

20 MR. KILLAR: On abstract summary for non-documents
21 it is an issue as far as an abstract. And so I have
22 problems approving it for non-documents. We feel abstracts
23 will be there for all documents whether it is a nondocument
24 or something else.

25 MR. HOYLE: So you would --

1 MR. KILLAR: The participant should be reasonable
2 in filling out the abstract.

3 MR. HOYLE: Their proposal is, bring up the
4 abstract summary from the optional field below?

5 MR. KILLAR: Really, deleting this from the field
6 optional to both participant and LSS and deleting this for
7 participants for non-documents. The participant is
8 responsible for filling out the abstract summary, whether or
9 not it is a document or a non-document.

10 MR. HOYLE: Let's discuss that.

11 Lynn, do you have a comment?

12 MS. SCATTOLINI: I have a comment. We are having
13 a very great difficulty hearing all of you.

14 MR. HOYLE: I guess we are getting to the position
15 that the stronger we feel on the subject, the stronger the
16 voice. But thank you. We will try to keep our voices up.

17 I think NRC believes that we do not need abstracts
18 for documents which are going to be in full text. I believe
19 it is a matter of cost-effectiveness.

20 The size of the header field data base or data
21 file would have to be quite large, I would think, if you are
22 going to have abstracts of every document here. You are
23 getting more and more subjective descriptions of documents
24 in the file.

25 Useful, yes. Certainly cost-effective. I'm not

1 sure about that.

2 MR. KILLAR: We are concerned with costs, as well.
3 We recommend that we have abstract summaries for every
4 document and that be a controlled format, that it be limited
5 to 200 words or 300 words or something along that line, so
6 you don't get a summary almost as long as the document.
7 That should help keep the cost down. It does require labor
8 manpower by the participant to generate that summary, but
9 there are costs to the participants, not the system.

10 The system cost would be limited to the space it
11 takes to get that out as well as the searching of that
12 summary abstract.

13 I know when I went through the prototype testing,
14 there were a lot of abstract summaries.

15 MR. HOYLE: Felix, I found that, too, when I did
16 the same thing.

17 MS. CERNY: We come in the middle between the two
18 of you.

19 MR. HOYLE: Your position is described in your
20 memo. Why don't you describe it quickly here?

21 MS. CERNY: That's right. We really ought to
22 look at classes of documents for which abstracts should be
23 prepared. They are very, very important, but there have to
24 be standards set for this, in which cases, abstracts don't
25 go or don't say everything, and don't say anything. But we

1 really think this has to be revisited.

2 MR. HOYLE: Kirk, do you have any comments on
3 this?

4 MR. BALCOM: I think what I would simply say has
5 already been presented in the paper, and it sounds like
6 Barbara was the last speaker, and I think that is probably
7 our position, too. It is not everything, and not nothing.

8 In the situation for non-documents, it is
9 different, than, of course, the situation for a lot of
10 extraneous material.

11 A non-document is critical. That will be a way to
12 present. And talking about this in some form, and we had
13 long elected to have this abstract field for tying this all
14 together. It is like a multi-field. But it is especially
15 important in the situation of non-documents.

16 MR. HOYLE: I think none of us have a quarrel with
17 that.

18 MR. BALCOM: Okay.

19 MR. HOYLE: I think we have to hold up this one,
20 Felix. Would you be willing to entertain a discussion at a
21 future time, as to whether there are some documents that
22 would not need to be abstracted -- correspondence which does
23 not have lengthy attachments, things like that -- that sort
24 of speak for themselves.

25 I am not trying to get into things which are

1 excluded.

2 MR. KILLAR: I would be glad to listen to the
3 recommendation to quantify what does need or does not need
4 to have an abstract.

5 MR. HOYLE: Would the LSS Administrator's office
6 like to take a shot at going over abstracts and give us a
7 proposal and let us review or comment on it?

8 MS. SHELBURNE: Well, I think if people, what I
9 would like to hear, and I would like to have the writer
10 report their pros and cons, and come up with a potential of
11 what you think the potential set of documents is that they
12 would like to have. We will end up making the final
13 decision. But what we are asking for are the thoughts of
14 people.

15 Barbara has already recommended a certain set of
16 ideas. What I would like to hear is which set we can divide
17 which way.

18 I can lay out the issues, and the way it makes the
19 best sense to us, or the feeling of the advisory group panel
20 on which ones they felt warranted exception or inclusion.

21 I would like to bring up one more issue on the
22 thought of abstracts. The time it takes to do it relates to
23 cost, but is also relates to delays in issuing the document.
24 There may be some issues that you may want to think about in
25 terms of when we are in a real time mode here. Yesterday's

1 documents have to get in. So we have an issue of how you
2 feel about something that does take time to do it right on
3 the submitter's part.

4 I am just raising the issue. I want to get
5 people's input on the answer.

6 MR. HOYLE: What did you think? Do you want to
7 give us to the end of the month to think about this? I
8 don't know that really we are prepared to talk about it now.

9 Do I have a suggestion from anyone as to how we
10 should proceed with grappling with the subject of abstracts?

11 MR. TREBY: Well, I guess I suggest that we decide
12 there will be a field of abstracts because we certainly need
13 them for non-documents and that the group consider with
14 regard to documents what standards they would like to have
15 for abstracting those and perhaps we could set a date
16 whereby everybody would submit in writing to John their
17 thoughts and he could circulate them and then at the next
18 meeting in October we could bring it up and have everybody's
19 views available and have an opportunity to think about it
20 and maybe resolve it at that meeting fairly promptly.

21 MR. HOYLE: I appreciate the proposal.

22 In your comments, Barbara, you point out it's
23 critical in terms of sizing header file -- data files. If
24 we don't get these resolutions until October, are we all
25 right, Dan?

1 MR. GRASER: We are probably all right because the
2 size of bibliographic header file in comparison to
3 comparison to the text is minuscule -- not minuscule but
4 it's really of much less magnitude than the volume of text
5 that we are going to be putting into the system but, yes,
6 the decision could be deferred but eventually some decision
7 would have to be forthcoming.

