

POLICY ISSUE
INFORMATION

SECY-00-0164

July 31, 2000

FOR: The Commissioners
FROM: Daniel J. Graser
Licensing Support Network Administrator
THROUGH: G. Paul Bollwerk, III
Chief Administrative Judge
SUBJECT: LICENSING SUPPORT NETWORK PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION - SEMIANNUAL REPORT

- PURPOSE:
- BACKGROUND:
- DISCUSSION:
 - I. Activities
 - II Issues
 - III. Future LSN-Related Activities
- COORDINATION:

PURPOSE:

In accordance with [10 C.F.R. § 2.1011](#) (c)(5), to inform the Commission of the status of the Licensing Support Network (LSN) and the activities of the LSN Administrator for the 6-month period ending June 30, 2000.

BACKGROUND:

Manual Chapter 0109 governing the former Licensing Support System (LSS) (currently designated as Directive 9.9 of the agency's Management Directives (MD)) required that status reports regarding that the centralized electronic discovery database system for the high-level waste (HLW) repository licensing proceeding be sent to the Commission on a quarterly basis. The Commission's Staff Requirements Memorandum (SRM) dated January 31, 1992, revised the report's frequency to semiannually. Following the adoption of the rule revisions to allow for an Internet-based LSN in December 1998, see 63 Fed. Reg. 71,729 (Dec. 30, 1998), a SECY paper requesting review and approval to reassign organizational responsibility for the LSN (SECY-99-114) was provided to the Commission in April 1999. On July 9, 1999, an SRM was issued approving the NRC Executive Council's (EC) recommendation that the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel (ASLBP) become the LSN business sponsor and assume responsibility for the LSN Administrator (LSNA). With that reassignment, the Panel also assumed responsibility for the semiannual reporting requirement.

The scope of this semiannual report includes LSN program activities from January 1, 2000, through June 30, 2000.

DISCUSSION:

I. Activities

A. Licensing Support Network Administrator and Staff

Daniel J. Graser was appointed as LSN Administrator, effective September 20, 1999. In this position, Mr. Graser is responsible for overseeing the design, development, and operation of the LSN. ASLBP staff assigned to LSN development includes Matthew Schmit, who was most recently a Senior Systems Analyst for the Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards (NMSS). Mr. Schmit will manage the contract under which the system is designed and implemented. An offer was made in May 2000 for a third individual scheduled to join the staff in July 2000, subject to security review and clearance. This individual will focus on the coordination of operational issues and developing data standards guidance as needed to ensure system operability in the Internet environment. A fourth position, database compliance auditor, will be filled early in FY 2001. Once the fourth position is filled, we will be at the approved level and staffing activity for the LSN will be complete.

B. Licensing Support Network Advisory Review Panel Chairman

In creating the LSN, the Commission decided to maintain the federal advisory committee that had been formed to provide stakeholder advice regarding the design and operation of the LSS. Former NRC Secretary John Hoyle continued to serve as the Chairman of the Licensing Support Network Advisory Review Panel (LSNARP) until resigning from that position on May 11, 2000. Pursuant to [10 C.F.R. § 2.1001](#) (d), Office of the Secretary (SECY) Senior Level Advisor Dr. Andrew Bates was subsequently appointed by the Secretary to be the new Chairman of the LSNARP.

C. Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA)-Related Activities

There was no activity associated with FACA or the LSNARP charter during the reporting period.

D. Formation of an Internal Working Group

The LSNA has begun using an internal working group comprised of representatives from SECY, the Office of the General Counsel (OGC), the Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO), the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO), the Office of Commission Appellate Adjudication (OCAA), and NMSS to coordinate internal NRC office activities and identify issues. The first meeting, held on June 2, 2000, identified an unresolved question as to when NMSS and OCIO need to finalize the agency's approach (e.g., hardware and software solution if not ADAMS) to making its relevant HLW documents available on a web accessible server. The group discussed target dates for completing the OCIO/NMSS study of approaches; deciding on the agency's target architecture for web-based HLW documents; and having the agency's HLW documents available for testing. OCIO and NMSS are in the process of issuing a contract to do the analysis of how the agency will meet its document availability commitments. When the contract is in place, the milestone dates will be finalized.

Additional Internal Working Group meetings will be held at approximately 4-week intervals.

