LABAT-ANDERSON INCORPORATED
2200 CLARENDON BOULEVARD, SUITE 900, ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22201 (703) 525-9400
FAX: (703) 525-7975 TELEX NUMBER 5106005227 LABAT AND

June 14, 1991

Ms. Elizabeth Shelburne
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of the Licensing Support
System Administrator
Mail Stop EW-W571
Washington, D.C. 20555

Reference: Task Order No. 2, June 10, 1991

Subject: Deliverables for Item d of Task Order No. 2 under NRC Contract No. 40-90-346

Enclosures: One Definition Paper and Four Step 1 Materials

Dear Ms. Shelburne,

Please find enclosed the revised deliverables of Items a and b required for Item d of the above-referenced task order. We have submitted a single integrated version of the three deliverables required by Item a as you requested. Under Item a, there were three draft papers on definitions of Satisfactory, Substantial, and Substantial and Timely Compliance as these terms relate to identification, preparation, and submission of documents to the LSS. Also included are four revised Step 1 materials, one each for document identification, preparation, and submission, and one for compliance assistance and reporting.

These deliverables complete our obligation under Item d of the task order. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at (703) 525-9400.

Sincerely,

LABAT-ANDERSON Incorporated

Tony Neville

Tony Neville
Project Manager

cc: Shirley Crampton
LAI Contract file

Definitions of Satisfactory Compliance, Substantial Compliance, and Substantial and Timely Compliance as They Relate to Documentary Material Identification, Preparation, and Submission Responsibilities of Parties and Potential Parties under the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Rules of Practice

1.0 Introduction

This document was developed under Item d, Section I.A.1 of Task Order No. 2 under Contract No. NRC-40-90-346, as a single, integrated version of the three deliverables required by Item a. It continues the process of clarifying the terms **satisfactory compliance, substantial compliance,** and **substantial and timely compliance** as they relate to the obligations of parties and potential parties under the documentary material identification (DMI), preparation (DMP), and submission (DMS) requirements of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (Commission's) Rules of Practice (the Rule) as stated in 10 CFR Part 2. The Statement of Work (SOW) requires that "the contractor shall develop a definition of 'Satisfactory Compliance' as it relates to the Licensing Support System Administrator's (LSSA) six-month evaluations of the extent of the Department of Energy's (DOE's) compliance with the Rule [2.1003(h)(2)(i)] and 'Substantial Compliance' as it relates to the LSSA's certification at least six months in advance of the submission of DOE's license application [2.1003(h)(1)]." This paper will also define **substantial and timely compliance** as the term relates to a potential party's eligibility for party status under Section 2.1012 of the Rule.

It is important to examine both the qualitative and quantitative measure of these obligations and to understand them in the context of "rule of reason" and "good faith" effort. According to *Black's Law Dictionary*, "rule of reason" incorporates the concept of "reasonableness" which means fair, proper, just, moderate, or suitable under the circumstances. From the same source, "good faith" is used to describe that state of mind denoting honesty of purpose, freedom from intention to defraud, and generally being faithful to one's duty or obligation.

Viability of the Quality Management Plans (QMPs) to be developed under the existing task order is dependent on reasonable compliance standards as established by the LSSA under the Rule. The underlying question is, "How do we define quality in the context of the LSS?" assuming that, at a minimum, quality requires compliance with the Rule and LSSA interpretations of the rule.

Before defining compliance, it is essential to review the overall strategy of the LSS and the LSSA. The LSS and LSSA serve as a means to achieve the following objectives:

- Minimize delay in the high-level waste licensing process by providing an automated alternative to the normally time-consuming discovery procedure involved in a licensing hearing

- Ensure a thorough safety review based on all relevant information as defined by the Rule.

The LSSA is interested in assisting parties and potential parties to become and to remain in compliance with the Rule requirements. Any judgment of the adequacy of a party's compliance must weigh the effect of non-compliance on the attainment of the overall objectives. In the certification process, the LSSA must consider whether non-compliance is contributing to a delay in the licensing process or obstructing the performance of a thorough safety review. Reasonable compliance standards must incorporate the concept of "good faith" effort, recognizing that the Rule was developed to achieve the above-stated objectives and not to deny participation rights in the process.

It is important to discuss the difference between measuring the process and measuring the results of the process. A "process measure" is meant to identify weaknesses in the process to help prevent unacceptable results. A "result measure" is intended to judge the output of the process as acceptable or unacceptable based on quantifiable standards. A combination of result and process measures is generally the most effective way to achieve objectives. This gives assurance that the process is effective and prevents the need to inspect every result. The following are examples of result and process measure combinations:

- DMI - A result measure for identification might be evaluating the rate at which a participant identifies relevant documents (e.g., 5,000 per month). A process measure might involve close examination of how documents are funneled into the screening process.

- DMP - A result measure for preparation might be evaluating consistency between header and image files. A process measure might be evaluating whether scanner operators are following written procedures.

- DMS - A result measure in this case might be comparing a computer listing of material loaded in a batch with the description of the batch sent by the participant. A process measure might be evaluating how well packers are following procedures.

The terms **substantial** and **substantial and timely** are specifically referenced in the Rule. To define these terms, a major component of the definitions must be addressed. This component of **substantial compliance** is **satisfactory compliance.**

Evaluations of **satisfactory compliance** are made at a series of milestones along the path toward **substantial compliance.** No party can achieve **substantial compliance** without first being in **satisfactory compliance. Satisfactory compliance** assumes that, although there may be variation in levels of performance prior to **substantial compliance,** unsatisfactory ratings (red flags) indicate this goal may not be met. At this point, taking into account a "rule of reason," penalties may be applied based on unsatisfactory ratings at various stages.

On the positive side, consistent evaluations of **satisfactory compliance** eventually result in achieving **substantial compliance.** The higher the level of consistent satisfactory performance, the more likely it is that the requirements of **substantial compliance** will be met, in terms of the pre-license application phase.

2.0 Satisfactory Compliance

The term **satisfactory compliance** does not appear in the Rule. The term, however, is an implicit and essential part of any evaluative process. The LSSA must therefore establish reasonable compliance standards in order to help the participants understand and carry out their obligations under the Rule. Being in **satisfactory compliance** is a measure of ongoing progress toward the goal of **substantial compliance** and involves a set of standards to be established by the LSSA.

