

**RULEMAKING ISSUE
NOTATION VOTE**

SECY-00-0135

June 23, 2000

FOR: The Commissioners

FROM: Karen D. Cyr
General Counsel

SUBJECT: PROPOSED RULE TO AMEND 10 CFR PART 2, SUBPART J, IN REGARD TO THE LICENSING SUPPORT NETWORK

- **PURPOSE:**
- **BACKGROUND:**
- **DISCUSSION:**
 - The LSN Site Design:
 - The Role of the LSN Administrator
 - The Timing of Participant Compliance Determinations:
- **Coordination:**
- **Recommendations:**
- **Scheduling:**

PURPOSE:

To seek Commission review and approval of proposed amendments to the Commission's Rules of Practice applicable to the use of the Licensing Support Network (LSN) for the licensing proceeding on the disposal of high-level waste (HLW) at a geologic repository. The proposed amendments would establish the basic data structure and transfer standards ("design standards") that LSN participant websites must use to make documentary material available. The proposed amendments would also clarify the authority of the LSN Administrator to establish guidance for LSN participants on how best to meet the design standards and to review participant designs for compliance with the standards. Finally, the proposed amendments would clarify the timing of participant compliance certifications.

BACKGROUND:

The Commission's regulations in [10 CFR Part 2](#), Subpart J, provide for the use of an electronic information management system, the Licensing Support Network (LSN), in the HLW licensing proceeding. Originally promulgated on April 14, 1989, (54 FR 14944), the information management system required by Subpart J is to have the following functions:

- (1) To provide full text search and retrieval access to the relevant documents of all parties and potential parties to the HLW repository licensing proceeding beginning in the time period before the Department of Energy (DOE **EXIT**) license application for the repository is submitted;
- (2) To provide for electronic submission of filings by the parties, as well as the orders and decisions of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, during the proceeding; and
- (3) To provide access to an electronic version of the HLW repository licensing proceeding docket.

The creation of the LSN (originally called the "Licensing Support System", but hereinafter the "LSN") was stimulated by the requirements of Section 114(d)(2) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (NWPA). This provision requires the Commission to issue a final decision approving or disapproving issuance of the construction authorization for a geologic repository for HLW within three years of the "submission" of the DOE license application. The Commission anticipated that the HLW proceeding would involve substantial amounts of documentary material created by well-informed parties on numerous and complex issues. The LSN is intended to facilitate the timely NRC technical review, and the timely petitioner "discovery-type" review, of DOE's license application by providing for electronic access to relevant documents before the license application is submitted, and to supplant the need for the traditional discovery process used in NRC proceedings of the physical production of these documents after the license application is submitted. In addition, the Commission believed that early access to these documents in an easily searchable form would allow for a thorough and comprehensive technical review of the license application by all parties and potential parties to the HLW licensing proceeding, resulting in better focused contentions in the proceeding. The LSN would also facilitate agency responses to FOIA requests by providing the public with electronic access to relevant documents.

Originally, the LSN was conceived of as a large centralized information management system administered by what was then called the Licensing Support System Administrator. In order to take advantage of the advances in technology that occurred since the promulgation of the original rule, the Commission revised the rule to utilize the Internet to link geographically dispersed sites rather than relying on a complex and expensive centralized system, while not changing the underlying mission to provide participants with effective and efficient access to other participants' discovery document collections (62 FR 60789; December 23, 1998). Although the Supplementary Information that accompanied these most recent amendments noted that the availability of the Internet to link geographically dispersed sites appears to have the potential to satisfy the requirements and objectives of Subpart J, no specific design for the LSN was set forth in that final

rule nor were any specific performance requirements established except to specify that the overall design must be "effective and efficient". Further evaluation by the LSN Administrator, and consultation with the Commission's LSN Advisory Review Panel of potential system users, would be necessary before the nature and scope of these design requirements would become clear. Under Section 2.1011(c)(1) of the current rule, the LSN Administrator has the responsibility to identify these types of LSN implementation issues to the Commission for Commission consideration.

DISCUSSION:

As a result of recent interactions with LSN Advisory Review Panel (LSNARP), the LSN Administrator and OGC believe that certain minimum design standards for data structure and data transfer ("design standards") for individual participant websites are necessary to ensure that the LSN meets its objectives. Without such standards, there is a potential that the parties and potential parties to the HLW licensing proceeding may be unable to identify needed documents efficiently and effectively because the system is slow, cumbersome, or simply unavailable, given the large number of documents and the many users trying to access the system. In addition, the lack of required standards may lead to skepticism about document and data integrity. The system should ensure that it provides the tools needed for participants' document discovery and for the technical staff to perform a thorough technical review of the license application. Any deficiencies in the information management system for the HLW repository licensing proceeding could easily result in time-consuming disputes that introduce additional schedule risk into the already tenuous three-year review/adjudication schedule. The cost of system failure is too high not to take all reasonable steps to ensure effective operation of the system by establishing some minimal design standards. The proposed rule provided for Commission review would establish these minimal standards for individual participant websites.

The successful implementation of a system to connect diverse collections of documents stored by the participants on a wide range of hardware and software platforms will depend on the use of data structure and transfer standards and protocols. Adherence to these standards will ensure usability and exchangeability to the users, and verifiability of data integrity to the LSN Administrator. These design standards are generally accepted data structure and transfer protocols currently in use in the Internet environment, and as such, reflect a "lowest common denominator" for participant websites while allowing the individual participants the flexibility to select the specific technologies (hardware and software) for their respective websites. The staff also intends to implement a design for the "LSN site" , discussed later, that will ensure that the totality of the individual websites operate in an "effective and efficient" manner. This "LSN site" design complements the capabilities of, and relies on compatibility with, the design standards for individual participant websites.

NRC has anticipated using ADAMS to fulfill its LSN document access and electronic docket responsibilities. ADAMS currently stores data in formats that are compatible with the proposed LSN design requirements, with the possible exception of its treatment of record/package relationships. There are, however, other ADAMS-related issues associated with LSN software access to NRC's publically available records, ADAMS document delivery response time, and public access to the electronic hearing docket, that are currently being evaluated by OCIO and NMSS, in consultation with the LSN Administrator, to identify alternative solutions should there be significant difficulties in using the current version of ADAMS.

In addition to the proposed design standards, the proposed amendments would supplement the existing responsibilities of the LSN Administrator by making it clear that the Administrator has the authority to review participant website designs to ensure compliance with the basic design standards, including the authority to allow variances from those standards. In addition, it will make clear that the LSN Administrator has the authority to issue guidance to the LSN participants on how they might best meet the design standards. The LSN Administrator will develop this guidance in consultation with the LSNARP and its Technical Working Group (TWG). OGC anticipates that the LSN Administrator's guidance will be routinely followed by the LSN participants. However, there will be flexibility for a participant to deviate from the guidance to take into account individual needs and differences as long as the fundamental design requirements are met.

