

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
Title: Commission Meeting: Briefing on Status of
OCIO Programs, Performance, and Plans
Docket Number: (not applicable)
Location: Rockville, Maryland
Date: Wednesday, January 31, 2001

Work Order No.:

NONE

Pages 1-89

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

COMMISSION MEETING

+ + + + +

BRIEFING ON STATUS OF OCIO PROGRAMS,
PERFORMANCE, AND PLANS

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY,

JANUARY 31, 2001

+ + + + +

The Commission met in the Commissioners Conference Room, 1F16, in One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, at 9:30 a.m., Richard A. Meserve, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

RICHARD A. MESERVE	Chairman
NILS J. DIAZ	Commissioner
GRETA J. DICUS	Commissioner
EDWARD McGAFFIGAN, JR.	Commissioner
JEFFREY S. MERRIFIELD	Commissioner

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(9:27 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: The Commission meets today to hear from the Office of the Chief Information Officer on the status of NRC's information technology and information management activities and programs.

This is an annual briefing intended to keep the Commission apprised of new developments, future plans, and anticipated challenges in providing information technology services to the agency and our external stakeholders.

As the use of information technology in government has grown exponentially in the last decade, so, too, have the challenges that need to be addressed and resolved. Critical assessments of information technology programs have increasingly focused on cost effectiveness, applicability of individual applications to the end user, and the relationship of IT programs and activities to the accomplishment of organizational mission.

Questions in these areas recently were addressed by Congress, General Accounting Office, and by the Commission itself, often in response to feedback provided by agency employees and the general public. To address such questions, the NRC, and in particular the staff of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, have worked hard since our last meeting to address concerns and improve agency programs.

This meeting is intended as a means for the Commission to exercise its oversight responsibility for information technology. It reflects the fundamental importance of IT to the achievement of our mission.

The Commission looks forward to the meeting this morning.

I will turn the meeting now over to Dr. William Travers, and to Mr. Stuart Reiter, the NRC's Acting Chief Information Officer.

DR. TRAVERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to you and the Commission. As you've indicated, we are here today, and we're pleased to be here to give you a briefing on the status of the programs of the Office of the Chief Information Officer.

I would like to point out briefly that, in accordance with Commission direction, the Office of the CIO is now a member of the EDO management team, and I'm certainly happy to welcome both Stu and his staff to our team.

In the last few weeks, we presented the annual briefings for the reactor, the materials, in the waste arena, and we're happy to continue today with the CIO programs. Those programs provide cross-cutting support to each of the arenas that we've already talked about, and they particularly support our strategic goals that deal with effectiveness, efficiency, and public confidence.

So as we have done, we're here to highlight for you the achievements of the CIO in the past fiscal year, the ongoing and planned staff initiatives, and the key agency challenges that we face in the upcoming fiscal year and during this fiscal year as well.

With me at the table, as you've indicated, Chairman, is Stu Reiter, our Acting CIO; Moe Levin, who is the Director of the Applications Development Division; Francine Goldberg, who is the Acting Director of the Information Management Division; Lynn Scattolini, who is detailed temporarily to focus on the ADAMS Program; Jesse Cloud -- I'm sorry -- Jim Schaeffer, who is our Information Technology Infrastructure Division Director; and Jesse Cloud, who is the Planning and Architecture Branch Chief.

And with that, I'll turn it over to Stu.

MR. REITER: Thank you, Bill.

And good morning, Chairman, and Commissioners.

On behalf of the OCIO, let me say that we look forward to working even more closely with the offices of the EDO under the new organizational alignment.

With your permission, and for the sake of time, I would like to go through the presentation material that we have prepared, and then we'll be happy to answer any of your questions.

Next slide, please.

In February of last year, the Commission issued a staff requirements memorandum providing guidance to our office. Additional guidance was provided as part of the Commission's response to the 2002 budget request in August of last year. Several of the topics covered by the SRMs are shown on this slide.

I am out of sync. Excuse me. The agenda slide, please. Yes, thank you. Sorry.

This slide is the agenda for the presentation.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: The technology will foul you up every time.

(Laughter.)

MR. REITER: Yes, right. Particularly if the pages get out of order.

And what we want to cover with you today is feedback on the Commission guidance that we received during the course of the year, and then using the framework presented in our annual report, which we just recently issued, discuss our applications and information management programs, infrastructure and planning, security and compliance programs.

In so doing, we will highlight areas where we believe significant efficiency and/or effectiveness gains have been achieved. And then finally we'll touch on what we view as some significant challenge areas for us.