Satisfactory compliance, as it relates to an LSS participant's obligations under the Rule, is composed of the following elements:

- An approved compliance plan that is participant-created, LSSA-evaluated, and describes the strategy proposed by the participant to satisfy standards and schedules established by the LSSA as they apply to DMI, DMP, and DMS. It should also reflect the scope of the participant's responsibilities. For example, a participant operating a capture station has responsibilities that other participants do not, which should be addressed in their compliance plan. In all cases, the plan should be stated in sufficient detail to provide the LSSA with a sound basis for evaluation.

- Periodic positive evaluations that focus on and measure three levels of quality (unit quality, cumulative quality, and incremental quality) and result in a positive outcome.

"Satisfactory," in the context of periodic evaluations, is applied to three levels of measure, 1) an individual process output (unit quality), 2) total output from the process (cumulative quality), and 3) the timeliness of completion compared to schedule (incremental quality).

The first level is a simple, binary approach, i.e., "Is the output (i.e., documentary material that has been identified, prepared or submitted) acceptable or not?" This level of quality is only focused on one item at a time. The second level assumes the cumulative effect of all the output will yield a percentage value of acceptability. In other words, if a process outputs 10 items, five of which are rejected for quality reasons, then the cumulative level of quality is 50%. The third level measures the number of acceptable units produced for a given period of time as compared to the plan. If a participant's compliance plan states they will process 8,000 documents by April 1, 1993, then this is a milestone by which to measure progress. If by April 1, 1993, the participant has only processed 7,000 documents (i.e., 88% of the planned total), and the allowable amount of deviation from the plan is 10%, then the participant may not be in compliance. On the other hand, they could be in compliance if they

have shown "good faith" effort by screening an acceptable number of documents, but the documents screened did not contain as much relevant material as was estimated. Further, if the participant has processed all 8,000 documents, but 1,000 were rejected, then they are still only within 88% of the target for acceptable outputs and not in **satisfactory compliance.**

In the previous example, if there were only 500 rejections, meaning the participant is close to the satisfactory target, the high number of rejections would indicate there still may be a problem that should be addressed. If the number of rejections was lower, but analysis of the errors revealed a pattern, there still may be a problem to be addressed. For example, if a relatively small number of rejections were coming out of the DMP process, but analysis revealed a pattern concerning scanned image readability, then it would be reasonable to check the scanner equipment and scanning subprocess.

Quantitative measures used to determine the **satisfactory compliance** of participants with their process responsibilities are intended to recognize that perfect compliance is not possible; rather, some error will be found in an audit of the process results. Therefore, in applying a "rule of reason" to the establishment of standards, it is important to consider two factors in determining an "acceptable" rate of error. Those factors are 1) the determination of what types of errors may be more "acceptable" than others, and 2) the quantity of "acceptable" error.

Determining what types of errors are acceptable will require analysis of the component parts or steps involved in executing the process. For example, in the DMI process, screening criteria, such as document date range, subject matter, and document source are components to consider. Logistical and administrative process procedures are also component process factors, such as determining document acquisition sources, batching, and logging. In analyzing these components, weight can be given to certain error types by excluding them from the quality measurement, or by assigning less "value" to such errors. Specific examples of how this concept might be applied are included in each of the process subsections (2.1, 2.2 and 2.3) below.

Quantitative measures will impact compliance plans. Understanding the quantitative measures and the component parts of the process included in the measures permits the participant to develop effective strategies to meet the specific requirements or standards for **satisfactory compliance.** The participant's compliance plan must explain, in detail, how the DMI, DMP, and DMS processes are to be managed, executed, and reviewed for effectiveness within the participant organization. The participant's plan must be submitted and approved by the LSSA and be subject to audit before the participant can gain access to the LSS.

The following three subsections address requirements for a compliance plan as it applies to each process individually, and what quantitative measurements may be applied to determine satisfactory compliance.

2.1 Documentary Material Identification

The DMI process relates to the screening of documents for inclusion in the LSS. Related to this process, the participant's compliance plan must, among other things, include:

- A staffing outline dedicating sufficient resources to managing and accomplishing the process on schedule, along with a training program
- Written procedures for identifying the universe of documents to be screened under relevancy guidelines
- Written procedures for determining the relevancy of screened documents in accordance with the *Regulatory Guide on LSS Topical Guidelines* and the LSSA-developed DMI Guidance
- A schedule for acquisition and screening of relevant documents that ensures completion of the DMI process according to the timing requirements established in the Rule
- Written procedures for tracking the various stages of the process, including the segregation of priority documents in accordance with the Priority Document Loading Schedule (PDLS)
- A formal quality control program to ensure adequate in-house review of document relevancy and selection determinations prior to the initiation of DMP activities for selected documents.

The following quantitative measures are initially recommended as indicators of **satisfactory compliance**, based on common practice in litigation support environments and reasonableness:

- No less than 98% accuracy in determining relevancy
- No less than 100% completion of document screening to account for 100% of all backlog determined as potentially relevant, six months prior to license application filing for DOE, and prior to application for party status for non-DOE participants.

Measurement of progress toward the goal of 100% completion is based on the total required throughput, which is the total volume of documents to be screened, plus an estimated additional increment for anticipated rejected material. This total is divided by the number of months available between startup and the above date (average monthly production requirement). Over time, the cumulative number of documents identified should approach the number of months times the average monthly goal. For example, if the average monthly goal is 1,000 documents, and the monthly production for the last three months was 100, 1,100, and

1,300, then even though the first month was behind schedule, the cumulative production (2,400 documents) is approaching the cumulative average goal (3,000 documents) over time.

At a more detailed level, a formula must be developed that applies to the selected or weighted component process factors to determine the quantity of acceptable screened material. For example, the formula may include a certain percentage of "not relevant" subject-matter documents interspersed in a batch of "relevant" documents, but count as an individual error every occurrence of "not relevant" date-range documents included in that same batch. The resulting percentage accuracy can be acceptable, therefore, even though there may be incorrectly screened documents for subject matter in the batch. Other formula considerations include determining what the quantitative standard (98%) applies to, i.e., all documents screened or "relevant" documents screened. Statistical sampling techniques, i.e., less than 100% review of every page or document, would be used to determine the accuracy rating for a particular batch of material. Using this type of approach, one can arrive at a relatively high accuracy rate as a standard while still incorporating acceptable standards of quality and a "rule of reason."

At this detailed level of measure, it is important to define exactly what a "unit" means, i.e., what is graded? For the DMI process, the unit is a document. The "grading" in this case applies to whether or not the document should be included in the LSS. For example, a measure might indicate that x% of the documents that were included in a batch are irrelevant or that x% of the documents that were excluded from the batch are relevant and should have been included in the batch.