8 MR. TREBY: Absolutely. The decision must be made
9 in October, no later.

10 MR. GRASER: It is not so much a question of size
11 of words, 200 words versus 1000, so much it is the
12 multiplier of how many documents are going to be or have to
13 be abstracted, whether it is 10,000, 100,000, a million --
14 the multiplier that you are dealing with there is really a
15 critical factor, so, yes.

16 You shake your head no, but I think we can defer
17 on that until October, yes.

18 MR. TREBY: I have one question though. Many
19 Government documents already have been abstracted. Those
20 abstracts could be found in the full search text.

21 MR. GRASER: Yes, or they could be put in the
22 abstract field. That might be one category of documents
23 that you automatically say yes, if an abstract is present in
24 a publication it will be placed in the abstract field.
25 There are no new abstracts that need to be created.

1 It's a very simple thing to accommodate. That
2 might be one of the recommendations that when somebody comes
3 to an abstract field in more detail.

4 MR. HOLSTEIN: That sounds great but I am not sure
5 that achieves what Felix is after.

6 MR. KILLAR: Really it does. What I was looking
7 for is in a search on headers rather than full text headers
8 to have a search of headers which is a lot easier than a
9 full text search.

10 MR. HOLSTEIN: Are you also looking to have
11 consistence across abstracts?

12 MR. KILLAR: Whoever is putting the abstract in is
13 going to be generating that document. They are going to put
14 their own abstract in rather than someone else's.

15 MR. HOLSTEIN: Let me pose this question to you.
16 I have seen a lot of abstracts of Government documents.

17 If your goal is to have some things consistent,
18 then in all abstracts -- then all abstracts can meet some
19 basic standards of usefulness to this system, are you
20 satisfied with all abstracts previously done by the authors
21 which may or may not meet those standards are somehow going
22 to by definition meet your needs of useability?

23 MR. KILLAR: The problem is even if you have a
24 very definitive set of standards you are going to have
25 abstracts that are not acceptable because there are

1 exceptions to standards.

2 MR. HOLSTEIN: That is a different question.

3 If somebody can't follow directions, if someone is
4 told write the abstract any way, you want to know what the
5 LSS standards are, it seems to be a separate problem.

6 MR. KILLAR: You will have to have some guidelines
7 and it is their responsibility to meet those guidelines or
8 not, I agree.

9 MR. GRASER: I believe in the prototype we had a
10 number of situations where a supplied abstract was found to
11 be deficient and required us to add additional material to
12 the abstract field to make sure that it fully described a
13 document. We weren't there in a situation in the prototype
14 where the abstract that was provided was not adequate and we
15 had to go a little bit further.

16 MR. HOLSTEIN: Presumably you don't want to have
17 to do that on a regular basis.

18 MR. GRASER: Also, let me point out that when the
19 abstract was done you want to utilize that and it's just
20 simply not a clear-cut answer.

21 I think this gets back to exactly -- this is
22 something that needs to be examined.

23 MR. HOLSTEIN: My point is just a very narrow one,
24 which is whatever the standard is created on, you are going
25 forward based on knowing who is in any event going to be

1 writing an abstract for his or her documents should be
2 exempted from having to review and meet these standards the
3 LSS system has for abstracts. That is leaving aside your
4 issue, Felix.

5 MR. GRASER: I will speak up on that one.

6 I think the probably type scenario, if I follow
7 what you are saying, would be that an engineer who wrote an
8 article out at Sandia, when they do an abstract of their
9 article, are you indicting they should be fully -- preparing
10 their abstract of their article out there?

11 I think the answer is it probably won't happen.
12 It will probably be a situation where a capture system
13 environment will be responsible for bringing that abstract
14 up to snuff.

15 MR. HOLSTEIN: I am saying fine, this is the
16 shortcomings but there is no reason why Sandia as a matter
17 of policy has anyone in their employ producing documents for
18 which abstracts can't be a matter of structure, please
19 prepare your abstracts according to the following set of
20 criteria.

21 There is no reason why you don't do both of those
22 things.

23 MR. KILLAR: I agree. You want an individual
24 putting the document in to make sure that abstract is
25 relative to the subject if that individual is at Sandia or

1 Los Alamos.

2 These are only guidelines.

3 When you develop a document, develop your abstract
4 to take these things into consideration and that saves the
5 individual from relying on or depending on what the
6 standards are we have for our abstracts, which may well be
7 different abstracts from some engineering publication or
8 from the Government as to what they require in an abstract.

9 MS. CERNY: It also becomes a contractual issue.

10 The contractors work under contract and to say
11 that they have to follow certain formats for abstracts would
12 have to be written into their contracts if you are really
13 going to insist that they do it.

14 That would then become a nightmare situation.

15 MR. GRASER: This is the LSS abstract which is the
16 one to conform to the general publication standard for
17 documents, which is different from the DOE. In that case,
18 it may very well be driven by what is already in the
19 standards for abstracts.

20 MS. SHELBURNE: Are there abstracts for the DOE
21 set forth, Steve?

22 MR. SCOTT: That is the situation. They must
23 comply. And we do incorporate those contractually.

24 MS. CERNY: I don't know the answer to that,
25 because we are getting into contractual issues.

1 MR. HOYLE: Well, this is going to be for October.

2 MR. HOLSTEIN: What we just heard was that they
3 are incorporated contractually. Does that not make it
4 unmanageable?

5 My point is only this. If you leave open a lot of
6 opportunities for shoddiness, if you will, by simply telling
7 yourself you are going to use a document control process to
8 catch all of these problems, you will end up with a costly
9 and an enormous job trying to go back and fix the problems.