Now I'll take the next slide.

In February of last year, the Commission issued a staff requirements memorandum providing guidance for the office, and then additional guidance was provided on -- from the Commission in response to our 2002 budget request. And that was in August of this last year.

Several of the topics covered by the SRMs shown on the slide include providing periodic updates to the Commission on significant activities, improving communications and coordination with stakeholders, defining, assessing, and closing the gap on staff IT skills. I will touch on these three items now and discuss follow-on actions to other Commission guidance that we received as part of our programs discussion.

We have focused on improving communications in several ways with the Commission by providing you with quarterly updates on significant program milestones and issues through periodic meetings that I have had with you individually and through topical updates with yourselves or your staffs on specific topics, such as web redesign, or, more recently, wireless computing.

And I would also include here your participation in our all-hands meetings as a way of improving communications with the Commission.

With internal stakeholders, we have improved communications by further formalizing the procedures we follow in making changes to the infrastructure. We have introduced procedures that result in all changes to our infrastructure being merged into monthly action items -- what we are calling consolidation points.

Scheduling is coordinated with affected offices and regions to minimize the impact of system upgrades and avoid surprises. We continue to work closely with the Information Technology Business Council, and we are pleased this year to have the EDO's office identify a member to the Council.

We have also published our second annual report to further communicate -- for further communications between our offices and other NRC offices. The annual report primarily discusses our internal program activities but also provides a discussion of significant office-sponsored initiatives.

We look for opportunities to engage with our external stakeholders. This past year we provided presentations on electronic information exchange in ADAMS at the Regulatory Information Conference and at NURMR's annual conference, and we also participated in a panel discussion on electronic information exchange, more commonly termed EIE, at NEI's licensing workshop.

We believe in each of these cases our stakeholders went away with a better understanding of our plans and we with a better understanding of stakeholder concerns and issues.

We also make selective use of surveys and have done so recently to determine how the closing of the LPDRs, the local public document rooms, have been affected -- have affected stakeholders and plan to survey customer satisfactions with our FOIA program in the near future. And we have engaged stakeholders in the web redesign initiative through usability tests, interviews, and focus groups.

As I will discuss shortly, ADAMS has been a challenging implementation for us. The public document room is the primary contact for ADAMS with the public, but our technical staff and management have been in contact with stakeholders to better understand issues and to offer one-on-one assistance when appropriate.

Working with the Office of Human Resources, we conducted an agency-wide IT basic skills assessment. We identified IT basic skills to focus groups with NRC office representatives and conducted an agency-wide survey to determine the level of basic IT skill in the agency. In June, the assessment was completed, and we provided the findings to the Human Resources for followup.

The services provided by OCIO are significant enablers for achieving agency performance goals. We use our performance plan goals and measures to demonstrate our progress. Last year, the goals we had for our infrastructure were met with 99.5 percent availability of our key infrastructure services.

Our application development goals were met with our smooth transition into year 2000 of mission critical application systems. This year, the ADAMS assessment action plan, with its milestones, replaced our earlier information management goals.

Next slide, please.

I will now discuss programs associated with our Applications and Information Management Divisions. But first, I want to recognize the work done by our staff in the Information Management Division in supporting day-to-day agency needs with regard to printing, web publishing, editing, and records management, and also acknowledge the fine job done by the staff of the public document room in smoothly and efficiently carrying out the relocation of the PDR from downtown to White Flint -- a move that will save the agenda several hundred thousand dollars annually in outside expense.

The Year 2K remediation program was completed in early February 1999, but the real effectiveness of the efforts were not known until we actually entered the new year, which we did quietly. This validated the A we earned on our reportcard, and a second place ranking in the Y2K program for all federal agencies. We did not encounter any Y2K issues during the course of the year.

ADAMS is a major program begun three years ago to provide the agency with a modern document management system. In November '99, ADAMS replaced NUDOCs as the mechanism to process and distribute documents and the PDR's bibliographical retrieval system as the mechanism to announce the release of new agency records to the public.

ADAMS provided improvement to those systems by processing documents in days rather than weeks, and in making the image rather than just a description of documents available to users to view and download locally at no charge.

NRC currently adds about 2,000 new documents to ADAMS per week. The system averages about 285 current internal users and about 270 public sessions per day. Support is provided staff users through the ADAMS Support Center, which fulfilled about 5,500 requests for assistance from the NRC staff from February through November 2000. Support is also provided to the public through the public document room and other OCIO staff.