Another point to consider is the effect of the PDLS on the document screening process. Where possible, the PDLS should be used as a guide in determining the order of material to be screened. This leads to the need to develop a standard of measure for adherence to the PDLS. Since, at this point in the LSS process, these measurements may be heavily influenced by participant-specific circumstances, "rule of reason" and "good faith" effort will weigh significantly in determining **satisfactory compliance** for the PDLS.

2.2 Documentary Material Preparation

The DMP process relates to the development of load files for submission to the LSS. Activities include unitization of documents, coding and data entry of header records, scanning of document images, and conversion of images to text-based (ASCII) files. Related to this process, the participant's compliance plan must, along with other things, include:

- A staffing outline dedicating sufficient resources to managing and accomplishing the process on schedule, along with a training program

- Written procedures for indexing the documents and preparing headers in accordance with the LSSA guidelines

- Written procedures for imaging the documents and technical data, and conversion to ASCII text

- A schedule and written procedures for tracking the various stages of the process, including the accelerated preparation of priority documents

- A formal quality control program to ensure adequate in-house review of document preparations prior to the initiation of document submission activities for prepared documents.

The following quantitative measures are initially recommended as indicators of **satisfactory compliance**, based on common practice in litigation support environments and reasonableness:

- No less than 98% accuracy in preparing headers (see explanation below regarding objective and subjective items)

- No less than 98% accuracy in scanning images

- A reasonable level of accuracy in creating ASCII full text documents, considering the limitations of technology in use at the time

- 100% accuracy in matching headers to ASCII full text and images

- No less than 100% completion of document preparation to account for 100% of all backlog determined relevant six months prior to license application filing for DOE, and prior to application for party status for non-DOE participants.

As with the DMI process, measurement of progress toward the goal of 100% completion is based on the total required throughput, which is the total volume of documents to be prepared, plus an estimated additional increment for anticipated rejected and reworked material. This total is divided by the number of months available between startup and the above date (average monthly production requirement). Over time, the cumulative number of documents prepared should approach the number of months times the average monthly goal. For example, if the average monthly goal is 1,000 documents, and the monthly production for the last three months was 100, 1,100 and 1,300, then even though the first month was behind schedule, the cumulative production (2,400 documents) is approaching the cumulative average goal (3,000 documents) over time.

At a more detailed level, a formula must be developed, using the "rule of reason" that applies to the selected or weighted process components to measure the quality standard and determine the quantity of acceptable prepared material. For example, in bibliographic header coding, the formula could emphasize that all mandatory fields be coded with 100% accuracy, and at least some specific optional fields will be measured for some lower level of quality, e.g., 95%, to arrive at an aggregated quality measurement of the batch at the 98% standard.

Another aspect of the formula may require that objective fields (e.g., dates, authors, document number, etc.) be coded at 98% accuracy, while a quality standard for subjective fields (e.g., subject codes) can be developed with greater flexibility. The resulting percentage of accuracy can be acceptable, therefore, even though various types of errors existed. Using this type of approach, one can arrive at a relatively high accuracy rate as a standard while still incorporating acceptable standards of quality and a "rule of reason."

At this detailed level of measure, it is important to define exactly what a "unit" means, i.e., what is graded? For the document preparation process, "units" may vary by subprocess, i.e., fields or data elements for indexing, pages for scanning, or documents for ASCII. The "grading" will apply to the evaluation of quality at the particular unit level, e.g., 98% of all fields or data elements coded for indexing or 98% of all pages scanned for imaging.

2.3 Documentary Material Submission

The DMS process relates to the "handover" of material from the participant to the LSSA. Related to this process, the participant's compliance plan must include:

- A staffing outline dedicating sufficient resources to manage and accomplish the process on schedule, along with a training program
- Written procedures for packaging and submitting documentary material in accordance with the LSSA guidelines, including the PDLS
- Written procedures for logging batches of documentary material in and out
- A document submission schedule and submission tracking mechanism
- An adequate record keeping and documentary material backup system
- A formal quality control program to ensure adequate in-house review of document submission activities prior to the initiation of document submission activities.

The quantitative measure that is initially recommended as an indicator of **satisfactory compliance** is as follows: a minimum of 98% of all submitted material must be packaged correctly, e.g., batch size, physical format of tapes, or diskettes for electronic submission, and the physical condition of boxes for manual content submissions must be suitable for further processing, and the count of records must match the number included in the transmittal information. Additionally, 100% of all backlog identified by the participant, at the time LSS access was initially granted, must be submitted by a date six months prior to the filing of the license application for DOE, and prior to application for party status by non-DOE participants. Periodic output, although variation is expected, must be at a rate which takes into account error loss and still maintains a high probability of achieving this ultimate goal.

The achievement of quality in the DMS process depends heavily on the quality of the output from the DMI, DMP, and DMS processes independently. Therefore, the interim goals for submissions must account for errors, downtime, and any other factors that may delay or negatively affect submissions. The application of a margin of error for interim document submissions is one such factor, based on the fact that all three processes are contributing to the level of error in a batch. If all three processes individually generate a 98% accuracy rate, then the overall potential accuracy of any batch flowing through all three processes is 0.98 x 0.98 x 0.98, which equals 0.94 or 94% accuracy. Thus, the average rate of production should be roughly equal to the estimated total divided by the number of months available, plus a factor of 6% to account for errors. By requiring a greater rate of production, the participant can reasonably achieve the expected volume goal of 100% when rejected and reworked material is incorporated into their production process.

In addition to meeting interim volume quotas, the submissions must also conform with the PDLS, which prioritizes the categories of documents to be submitted. Evaluation of this aspect of **satisfactory compliance** is more subjective and open to individual interpretation. The performance measure in this case would likely include a comparison of actual versus planned submissions of a document category for a specific point in time.

For example, assume a participant estimates they will submit 2,000 reports generated in the 1980s regarding mineral deposits, and this type of document is due to be submitted by April 1, 1993. When they only submit 1,000 reports by that date, they may or may not be in **satisfactory compliance.** The situation will require a reasonable explanation for the shortage, such as an error was made in the estimation process and certain reports were mislabeled. The explanation may also indicate problems with the DMI or DMP processes that have affected the results of the DMS process. A judgment must then be made as to the "good faith" effort of the participant in estimating and producing the material.

2.4 Summary

The measure of **satisfactory compliance** will be a comparison of activity versus procedures as stated in the compliance plan for each individual participant. Thus, compliance of individual participants will be evaluated based on adherence to their own compliance plans, once those plans have been accepted by the LSSA.