10 I am simply suggesting it is relatively easy-to-
11 handle by some minimal guidance at the front end.

12 MR. ALTOMARE: I work in the Division of High-
13 Level Waste. We start out a lot of these things.

14 We looked at these problems of going after the
15 abstracts and taking the full text. But when we went over
16 to a professional abstractor, they were doing it quickly,
17 but we got the impression that there is a cost of having the
18 professional or somebody doing that; and putting it into
19 abstract form quickly exceeded the cost of putting in the
20 full document.

21 That is not a cheap thing. You have to have
22 professionals, people who know what they are doing. Our
23 conclusion, you could just go ahead and depend on the full
24 text as much as you can capture electronically in the
25 generation of a document.

1 If there is an abstract, there are ways to pull it
2 out of a field and put it in another field like the header.
3 But it depends upon somebody going into the document if he
4 is the one who wrote it, depending on him getting that
5 abstract correct. It is an expensive operation, and we
6 hesitate to do it.

7 I am very concerned about your asking the LSS
8 Administrator to go in and develop abstracts.

9 MR. KILLAR: I'm not saying that the LSS
10 Administrator is the individual who is putting that document
11 together or is responsible for that abstract at all.

12 MR. ALTOMARE: If you do know what you should be
13 doing with the document, it is possible to take the document
14 and tap electronically and transfer that over to a header,
15 if you wish.

16 But having a specialist of some kind, somebody
17 checking to see if that is correct, if that covers the
18 document, you are talking about a big expense. And I would
19 be very hesitant about doing that.

20 MR. KILLAR: The onus is on the individual putting
21 that document together to make sure that it represents the
22 document.

23 If we have some guidelines we develop as to what
24 should be in there, it is fairly self-evident that if the
25 existing abstract is adequate, then that task is not needed.

1 MR. ALTOMARE: I think having guidelines
2 requesting certain types of documents as has been suggested
3 is fine, seeing if you can get that as something else, it
4 can get a little bit out of control.

5 We have to think about it on a cost basis, as Dan
6 was saying. It's not 200 words. You start multiplying it
7 by millions, and it does get to be expensive.

8 MR. HOLSTEIN: I think we are agreeing with
9 everything you said. We are saying, for having reasons at
10 the front end, for the authors, not subsequent people, but
11 for the authors, that is precisely to avoid the cost
12 problems later on.

13 MR. ALTOMARE: Let me make one more point, and I
14 will stop.

15 From my perspective, from working in the technical
16 staff side, we did not want to start generating a lot of
17 work for our staff to pick out a specific identification
18 field that should be in the header.

19 We are watching carefully as to what it takes to
20 fill out the header. We want to utilize that as the primary
21 source. We agree with that.

22 But if you are asking now that every time you have
23 added maybe just five minutes, is it worth the cost? I
24 don't think it necessarily is.

25 In our case, the document normally has a header

1 and an abstract, so that is one thing. I am a little bit
2 cautious about what you are asking our staff to do. I am
3 just adding this caution, that I do not think you should be
4 agreeing to things that are just going to be adding work
5 that has to be paid for by somebody.

6 MR. KILLAR: I don't think we disagree with you.
7 In fact, some of the suggestions have been what we should
8 include in an abstract and what we should not. You are
9 talking about a letter and we don't need an abstract for a
10 four-page letter.

11 MR. HOYLE: I think we have had sufficient
12 discussion on the point.

13 The point that Mr. Holstein has raised is a very
14 good one. Phil's point is a very valuable commentary. I
15 think we should all take this discussion into account.

16 I would suggest that you provide to me by July 15,
17 in a little over a month, if that is agreeable, your
18 thoughts on what standards ought to be used for abstracting
19 one set of documents, and that set of documents should be
20 abstracted whether or not you believe all of it, including
21 correspondence and so forth, and who should do the
22 abstracting. Comment on who should do the abstracting.

23 MS. SCATTOLINI: I have a couple of comments.

24 There are costs to be realized here. But I don't
25 know if the group is aware as to what the cost is.

1 There are three different types of abstracts that
2 I know of. I don't know if the group is aware of what they
3 are. So I think you need some common information based on
4 which to make a decision that should be provided.

5 MS. SHELBURNE: I would agree to provide a talking
6 point or thought point to distribute to the members for
7 their consideration prior to their recommendation. I don't
8 know if I can give you dollar values or whatever, but there
9 are issues I think the members should take into
10 consideration before they make their recommendation.

11 If not, you will have to come back with what do
12 you think about this, what do you think about that.

13 MR. HOYLE: When do you think you could get me
14 that? Maybe July 15?

15 MS. SHELBURNE: Well, July was the date I set down
16 here [indicating].

17 MR. HOYLE: I need to send your material out.

18 MS. SHELBURNE: It is not like I have not thought
19 about this before.

20 I think in the next couple of weeks I ought to be
21 able to get something together.

22 MR. HOYLE: Perhaps I will set 31 days from the
23 date I send the LSS data out; I will expect back your items
24 for discussion in October.

25 Kirk, are you hearing?

1 MR. BALCOM: 30 days after the receipt of Betsy's
2 review?

3 MR. HOYLE: Yes, sir.

4 MR. BALCOM: That sounds good.

5 MR. HOYLE: I believe, with the exception --

6 MR. TREBY: No. I just have a comment on "special
7 class." And that is what the interim team was thinking
8 about.

9 A special class that came to mind to us was all
10 adjudicatory documents. We would certainly want those to be
11 flagged. That would identify what the record was.

12 I guess all we want to do is make sure that was
13 included as an example of a special class.

14 MR. GRASER: I believe the rule says that the LSSA
15 shall establish a separate file reflecting the official
16 file.

17 So in that regard, adding a separate field to that
18 would be, in a lot of ways, redundant, because the rule says
19 there has to be a separate file for that.

20 MS. SHELBURNE: What flag on the record? One of
21 the things I had thought about this issue is how we use
22 different fields.

23 MR. GRASER: Are the people taking a document into
24 the capture system environment going to know, so this is not
25 a cataloging of a field?

