

SUMMARY OF MAJOR ISSUES
LSS ADVISORY REVIEW PANEL MEETING
DECEMBER 12 - 13, 1994

In general, the meeting demonstrated significant progress towards the development and implementation of the LSS. Although, many critical details still need to be addressed, it appears that we are making progress on both the management framework necessary for successful implementation of the LSS, and on a cost-effective LSS design.

1. FUNDING MECHANISM FOR NRC (LSS ADMINISTRATOR) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS

Based on discussions between the NRC and DOE staff, DOE proposed to implement the funding of the LSS operation and maintenance (O&M) costs through an interagency agreement between the two agencies. The agreement would provide for DOE to request appropriations for LSS O&M costs. NRC would then draw against a separate account established for this purpose. Although not yet specifically addressed, it is anticipated that the funds appropriated would be counted against DOE's budget cap rather than NRC's. This proposal is much simpler, and subject to less potential complications, than the previous funding proposal developed at the April, 1994, LSSARP meeting, which would have established the LSS Administrator as the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) on the DOE contract for operation and maintenance of the LSS.

Under the Interagency Agreement proposal, the LSS Administrator would carry forth the NRC's responsibilities in the LSS rule to operate and maintain the LSS. However, these responsibilities would be funded by DOE. The other participants on the LSSARP enthusiastically supported this proposal, particularly because it would not create any ambiguities in regard to whether the NRC was fully in control of LSS operation and maintenance. DOE expects to receive DOE management closure on this proposal within the next two months. During the same time period, the NRC staff will fully explore the legal and budgetary implications of the proposal. It should be emphasized that even with DOE approval of the concept, successful implementation will obviously depend on DOE including the LSS O&M costs in its appropriations requests, and receiving OMB and Congressional approval of those requests.

2. USE OF THE DOE RECORDS MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE

In the June 4, 1993 SRM on SECY-93-107, the Commission endorsed a management and budget strategy (Alternative 3) for the LSS that would build on the use the DOE InfoSTREAMS system (originally described by DOE as the DOE "records system") as the foundation of the LSS. Under this alternative, the use of InfoSTREAMS would reduce total LSS costs by avoiding duplication of specific LSS functions. Based on the DOE presentations at the LSSARP meeting,

the status of DOE's records system and how it relates to plans for the LSS is as follows:

InfoSTREAMS is a suite of applications that links document creation with workflow and eventual delivery into the records management system. DOE has stepped back from deployment of that applications software. However, the underlying architecture for InfoSTREAMS is still the foundation for their systems development.

In March 1994, DOE began developing a suite of software called the Licensing Data Management System (LDMS) that will deliver header, text, and images to their records management system if the original document is provided as paper. The LDMS makes use of some of the components developed/acquired for InfoSTREAMS - such as the text retrieval engine, the data storage software, and the data management software. Both InfoSTREAMS and LDMS are also based on the same hardware and systems software platforms.

LDMS is not, however, integrated with their records management database management environment, IRIS. IRIS is a new bibliographic database structure that forces more accurate cataloging and includes all the fields currently required by the LSS header design.

The reason that the LDMS technology is not integrated is because it is still in the process of testing. A decision by DOE on whether to accept the product and implement it in their records environment is not expected before June, 1995. Thus, all the statements made by DOE at the most recent ARP meeting downplayed any strategy for re-use of InfoSTREAMS (now on hold), and, made conditional all the statements related to use of the LDMS technologies (now in testing). Since both InfoSTREAMS and the LDMS system have a common hardware and software architectural underpinning, it would be reasonable to assume that some aspects of the that architecture will comprise any technological solution if DOE commits to reuse of its technology.

The extent of DOE's commitment to reuse this technology is, however, not firm. DOE is committed to performing a "make" versus "buy" analysis on the LSS. That is, an analysis to determine whether they should build the system themselves or have a systems integrator put together a system comprised of off-the-shelf components. If DOE's current management and operations contractor (the contractor providing program-wide, comprehensive integration and support services) is directed to act as a system integrator for delivery of an LSS, chances are high that they would base their LSS solution on the existing DOE technologies and knock-off a near replica of the DOE suite. If the decision is to buy the system, via full and open competition, the functional requirements would not be sufficient to ensure that the winning solution utilizes any of the products already developed by DOE.

However, the substantial cost savings, identified in SECY-93-107, associated with the use of the DOE records management system for

the capture of all non-DOE documents, could still be achieved regardless of the "make" or "buy" decision.

3. LSS DESIGN

DOE has reevaluated the design requirements for the LSS to ensure that all LSS functionalities are achieved in the most cost-effective manner, and that current technological capabilities are incorporated into the system design. DOE has evaluated seven design options against a number of criteria, including cost, and is focussing on two preferred options. Both options provide for the full text search capability of the document data base. One option would provide for the electronic transmission of images to participants, while the other option would primarily provide the electronic image of documents through the distribution of cd-roms to the participants. The final draft of the LSS requirements document that discusses these alternatives will be available for NRC and LSSARP review in January, 1995. It will be a major topic of discussion at the next meeting of the LSSARP, scheduled for March 22 - 23, 1995.

4. LSS COST AND SCHEDULE

The cost of the LSS, including design, development, operation and maintenance through 2004 (the date required for the Commission decision on the DOE license application, assuming it is submitted in 2001) will be approximately \$60 million under either of the preferred design alternatives. This is a considerable reduction from the original LSS cost estimates.

DOE plans to have the LSS ready for turnover to the LSS Administrator in 1999. At this point, the LSS Administrator will be required to load the documents into the search and retrieval segment of the LSS. In order to avoid the delay associated with having to wait until 1999 to perform the necessary quality assurance checks on the document data base before loading, the LSS Administrator plans to propose that these quality assurance checks be performed on the documents as major segments of the database are captured by DOE in the period before 1999. This will facilitate the quick loading of the system once it is made available by DOE.

In addition, the LSSARP has proposed that DOE implement the "pilot" use of the LSS before it is turned over to the NRC in 1999, to ensure that the system works properly. The LSSARP has requested that the NRC and DOE explore the selection of a technical issue that would serve as the subject data base for the pilot. It is anticipated that this topic will be tied to one of the "higher order" findings in the DOE Annotated Outline of the License Application, such as tectonics. The LSSARP agreed that the certification of the MultiPurpose Cask for transportation and storage of spent fuel would not be an appropriate topic for the pilot.

5. FUTURE ACTIONS

The staff plans to develop a decision schedule that identifies the items that must be addressed by DOE and NRC in order for the LSS to be developed and implemented. The decision schedule will be the basis for a Commission briefing on the LSS, which will be scheduled for some point after the review of the DOE LSS requirements document by the LSSARP in March, 1995.