The objectives for **satisfactory compliance** include 1) submitting a comprehensive compliance plan for compliance with the document processing requirements of the Rule, 2) adhering to the plan, and 3) achieving the measurable points and standards in a process that leads to **substantial compliance.**

3.0 Substantial Compliance

Satisfactory compliance has been defined in the context of evaluating the ongoing efforts of participants to achieve and remain in compliance with their document processing obligations as they approach the licensing phase. The term **substantial compliance** represents a determination that, at a point six months prior to the filing of the license application by DOE, or when a participant other than DOE, applies for party status, the participant has met a quantitative standard, or milestone, established by the LSSA.

Specifically, a participant would be in **substantial compliance** with their document submission obligations if:

- By the six-month deadline, or upon application for party status by non-DOE participants, they have submitted 100% of the actual documents included in the estimate made at the time they were granted access to the LSS

- Reasonable progress (i.e., based on demonstrated capacity) has been made to prepare and submit any materials identified but not included as part of the original estimate (i.e., "contemporaneously-generated" materials).

Once the LSSA has certified that a participant is in **substantial compliance**, all material submitted from that point forward, throughout the hearing phase, to the LSS should be "reasonably contemporaneous" with its generation. As a proposed definition of **substantial compliance**, this means that all new, relevant material must enter the preparation and submission process flow within 30 days of creation and that no new material is intentionally delayed. Therefore, decisions to accept non-contemporaneous material (i.e., material generated and identified, but not immediately prepared and submitted) should be made by the Pre-license Application Licensing Board (PALB) or Hearing Licensing Board (HLB).

By achieving and maintaining **satisfactory compliance** throughout the pre-licensing phase, a participant will be substantially compliant. LSSA evaluation of **substantial compliance** occurs at a definite, pre-set point (when or if a participant applies for party status, or, for DOE, at the point six months before the application for license is submitted), and at periodic intervals thereafter, until the Commission determines additions to the LSS should cease.

In summary, **substantial compliance** refers to the completion of DMI, DMP, and DMS activities in a manner that meets the established accuracy standard when regulatory measurement occurs.

4.0 Substantial and Timely Compliance

The term **substantial and timely compliance** relates to the evaluation of a potential party's adherence to its obligations under the Rule when it requests participation (party status) in the licensing proceeding. In order to be granted party status, an evaluation must be made by the HLB or PALB indicating the potential party has met its obligations under the standards of **substantial compliance**, and that the potential party has done this in a timely manner. The purpose of adding this timeliness requirement is to discourage a potential party from intentionally being a "latecomer" to the LSS process. This would prevent the potential party from adding materials to the LSS at the last minute, thereby attempting to gain an unfair advantage over others by effectively limiting the other participants' opportunity to review the materials.

To achieve **substantial and timely compliance**, the "late-comers" must demonstrate all the elements of **substantial compliance**, plus timeliness to prevent obstruction, or to avoid an unfair advantage from including their information at the last minute. As a proposed definition of **substantial and timely compliance**, this means they must do the following:

- Submit an acceptable compliance plan within 30 days of application for party status as defined by the LSSA guidance
- In effectively executing the plan, abide by the same basic rules and performance measures imposed on the other parties
- Submit all documentary materials within six months, but at a reasonable rate based on the capacity of the participant and the performance of other participants.

5.0 Conclusion

The definitions of **satisfactory, substantial,** and **substantial and timely compliance** have been developed within the context of 1) "good faith" effort by the participant, 2) the rule of reason, and 3) the effect of non-compliance on the overall objectives of the LSS, which are to minimize delay in the licensing process and to conduct a thorough safety review.

The concepts of **satisfactory** and **substantial compliance** can be related to all potential users of the LSS. Each participant will develop their own compliance plan for the type of media and volume of documents to be submitted. Each participant can then be "certified" by the LSSA regarding their compliance.

This document states a general philosophy defining what is compliance and its measurement for document submission requirements. It should be used as a source in the development of the QMPs, where applicable. It particularly applies to Step 2, in which performance measures are defined.

Revised Step 1 Materials

Licensing Support System Administrator's

Quality Management Plans

for

Task Area 7 of Contract No. NRC-40-90-346

Task Order No. 2

June 14, 1991

by

LABAT-ANDERSON Incorporated

with

Price Waterhouse

Step 1: Design/Define the Process

Work Breakdown Structure 1.1 - Documentary Material Identification

1.0 Process Definition

Documentary material identification (DMI) is the process of screening a known "universe" of documents and technical data to determine their relevance or potential relevance to the High Level Waste (HLW) licensing proceeding by employing established relevancy criteria. The "universe" to be screened is determined as part of the Licensing Support System (LSS) Participant's Compliance Plan development, which is reviewed and approved by the Licensing Support System Administrator (LSSA). Documents or technical data determined to be relevant or potentially relevant are considered "documentary material" under the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (Commission's) Rules of Practice (the Rule - 10 CFR Part 2) and are targeted for further processing and eventual submission to the LSS. The identification process begins with the initial development of DMI guidance to the LSS Participants and the collection of the "universe" of potential "documentary material." It ends with the conclusion of screening activities (including the documentation of reasons for all relevancy determinations) for that group of material and any other materials developed prior to the cessation of LSS operation.

DMI is a three-step process encompassing process design, process implementation and process management. Process design focuses on the development of guidelines for relevance and inclusion in the LSS and the development of DMI guidance. Process implementation is the actual application of the process to the work to be performed, in this case, the use of that guidance in selecting documentary material for entry into the LSS. Process management includes the ongoing effort to review and improve the process in order to achieve maximum results with the minimum expenditure of resources. For the purposes of this discussion, parties and potential parties (as defined in the Rule) are referred to as LSS Participants.

2.0 Suppliers (Input) and Customers (Output)

This section lists a series of suppliers who develop inputs to the DMI process and a series of customers who receive outputs from the process.