The LSN Site Design:

The LSN Administrator also intends to implement a design for the "LSN site" that will ensure that the totality of the individual websites operate cohesively in an "efficient and effective" manner. The proposed design standards for individual participant websites are fully consistent and supportive of the design for the "LSN site". In order to evaluate the alternative designs for the "LSN site", the LSNARP TWG identified and characterized five design alternatives for review by the full LSNARP. These alternatives were then reviewed by the full LSNARP. The LSN Administrator then evaluated the recommendations of the LSNARP in preparing a Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) Business Case Analysis for review by the NRC Information Technology Business Council (ITBC). Alternatives 2 and 4 identified by the Technical Working Group were not included in this analysis because no members of the LSNARP supported these alternatives. The Business Case and the recommendations of the ITBC were then reviewed by the NRC Executive Council (EC).

In the Business Case Analysis, the LSN Administrator recommended the selection of the alternative originally identified as "Alternative 3" (Design Option 2 in the Regulatory Analysis) in the report of the LSNARP TWG. The Administrator's recommendation was supported by the ITBC and the EC.

The recommended design is characterized by an LSN homepage/website developed using portal software technology. Web portals represent a fully featured hardware and software environment capable of "crawling" participant sites, characterizing (to the byte level) all structured and unstructured data located at that site, establishing a snapshot at defined points-in-time as baselines, and then routinely "recrawling" those sites and comparing new findings against the previous baseline. Portal software adds significant value to the inherent information management capabilities found at any of the participant

sites. Each participant web site acts as a file server to deliver to Internet users the text documents responsive to a query found through a search at the LSN website.

Under a portal architecture, the LSN would organize and identify the contents of participant collections in its own underlying database environment for structured data and would index unstructured data located at a "crawled" location. The portal software uses these underlying databases to respond to search queries with lists of candidate documents that are responsive to a user's request. When the user seeks to retrieve the file, the portal software directs the request back to the original source (participant) collection server that directly delivers the file back to the user. Portal software provides a single user search interface rather than requiring users to learn the search and retrieval commands from each different site. Portal software contains underlying data dictionaries that "interpret" how data was stored in the participant servers and presents it to the user as "normalized." Portal software also assigns a unique identifying number to each file located at a crawled site.

The LSN homepage/web site would also provide information gathered by the LSN Administrator regarding documents the participants may have updated at their sites. It would also provide information about the performance of the participants' external servers such as server availability, the number of text or image files sent in response to queries, and the response time experienced at each server. It will also be used to post announcements about the overall LSN program or items of interest (hours of availability, scheduled outages, etc.) for the participant sites.

The LSN Administrator, supported by the EC, believes that the recommended design represents the least cost to both NRC and the individual parties to the HLW licensing proceeding, while at the same time providing high value to the users. It is based on a proven technical solution that has been successfully implemented; will provide a document discovery system that will facilitate the NRC's ability to comply with the schedule for decision on the repository construction authorization; provides an electronic environment that facilitates a thorough technical review of relevant documentary material; ensures equitable access to the information for the parties to the HLW licensing proceeding; ensures that document integrity has been maintained for the duration of the licensing proceeding; most consistently provides the information tools needed to organize and access large participant collections; features adequately scaled and adaptable hardware and software; and includes comprehensive security, backup, and recovery capabilities.

The Role of the LSN Administrator

The role of the LSN Administrator under the current rule is to coordinate access to, and the functioning of, the LSN, as well as to coordinate the resolution of problems regarding the availability and integrity of documentary material and data. As a necessary supplement to the specification of the design standards set forth in this proposed rule, OGC believes that the LSN Administrator should have additional responsibilities. The proposed rule would give the LSN Administrator the responsibility to review all participant website designs to verify that they meet the design standards and to allow variances from the design standards to accommodate changes in technology, and problems identified during initial operability testing of the individual websites or the "LSN site". The Administrator would also have the authority to develop and issue guidance for LSN participants on how best to incorporate the LSN standards in their system. Any disputes related to the Administrator's evaluation of participant compliance with the design standards would be referred to the Pre-license Application Presiding Officer under the authority of § 2.1010 of the current rule.

Section 2.1011(c)(3) and (c)(4) of the current rule give the Administrator the responsibility to "coordinate the resolution of problems" in regard to "LSN availability" and the "integrity of documentary material", respectively. In order to be more explicit regarding the Administrator's responsibilities, OGC is recommending that the Commission propose to amend these sections to authorize the Administrator to identify problems, notify the participant(s) of the nature of these problems, and recommend a course of action to the participant(s) to resolve the problem in regard to LSN availability, 2.1011(c)(3), or the integrity of documentary material, 2.1011(c)(4). Finally, the proposed rule would specify that all disputes over LSN operation, including those involving the Administrator's evaluation of individual LSN participant website compliance with the basic design standards in proposed § 2.1011(b)(2) or his recommendations as to documentary material or data availability and integrity, will be referred to the Pre-License Application Presiding Officer, who would call upon the LSN Administrator to provide additional information or recommendations relating to the dispute.

The Timing of Participant Compliance Determinations:

Section 2.1009 of the current rule requires each potential party, interested governmental participant, or party to certify to the Pre-License Application Presiding Officer that the documentary material specified in Section 2.1003 has been identified and made electronically available. In addition, DOE must update this certification at the time of submission of the license application to ensure that all documentary material generated by DOE between the initial certification and the submission of the license application have been made available in the LSN. Section 2.1012(a) authorizes the Director of the NRC's Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards not to docket the DOE license application if the application is not accompanied by an updated DOE certification of compliance with the LSN rule.

The current rule, however, does not specify when the initial certification must be made. OGC is recommending that the Commission propose a revision to Section 2.1009 to clarify that the initial participant certification of compliance ("initial certification") must be made at the time that each participant's documentary material must be made available under Section 2.1003 of the rule (DOE and NRC beginning thirty days after DOE's submission of its site recommendation to the President; other participants no later than thirty days after the date that the repository site selection decision becomes final after review by Congress).

The DOE has recently alerted the staff that approximately 200,000 potentially relevant documents, comprising an estimated 4 million pages of material, has not yet been screened by DOE to determine if the material must be entered into the LSN. Any material that qualifies as "documentary material" would then need to be formatted according to the requirements of 10 CFR Part 2, Subpart J, and placed on the DOE website. Moreover, due to possible budget constraints, DOE may not be able to screen and format this material for entry onto the DOE website in time to meet the compliance requirements of the LSN (thirty days after DOE's submission of its site recommendation to the President). This raises the possibility that DOE would be unable to provide the initial certification for its full document collection. Therefore, in order to preserve the existing period of time now available under the rule for participant review of documents through the LSN before the DOE license application is docketed (based on the current DOE repository schedule, the LSN rule provides for approximately eight months of LSN availability before the license application is docketed under the current DOE repository schedule), OGC is recommending that the Commission propose an amendment to the LSN rule that would specify that the DOE initial certification must be made at least eight months before the DOE license application is submitted. The proposed revision will ensure that a reasonable period of time is available for the participants to have an adequate opportunity to access and use the DOE collection of documentary material before the license application is submitted. It also makes clear, however, that the Commission expects that all documents that are then in an appropriate format will be made publically available at the time specified in Subpart J.