E. Interactions with the Office of the Inspector General

During the month of April 2000, closure was attained on two recommendations contained in the February 17, 2000 Office of the Inspector General (OIG) report on the status of the LSN. Those recommendations included the need to address how participant funding issues were resolved and for more frequent reports to the Commission on the status of the LSN. Relative to the first matter, ASLBP reported to OIG that at the February 2000 LSNARP meeting, the Department of Energy (DOE **EXIT**) indicated that affected units of local government (AULGs) could use DOE grant money for LSN-related activities, an interpretation that apparently would apply to Native American Tribes as well. In connection with the second matter, ASLBP has agreed to include enhanced reports on the status of LSNA activities (which are also provided to OIG) with ASLBP's routine monthly report to the Commission in lieu of the OIG recommended quarterly formal SECY paper reports. SECY paper reports will continue to be provided semiannually. All outstanding issues resulting from the IG report are considered closed.

F. Licensing Support Network Advisory Review Panel Meeting

On February 23, 2000, a meeting of the LSNARP was held in Las Vegas, Nevada, to consider design alternatives for meeting LSN requirements. Topics included plans for additional consultations needed in preparing a business case presentation to NRC management, a status report on participants' use of DOE grant funds to support their licensing activities, a report on communications with the Nevada State Office of Libraries and Archives on public access to the Internet, and a draft version of functional requirements for a web-based LSN.

As noted in our previous report, a Technical Working Group (TWG) comprised of technical and licensing representatives of the LSNARP members met for a number of sessions and developed five system architectures that met the criteria for a web-based solution that could provide an efficient and effective document discovery system. The TWG recommended three of those solutions to the LSNARP at the February 2000 meeting.

Non-NRC members of the LSNARP expressed strong sentiment, but not consensus, in favor of a technical approach (designated as Alternative 1) that (a) was "Not Recommended" by the LSNARP's own Technical Working Group, and that (b) ASLBP was concerned will not adequately support the Agency's mission to accomplish the Yucca Mountain licensing process within the congressionally-mandated 3-year time frame. Indeed, this technology solution, has the potential to emasculate the discovery process because it fails to provide a centralized search capability. NRC's representatives and ASLBP were concerned that the deficiencies in the discovery process that were likely to result from that solution, rather than the merits of DOE's license application, would become the salient issue. If the discovery process is flawed by an inadequate LSN technical solution that should have been identified and avoided, there is also concern that the Commission will bear the brunt of congressional criticism for failing to meet its 3-year licensing mandate.

Because the LSNARP was unable to reach consensus on a preferred solution, subsequent presentation of the results of that February meeting to NRC's Information Technology Business Council (ITBC) led to a recommendation that three alternatives (numbered 1, 3 & 5) be fully characterized and presented in the Business Case. This is further discussed below.

G. Agency Review and Approval of LSN Project

Since the responsibility for implementing this system was assigned to ASLBP in the summer of 1999, we have been

working aggressively to elicit stakeholder input, define the system requirements and architecture, coordinate budget support, and present the business case justification for proceeding with this project. These efforts were capped by intensive activities in response to the Clinger-Cohen Act requirements, as implemented by NRC.

Per the agency's procedures for review and approval of information technology (IT) initiatives, the LSNA submitted an IT screening form to OCIO as the first step in the required Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process. The screening form provided the OCIO with an early opportunity to categorize the size of the project, determine the level of evaluation detail the project sponsor must provide, and provide guidance for development of a CPIC Business Case Analysis.

After meeting with representatives of various constituencies within NRC and giving full consideration to the input from the LSNARP, ASLBP (as the LSN business sponsor) developed three alternatives that were fully characterized in the Business Case Analysis for the Licensing Support Network (LSN). Under Alternative 1, the LSN web site is merely a gateway to the other participant sites, at which search and retrieval activities are conducted with the tools provided by the site sponsor. In contrast, Alternative 3 uses portal technology to provide a unified search and retrieval interface, while Alternative 5 adds the potential performance boosting mechanism of a central cache that holds copies of all participant discovery information.

The Business Case Analysis for the Licensing Support Network (LSN) presented the following conclusions relative to the LSN system alternatives:

Alternative 1 is of low benefit to users in terms of delivering efficient or effective access; is comparable in risk to Alternatives 3 and 5; and costs NRC approximately \$827K less than Alternative 3 and \$3.6 million less than Alternative 5, but places the highest cost burden on the participants. This alternative was not recommended by the technical representatives of the members of the LSNARP. Moreover, its selection would be of concern because it creates a significant risk that system implementation and operation issues may result in disputes whose resolution could impact negatively on the agency's ability to meet its 3-year schedule for making a decision on repository construction authorization.