INPUTS:

WHAT	FROM WHOM
Process Design:	
▸ The LSS Rule (as amended)	▸ The Commission (via Commission Staff and General Counsel and with the advice of the LSS Advisory Review Panel [LSSARP])
▸ Commission's *Regulatory Guide on LSS Topical Guidelines*, original and any required revisions	▸ The Commission (via Commission Staff and General Counsel and with the advice of the LSSARP)
▸ Department of Energy (DOE)/DOE contractor studies: "Licensing Support System Revised Data Scope Analysis" "Licensing Support System Prototype Test Report"	▸ DOE/DOE contractor
Process Implementation:	
▸ LSS Big Book	▸ LSSA, Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) 1.4
▸ LSS Priority Document Loading Schedule (PDLS)	▸ LSSA, WBS 1.3
▸ LSS Participants' Compliance Plans as approved by LSSA	▸ LSS Participants, WBS 1.4
▸ Universe of materials to be screened as defined in LSS Participants' Compliance Plans	▸ LSS Participants and their contractors

INPUTS (continued):

WHAT	FROM WHOM
Process Management:	
▸ Designated LSS Officials (DLOs) Certifications	▸ LSS Participants' DLOs

OUTPUTS:

WHAT	TO WHOM
Process Design:	
▸ DMI Guidance	▸ LSSA for Big Book publication, WBS 1.4
▸ Revisions to DMI Guidance	▸ LSSA for Big Book publication, WBS 1.4
Process Implementation:	
▸ LSS Documentary Materials	▸ LSS Participant documentary material "preparers," WBS 1.2
Process Management:	
▸ Data on the process ▸ Data from LSS Participants ▸ Data from LSS Operations and Maintenance Contractor ▸ LSSA Audit Reports	▸ LSSA ▸ For Compliance Evaluation Program, WBS 1.4 ▸ For review and management of the process ▸ For revisions to the PDLS, WBS 1.3

3.0 Process Participants/Responsibilities

- Office of the LSSA
  - Develops Quality Management Plan (QMP)
  - Directs development of and revisions to DMI Guidance
  - Evaluates/implements advice of the LSSARP
  - Responds to requests for interpretation/clarification of DMI Guidance
  - Oversees and evaluates DMI process of LSS Participants, including directing compliance audits
  - Evaluates process data to improve the process

- LSSA Contractors
  - Compliance Requirements and Evaluation Program (CREP) Contractor (LABAT-ANDERSON Incorporated/Price Waterhouse and successor)
    - Assists in development of QMP
    - Assists in development of DMI Guidance
    - Maintains DMI Guidance
    - Conducts audits of LSS Participants' DMI activities, under the direction of LSSA
    - Assists in evaluating process data
  - Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analysis (CNWRA)
    - Provides input related to the identification of "technical data"

- LSS Participant DLOs
  - Participate in QMP Step 4 meetings
  - Provide comments on draft DMI Guidance
  - Provide data about own DMI process
  - Ensure that the LSS Participant maintains materials rejected as non-relevant or not appropriate for entry into the LSS and documentation relative to those determinations for review by LSSA auditors

- LSS Participant Screeners
  - Participate in QMP Step 4 meetings
  - Screen materials, using the Big Book, including the topical guidelines, the DMI Guidance, and the PDLS
  - Collect and report data on the process
  - Request interpretation/clarification of guidance, as appropriate

- LSSARP
  - Reviews and comments on draft DMI Guidance
  - At the request of LSSA, provides advice on other DMI issues
- Pre-license Application Licensing Board (PALB), and its successor Hearing Licensing Board (HLB)
  - Rule on issues related to the topical guidelines and DMI Guidance, as required
- The Commission (with Commission Staff and General Counsel)
  - Provides advice and rulings on copyright and exclusions policies within the LSS
  - Responds to queries about the topical guidelines

4.0 Objectives

The objectives of the DMI process are:

1. Fully involve users (LSSARP) in the development of DMI guidance, standards, and schedule.

2. Produce clear DMI Guidance and assistance to permit LSS Participants to identify all relevant or potentially relevant LSS documentary material.

   2a. Produce guidance sufficient to assist LSS Participants in identifying their "universe" of materials to be screened.

   2b. Produce guidance sufficient to assist LSS Participants in making relevancy determinations based on the Commission's *Regulatory Guide on LSS Topical Guidelines.*

3. Identify all relevant or potentially relevant documentary material on a timely basis in order to ensure the usefulness of the LSS for technical review during the pre-license and licensing phases.

4. Ensure that there is as little duplication as possible in the LSS resulting from the DMI process.

5. Have a suitable basis to retrospectively decide whether relevance determinations have been made properly.

5a. Ensure that a suitable record of relevancy determinations is maintained by LSS Participants.

5b. Ensure that material rejected for entry into the LSS by the LSS Participants is maintained for review by LSSA.

6. Minimize the risk of willful destruction or diversion of documents during the DMI process.

5.0 Overall Objective Attainment Strategy

LSSA will allow the responsible DLOs as much freedom as possible to establish and manage their DMI programs. The Commission's Topical Guidelines will be used by DLOs to determine which materials should be identified for the LSS. LSSA will exert influence on these programs by:

- requiring that Compliance Program Plans be developed by DLOs
- reviewing and commenting on the Compliance Plans
- providing supplementary guidance to help identify relevant and potentially relevant documentary material
- auditing program results and providing recommendations on ways to improve performance
- imposing sanctions when LSS Participants are determined non-compliant with the Rule and/or other established requirements.

Step 1: Design/Define the Process

Work Breakdown Structure 1.2 - Documentary Material Preparation

1.0 Process Definition

Documentary material preparation (DMP) is the process of preparing a known universe of documents and technical data for subsequent entry into the high level waste (HLW) Licensing Support System (LSS). Documents or technical data that have been identified as relevant or potentially relevant to the licensing proceeding are considered "documentary material" under the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (Commission's) Rules of Practice (the Rule - 10 CFR Part 2) and are targeted for preparation and eventual submission to the LSS. The preparation process begins with the establishment of the DMP Guidance and the conclusion of the identification process. It ends with the conclusion of preparation activities for all materials identified as relevant prior to the cessation of LSS loading.

DMP is a three-step process encompassing process design, process implementation and process management. Process design focuses on header standards and records; unitization, indexing, and image rules; image specifications; ASCII format standards; authority files (organization authority lists, thesaurus, document type lists, other file [special classes] lists); and the ADP /software requirements. Process implementation is the actual application of the process to the work to be performed, in this case, the use of the guidance in preparing documentary material for entry into the LSS. Process management includes the ongoing effort to review and improve the process in order to achieve maximum results with the minimum expenditure of resources. For the purposes of this discussion, parties and potential parties (as defined in the Rule) are referred to as LSS participants.

2.0 Suppliers (Input) and Customers (Output)

This section lists a series of suppliers who develop inputs to the DMP process and a series of customers who receive outputs from the process.