Coordination:

The attached rulemaking proposal was developed in cooperation with the LSN Administrator and the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel Chairman.

Recommendations:

The Office of the General Counsel recommends that the Commission:

1. Approve publication of the attached notice of proposed rulemaking allowing 45 days for public comment.
2. To satisfy the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 605(b), certify that this rule, if promulgated, will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. This certification is included in the attached Federal Register Notice.

Scheduling:

The LSN participants and the LSN Administrator are now in the process of designing their websites in order to meet the compliance requirements of the LSN rule. The proposed design standards are necessary to complete these designs. Expedient Commission action on the attached proposal will facilitate the ability of the LSN participants to complete the design and implementation of their websites. The staff target date for a final rulemaking is the beginning of FY2001.

/RA/

Karen D. Cyr
General Counsel

CONTACT: Francis X. Cameron, OGC
415-1642

Dan Graser, LSN Administrator
415-7401

Attachment: [Draft Federal Register Notice](#)

ATTACHMENT

[7590-01-P]

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

10 CFR PART 2
RIN 3150-AG44

Licensing Proceedings for the Receipt of High-Level Radioactive
Waste at a Geologic Repository: Licensing Support Network,
Design Standards for Participating Websites

- [SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:](#)

- I. Background
- o II. LSN Design Standards
- o III. The LSN Site Design
- o IV. The Role of the LSN Administrator
- o V. The Timing of Participant Compliance Determinations
- o VI. Section-by-Section Changes
- o Plain Language
- o Voluntary Consensus Standards
- o Environmental Impact: Categorical Exclusion
- o Paperwork Reduction Act Statement
- o Public Protection Notification
- o Regulatory Analysis
- o Regulatory Flexibility Certification
- o Backfit Analysis
- o List of Subjects in 10 CFR Part 2
- PART 2 - RULES OF PRACTICE FOR DOMESTIC LICENSING PROCEEDINGS AND ISSUANCE OF ORDERS

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is proposing to amend its Rules of Practice applicable to the use of the Licensing Support Network (LSN) for the licensing proceeding on the disposal of high-level waste (HLW) at a geologic repository. The proposed amendments would establish the basic data structure and transfer standards ("design standards") that LSN participant websites must use to make documentary material available. The proposed amendments would also clarify the authority of the LSN Administrator to establish guidance for LSN participants on how best to meet the design standards and to review participant designs for compliance with the standards. Finally, the proposed amendments would clarify the timing of participant compliance certifications.

DATES: Submit comments (insert date forty-five days after publication in the Federal Register). Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the Commission is able to ensure consideration only for comments received on or before this date.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be sent to: Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001. Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff.

Deliver comments to: 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, between 7:30 am and 4:15 pm on Federal workdays.

You may also provide comments via the NRC's interactive rulemaking website at <http://ruleforum.llnl.gov>. This site provides the capability to upload comments as files (any format), if your web browser supports that function. For information about the interactive rulemaking website, contact Ms. Carol Gallagher, (301) 415-5905 (e-mail: CAG@nrc.gov).

Certain documents related to this rulemaking, including comments received, may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, N.W., Washington DC 20003-1527.

Documents created or received at the NRC after November 1, 1999, are also available electronically at the NRC's Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at <http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/ADAMS/index.html>. From this site, the public can gain entry into the NRC's Agencywide Document Access and Management System (ADAMS), which provides text and image files of NRC's public documents. For more information, contact the NRC Public Document Room (PDR) Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 202-634-3273 or by email to pdr@nrc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Francis X, Cameron, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555, telephone (301) 415-1642, e-mail FXC@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Commission's regulations in 10 CFR Part 2, Subpart J, provide for the use of an electronic information management system, the Licensing Support Network (LSN), in the HLW repository licensing proceeding. Originally promulgated on April 14, 1989, (54 FR 14944), the information management system currently required by Subpart J is to have the following functions:

1. To provide full text search and retrieval access to the relevant documents of all parties and potential parties to the HLW repository licensing proceeding beginning in the time period before the Department of Energy (DOE) license application for the repository is submitted;
2. To provide for electronic submission of filings by the parties, as well as the orders and decisions of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, during the proceeding; and
3. To provide access to an electronic version of the HLW repository licensing proceeding docket.

The creation of the LSN (originally called the "Licensing Support System", but hereinafter the "LSN") was stimulated by the requirements of Section 114(d)(2) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (NWPA). This provision requires the Commission to issue a final decision approving or disapproving issuance of the construction authorization for a geologic repository for HLW within three years of the "submission" of the DOE license application. The Commission anticipated that the HLW proceeding would involve substantial amounts of documents created by well-informed parties on numerous and complex issues. The Commission believed that the LSN could facilitate the timely NRC technical review, and the timely petitioner "discovery-type" review, of DOE's license application by providing for electronic access to relevant documents before the license application is submitted, and to supplant the need for the traditional discovery process used in NRC proceedings of the physical production of these documents after the license application is submitted. In addition, the Commission believed that early provision of these documents in an easily searchable form would allow for a thorough and comprehensive technical review of the license application by all parties and potential parties to the HLW licensing proceeding, resulting in better focused contentions in the proceeding. The LSN would also facilitate agency responses to FOIA requests by providing the public with electronic access to relevant documents.

The current requirements contained in the LSN rule require DOE and NRC to make their documentary material available in electronic form beginning thirty days after DOE's submission of its site recommendation to the President of the United States. All other participants must make their documents available in electronic form no later than thirty days after the date that the repository site selection decision becomes final after review by Congress. Originally, the LSN was conceived of as a large centralized information management system administered by what was then called the Licensing Support System Administrator. In order to take advantage of the advances in technology that occurred since the promulgation of the original rule, the Commission revised the rule to use the Internet to link geographically dispersed sites rather than relying on a complex and expensive centralized system (62 FR 60789; December 23, 1998). Although the Supplementary Information that accompanied these most recent amendments noted that the availability of the Internet to link geographically dispersed sites appears to have the potential to satisfy the requirements and objectives of Subpart J, no specific design for the LSN was set forth in that final rule nor were any specific performance requirements established except to specify that the overall design must be "effective and efficient". Further evaluation by the LSN Administrator, and consultation with the Commission's LSN Advisory Review Panel (LSNARP) of potential system users, would be necessary before the nature and scope of these design requirements would become clear. Under § 2.1011(c)(1) of the current rule, the LSN Administrator has the responsibility to identify these types of LSN implementation issues to the Commission for Commission consideration.

The Commission now believes that certain minimum design standards for data structure and data transfer ("design standards") for individual participant websites are necessary to ensure that the LSN meets its objectives and functions. Without such standards, there is a potential that the parties and potential parties to the HLW licensing proceeding may be unable to identify needed documents efficiently and effectively because the system is slow, cumbersome, or simply unavailable, given the large number of documents and the many users trying to access the system. In addition, the lack of required standards may lead to skepticism about document and data integrity. The system should ensure that it provides the tools needed for participants' document discovery and for the technical staff to perform a thorough technical review of the license application. Any deficiencies in the information management system for the HLW licensing proceeding could easily result in time-consuming disputes that place the three-year repository application review schedule at risk. The Commission believes the cost of system failure is too high not to try to ensure effective operation of the system through establishing some minimal design standards.