Alternative 5 adds significant qualitative value over Alternative 1, provides the highest benefit to users, represents the lowest availability and performance risk, but presents the greatest risk of not meeting the existing implementation schedule, and is the highest cost of all solutions examined, with NRC bearing a significant share of that cost burden. Moreover, its selection would be of concern to the LSNA because it places the LSNA in a position of being accountable for the availability, accuracy, integrity, and custodial chain of participant discovery materials.

OCIO reviewed the screening form and authorized the development of the Business Case Analysis. OCIO directed that the Business Case Analysis fully characterize the cost, benefits, and risks associated with the three alternatives that had generated the most interest: Alternatives 1, 3, and 5. The Business Case Analysis reflected the input of the various external stakeholders and coordination with internal organizations involved in the licensing process including the SECY, NMSS, OGC, OCFO, and OCIO. The LSNA, with concurrence of ASLBP management, recommended Alternative 3 with the LSN servers established at an external location. While neither the least risky, nor the most beneficial, it represented the least cost to NRC and the parties, both individually and in totality, while still providing high value to the licensing proceeding users. It also is the lowest cost of the two alternatives endorsed by the LSNARP TWG; is based on a proven technical solution that has been successfully implemented; facilitates 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; and ensures equitable access to the information for the parties to the hearing.

The Business Case Analysis for the LSN was delivered to OCIO on April 6, 2000. OCIO promptly convened a meeting of the NRC's ITBC, an interoffice group that reviews proposed agency IT projects, and the LSNA presented the business case to them on April 12, 2000.

The recommendation was endorsed by the ITBC, and the Business Case Analysis was forwarded to the NRC's Executive Council (EC) for its consideration. The EC consists of the Agency's Executive Director for Operations, Chief Information Officer, and Chief Financial Officer. The LSNA presented the Business Case Analysis to the EC on April 25, 2000, and the EC provided Agency direction to the LSNA to implement Alternative 3. The EC requested an update status briefing for July 2000 in order to present more detailed project cost estimates after the contract has been competed, bid, and awarded. This follow-up report to the EC, originally scheduled for July 2000, has been rescheduled until September 2000 due to delays experienced in issuing the solicitation.

The reviews, presentations, and documentation noted above are all pursuant to the agency's implementation of Clinger-Cohen Act direction and represent a 3-month, multi-level review of this project that was extensively documented.

H. LSNARP Technical Working Group Meetings

The LSNARP TWG met on March 20, 2000, to develop a restatement of system functional requirements for the web-based solution. Documented functional requirements are a required component of the CPIC process, which is an agency prerequisite to receiving authorization to commence system design activities. The presentation set of functional requirements used to commence the TWG discussion was based on a restatement of the functional requirements generated by DOE and its contractors, TRW Inc., and presented to the LSNARP's predecessor, the LSSARP, in 1995 as well as additional requirements derived from the current rule. Agreement was reached on a series of high-level functional requirements and additional discussions addressed some of the second-level functional requirements. The results of this meeting were forwarded to the LSNARP members with the recommendation that closure on both the first and second level functional requirements be accomplished via e-mail comment. This has been briefed as an action item to Dr. Andrew Bates, who has assumed the position of the Chairman of the LSNARP.

At the outset of the March TWG meetings, a DOE representative instituted a follow-on discussion to comments initially made by DOE at the February 23, 2000 LSNARP meeting. Prior to the discussions about the technical attributes of the system, DOE outlined a number of concerns regarding the LSNA's authority to levy requirements, whether the system functional requirements have any status as regulations or "compliance documents," and the focus of authority for establishing policy for the agency or on behalf of the agency relative to the LSN. DOE also expressed concern that any adopted functional requirements will be fair game for challenges in a proceeding and requested that OGC "opine on the role of the LSNA."

These issues were forwarded by the LSNA to OGC and are addressed in greater detail in the discussion in section I.I below on amendments to 10 C.F.R. Part 2, Subpart J.