1 MS. SHELBURNE: I will turn to John Hoyle, the
2 Secretary. It is a designation of what is the content of
3 the official file.

4 MR. HOYLE: The official file is going to be
5 established after the proceeding begins, and there will be a
6 number of documents that will be placed into the LSS well
7 before that time that will eventually become part of the
8 record. They will be introduced by DOE or others as
9 pertinent to the record.

10 Stu, are you suggesting that there needs to be
11 something flagged on the document when it is put in, if it
12 is a potential adjudicatory item?

13 MR. TREBY: We were considering a flag after the
14 fact, after the proceeding began, of a document previously,
15 let's say a site characterization of DOD was entered as an
16 exhibit, and there would be a flag that says this is part of
17 the adjudicatory record.

18 MR. HOYLE: And a notation would go into the
19 system saying that this is a special class and saying it is
20 an adjudicatory-type record.

21 MS. SHELBURNE: Well, I do understand that. But
22 I'm asking the question, whatever the type is, it used to be
23 one thing and it is now something else?

24 MR. HOYLE: Yes. And still, it is what it was.
25 Does that help?

1 Yes, there does need to be a separate file of an
2 adjudicatory record, and it could be flagged. There are a
3 number of new records generated within the proceeding
4 itself.

5 MS. SHELBURNE: One of the things I had here when
6 I was going in this [indicating] that it might be not one of
7 these, but an additional field.

8 However, in working with the Board and the Office
9 of the Secretary as to what needs to be also added, I have a
10 letter and the date that the document is required. These
11 are issues. The date received on it I think is an area
12 where we will have to work to make sure the system, LSSA, is
13 meeting the needs of adjudicatory records. I think a
14 special-type code would be used and part of that parameter
15 will be to determine that. We will make sure that
16 requirement is met.

17 MR. HOYLE: Okay. Those discussions are certainly
18 needed.

19 Maybe Stu was going to further comment, as I will,
20 that a lot of work has previously been done on the subject
21 of legal documents and adjudicatory documents, and how to
22 get some detailed descriptions of this into the header so
23 they can be found in search easily. We would hope to
24 preserve that work which was done two years ago some way or
25 another.

1 Anything further, Stu?

2 MR. TREBY: No.

3 MR. HOYLE: Moving to "Fields Optional to
4 Participant But Completed by LSSA."

5 There are six items in here: document type;
6 sponsoring organization; copyee; copyee organization;
7 publication data; descriptors.

8 Kirk, we were talking about copyee before. Felix
9 has suggested copyee be deleted from the list of header
10 fields.

11 MR. BALCOM: As just a concept moved back up to
12 addressee or the concept deleted?

13 MR. KILLAR: The concept deleted. We have raised
14 a question as to what is the value of the copyee and copyee
15 organization in the header.

16 Why do you have it when you have a full text
17 capability and you are able to call up the document and see
18 who the copyees are?

19 MR. BALCOM: The reason is usually in the
20 litigation support setting, where you want to find out
21 everyone who received a copy of a document, basically for
22 depositions and examination purposes, and full text
23 sometimes doesn't always work.

24 MR. KILLAR: If that is going to help, having it
25 in the header -- Aren't there standards about having them in

1 the header?

2 MR. BALCOM: At least you know where to search for
3 them.

4 MR. KILLAR: I hate to put Jay Silberg, our
5 attorney, in this position. But he would have been able to
6 be more supportive of your position rather than our opinion
7 that we don't need it.

8 MR. BALCOM: Well, the reason we actually had
9 originally I think planned to put copyees names in the
10 addressee field is simply to lump all of those together.

11 I think I probably made the case that in terms of
12 handling depositions efficiently, that it would be the best
13 place to do it. That is typically the way it is done.

14 If it is felt it is important to have those names
15 available for an examination, in other words, to find every
16 person who got a copy of a memo, for example, if we don't do
17 that, the full text probably won't pick that up and you
18 won't know every person who got the memo.

19 MS. SHELBURNE: I want to raise another issue, and
20 muddy the water.

21 If you search full text on somebody's name, you
22 will get those responses, and you will have to go through
23 and figure out if they were copyees.

24 MR. KILLAR: Well, then, we would have the reverse
25 where you are not.

1 MR. BALCOM: In full text, if you don't find them
2 in the document, you have seen that document, and you search
3 the document, you will then see who actually got the
4 document.

5 In fact, if you would look at the document, you
6 would be able to see whether or not the name is correct,
7 whether or not the address used is correct, rather than
8 putting a corrected address in or a corrected name in at the
9 end.

10 If you want to find out all about that document,
11 as to the persons who received it, for example, so you can
12 have a full history of what that person had to make
13 decisions with or be a participant in the decision, then the
14 only way is to find everything for which they were either
15 addressee or copyee and having a document, and then looking
16 up who received it is not quite the same thing as finding
17 out the document that the person was a recipient of.

18 MS. CERNY: Can I muddy the waters, too?

19 In DOE correspondence control, in the addressee,
20 if you are sending a memo, you don't put the person's name
21 in; you would show "Licensee Support Branch" and you are not
22 going to know who got the memo, whether it was the Branch
23 Chief or who was the Branch Chief of that support branch.
24 Then, that is all the information you have, is addressee.

25 Then we get into the position where I would have

1 to keep a file to have all of the names of the people who
2 got copies. So I would suggest that you would have to have
3 this addressee field distribution, and then you will have
4 names specified for distribution along with the
5 organizations.

6 But this is just a mixed bag of how these fields
7 are used.

8 MS. SHELBURNE: Well, I would look to Steve. Do
9 you want to talk about NRC's distribution codes also?

10 MR. SCOTT: Ours is a coded system. The code then
11 goes back to a data base which identifies who was on that
12 list.

13 MS. CERNY: When?

14 MS. SHELBURNE: At the point in time --

15 MS. CERNY: We don't have that. We have a Chief
16 of a support branch. There is no matching of the data base
17 as to who the Chief at a particular time was. You have to
18 just know that.