In addition to the proposed design standards, the Commission is also proposing to supplement the existing responsibilities of the LSN Administrator by making it clear that the Administrator has the authority to review participant website designs to verify compliance with the basic design standards, including the authority to allow variances from those standards. In addition, it will make clear that the LSN Administrator has the authority to issue guidance to the LSN participants on how they might best meet the design standards. The LSN Administrator will develop this guidance in consultation with the LSNARP. The Commission anticipates that the LSN Administrator's guidance will be, in most cases, routinely followed by the LSN participants. However, there will be flexibility for a participant to deviate from the guidance to take into account individual needs and differences as long as the fundamental design requirements are met.

II. LSN Design Standards

The successful implementation of a system to connect diverse collections of documents stored by the participants on a wide range of hardware and software platforms will depend on the use of data structure and transfer standards and protocols. Adherence to these standards will ensure usability and exchangeability to the users, and verifiability of data integrity to the LSN Administrator. These standards must-

1. Be broad enough to encompass a wide range of automation products;
2. Be focused enough to accomplish successful document access;
3. Impose the least amount of burden on the participants; and
4. Be dynamic enough to address new technologies that may be used by as yet unidentified participants.

These design standards are generally accepted data structure and transfer protocols currently in use in the Internet environment, and as such, reflect a "lowest common denominator" for participant websites while allowing the participants the flexibility to select the specific technologies (hardware and software) for their websites. The Commission also intends to implement a design for the "LSN site", discussed later, that will ensure that the totality of the individual websites operate in an "effective and efficient" manner. This "LSN site" design complements the capabilities of, and relies on

compatibility with, the design standards for individual participant websites. The Commission is proposing the following design standards:

1. The participants must make textual (or, where non-text, image) versions of their documents available on a web accessible server which is able to be canvassed by web indexing software (a.k.a. robot, spider, crawler) and the participant machine must make both data files and log files accessible to this software.

This proposed clarification provides a means for the LSN Administrator to establish a baseline of data and documents placed on participant systems and to then routinely revisit those documents and their home servers to monitor any changes. This proposed revision is consistent with the Administrator's responsibility under [10 CFR 2.1011\(c\)\(4\)](#) in regard to the resolution of problems regarding the integrity of LSN documentary material. The proposed revision provides a mechanism for the Administrator to identify any problems with document integrity.

This proposed revision does not affect the ability for parties or potential parties to correct or revise information they have already made available on their websites. Changes to documents previously entered are permitted so long as:

1. A corrected or updated document is noted as superseding a previously provided document;
2. The previous version is not removed; and
3. Other parties or potential parties are notified of the change.

2. The participants must make structured data available in the context of (or, under the control of) an accessible SQL-compliant database management system (DBMS). Alternatively, the structured data may be made available in a standard database readable (e.g., comma delimited) file.

This proposed clarification identifies two mechanisms by which parties or potential parties can make bibliographic header (structured data) available so that it can be used by the LSN portal search engine. SQL-compliant identifies a broad range of widely used database products for which data exchange is demonstrable. Identifying readable files establishes a low threshold for participants, not requiring the investment in a DBMS, but still providing for formatting of the data so that bulk load routines could be easily developed to import data into the LSN search indexes.

3. Textual material must be formatted to comply with the US.ISO_8859-1 character set and be in one of the following acceptable formats: plain text, native word processing (Word, WordPerfect), or PDF Normal.

This proposed clarification establishes the standard Latin alphabet set to facilitate data exchange. It further identifies a broad range of widely used text file formats for unstructured data which can be recognized by state-of-technology indexing software and are viewable with current browser/viewer software.

4. Image files must be formatted as TIFF CCITT G4 for bi-tonal images or PNG (Portable Network Graphics) per [<http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-png-multi.html>] **EXIT**) format for grey-scale or color images, or PDF (Portable Document Format - Image) for compound documents. TIFF images will be stored at 300 dpi (dots per inch), grey scale images at 150 dpi with eight bits of tonal depth, and color images at 150 dpi with 24 bits of color depth. Images found on participant machines will be stored as single image-per- page to facilitate retrieval of no more than a single page, or alternatively, images may be stored in a page-per-document format if software is incorporated in the web server that allows single-page representation and delivery.

This proposed clarification establishes three standards which parties or potential parties can use to make non-textual documentary materials available so that they can be viewed with current browser/viewer software and can be used by the LSN portal search engine. Additionally, they all use predictable algorithms for compression and uncompression of files to help ensure compatibility and usability by users.

These formats all have file attributes that can be used to verify that an image file has not been revised since initially being placed in a participant's collection.

5. The parties or potential parties must programmatically link the bibliographic header record with the text or image file it represents. The header record must contain fielded data identifying its associated object (text or image) file name and directory location, thus enabling file retrieval and display from participant machines using the LSN system.

This proposed clarification establishes basic information management controls to clearly and systematically identify the index (bibliographic record) entry with the data it is describing.

6. To facilitate data exchange, participants must adhere to hardware and software standards, including, but not limited to:

Network access must be HTTP/1.1 [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc2068.html> **EXIT**] over TCP (Transmission Control Protocol, [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc793.html> **EXIT**]) over IP (Internet Protocol, [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc791.html> **EXIT**]).

Associating server names with IP addresses must follow the DNS (Domain Name System), [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc1034.html> **EXIT**] and [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc1035.html>] **EXIT**.

Web page construction must be HTML version 4.0 [<http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-html40/> **EXIT**].

Electronic mail (e-mail) exchange between e-mail servers must be SMTP (Simple Mail Transport Protocol, [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc821.html> **EXIT**]).

Format of an electronic mail message must be per [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc822.html> **EXIT**] optionally extended by MIME (Multimedia Internet Mail Extensions) per [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc2045.html> **EXIT**]) to accommodate multimedia e-mail.

This proposed clarification identifies standard data exchange protocols commonly used in the Internet environment to help ensure data exchange and usability.

III. The LSN Site Design

As noted, the Commission also intends to implement a design for the "LSN site" that will ensure that the totality of the individual websites operate in an "efficient and effective" manner. The proposed design standards for individual participant websites are fully consistent and supportive of the design for the "LSN site". In order to evaluate the alternative designs for the "LSN site", the Technical Working Group of the LSN Advisory Review Panel identified and characterized five design alternatives for review by the full Advisory Panel. These alternatives were then reviewed by the full LSN Advisory Review Panel. The LSN Administrator then evaluated the recommendations of the Advisory Review Panel in preparing a Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) Business Case Analysis for review by the NRC Information Technology Business Council. Two of the alternatives identified by the Technical Working Group, Alternatives 2 and 4, were not included in this analysis because no members of the LSN Advisory Review Panel supported these alternatives. The Business Case and the recommendations of the Information Technology Business Council were then reviewed by the NRC Executive Council.