I. Revisions to 10 CFR Part 2, Subpart J

As noted above, DOE representatives raised questions about the LSNA's role and responsibilities at both the February 2000 LSNARP meeting and at a subsequent March 2000 TWG meeting. Those questions included the authority of the LSNA to issue technical guidance that could be construed as a compliance document. In May, DOE alerted NRC staff that approximately 200,000 potentially relevant documents, comprising an estimated 4 million pages of material, have not yet been screened by DOE to determine if the material must be entered into the LSN. DOE also indicated that, due to possible budget constraints, it 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 (i.e., 30 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. In consultation with OGC, these two issues resulted in a recommendation, which is before the Commission in [SECY-00-0135](#), that the LSN rule be amended.

The proposed amendments would (1) establish the basic data structure and transfer standards ("design standards") that the LSN participant websites must use to make documentary material available; and (2) clarify the authority of the LSN Administrator to establish guidance for the participants on how best to meet the design standards to ensure that the system will work. If approved by the Commission, this rule revision would clarify the role of the LSNA, and simultaneously provide the implementation guidance that the LSNA was attempting to coordinate by consensus and that DOE asserted the LSNA was not authorized to issue.

The proposed amendments also would clarify the timing of the compliance certifications that all parties and potential parties, including the NRC staff, are required to make under [10 C.F.R. § 2.1009](#). The current rule does not specify when the initial certification must be made, but the proposed amendment indicates that the initial participant certification of compliance must be made at the time that each participant's documentary material must be made available under section 2.1003. This should ensure that a reasonable period of time is available for the participants to have an adequate opportunity to access and use documentary material, particularly the extensive DOE collection, before the license application is submitted.

J. LSNA Support Contracts

The contract placed in August 1999 with Labat-Anderson, Inc., (Labat) to provide support to the LSNA in developing revised technical approaches to implementing the Internet-based LSN system was completed at the end of May 2000. All products were delivered on schedule and the project was completed (pre-audit) under budget.

Efforts have been underway since the completion of the LSN CPIC process to launch the competition for the LSN design and implementation contract. On April 28, the LSNA met with ADM/DCPM to coordinate procurement support for establishing the LSN design and development contract. ADM/DCPM was very enthusiastic about working with ASLBP to meet the aggressive schedule for LSN implementation. We subsequently met with representatives of the General Services Administration (GSA) to explore the use of the GSA Schedule 70 contract vehicle to expedite implementation of the LSN design contract. GSA indicated that, working in conjunction with ADM/DCPM, there is sufficient flexibility in GSA schedule contracts to support a relatively quick contract award. This Schedule 70 acquisition approach was selected because (1) accessing previously competed schedules expedites the procurement process; (2) the contracts contain the appropriate terms and conditions for our needs; (3) we can get both

hardware/software and services under the same contract; (4) it provides for expedited oral presentations and subsequent formal proposal submissions; and (5) it affords the NRC contracting officer the opportunity to negotiate and award the delivery order to the firm offering the best value.

II. Issues

We have retained the issues identified in the initial LSNA report to the Commission (SECY-00-15) and updated them as appropriate. Newly identified issues have been added to the end of this list.

A. Consistency with DOE's Yucca Mountain Schedule

The LSN development time line, which calls for a system capable of operating by July 2001, is consistent with a DOE schedule of a potential Yucca Mountain site recommendation by July 2001, and a potential license application by March 2002. However, this requires an LSN time line that is very constrained. Various system development activities, such as a system pilot, that normally would be considered important, are not included in the LSN development time line. Such activities would be undertaken if the LSN development time line were less truncated. There has been no official indication from DOE that it intends to announce any relaxation in its current, published schedule; nonetheless, even if for some reason the schedule were to change, the development momentum for the LSN must be maintained because the development time line is already severely constrained.

Update: Although DOE has not changed its official site recommendation date of July 2001, it has indicated that its official license application submittal date of March 2002 might be delayed if DOE is not able to obtain the resources requested in the President's FY 2001 budget submission to the Congress. There are a number of impacts - - enough to warrant a detailed study - - of such delay. For example, one impact would be that the system's operational use extends further back into the system's design life, increasing the potential for substantial technology refreshment during active use in the licensing proceeding. It would also mean that some of the budgeted costs for document processing would have to roll out into later fiscal years from where they are currently reflected.