INPUTS:

WHAT	FROM WHOM
Process Design:	
▸ The LSS Rule (as amended)	▸ The Commission (via Commission Staff and General Counsel and with the advice of the LSS Advisory Review Panel [LSSARP])

INPUTS (continued):

WHAT	FROM WHOM
▸ Department of Energy (DOE)/DOE contractor studies: "LSS preliminary Prototype Header Design" "LSS Cataloging Manual" "LSS Organization Name Authority List" "Search and Image Design Document for the LSS" volumes 1 and 2 LSS White Papers: "ASCII Text Storage Replication" "User Interface Attributes" "Page Size Limit Decision" "LEXICO Thesaurus Software" "300 dpi Image Storage Density Decision" "LSS Search and Image System Partitions" "Copyright Law" "LSS Controlled Tests - Differential OCR Processing"	▸ DOE/DOE contractor

<u>Process Implementation:</u>

▸ LSS Big Book	▸ LSS Administrator (LSSA), Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) 1.4

INPUTS (continued):

WHAT	FROM WHOM
▸ LSS Priority Document Loading Schedule (PDLS)	▸ LSSA, WBS 1.3
▸ LSS Participants' Compliance Plan as approved by LSSA	▸ LSS Participants, WBS 1.4
▸ Universe of screened materials to be prepared as defined in LSS Compliance Plans	▸ LSS Participants and their contractors
Process Management:	
▸ Designated LSS Official (DLO) Certifications	▸ LSS Participants' DLOs

OUTPUTS:

WHAT	TO WHOM
Process Design:	
▸ DMP Guidance	▸ LSSA for Big Book publication, WBS 1.4
▸ Revisions to DMP Guidance	▸ LSSA for Big Book publication, WBS 1.4
Process Implementation:	
▸ Prepared LSS Documentary Materials	▸ LSS Participant documentary material "submitters," WBS 1.3

OUTPUTS (continued):

WHAT	TO WHOM

Process Management:

- Data on the process
  - Data from LSS Participants
  - Data from LSS Operations and Maintenance Contractor
  - LSSA Audit Reports

- LSSA
  - For Compliance Evaluation Program, WBS 1.4
  - For review and management of the process
  - For revisions to the PDLS, WBS 1.3

3.0 Process Participants/Responsibilities

- Office of the LSSA

  - Develops Quality Management Plan (QMP)
  - Directs development of and revisions to DMP Guidance
  - Evaluates/implements advice of the LSSARP
  - Responds to requests for interpretation/clarification of DMP Guidance
  - Oversees and evaluates DMP process of LSS Participants, including directing compliance audits

- LSSA Contractors

  - Compliance Requirements and Evaluation Plan (CREP) Contractor (LABAT-ANDERSON Incorporated/Price Waterhouse and successor)
    - Assist in development of QMP
    - Assist in development of DMP Guidance
    - Maintain DMP Guidance
    - Assist in development of indexing rules and header/image/ASCII format standards
    - Develop and maintain authority files

- Conduct audits of LSS Participants' DMP activities, under the direction of LSSA

- Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analysis (CNWRA)
  - Provides input related to the preparation of "technical data"

- Operations and Maintenance Contractor
  - Participate in QMP Step 4 meetings
  - Prepare materials, using the Big Book, including the indexing rules, header/image/ASCII format standards, and the PDLS
  - Collect and report data on the process
  - Request interpretation/clarification of guidance, as appropriate

- LSS Participant DLOs

  - Participate in QMP Step 4 meetings
  - Provide comments on draft DMP Guidance
  - Provide data about own DMP process

- LSS Participant Preparers

  - Participate in QMP Step 4 meetings
  - Prepare materials, using the Big Book, including the indexing rules, header/image/ASCII format standards, and the PDLS
  - Collect and report data on the process
  - Request interpretation/clarification of Guidance, as appropriate

- LSSARP

  - Reviews and comments on draft DMP Guidance

- Pre-licensing Application Licensing Board (PALB), and its successor HLW Licensing Board

  - Rules on issues related to the DMP Guidance, as required

- Office of the Secretary (SECY)/Atomic Safety Licensing Appeal Board (ASLAB)

  - Provide information for special headers

4.0 Objectives

The objectives of the DMP process are:

1. Fully involve users (LSSARP) in the development of DMP Guidance, standards, and schedule.

2. Produce clear DMP Guidance and assistance to permit LSS Participants to prepare all the identified current and backlog LSS documentary material.

   2a. Ensure the LSSA-developed DMP guidance is sufficient and the information characterized for the LSS is complete, consistent, and accurate.

   2b. Ensure the DMP guidance is properly applied by participants.

   2c. Develop standards necessary to achieve output consistency among participants.

3. Establish a reasonable balance between header design and indexing rules to achieve maximum accessibility of documentary material preparation throughput, maximize retrieval, and minimize indexing.

4. Prepare and verify all identified documentary material on a timely basis in order to ensure the usefulness of the LSS for technical review during the pre-license and licensing phases.

5. Minimize the risk of willful destruction or diversion of documents during the DMP process.

5.0 Overall Objective Attainment Strategy

LSSA will allow the responsible DLOs as much freedom as possible to establish and manage their DMP programs. The Commission's Topical Guidelines will be used by DLOs to determine which materials should be prepared for submission into the LSS. LSSA will oversee these programs by:

- requiring that compliance program plans be developed by DLOs
- reviewing and commenting on these plans
- providing supplementary guidance concerning preparation of documentary materials, as necessary
- auditing program results and providing recommendations on ways to improve performance

- imposing sanctions when LSS Participants are determined to be non-compliant with the Rule and/or other established requirements.

Step 1: Design/Define the Process

Work Breakdown Structure 1.3 - Documentary Material Submission

1.0 Process Definition

Documentary material submission (DMS) is the process by which documentary materials are submitted to the Licensing Support System Administrator (LSSA) for inclusion in the Licensing Support System (LSS), under the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (Commission's) Rules of Practice, 10 CFR Part 2 (the Rule). The LSSA develops and issues DMS guidance to assist LSS Participants in the proper submission of their documentary materials. The LSSA receives and enters the documentary materials into the LSS and audits selected activities to ensure that the submissions are being made in accordance with the guidance. The submission process begins with the initial establishment of DMS guidance to the LSS Participants which they use to create appropriate submission lots of documentary materials after they have been prepared for submission. It ends after the documents have been transferred to the LSSA, verified, and corrected, if necessary. Corrections, amendments and updates submitted after the time period specified for verification are submitted as separate documents, and therefore constitute a separate submission.