In the Business Case Analysis, the LSN Administrator recommended the selection of the alternative originally identified as "Alternative 3" (Design Option 2 in the Regulatory Analysis) in the report of the LSN Advisory Review Panel Technical Working Group. The Administrator's recommendation was supported by the Information Technology Business Council and the Executive Council. A summary comparison of the alternative designs is included in the Regulatory Analysis for this proposed rule. The entire Business Case Analysis (with budgetary data redacted) is available from the LSN Administrator. Contact Dan Graser, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington D.C. 20555, telephone (301) 415-7401, email DJG2@NRC.Gov.

The recommended design is characterized by an LSN homepage/website developed using portal software technology. Web portals represent a fully featured hardware and software environment capable of "crawling" participant sites, characterizing (to the byte level) all structured and unstructured data located at that site, establishing a snapshot at defined points-in-time as baselines, and then routinely "recrawling" those sites and comparing new findings against the previous baseline. Portal software adds significant value to the inherent information management capabilities found at any of the participant sites. Each participant web site acts as a file server to deliver to Internet users the text documents responsive to a query found through a search at the LSN website.

Under a portal architecture, the LSN would organize and identify the contents of participant collections in its own underlying database environment for structured data and would index unstructured data located at a "crawled" location. The portal software uses these underlying databases to respond to search queries with lists of candidate documents that are responsive to a user's request. When the user seeks to retrieve the file, the portal software directs the request back to the original source (participant) collection server that directly delivers the file back to the user. Portal software provides a single user search interface rather than requiring users to learn the search and retrieval commands from each different site. Portal software contains underlying data dictionaries that "interpret" how data was stored in the participant servers and presents it to the user as "normalized." Portal software also assigns a unique identifying number to each file located at a crawled site.

The LSN homepage/web site would also provide information gathered by the LSN Administrator regarding documents the participants may have updated at their sites. It would also provide information about the performance of the participants' external servers such as server availability, the number of text or image files sent in response to queries, and the response time experienced at each server. It will also be used to post announcements about the overall LSN program or items of interest (hours of availability, scheduled outages, etc.) for the participant sites.

The Commission believes that the recommended design represents the least cost to both NRC and the individual parties to the HLW licensing proceeding, while at the same time providing high value to the users. Based on a proven technical solution that has been successfully implemented; will provide a document discovery system that will facilitate the NRC's ability to comply with the schedule for decision on the repository construction authorization; provides an electronic environment that facilitates a thorough technical review of relevant documentary material; ensures equitable access to the information for the parties to the HLW licensing proceeding; ensures that document integrity has been maintained for the duration of the licensing proceeding; most consistently provides the information tools needed to organize and access large participant collections; features adequately scaled and adaptable hardware and software; and includes comprehensive security, backup, and recovery capabilities.

IV. The Role of the LSN Administrator

The role of the LSN Administrator under the current rule is to coordinate access to, and the functioning of, the LSN, as well as to coordinate the resolution of problems regarding the availability and integrity of documentary material and data. As a necessary supplement to the specification of the design standards set forth in this proposed rule, the Commission believes that the LSN Administrator should have additional responsibilities. The proposed rule would give the LSN Administrator the

responsibility to review all participant website designs to ensure that they meet the design standards and to allow variances from the design standards to accommodate changes in technology, problems identified during initial operability testing of the individual websites or the "LSN site". The Administrator would also have the authority to develop and issue guidance for LSN participants on how best to incorporate the LSN standards in their system. Any disputes related to the Administrator's evaluation of participant compliance with the design standards would be referred to the Pre-License Application Presiding Officer under the authority of § 2.1010 of the current rule.

Section 2.1011(c)(3) and (c)(4) of the current rule give the Administrator the responsibility to "coordinate the resolution of problems" in regard to "LSN availability" and the "integrity of documentary material", respectively. In order to be more explicit regarding the Administrator's responsibilities, the Commission is proposing to amend these sections to authorize the Administrator to identify problems, notify the participant(s) of the nature of these problems, and recommend a course of action to the participant(s) to resolve the problem in regard to LSN availability, § 2.1011(c)(3), or the integrity of documentary material, §2.1011(c)(4). The LSN Administrator would also report all such problems and recommended resolutions to the Pre-License Application Presiding Officer provided for in § 2.1010 of the rule. All disputes over his recommendations as to documentary material or data availability and integrity will be referred to the Pre-License Application Presiding Officer.

V. The Timing of Participant Compliance Determinations

Section 2.1009 of the current rule requires each potential party, interested governmental participant, or party to certify to the Pre-License Application Presiding Officer that the documentary material specified in § 2.1003 has been identified and made electronically available. In addition, DOE must update this certification at the time of submission of the license application to ensure that all documentary material generated by DOE between the initial certification and the submission of the license application have been made available in the LSN. Section 2.1012(a) authorizes the Director of the NRC's Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards not to docket the DOE license application if the application is not accompanied by an updated DOE certification of compliance with the LSN rule. However, the current rule does not specify when the initial certification must be made. The Commission is proposing a revision to § 2.1009 to clarify that the initial participant certification of compliance ("initial certification") must be made at the time that each participant's documentary material must be made available under § 2.1003 of the rule (DOE and NRC beginning thirty days after DOE's submission of its site recommendation to the President; other participants no later than thirty days after the date that the repository site selection decision becomes final after review by Congress).

The Commission expects that DOE will be able to certify compliance with the LSN rule at this initial certification. However, the Commission also recognizes that circumstances may raise the possibility that DOE would be unable to provide the initial certification at the time set for compliance. In that event, the Commission believes that it would be important to preserve the period of time now available under the rule for participant review of documents through the LSN before the DOE license application is docketed. Based on the current DOE repository schedule, the LSN rule provides for approximately eight months of LSN availability before the license application is docketed. Accordingly, the Commission is proposing to amend § 2.1009 to require the DOE initial certification to be made at least eight months before the DOE license application is submitted. The existing provision in § 2.1012 authorizing the Director of the NRC Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards not to docket the license application if DOE does not provide an updated certificate of compliance with the LSN rule is retained. The proposed revision will ensure that a reasonable period of time is available for the participants to have an adequate opportunity to access and use the DOE collection of documentary material before the license application is submitted.

If DOE cannot make the initial certification, the Commission would emphasize that DOE still has the obligation under Section 2.1003 to make the documentary material that is available at that time accessible to the participants through the LSN, rather than delaying all availability until the time that it can certify compliance. Any disputes arising in these circumstance would fall within the existing authority of the Pre-License Application Presiding Officer under § 2.1010.

VI. Section-by-Section Changes

The Commission is proposing two major revisions to § 2.1011 Management of Electronic Information. The first would add a new paragraph (b)(2) to specify the basic design standards for individual LSN participant websites. The second major revision would clarify the authority of the LSN Administrator in regard to these design standards.