19 MR. SCOTT: My other point was that we have
20 another problem we would incur if you are looking towards
21 retrievability. Organizationally we change quite frequently
22 and you would have to maintain the linkage to know what it
23 was the day before if you are going to try to get this
24 information.

25 MS. CERNY: We don't maintain that. We just

1 reorganize that.

2 [Laughter.]

3 MR. SCOTT: You can't tell the players without a
4 scorecard.

5 MS. CERNY: It might be useful, by the way. I'm
6 circulating one.

7 MR. KILLAR: I guess that the other comment is we
8 talked about this earlier. One of the things we talked
9 about in litigation is -- and this is only as to
10 correspondence, we have to talk about what the
11 correspondence is: Does that include formal letters, does
12 that include memos, does that include transmittal letters,
13 things along that line?

14 Maybe once we go back and define the field, then
15 we can come back and address what is appropriate and
16 inappropriate as to copyees and copyee organizations in
17 here.

18 MR. TREBY: I agree. It seems to me this falls
19 into the same category as abstracts.

20 I would like to recommend we follow the same
21 procedure and go back and think about it and each submit
22 recommendations and thoughts on it. We can take it up at
23 our October meeting. I don't know whether Betsy is going to
24 volunteer to offer any talking point on that.

25 MR. HOYLE: Is that agreeable? Okay. When I

1 write you on the subject of abstracts I will remind you to
2 give me your thoughts on the copyee situation. We will
3 discuss it further in October and a copyee organization.

4 The next item is publication data and then we have
5 descriptors.

6 Any further discussion of those items?

7 ~~MS. VIBERT:~~ *MR. BECHTEL:* Just the fact that we need
8 observation and we need to flesh a lot of those out as to
9 what those things mean, especially the descriptors.

10 MR. HOYLE: The descriptors are from the LSS
11 Thesaurus. There is a thesaurus which of course is in draft
12 form.

13 MR. GRASER: And it is an ongoing process.

14 MR. HOYLE: Would you like to know exactly --

15 MR. GRASER: I will get you a copy.

16 MR. HOYLE: It might be in your administrator's
17 office but why don't you send him one.

18 All right, can I consider that group with the
19 exception of the copyee issue approved?

20 MS. SHELBURNE: Does this mean they are approving
21 the definition or the name?

22 MR. HOYLE: We are approving the field, I believe
23 as described in the document submitted to us by Kirk's
24 letter: "Fields optional to both participant and LSSA."

25 Three categories: identifiers, comments, and

1 abstract/summary.

2 Any discussion on identifiers or comments?

3 [No response.]

4 MR. HOYLE: All right. We consider them a part of
5 the field. That ought to be in, approved.

6 Next category is "Fields Not Applicable to
7 Participant but Supplied by System or LSSA."

8 This is LSS System Accession No., number of
9 images, and pointers.

10 Any discussion?

11 [No response.]

12 MR. HOYLE: Okay, they are approved as Header
13 Fields.

14 The next part of the working group's document goes
15 into issues, some of which we touched on, perhaps all but
16 one or two, that kept coming up as Betsy described in the
17 course of the working group's activity.

18 We talked about triple submissions of the same
19 document already. It seems like two days ago we did that.
20 I am not sure I know what the resolution of that was.

21 Is there any more discussion on the point of
22 multiple publications?

23 [No response.]

24 MR. HOYLE: Editing of headers by LSSA is the
25 second issue.

1 I believe that too is an issue that needs further
2 discussion and I would suggest we do that later but I would
3 entertain any thoughts or comments that participants would
4 want to make today.

5 The DOE I am sure has some comments there and NRC
6 has comments along the lines that as far as 2A is concerned
7 on page 3 that instead of having LSSA make it discretionary,
8 rather than when LSSA implements, or rather than have them
9 supplement, they may supplement.

10 We would also want to be sure that the
11 administrator would flag the supplement in some way and
12 inform the participant, the submitter, that they have
13 supplemented the record. I am sorry. I am getting off into
14 something else.

15 MS. SHELBURNE: If we add another key term, we
16 have to say we added it or let the participant know.

17 MR. TREBY: We want the participant to know that
18 his submittal had been modified in some way. We were
19 thinking there could be an asterisk so the submitter could
20 check. If he found the asterisk, he could go back and look
21 to see whether or not, within the time that he has to make
22 corrections to his submittal, he had any disagreement with
23 what the LSSA administrator had done.

24 To take the cycle, for example let's say the LSSA
25 administrator looked through the document and he saw that

1 the document is dated January 2, 1990, and put on the
2 header, it says "This was a document that was sent out
3 January 2, 1991," so he just corrected it and said, "1990,"
4 it is possible that the submitter was, in fact, accurate in
5 his header that the letter was sent out January 2 1991, but
6 they hadn't gotten around to realizing that the year had
7 changed and had dated it 1990 on the letter. The submitter
8 might want to go back to the administrator and tell him,
9 "No, this is an incorrect change that you had made." This
10 would be disastrous."

11 MS. SHELBURNE: This is a difference between what
12 someone submitted, and you add a new value, a new
13 descriptor, a new author, or a new number -- what I'm trying
14 to do is just clarify what you really mean.

15 MR. TREBY: Any of those changes.

16 MS. SHELBURNE: Do you want to flag changes or
17 corrections versus flagging what we have added?

18 MR. TREBY: We were just looking at two ways
19 related to changes and also modifications, and we said, when
20 we have a change made, the submitter ought to have the
21 opportunity to know that the change was made within a
22 reasonable period of time. We thought the reasonable period
23 of time in which it had to make corrections, to get back to
24 the LSSA administrator and say, "We thought that you have
25 made this change, and, for whatever reason, we don't think

1 that is an appropriate change --

2 MS. CERNY: This whole section, to me, raised a
3 major policy and design issue, because I think you have two
4 cases. One, where we have 80 or 90 percent of the
5 information, it is a huge quantity of information. In no
6 way do we see you going over it in the detail that you are
7 talking about.