DMS is a three-phase process, encompassing process design, process implementation, and process management. Process design focuses on the establishment of guidelines for priority document scheduling, packaging standards, and transfer guidelines. DMS process implementation is the actual application of the process to the work to be performed. Process management includes the overall effort to review and improve the process to achieve maximum results with the minimum expenditure of resources. For the purposes of this discussion, parties and potential parties (as defined in the Rule) are referred to as LSS Participants.

2.0 Suppliers (Input) and Customers (Output)

This section lists a series of suppliers who develop inputs to the DMS process and a series of customers who receive outputs from the process.

INPUTS:

WHAT	FROM WHOM
Process Design:	
▸ The LSS Rule (as amended)	▸ The Commission (via Commission Staff and Office of General Counsel and with the advice of the LSS Advisory Review Panel [LSSARP])
▸ Department of Energy (DOE)/DOE contractor studies: "Licensing Support System Search and Image Design Document" "Licensing Support System Communication System Design Document" "LSS Capture System Design Document" "Use of Facsimile (FAX) Transmission in the High-Level Waste Proceedings" "Licensing Support System Revised Data Scope Analysis"	▸ DOE/DOE contractor
Process Implementation:	
▸ LSS Big Book	▸ LSSA, Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) 1.4
▸ Commission's *Regulatory Guide on LSS Topical Guidelines*	▸ The Commission
▸ LSS Participants' Compliance Plan as approved by LSSA	▸ LSS Participants, WBS 1.4

INPUTS (continued):

WHAT	FROM WHOM
▸ Prepared documentary materials to be submitted as defined in LSS Compliance Plans	▸ LSS Participants and their contractors
Process Management:	
▸ Designated LSS Officials (DLO) Certifications	▸ LSS Participants' DLOs

OUTPUTS:

WHAT	TO WHOM
Process Design:	
▸ DMS Guidance	▸ LSSA for Big Book publication, WBS 1.4
▸ Revisions to DMS Guidance	▸ LSSA for Big Book publication, WBS 1.4
Process Implementation:	
▸ Packaged LSS Documentary Materials	▸ LSSA
▸ LSS Priority Document Loading Schedule (PDLS)	▸ LSS Participants, WBS 1.1, 1.2, 1.4
Process Management:	
▸ Data on the process ▸ Data from LSS Participants ▸ Data from LSS Operations and Maintenance contractor ▸ LSSA Audit Reports	▸ LSSA ▸ For Compliance Evaluation Program, WBS 1.4 ▸ For review and management of the process

3.0 Process Participants/Responsibilities

- Office of the LSSA
  - Develops QMP
  - Directs development of and revisions to DMS Guidance
  - Evaluates/implements advice of the LSSARP
  - Responds to requests for interpretation/clarification of DMS Guidance
  - Oversees and evaluates DMS process of LSS Participants, including directing compliance audits
  - Evaluates process data to improve the process

- LSSA Contractors
  - Compliance Requirements and Evaluation Program (CREP) Contractor (LABAT-ANDERSON Incorporated/Price Waterhouse and successor)
    - Assist in development of QMP
    - Assist in development of DMS Guidance
    - Maintain DMS Guidance
    - Conduct audits of LSS Participants' DMS activities, under the direction of LSSA
  - LSS operations and maintenance contractor
    - Provides DMS support to the LSSA for those materials submitted by LSS Participants in non-electronic format
  - Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analysis (CNWRA)
    - Provides input related to the submission of "technical data"

- LSS Participant DLOs
  - Participate in QMP Step 4 meetings
  - Provide comments on draft DMS Guidance
  - Provide data about own DMS process

- LSS Participant Submitters
  - Participate in QMP Step 4 meetings
  - Submit materials, using the Big Book, including the DMS Guidance and the PDLS
  - Collect and report data on the process
  - Request interpretation/clarification of guidance, as appropriate

- LSSARP
  - Reviews and comments on draft DMS Guidance
  - As requested by LSSA, provides advice on other DMS issues
- Pre-license Application Licensing Board (PALB), and its successor Hearing Licensing Board (HLB)
  - Rules on issues related to the DMS Guidance, as required

4.0 Objectives

The objectives of the DMS process are:

1. Fully involve users (LSSARP) in the development of the DMS Guidance, standards, and schedule.

2. Produce clear DMS guidance and assistance to permit LSS Participants to properly submit all relevant or potentially relevant LSS documentary material in a complete, consistent, and accurate manner.

   2a. Produce clear guidance and assistance concerning electronic submissions.

   2b. Produce clear guidance and assistance concerning non-electronic submissions.

   2c. Produce priority document loading schedule.

3. Submit all prepared documentary material on a timely basis in order to ensure the usefulness of the LSS for technical review during the pre-license and licensing phases.

4. Collect information (a complete record of the timing and content) to retrospectively decide whether submissions have been properly made.

5. Minimize the risk of willful destruction or diversion of documents during the DMS process.

5.0 Overall Objective Attainment Strategy

LSSA will allow the responsible Designated LSS Officials as much freedom as possible to establish and manage their DMS programs. The LSSA's DMS Guidance will be used by DLOs to determine the manner in which prepared documentary materials should be submitted to the LSS. LSSA will exert influence on these programs by:

- requiring that Compliance Program Plans be developed by DLOs
- reviewing and commenting on these plans
- providing supplementary guidance concerning documentary material submission as necessary
- auditing program results and providing recommendations on ways to improve performance
- imposing sanctions when LSS Participants are determined to be non-compliant with the LSS Rule and/or other established requirements.

Step 1: Design/Define the Process

Work Breakdown Structure 1.4 - Compliance Assistance and Reporting

1.0 Process Definition

Compliance Assistance and Reporting (CAR) includes those activities which involve the Licensing Support System Administrator's (LSSA) responsibilities in defining, evaluating and managing compliance in accordance with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (Commission's) Rules of Practice (the Rule), (Sections 2.1003, 2.1011, and 2.1012), including providing support to Licensing Support System (LSS) Participants in their efforts to attain, maintain or regain that status of compliance. CAR involves the full range of LSS process activities (i.e., Document Material Identification - DMI; Document Material Preparation - DMP; and Document Material Submission - DMS) and encompasses the compilation, formation and distribution mechanism for the standards, guidance, and process data collection materials and activities of all the other LSS processes. The CAR process is where the other processes converge, providing a focal point to allow for a coordinated and comprehensive evaluation of LSS Participant compliance. The process has begun with the current effort to develop a compliance program strategy and will end with the cessation of LSS activities at the direction of the Commission.