In § 2.1011:

Paragraph (b)(2) would include the following design standards for LSN participant websites: :

Paragraph (b)(2)(i) would require that the participants make textual (or, where non-text, image) versions of their documents available on a web accessible server which is able to be canvassed by web indexing software (i.e., a "robot", "spider", "crawler") and the participant system would be required to make both data files and log files accessible to this software.

Paragraph (b)(2)(ii) would require that the participants make structured data available in the context of (or, under the control of) an accessible SQL-compliant database management system (DBMS). Alternatively, the structured data may be made available in a standard database readable (e.g., comma delimited) file.

Paragraph (b)(2)(iii) would require that textual material be formatted to comply with the US.ISO_8859-1 character set and be in one of the following acceptable formats: native word processing (Word, WordPerfect), or PDF Normal.

Paragraph (b)(2)(iv) would require that image files be formatted as TIFF CCITT G4 for bi-tonal images or PNG (Portable Network Graphics) per [<http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-png-multi.html>] **EXIT** format for grey-scale or color images, or PDF (Portable Document Format - Image) for compound documents. TIFF images will be stored at 300 dpi (dots per inch), grey scale images at 150 dpi with eight bits of tonal depth, and color images at 150 dpi with 24 bits of color depth. Images found on participant machines will be stored as single image-per- page to facilitate retrieval of no more than a single page, or alternatively, images may be stored in a page-per-document format if software is incorporated in the web server that allows single-page representation and delivery.

Paragraph (b)(2)(v) would require that the parties programmatically link the bibliographic header record with the text or image file it represents. The header record must contain fielded data identifying its associated object (text or image) file name and directory location.

To facilitate data exchange, paragraph (b)(2)(vi) would require that participants adhere to hardware and software standards, including the following:

- (A) Network access must be HTTP/1.1 [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc2068.html>] **EXIT** over TCP (Transmission Control Protocol, [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc793.html>] **EXIT**) over IP (Internet Protocol, [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc791.html>] **EXIT**).
- (B) Associating server names with IP addresses must follow the DNS (Domain Name System), [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc1034.html>] **EXIT** and [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc1035.html>] **EXIT**.
- (C) Web page construction must be HTML version 4.0 [<http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-html40/>] **EXIT**.
- (D) Electronic mail (e-mail) exchange between e-mail servers must be SMTP (Simple Mail Transport Protocol, [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc821.html>] **EXIT**).
- (E) Format of an electronic mail message must be per [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc822.html>] **EXIT** optionally extended by MIME (Multimedia Internet Mail Extensions) per [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc2045.html>] **EXIT** to accommodate multimedia e-mail.

Section 2.1011(c) would be amended as follows to clarify the responsibilities and authority of the LSN Administrator:

Paragraph (c)(6) would require that the LSN Administrator evaluate LSN participant compliance with the basic design standards in § 2.1011(b)(2), and provide for individual variances from the design standards to accommodate changes in technology, problems identified during initial operability testing of the individual websites or the "LSN site", or the infeasibility of an individual LSN participant's strict adherence to guidelines because of unique technical problems that would not affect the effectiveness or efficiency of the LSN.

Paragraph (c)(7) would require that the LSN Administrator issue guidance for LSN participants on how best to comply with the design standards in § 2.1011(b)(2).

In § 2.1011, paragraphs (c)(3) and (c)(4) would also be amended In order to be more explicit regarding the Administrator's responsibilities in regard to LSN availability and the integrity of documentary material. The Commission is proposing to amend these sections to authorize the Administrator to identify problems, notify the participant(s) of the nature of these problems, and recommend a course of action to the participant(s) to resolve the problem in regard to LSN availability, § 2.1011(c)(3), or the integrity of documentary material, §2.1011(c)(4). In accordance with Section 2.1010 of the rule, a dispute over the Administrator's evaluation of individual LSN participant website compliance with the basic design standards in proposed § 2.1011(b)(2) or the Administrator's recommendations as to documentary material or data availability and integrity would be referred to the Pre-License Application Presiding Officer. In the case of such referral, the Commission anticipates that the Pre-License Application Presiding Officer may wish to call upon the LSN Administrator to investigate and report on particular problems and to recommend proposed solutions.

Section 2.1009 would be amended to clarify that the initial participant certification of compliance ("initial certification") must be made at the time that each participant's documentary material must be made available under § 2.1003 of the rule. In addition, § 2.1009 would be amended to require the initial certification of compliance by DOE to be made at least eight months before DOE submits the license application for the repository.

Plain Language

The Presidential memorandum dated June 1, 1998, entitled, "Plain Language in Government Writing," directed that the government's writing be in plain language. This memorandum was published June 10, 1998 (63 FR 31883). In complying with this directive, editorial changes have been made in these proposed revisions to improve the organization and readability of the existing language of the paragraphs being revised. These types of changes are not discussed further in this document. The NRC requests comments on the proposed rule specifically with respect to the clarity and reflectiveness of the language used. Comments should be sent to the address listed under the ADDRESSES caption of the preamble.

Voluntary Consensus Standards

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995, Pub. L. 104-113, requires that Federal agencies use technical standards that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies unless using such a standard is inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. This proposed rule would establish basic design standards that Licensing Support Network participant websites must use to participate in the HLW licensing process. This design standard is an NRC developed standard that is designed particularly for use in the LSN that is developed for a particular licensing proceeding. The NRC is not aware of any voluntary consensus standard that could be used instead of the proposed Government-unique standard. The NRC will consider using a voluntary consensus standard if an appropriate standard is identified. If a voluntary consensus standard is identified for consideration, the submittal should explain how the voluntary consensus standard is comparable and why it should be used instead of the proposed Government-unique standard.

Environmental Impact: Categorical Exclusion

The NRC has determined that this proposed regulation is the type of action described in categorical exclusion [10 CFR 51.22\(c\)\(1\)](#). Therefore, neither an environmental impact statement nor an environmental assessment has been prepared.

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement

The proposed rule contains no information collection requirements and therefore is not subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.).

Public Protection Notification

If a means used to impose an information collection does not display a currently valid OMB control number, the NRC may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, the information collection.

Regulatory Analysis

The following regulatory analysis identifies several alternatives ("regulatory options") to the Commission's proposal to establish required design standards for the design of individual participant websites. It also provides information on the LSN Administrator's evaluation of alternatives for the "LSN site" ("design options").

Regulatory Options. Option 1 would retain the status quo of the existing rule consisting of requirements for participants to provide their documentary material in electronic form. Provision of this material would be on individual participant websites. No requirements would be established to assure that the information on the participant websites was readily available to other participants in a timely manner. Option 2 would provide for the development of suggested design standards by the LSN Administrator in consultation with the LSN Advisory Review Panel. Individual participants would be free to adopt or reject these suggested standards. Option 3 is reflected in the proposed rule. This Option establishes basic design standards for individual websites but also provides for flexibility in the implementation of the standards.