8 In fact, it's sort of antithetical in the way the
9 program is laid out, the QA procedures that are approved by
10 the NRC, and then the NRC comes in and does an audit or
11 surveillance against the procedures. It seems that this is
12 just another issue covered under the procedures, that DOD is
13 responsible for corrections of the indexes information, the
14 headers for its information under procedures, under QA, if
15 you will. We don't have to call it theoretically approved
16 by the time you come in and audit our processing procedures.

17 If you find problems, you can tell us. Just like
18 we correct deficiencies under other QA audits, if you find
19 problems with the information or for batches of information,
20 you come back to us and say, "Now, fix this."

21 We will have that capture station with which we do
22 all this indexing, and you will have a capture station.
23 What you are proposing is actually a duplication of all this
24 work all over again.

25 MS. SHELBURNE: Can I clarify something here? It

1 is something we ran into multiple times in developing this
2 submitter's header versus capture stations full header.

3 We thought, in terms of the bibliographic header
4 being what would be submitted to a capture station, and then
5 what happened to it in the capture station under the rules
6 of procedures in the capture station, would be to review
7 what was submitted and to make changes.

8 What is raised here is after review at the capture
9 station, if the submitter has submitted this to the capture
10 station which feels it is wrong, how they alter the record.
11 What we get confused on is that the DOE will operate one of
12 those capture stations.

13 MS. CERNY: That's right.

14 MS. SHELBURNE: You are correct if the issue is
15 that it's decided by DOE under the rules of procedures, and
16 everybody is following the same rules, and they will be
17 generating the full header.

18 MS. CERNY: Right. That is all that makes sense.

19 MS. SHELBURNE: There is not a difference here.
20 It is just a problem of -- if it is agreed that DOE will
21 operate capture stations, your comments I only got this
22 morning and I am sort of reacting to them quickly.

23 We will not review every record. We would be
24 auditing.

25 Everybody is running capture stations the same way

1 and we want consistency however that is determined to be
2 done.

3 What is discussed here for those sets of records
4 that other participants submit to the capture station, NRC,
5 the state of Nevada, if there is a supplementation or
6 correction because we believe it is a typo or whatever, how
7 do we handle that. That was the issue, how should it be
8 handled?

9 Does that clear up your concern?

10 MS. CERNY: It isn't written that way. There are
11 two cases there.

12 One is our case. We really us doing this all
13 under the procedures, you know, like we do the rest of the
14 QA, what falls into quality effective procedures for the
15 program. That is one case.

16 The other case is for the other participants who
17 will be submitting information with maybe only the
18 submitters' headers filled out where you won't be put in a
19 place -- with those very stringent quality procedures you
20 will do it yourself because it is easier to take the
21 information from a small party to check information itself.

22 MS. SHELBURNE: If there is something wrong, there
23 is wrong information that submitter has given us, what do we
24 do? What is the supplemental information?

25 Those are two questions we could or want to do.

1 Kirk, chime in here.

2 MR. BALCOM: I am not sure I can talk on behalf of
3 Nevada, really, that Nevada has a strong interest one way or
4 the other.

5 I think the original impression that I got, that
6 it was simply an attempt, as Barbara raised the issue of QA,
7 which is an issue of one being more concerned with
8 integrity, and I think Barbara raises a good point about
9 simply letting the participant or the submitter knowing what
10 you found in the LSSA's opinion is in error and then to deal
11 with it normally like a compliance.

12 I don't have strong feelings one way or the other
13 on this.

14 MR. KILLAR: When I went through and I didn't have
15 any problems with it but now after discussions I have
16 interest or I am concerned about who is going to be
17 monkeying with whose data and who has access to change what
18 fields in somebody's header and who created this. This is
19 my concern.

20 I want to know who has been at my document. I
21 want to have them define it. I don't want someone else who
22 doesn't want my document for their own benefit to go in and
23 change the header so that the document doesn't get pointed
24 out.

25 MS. CERNY: It's really the role of the LSSA just

1 taking this information we give you are produced under
2 certain procedures that you have approved or are you really
3 going in, say, "we don't agree with your characterization of
4 your information."

5 It seems to me that is a real policy decision here
6 that this brings up.

7 MR. HOYLE: Could I interject at this point and
8 perhaps ask Betsy, would you comment on what you think is
9 appropriate at the October meeting for you to come in and
10 describe what you see is the role of the administrator and
11 the role of the capture station unit?

12 I don't think we have really heard too much about
13 what the capture station is going to do, who operates it,
14 what the audit program is going to be and what that is going
15 to have or operate -- I don't know what the right term is --
16 versus the LSSA is going to have and operate.

17 Is that appropriate to do then or now or how do
18 you want to go about that?

19 MR. DONNELLY: I am Lloyd Donnelly, the LSS
20 Administrator.

21 You are getting into an area now and there are a
22 lot of similar areas where we have not worked out all of the
23 details and don't know everything that we are going to be
24 doing.

25 I have one fundamental requirement and that is

1 ultimately everyone is going to be looking to me for the
2 integrity of that data because whatever integrity means, it
3 means accuracy. It means no tampering by unauthorized
4 sources and other things.

5 To me it is clear if an accepted submission from
6 ^EDOP or one of the other parties is in error, I feel I have
7 the obligation to resolve that on your behalf to make sure
8 the best information is put in. Exactly how that will be
9 done is a matter that has to be thought through very
10 carefully in terms of the people submitting the QA, in terms
11 of my contractor, it is all integrated so we are not all
12 overkilling, but I can assure you that the data is correct.

13 I think we can talk further about it and we will
14 give it further thought and talk with DOE further about it
15 at the October meeting and provide more information.