CAR is a three-phase process, encompassing process design, process implementation, and process management. Process design focuses on providing rules, guidance, standards, and procedures for compliance with the requirements of the Rule, providing briefings, training, and support assistance to LSS Participants, evaluating and reporting on LSS Participant compliance, and working with them to help them remain in compliance with their LSS responsibilities. CAR process implementation is the application of the process to the work to be performed. Process management includes the ongoing effort to review and improve the process in order to achieve maximum results with the minimum expenditure of resources. For purposes of this discussion, parties and potential parties (as defined by the Rule) are referred to as LSS Participants.

2.0 Suppliers (Input) and Customers (Output)

This section lists a series of suppliers who develop inputs to the CAR process and a series of customers who receive outputs from the process.

INPUTS:

WHAT	FROM WHOM
Process Design:	
▸ The LSS Rule (as amended)	▸ The Commission (via Commission Staff and General Counsel and with the advice of the LSS Advisory Review Panel [LSSARP])
Process Implementation:	
▸ LSS Access Application	▸ LSSA, Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) 4.6
▸ LSS Priority Document Loading Schedule (PDLS)	▸ LSSA, WBS 1.3
▸ LSS Participants' Compliance Plans as approved by LSSA	▸ LSS Participants
Process Management:	
▸ LSSA Audit Reports	▸ LSSA Compliance Evaluation Program
▸ Designated LSS Officials (DLOs) Certifications	▸ LSS Participants' DLOs
▸ Data on the DMI, DMP, and DMS processes	▸ LSS Participants, WBS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3

OUTPUTS:

WHAT	TO WHOM
Process Design:	
▸ Compliance Evaluation Program Plan	▸ Commission

OUTPUTS (continued):

WHAT	TO WHOM
Process Implementation:	
▸ LSS Big Book and Training	▸ LSS Participants, WBS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3
▸ LSS Participant Compliance Plan Guidance	▸ LSS Participants, WBS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3
▸ LSSA Evaluations of LSS Participants' Compliance	▸ LSS Participants Pre-license Application Licensing Board (PALB), Hearing Licensing Board (HLB) or the Commission
▸ Commission Determinations of LSS Participant Compliance	▸ LSS Participant LSSA
Process Management:	
▸ Data on the Compliance Evaluation Process	▸ LSSA for review and management of the process
▸ Evaluation Reports	▸ Commission

3.0 Process Participants/Responsibilities

- Office of the LSSA

  Develops Quality Management Plan (QMP)
  - Responds to requests for clarification of compliance guidance
  - Prepares and distributes Big Book and compliance program strategy and guidance to LSS Participants for their development of compliance plans for all LSS processes
    - Reviews submitted plans for acceptability
    - Provides feedback and assistance where necessary
  - Develops and implements briefing and training programs for LSS Participant training in correct DMI, DMP, and DMS procedures
  - Conducts periodic (minimum every six months) audits and evaluations of LSS

Participant processing activities and determines if they are 1) adhering to compliance plans, and 2) are in compliance

- Submits reports to the Commission on LSS Participant compliance status, highlighting problems and concerns with recommendations for corrective action(s)
- Provides LSS Participants with copies of the report, and works directly with them to resolve concerns, when possible
- Periodically requests process (DMI, DMP, DMS) result data from LSS Participants and solicits feedback on the process(es) to determine if changes to the process(es) should be recommended, and if so, recommends changes and presents them to the LSSARP for review and comment

- LSSA Contractors

  - Compliance Requirements and Evaluation Program (CREP) Contractor (LABAT-ANDERSON Incorporated/Price Waterhouse and successor)
    - Assists in development of QMP
    - Assists in the development of guidance and standards for DMI, DMP, and DMS and the attendant evaluation procedures
    - Conducts audits of LSS Participants' LSS activities, under the direction of LSSA
  - LSS operations and maintenance contractor
    - Provides data on the operation of the LSS to LSSA for use in review and management of the system and in identifying compliance problems

- LSS Participant DLOs

  - Participates in QMP Step 4 meetings
  - Provides data about own LSS processes
  - Requests interpretation/clarification of guidance, as appropriate

- LSSARP

  - Reviews and comments on draft Compliance Evaluation Program Plan
  - As requested by LSSA, provides advice on other matters related to compliance evaluation

- PALB, and its successor HLB

  - Rules on issues related to compliance of LSS Participants with LSSA compliance guidance, as required
  - Issues sanctions against non-compliant LSS Participants

- The Commission (with the Commission Staff and General Counsel)
  - Reviews sanctions issued against LSS Participants if appealed, and issues final ruling
  - Approves final Compliance Evaluation Program Plan

4.0 Objectives

The objectives of the CAR process are:

1. Fully involve users (LSSARP) and NRC during the development of the CAR strategy, guidance, standards, and schedules.

2. Provide compliance assistance commensurate with the need to provide thorough participant briefing and training while not intervening unnecessarily into the participants development of compliance plans.

   2a. Ensure that LSS Participant Compliance Plans are acceptable and implemented to facilitate their meeting the standards and objectives of the underlying processes (DMI, DMP, and DMS).

   2b. Provide for the complete, accurate, and useable documentation and guidance materials distribution and update in a timely manner to all LSS Participants so that processing activities and LSS development are not unduly delayed.

   2c. Provide briefing and training programs to ensure thorough understanding of LSS DMI, DMP, and DMS procedures.

   2d. Collect information during the briefings and training to improve the assistance program.

3. Implement CAR process to ensure effective management and evaluation of the overall LSS process without unnecessarily imposing information supply burdens on participants.

   3a. Ensure that periodic audits and other reviews of LSS Participant process activities are thorough and conducted expeditiously to facilitate proper LSS development and minimize the impact of any identified process problems.

   3b. Conduct audits to the degree require to confirm adherence to participants compliance plans.

4. Provide periodic and thorough reports on LSS Participant compliance progress to the Commission.

5.0 Overall Objective Attainment Strategy

LSSA will allow the responsible DLOs as much freedom as possible to establish and manage their DMI, DMP, and DMS processes. The LSSA's Participant Compliance Plan Guidance (and the Big Book) will be used by these officials to determine their specific responsibilities and develop their LSS Compliance Plans. LSSA will exert influence on these programs by:

- requiring that compliance plans be developed by DLOs
- reviewing and commenting on the Compliance Plans
- providing briefing and training programs on LSS procedures
- providing a submitter assistance and support program
- auditing LSS program results and providing recommendations on ways to improve performance
- providing periodic evaluation reports to the Commission on LSS Participant compliance progress
- imposing sanctions when LSS Participants are determined to be non-compliant with the Rule and/or other established requirements.