In regard to Option 1, the Commission believes that the role of the LSN for providing a document discovery system to minimize delay in the HLW licensing proceeding, as well as for facilitating the effective review and use of relevant licensing information by all parties, is too important to not provide contextual guidance to the parties and potential parties in the design of individual websites. Individual participant judgments on the cost-benefit of providing data without a contextual framework of what is necessary to provide for effective data availability may compromise effective design. Without such guidance, the funds that have been spent on the design and development of the LSN would be compromised by poor implementation, particularly by parties who have large document collections. Option 2 would attempt to provide suggested standards through the LSN Administrator and the LSN Advisory Review Panel. Unfortunately, there is no assurance of consensus on the standards, or that any consensus standards would be followed even if they were developed. As with Option 1, the Commission believes that the role of the LSN in the HLW licensing proceeding is too important to not establish minimal standards to ensure effective operation. Therefore, the Commission has adopted Option 3 which is reflected in the proposed rule.

LSN Site Design Options. In order to evaluate the alternative designs for the "LSN site", the Technical Working Group of the LSNARP identified and characterized five design alternatives for review by the full Advisory Panel. These alternatives were then reviewed by the full LSNARP. Two of the alternatives that were identified by the Technical Working Group, Alternatives 2 and 4, were not included in this analysis because no members of the LSN Advisory Review Panel supported these alternatives. Therefore, the Commission ultimately considered three options for the design of the LSN site: Design Option 1 (TWG Alternative 1); Design Option 2 (TWG Alternative 3); and Design Option 3 (TWG Alternative 5).

Design Option 1 is characterized by an LSN homepage/website that points end-users to the web accessible documentary collections of each of the participants. The LSN homepage/website adds no value to the inherent information management capabilities found at any of the participant sites. The "LSN site" simply serves as a pointer to other home pages. This option provides no search and retrieval or file delivery processes to any user. The participant web site provides the sole search and retrieval tools to access its text documents. Participants may use any software to provide text search and retrieval, and those packages may represent a wide range of capabilities from minimal to fully featured.

The recommended design, Design Option 2, is characterized by an LSN homepage/website developed using portal software

technology. Web portals represent a fully featured hardware and software environment capable of "crawling" participant sites, characterizing (to the byte level) all structured and unstructured data located at that site, establishing a snapshot at defined points-in-time as baselines, and then routinely "recrawling" those sites and comparing new findings against the previous baseline. Portal software adds significant value to the inherent information management capabilities found at any of the participant sites. Each participant web site acts as a file server to deliver to Internet users the text documents responsive to a query found through a search at the LSN website.

Under a portal architecture, the LSN would organize and identify the contents of participant collections in its own underlying database environment for structured data and would index unstructured data located at a "crawled" location. The portal software utilizes these underlying databases to respond to search queries with lists of candidate documents that are responsive to a user's request. When the user seeks to retrieve the file, the portal software directs the request back to the original source (participant) collection server that directly delivers the file back to the user. Portal software provides a single user search interface rather than requiring users to learn the search and retrieval commands from each different site. Portal software contains underlying data dictionaries that "interpret" how data was stored in the participant servers and presents it to the user as "normalized." Portal software also assigns a unique identifying number to each file regardless of file location.

Design Option 3 is identical to Design Option 2 except that (1) when the user seeks to retrieve the file, the portal software delivers the document to a user from the copy maintained on the a very large storage unit that would be maintained by the LSN Administrator; and (2) the storage cache is provided with high-capacity bandwidth under the control of the Administrator. Participant servers' versions of the document serve as backup copies should the LSN site become inoperative.

The Commission believes that Design Option 1 is of low benefit in terms of delivering efficient or effective access to users and shifts the cost burden to individual participants. This Option creates a significant risk that system implementation and operation issues may result in disputes whose resolution could have a negative impact on the agency's ability to meet its three-year schedule for making a decision on repository construction authorization. The Commission would also note that the LSNARP TWG did not believe that Design Option 1 provided the functionality to be effective.

Although Design Option 3 adds value over and above the design in Design Option 2, it also has the highest cost of all alternatives. Design Option 3, while it offers more assurance of performance and document delivery, has initial costs to NRC almost double those of Design Option 2, which fulfills the same number of functional requirements as Design Option 3. Design Option 3 also presents a potential conflict for the LSN Administrator, who would be in a position of being accountable for the availability, accuracy, integrity, and custodial chain of participant materials.

The Commission believes that the recommended design represents the least cost to both NRC and the individual parties to the HLW licensing proceeding, while at the same time providing high value to the users. It is based on a proven technical solution that has been successfully implemented; it will provide a document discovery system that will facilitate the NRC's ability to comply with the schedule for decision on the repository construction authorization; it provides an electronic environment that facilitates a thorough technical review of relevant documentary material; it ensures equitable access to the information for the parties to the HLW licensing proceeding and that document integrity has been maintained for the duration of the licensing proceeding. Design Option 2 most consistently provides the information tools needed to organize and access large participant collections. It features adequately scaled and adaptable hardware and software and includes comprehensive security, backup, and recovery capabilities.

Regulatory Flexibility Certification

As required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 605(b)), the Commission has evaluated the impact of the proposed rule on small entities. The NRC has established standards for determining who qualifies as small entities (10 CFR 2.810). The Commission certifies that this proposed rule, if adopted, would not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities. The proposed amendments would modify the NRC's rules of practice and procedure in regard to the HLW licensing proceeding. Participants will be required to make their documentary material available electronically on a website that complies with the basic design standards established in the proposed rule. Some of the participants affected by the proposed rule, for example, DOE, NRC, the State of Nevada, would not fall within the definition of "small entity" under the NRC's size standards. Other parties and potential parties may qualify as "small entities" under these size standards. However, the required standards reflect standard business practice for making material electronically available. In addition, the proposed requirements provide flexibility to participants in how these standards are implemented.

Backfit Analysis

The NRC has determined that a backfit analysis is not required for this proposed rule because these amendments would not include any provisions that require backfits as defined in 10 CFR Chapter I.

List of Subjects in 10 CFR Part 2

Administrative practice and procedure, Antitrust, Byproduct material, Classified information, Environmental protection, Nuclear materials, Nuclear power plants and reactors, Penalties, Sex discrimination, Source material, Special nuclear material, Waste treatment and disposal.

For the reasons set out in the preamble and under the authority of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended; and 5 U.S.C. 553; the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is proposing the following amendments to 10 CFR Part 2.

PART 2 - RULES OF PRACTICE FOR DOMESTIC LICENSING PROCEEDINGS AND ISSUANCE OF ORDERS

1. The authority citation for Part 2 continues to read as follows:

AUTHORITY: Secs.161, 181, 68 Stat. 948, 953, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2201, 2231); sec. 191, as amended, Pub. L. 87-615, 76 Stat. 409 (42 U.S.C. 2241); sec. 201, 88 Stat.1242, as amended (42 U.S.C. 5841); 5 U.S.C. 552.