16 We will have this whole issue at that point but I
17 think it would be helpful to you if we do that.

18 MR. HOYLE: I think that it would be very helpful.
19 Thank you.

20 We would find -- we would all find that useful.

21 How are we doing on time?

22 Does everybody have time to work a little longer?

23 People are leaving.

24 MS. VIBERT: I have a meeting at one.

25 MR. HOYLE: Stu has to leave in about five

1 minutes.

2 The third item on page 3 is Abstracts.

3 We have already held that already.

4 The fourth is Fields for Non-Document Materials.

5 Is there anything we need to do with that one at this time?

6 MR. GRASER: Yes. I would like to bring to your
7 attention that in Barbara's letter there was an item in
8 Barbara's comments where basically we agree with the
9 recommendation there should be some field available to
10 identify where non-text material such as core samples or
11 data tapes or whatever are located, and who the point of
12 contact is.

13 I think it might be appropriate at this time that
14 the panel entertain adding some addition field to the list
15 of headers, even though it is a non-textual type material
16 and for the most part, we have been talking about text
17 headers. At this point, it be considered for addition to
18 the list of headers and perhaps having the meeting acting on
19 another field that could be dealt with in a little more
20 detail and some sort of presentation made as to how to
21 include that field.

22 MS. SHELBURNE: I guess our only point in
23 supporting that one is that if you add one, there is another
24 one, and then another one, and we could just not wrap around
25 what fields there are. That is why we just limited our

1 recommendation.

2 MR. HOYLE: Are you getting to a miscellaneous?

3 MS. SHELBURNE: Well, that's number 4.

4 Dan said there is a recommendation to add a field
5 called "code" which deals with who, what and where, and you
6 could get the material at this point. The question is, are
7 there other fields, and if the committee is going to
8 recommend them. Is that the recommendation of the
9 committee?

10 MR. HOYLE: I don't know about the others on the
11 committee but --

12 MR. GRASER: Well, I've got to ask the question
13 then, what are we going to do with depositions, mark ups,
14 and perhaps we should have a working group at least
15 participating or working with those sorts of categories or
16 materials and the fields required for them. Maybe it is
17 premature to put this on the list of documentary materials.

18 MR. HOYLE: Is that something we can defer and
19 pick up in October? Okay.

20 Let me talk to you further on that. I will add
21 that.

22 The last item is Miscellaneous Fields. You are
23 just recognizing there might be other fields that someone is
24 going to think of. You heard one earlier today, location,
25 that might be useful. I think we should all recognize as we

1 get closer and closer, there might well be fields that we
2 want added.

3 MS. SHELBURNE: I guess the only thing is to
4 caution people about, in the middle -- well, you have to
5 feel strongly enough about an addition to want to include it
6 now.

7 MR. HOYLE: Agreed.

8 MS. SHELBURNE: This is not just sort of the, gee,
9 we will think about it later. This is acknowledging there
10 may be at some point in time new pieces of information with
11 new document types. To me, it was only the acknowledging
12 that we must be flexible and be able to accommodate.

13 MR. HOYLE: In spite of the hazards of having to
14 backfill.

15 MR. TREBY: I would agree. I am unclear. I
16 mentioned that under special class we would have other
17 documents. This is not an add category, I gather was one of
18 the purposes of it. All right.

19 VOICE: There needs to be somewhere a field that
20 identifies adjudication documents once they get to that
21 point. We may be a ways from this right now.

22 MS. SHELBURNE: We have identified a sort of
23 unique set of non-documents, the adjudicatory ones, and you
24 alluded to depositions. Is there anything special about
25 depositions that could not be captured in these fields or in

1 full text? I don't know. Maybe you want to ask people to
2 think about that for a certain set that you have that we
3 have identified, or they can identify.

4 MR. HOYLE: Okay. I will add that to the letter.

5 Turning to Appendix A, which is a 2-page relisting
6 of each of the fields, we have now approved with comment --
7 Betsy and Kirk, you have listened to the fields then as to
8 why they are not applicable under the columns called multi-
9 valued, controlled authority, format control, free text
10 searchable.

11 As the NRC group looked at this, we were comparing
12 control authority column with free text searchable. We
13 thought if you have a "no" under control authority, you
14 might expect to see a "yes" under free text searchable, or
15 vice versa.

16 Could you describe for me briefly the 2 non-
17 exclusive, they are exclusive, or whatever?

18 MS. SHELBURNE: You are asking me or Kirk?

19 MR. HOYLE: Kirk.

20 MR. BALCOM: I will try and respond. The way this
21 came up was in anticipating how a sample would actually be
22 prepared on a field such as descriptor. Let the descriptor
23 concept be extremely useful if it's done correctly, but
24 somewhat to navigate until the field is done in the
25 following way. This is a retrieval system. In a field like

1 descriptors where you may have 2, 3, or 4 that tries
2 automatically to be an indexing system, you would index the
3 whole phrase and simply the whole phrase or part of the
4 first word is done with your root search, or just the first
5 word, but you wouldn't search for the third word in the
6 phrase.

7 That is to make the distinction between a full
8 text search of an ASCII text of the document and get phrase
9 oriented. Another example would be that you don't remember
10 exactly what the entire descriptor was and then at least you
11 would be able to go at it word by word and do a search and
12 probably hit it.

13 It is a very subtle retrieval activity. The one
14 who raised it wanted to make sure that that be excluded from
15 the design.

16 MR. HOYLE: Okay. I'm not sure I understand what
17 all has been said, but I don't have any further question on
18 it.

19 MR. KILLAR: I have the benefit of being in an
20 index version text searchable system.

21 Where would you use this to follow your free text
22 searchable under that particular one?

23 MR. BALCOM: A good question. I don't remember.

24 MS. SHELBURNE: Can I make up one.

25 This is the third draft of the fifth revision. If

1 there is no control with it, we avoid the need for that.

2 If it is free text searchable, it may present
3 other questions. I guess I'm going to have to give you a
4 better example.

5 MR. KILLAR: It might be helpful, but at the
6 present time I think you're actually limiting yourself and
7 that is the problem with free text searchable on edition.