B. System Cost Against NRC Budget

The LSN business case analysis set forth estimated system costs and, by working with the OCFO and the EC during the mid-year review process, resources were identified to fully fund the LSN for FY 2000. The budget request for FY 2001 includes full funding for the LSN pending enactment by Congress. Resources have been budgeted in OCIO, NMSS, and OGC through the FY 2002 budget cycle in support of their LSN responsibilities. An assessment is being undertaken (expected in September 2000) by OCIO and NMSS to identify certain requirements for their portion of the LSN. There may be additional resource implications in FY 2003 and beyond based on reassessment and actual experiences operating under the LSN.

It is anticipated that the LSN design and development contract will be in place in time to obligate the FY 2000 funding, thus this issue is considered closed.

C. Document Volume Identification

Document volume is a significant consideration in system design because it is a major system performance factor. Imprecise volume estimates make it extremely difficult to design a system that ensures performance that will allow the participants to take part effectively in the licensing hearing process. To provide accurate document volume estimates, major system participants, including DOE, must come to an early understanding of exactly what is necessary to meet the definition of "documentary material."

Update: Indications are that DOE is making some progress in identifying the documents it needs to make available (see issue II.D, below). NRC has adhered to a rigorous methodology for identification of HLW-relevant documents since 1989 and its document volume is well-known. Other participants' actions indicate that they are, generally, beginning to gear up for the LSN. For example, Nye County, Nevada, reports that it is beginning the process of procuring the hardware and software for its external collection. Likewise, Clark County, Nevada, reports that it will begin to establish its web site during the summer of 2000 and has indicated its intent to have its computer systems staff consult and coordinate with the LSNA during that process. Additionally, the Nevada counties of Lincoln, White Pine, and Esmeralda have a preliminary agreement for a shared site to house their limited number of documents. There is no information on the progress being made by the State of Nevada at this time.

D. Participant Resource Management Efforts

The previous report noted that participant readiness was a looming issue, and it has indeed emerged. As noted above, DOE recently alerted the NRC 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. DOE also indicated that, due to possible budget constraints, it 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 (estimated to be August 2001). As was discussed in section I.I above, this issue was identified to OGC and has been addressed in proposed modifications to the LSN Rule. The proposed revisions will ensure that other participants have a reasonable amount of time to review materials that may not be made timely available, and also ensures that DOE is not placed in a situation where it must choose between noncompliance with [10 C.F.R. § 2.1003](#) and providing an inaccurate certification of availability.

E. Availability of Resources for Participants and Late-Identified Participants

Availability of resources to the AULGs was addressed at the February 2000 LSNARP meeting and this issue should be considered closed.

OGC has indicated that the Presiding Officer has the latitude to address issues of the status of individuals or others who, because of resource constraints or other factors, seek to participate for the first time in response to the post-application acceptance hearing opportunity notice and have some amount of "documentary material" that is not already in the LSN. We will be working with OGC during the next reporting period to place this in complete context for the Commission and provide a comprehensive summary of this aspect of participation. This summary will be included in our next semiannual report.

F. Scheduling

Unanticipated delays in attaining internal concurrence on the statement of work approval paper from ADM to the Chairman has resulted in a 6-week schedule delay that makes it unlikely we will meet the July 2001 LSN implementation date, unless the system development goes much quicker than is currently anticipated. If the LSN is not operational by July 2001, DOE and NRC can still fulfill their commitments to make their documents Internet accessible. Rather than having a central search portal, users will have to visit the DOE and NRC sites separately and utilize whatever interfaces are found at each of those sites until such time as they are connected via the LSN. Once the design contract is in place, and we can confirm this delay will occur, the LSNA will report the projected delay to the Commission and seek further guidance.

The award of the LSN support contract is now projected for early September 2000. This means that the next major milestone - - completion of the design phase of the project, which was scheduled for August 10, 2000 - - will not be met. The LSN staff planning anticipates that the design phase of the contract will now complete on November 30, 2000, assuming that a contract can be awarded by September 8, 2000. This date is, however, subject to change based on the vendor's proposal and subsequent negotiation during the contract award process.

The LSNA currently believes that even with delays in issuing the request for proposals (RFP) for LSN design, we will award a contract in time to commit currently available FY 2000 funds.