Section 2.101 also issued under secs. 53, 62, 63, 81, 103, 104, 105, 68 Stat. 930, 932, 933, 935, 936, 937, 938, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2073, 2092, 2093, 2111, 2133, 2134, 2135); sec. 114(f), Pub. L. 97-425, 96 Stat. 2213, as amended (42 U.S.C. 10134(f)); sec. 102, Pub. L. 91-190, 83 Stat. 853, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4332); sec. 301, 88 Stat. 1248 (42 U.S.C. 5871). Sections 2.102, 2.103, 2.104, 2.105, 2.721 also issued under secs. 102, 103, 104, 105, 183, 189, 68 Stat. 936, 937, 938, 954, 955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2233, 2239). Section 2.105 also issued under Pub. L. 97-415, 96 Stat. 2073 (42 U.S.C. 2239). Sections 2.200-2.206 also issued under secs. 161 b, i, o, 182, 186, 234, 68 Stat. 948-951, 955, 83 Stat. 444, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2201 (b), (i), (o), 2236, 2282); sec. 206, 88 Stat 1246 (42 U.S.C. 5846). Sections 2.205(j) also issued under Pub. L. 101-410, 104 Stat. 890, as amended by section 31001(s), Pub. L. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321-373 (28 U.S.C. 2461 note). Sections 2.600-2.606 also issued under sec. 102, Pub. L. 91-190, 83 Stat. 853, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4332). Sections 2.700a, 2.719 also issued under 5 U.S.C. 554. Sections 2.754, 2.760, 2.770, 2.780 also issued under 5 U.S.C. 557. Section 2.764 also issued under secs. 135, 141, Pub. L. 97-425, 96 Stat. 2232, 2241 (42 U.S.C. 10155, 10161). Section 2.790 also issued under sec. 103, 68 Stat. 936, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2133) and 5 U.S.C. 552. Sections 2.800 and 2.808 also issued under 5 U.S.C. 553. Section 2.809 also issued under 5 U.S.C. 553 and sec. 29, Pub. L. 85-256, 71 Stat. 579, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2039). Subpart K also issued under sec. 189, 68 Stat. 955 (42 U.S.C. 2239); sec. 134, Pub. L. 97-425, 96 Stat. 2230 (42 U.S.C. 10154). Subpart L also issued under sec. 189, 68 Stat. 955 (42 U.S.C. 2239). Appendix A also issued under sec. 6, Pub. L. 91-560, 84 Stat. 1473 (42 U.S.C. 2135).

2. In § 2.1009, paragraph (b) is revised and paragraph (c) is added to read as follows:

§ 2.1009 Procedures.

* * * * *

(b) The responsible official designated under paragraph (a)(1) of this section shall certify to the Pre-License Application Presiding Officer that the procedures specified in paragraph (a)(2) of this section have been implemented, and that to the best of his or her knowledge, the documentary material specified in § 2.1003 has been identified and made electronically available. The initial certification must be made at the time the participant is required to comply with § 2.1003. The responsible official shall update this certification at twelve month intervals if necessary. The responsible official for the DOE shall also update this certification at the time of submission of the license application.

(c) If DOE is unable to make an initial certification at the time specified in § 2.1003(a) for making documentary material available, DOE shall make an initial certification as soon as possible. However, the DOE initial certification must be made at least eight months before DOE submits the license application for the repository.

3. In § 2.1011, paragraphs (b), (c)(3), and (c)(4) are revised and paragraphs (c)(6) and (c)(7) are added to read as follows:

§ 2.1011 Management of electronic information.

* * * * *

(b)(1) The NRC, DOE, parties, and potential parties participating in accordance with the provision of this subpart shall be responsible for obtaining the computer system necessary to comply with the requirements for electronic document production and service.

(2) The NRC, DOE, parties, and potential parties participating in accordance with the provision of this subpart shall comply with the following standards in the design of the computer systems necessary to comply with the requirements for electronic document production and service:

(i) The participants shall make textual (or, where non-text, image) versions of their documents available on a web accessible server which is able to be canvassed by web indexing software (i.e., a "robot", "spider", "crawler") and the participant system must make both data files and log files accessible to this software.

(ii) The participants shall make structured data available in the context of (or, under the control of) an accessible SQL-compliant database management system (DBMS). Alternatively, the structured data may be made available in a standard database readable (e.g., comma delimited) file.

(iii) Textual material must be formatted to comply with the US.ISO_8859-1 character set and be in one of the following acceptable formats: plain text, native word processing (Word, WordPerfect) or PDF Normal.

(iv) Image files must be formatted as TIFF CCITT G4 for bi-tonal images or PNG (Portable Network Graphics) per [<http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-png-multi.html>] **EXIT**) format for grey-scale or color images, or PDF (Portable Document Format - Image) for compound documents. TIFF images will be stored at 300 dpi (dots per inch), grey scale images at 150 dpi with eight bits of tonal depth, and color images at 150 dpi with 24 bits of color depth. Images found on participant machines will be stored as single image-per- page to facilitate retrieval of no more than a single page, or alternatively, images may be stored in a page-per-document format if software is incorporated in the web server that allows single-page representation and delivery.

(v) The participants shall programmatically link the bibliographic header record with the text or image file it represents. The header record must contain fielded data identifying its associated object (text or image) file name and directory location.

(vi) To facilitate data exchange, participants shall adhere to hardware and software standards, including, but not limited to:

(A) Network access must be HTTP/1.1 [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc2068.html>] **EXIT** over TCP (Transmission Control Protocol, [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc793.html>] **EXIT**) over IP (Internet Protocol, [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc791.html>] **EXIT**).

(B) Associating server names with IP addresses must follow the DNS (Domain Name System), [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc1034.html>] **EXIT** and [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc1035.html>] **EXIT**.

(C) Web page construction must be HTML version 4.0 [<http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-html40/>] **EXIT**.

(D) Electronic mail (e-mail) exchange between e-mail servers must be SMTP (Simple Mail Transport Protocol, [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc821.html>] **EXIT**).

(E) Format of an electronic mail message must be per [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc822.html>] **EXIT** optionally extended by MIME (Multimedia Internet Mail Extensions) per [<http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc2045.html>] **EXIT**) to accommodate multimedia e-mail.

(c) * * *

(3) Identify any problems experienced by participants regarding LSN availability, including the availability of individual participant's data, and provide a recommendation to resolve any such problems to the participant(s) and the Pre-license Application Presiding Officer relative to the resolution of any disputes regarding LSN availability;

(4) Identify any problems regarding the integrity of documentary material certified in accordance with § 2.1009(b) by the participants to be in the LSN, and provide a recommendation to resolve any such problems to the participant(s) and the Pre-license Application Presiding Officer relative to the resolution of any disputes regarding the integrity of documentary material;

(6) Evaluate LSN participant compliance with the basic design standards in

* * * * *

§ 2.1011(b)(2), and provide for individual variances from the design standards to accommodate changes in technology or problems identified during initial operability testing of the individual websites or the "LSN site".

(7) Issue guidance for LSN participants on how best to comply with the design standards in § 2.1011(b)(2).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, _____this ____ day of July, 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Annette L. Vietti-Cook,
Secretary of the Commission.