8 MS. SHELBURNE: I think one of the -- if you
9 search for a particular document and if you have multiple
10 versions coming in, it is a most valuable tool if you are
11 looking for a specific version, and if we have format
12 control, then you ought to be able to request the fourth
13 version.

14 The problem I have seen is where there are erratas
15 to the editions to, say, 14 drafts and really it gets very
16 complicated. Hopefully, we won't have that many in the
17 system, but I am not wedded to the use of the free text
18 searchable field.

19 MR. HOYLE: This is a design issue?

20 MR. GRASER: Not at this point.

21 MR. HOYLE: How do we want to leave that?

22 MR. GRASER: It's probably something that, as we
23 move to the next stage where we have gone beyond having the
24 fields identified and actually begun the process of saying
25 this is now data will be represented in the field, a field

1 like this after some hashing through, we may decide can have
2 standardized statements just as Lyband mails out its catalog
3 and L.C. Mark for its rev ed. We may be able to standardize
4 that and that can be incorporated in the cataloging. It may
5 turn out that you can go ahead and use a code environment in
6 the field.

7 On the other hand, you might get something like
8 farsi language edition, which doesn't have a code value in
9 the system. It may be that the environment you have has to
10 have the ability to put in a more robust description of what
11 you are dealing with. I can also see that situation in
12 terms of software where you are dealing with versions of
13 software, where you are just going to have almost an
14 infinite number of software versions. That could be
15 referred to in that field.

16 One way or the other, I think we get to the field
17 problem of just gathering all of this up and working
18 together to arrive at a solution.

19 MR. HOYLE: Okay. Enough discussion. I believe
20 that we have gone as far as we wanted to go today. I
21 believe NRC brought out all of the comments that we wanted
22 to bring out.

23 In proving these fields, we pointed out the
24 alternatives and we also approved the language describing
25 the fields, in particular, as we have listed them.

1 Now I should point out that we are going to have
2 to come back in October, and I will be corresponding with
3 you within the next month, probably on those items which we
4 will have.

5 I have abstracts, the ^{copyee}~~copy~~-E-issue, non-document
6 issue, whether we want to do something about adjudicatory
7 documents focusing on approval of the LSS administrator.

8 We also had on our other list of documents for
9 October that is in the folders that you have here at the
10 table at least, and we get into the summer, and I wanted to
11 firm up whether or not those topics are still ripe for
12 discussion in October.

13 When is that?

14 MS. ROOD: The 10th and 11th.

15 MR. HOYLE: That is October 10 and 11, the date we
16 agreed upon the last time in Reno. We are going to be
17 meeting in the Quality Inn in Reno.

18 Is there any more business to discuss?

19 MR. HOLSTEIN: Just a suggestion, Mr. Chairman.
20 In the letter that you sent out to us about abstracts and
21 the other issues that you just listed, I would certainly
22 welcome any pros, cons, descriptions of options that you
23 might want to include in that so we can get the most
24 complete discussion among ourselves for our respective
25 parties prior to the meeting. I think that overall today's

1 meeting and deferring issues to October was done not because
2 we weren't willing, but because we genuinely wanted to think
3 about it and talk to our respective gangs about them.

4 To the extent that we can hear other people's
5 views or have a broader understanding of issues involved
6 prior to coming to the table makes it that much easier.

7 I think that everyone agrees that we will reach
8 the point where we will not be able to have different issues
9 without harming the development of this whole thing.

10 MR. HOYLE: That's right. Thank you.

11 Barbara, did you have anything else to raise in
12 terms of your comments?

13 MS. CERNY: No.

14 MR. HOYLE: Kirk, do you have anything else for
15 us?

16 MR. BALCOM: My question is, were there any
17 changes to fields prior to my getting on the phone?

18 MR. HOYLE: No, there were none.

19 MR. BALCOM: I have no further issues.

20 MR. KILLAR: I do want to raise a question. This
21 deals with the October meeting and the preparation for the
22 meeting. I remember from our last meeting the various
23 design documents were going to be sent out as they became
24 available, so we didn't get a whole lump. Are they
25 sequestered somewhere, and is there going to be a surprise

1 attack? What about it? Have any design documents been
2 released?

3 MR. GRASER: The design documents are going to be
4 developed in a rather piecemeal manner. We are focusing on
5 some very specific areas. The first piece we can focus on
6 came out just at the end of May. There is another one
7 coming out, and I am expecting it to be this week. I can go
8 ahead and do distribution to John on those. Did we send you
9 the first one?

10 MR. HOYLE: I don't have anything since May. The
11 last thing is the thesaurus material.

12 MR. GRASER: We are going through that about every
13 two weeks between now and at the end of September, with
14 draft products coming out at which there has been a fairly
15 detailed discussion of those walk-throughs. We just are
16 beginning at that process now. I can go ahead and start
17 forwarding pieces of those documents. There is the question
18 of whether or not you want to see the initial draft or the
19 final product of the discussions, and that is something you
20 may want to consider.

21 MR. KILLAR: I was under the impression we agreed
22 at the last meeting we would look at something close to the
23 final draft rather than you have something finalized and we
24 say, "Gee, maybe you ought to look at this." But at the
25 same time, we wanted something so if we wanted to add it, it

1 could be brought up.

2 MR. HOYLE: Thank you.

3 Is there anything else anyone wants to add?

4 [No response.]

5 MR. HOYLE: All right. We stand adjourned. Thank
6 you much for your attention.

7 [Whereupon, at 1:05 p.m., the hearing adjourned.]

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission

in the matter of:

NAME OF PROCEEDING: LSS Advisory Panel Meeting

DOCKET NUMBER:

PLACE OF PROCEEDING: Bethesda, Maryland

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission taken by me and thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under the direction of the court reporting company, and that the transcript is a true and accurate record of the foregoing proceedings.



Dean A. Robinson

Official Reporter
Ann Riley & Associates, Ltd.