The LSNA will pursue strategies to accomplish this funding commitment as follows:

1. The NRC contracting officer has coordinated with GSA's Federal Supply Service Schedule managers and they have agreed that the NRC contracting officer can put a blanket purchase agreement in place and fund it with all available FY 2000 funds so that the money is committed before the end of the fiscal year.
2. The NRC contracting officer has verified with the GSA schedule managers that hardware and software acquisitions are not going to be considered incidental to a service contract, thereby giving us the latitude to purchase the hardware and software as commodities off the schedules.
3. During oral negotiations, the vendors will be asked to address making their own resources available for initial development pending the delivery of the project's procured/dedicated hardware and software.
4. An alternative strategy that will be pursued by NRC during oral negotiations will be for the Internet application service provider (such as PSINet or UUNet) to provide the hardware platform as part of their upper tier service and pricing.

The larger issue is whether there are realistic ways to get the project back on schedule without incurring additional, unacceptable risk. Unfortunately, there is no work that can be cut out of the design and development effort because:

1. Using GSA schedules does not afford us the opportunity of doing a directed (sole-source) acquisition.
2. Using a Systems Development Life-Cycle Methodology (SDLCM) is required, and we had already identified a package-based development life-cycle model that is the shortest duration model for new system development.

3. Piloting a system has already been removed from our time line due to schedule constraints.

Moreover, LSNA planning included neither schedule lag-time nor contingency for unanticipated costs, and the system availability due date is well-defined under 10 C.F.R. Part 2, Subpart J.

The remaining variable is whether an increase in contractor staffing resources will have any appreciable impact on the ability to meet the schedule without introducing more coordination effort and increased costs by using multiple software teams. However, we cannot make any judgments about this factor without further information as to the time lines associated with customization, integration, and testing and acceptance on the specific hardware and software that will be proposed. This question will be posed to prospective vendors during the contract competition, and our findings will be reported to the Commission via our routine monthly reports.

G. Responsibility for NRC Compliance with 10 C.F.R. Part 2, Subpart J Requirements

In budget review sessions recently, questions were raised about the degree to which the LSNA is generally responsible for the oversight of budgeting and other aspects of various agency HLW repository adjudicatory proceeding related-activities. In coordination with the parties and potential parties to HLW repository licensing adjudication, the LSNA clearly is the agency official responsible for the design, implementation, and integrity of the LSN electronic discovery database system. See 10 C.F.R. § 2.1011(b). And, in the context of the Internal Working Group, the LSNA stands ready to aid other offices in recognizing and addressing the non-LSN requirements that may flow from the various provisions of Subpart J, such as planning for, budgeting for, or operationally performing the identification of relevant documents, certifying their timely availability, placing those documents on an Internet-accessible server, establishing the electronic hearing docket, and delivering or making available images of documents to users upon request.

This, however, does not make the LSNA responsible for all aspects of the agency's activities relating to the 10 C.F.R. Part 2, Subpart J, HLW repository hearing process. Indeed, to do so would run afoul of the recognized "neutral" status of ASLBP and the LSNA relative to the repository adjudicatory process. See 10 C.F.R. § 2.1001 definition of "Licensing Support Network." Sponsorship and/or responsibility for implementing those requirements for the agency as a participant, remains with other offices.

In an attempt to clarify the LSNA's role, and to address any existing uncertainty about the roles and responsibilities of other offices relative to the HLW repository hearing proceeding, the LSNA intends to make this a regular discussion item at the LSN Internal Working Group meetings.

III. Future LSN-Related Activities

As was discussed in sections I.I and II.D above, OGC is leading the effort to amend 10 C.F.R. Part 2, Subpart J, to remedy the LSNA authority and document availability issues identified by DOE. It is hoped that this effort will be finalized by early FY 2001.

The schedule proposed by ADM/DCPM for the LSN support contract implementation is as follows:

Chairman approval of an agency acquisition exceeding \$3 million	7/18/2000
Oral presentations by prospective bidders	7/31-8/4/2000
Request for written proposals	8/7/2000
Delivery of formal written proposals	8/21/2000
Vendor selection	9/5/2000
Delivery Order issued and funds committed	9/8/2000

COORDINATION:

The Office of General Counsel has no legal objection.

The Office of the Chief Financial Officer has reviewed this paper for resource implications and has no objections.

/RA/

Daniel J. Graser
Licensing Support Network Administrator
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel

CONTACT: Daniel J. Graser, ASLBP
415-7401