ADAMS has been an ambitious and difficult program to implement for both OCIO and the user community. It is more than just delivering software. It is the use of that software in NRC's business environment by NRC users which has involved adjustments to the way in which we do business. Neither OCIO nor the offices fully understood or adequately addressed the change -- the change management issues related to making the transition to the new target environment.

As a result, the agency is still on a learning curve, making adjustments to the program as OCIO works to improve the stability and availability of the ADAMS production environment.

The ADAMS steering group, composed of the assistant to the EDO, deputy office directors of program offices and OGC, and the secretary of the Commission, have been instrumental in setting the direction of the program and focusing on issues relating to standardization of work processes, roles and responsibilities, communications, and change management issues.

It is clear that improvements that come through execution of activities in the ADAMS action plan must be a collegial effort between OCIO and ADAMS customers with buy-in from agency management.

We are making progress in implementing elements of the ADAMS action plan related to reducing the burden on NRC staff of entering their documents into the system and improving the integrity of the database. While we are making progress, we are proceeding cautiously.

We also have initiatives underway to improve ADAMS functionality, performance, and reliability. The most immediate improvements are included in the next release of ADAMS with deployments scheduled for the March/April timeframe of this year. The release includes software enhancements requested by both staff and the public.

We are also evaluating the feasibility of prototyping a web-based interface for the public which operates similarly to search engines found on the web. We will determine whether we can use this approach in the next several months, and, if so, invite public participation in this prototyping effort.

Further improvements in system availability, stability, and performance will be delivered in fiscal year 2000 when we complete migration to the current release of our COTS product, which will also position to further integrate ADAMS with the NRC web environment.

We are also contracting --

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: You said fiscal year 2000?

MR. REITER: And two.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Two. Okay.

MR. REITER: I'm sorry.

We are also contracting for an independent assessment of NRC's longer term document processing needs to determine if we are on an appropriate path to establish an electronic document management environment for those needs. We expect this study to be complete in late March, and we will use its findings to inform future investments in ADAMS. And at the same time we are in the process of completing an ADAMS lessons learned analysis.

Let me now turn to our initiatives with electronic information exchange or EIE. The capability for an electronic information exchange was implemented last year to allow our licensees to securely send regulatory information to the NRC electronically in a legally defensible manner, and we completed a digital signature pilot program with the Fermi, Calvert Cliffs, and Grand Gulf nuclear powerplants.

In coordination with the Offices of Nuclear Reactor Regulations and the General Counsel, NRC recently issued a regulatory issue summary that grants a blanket exception to allow for the electronic submittal of Part 50 documents via the web using the EIE system.

We are working closely with OGC on a rulemaking to allow all material licensees to submit documents via EIE as well. We plan to submit the rule for Commission consideration in the third quarter of this fiscal year.

We are also working with ASLBP to design a pilot program to more fully define the requirements for receiving documents electronically in support of adjudicatory matters.

In a November 1999 staff requirements memorandum, the Commission directed the staff to improve our external web site and to identify and implement web site objectives that support the agency's strategic plan to solicit the views of stakeholders and to make the site easier to navigate. Last year, we undertook a number of initiatives to respond to this guidance and improve the external web site.

We contracted with web useability experts who involved agency stakeholders and focus groups to assess how well NRC's current web site followed best practices, considered human factors, and was accessible to individuals with disabilities. The staff also compared our web site with other highly-rated government sites.

A prototype for the redesigned site has been developed. This year, we are planning to give stakeholders an opportunity to provide additional input on the prototype, and we will fully populate the prototype with information from the public site when we employ the redesign site later this year. When the prototype reaches maturity, we will brief the Commission on it and seek your input prior to its deployment.

In another area where we disseminate information to the public, we continue to meet our FOIA processing goals, and we recently learned that GAO, in a preliminary report to Congress, found that NRC is one of only a handful of agencies that satisfied all of GAO's 14 review criteria for completeness of FOIA information on their public web sites.

In addition, to ensure that we continue to maintain a strong FOIA program, we are preparing a questionnaire that will be sent to a sample of FOIA requesters to measure their satisfaction with our FOIA process.

On a related note, you are aware that NRC must receive a clearance from OMB before requesting stakeholder feedback on its programs. We have been successful in obtaining OMB approval for an expedited review process that will reduce the clearance period from four and a half months to 30 days for clearances for customer satisfaction surveys, and we have used this new process successfully on three occasions to date.

Next slide, please.

This slide identifies programs associated with our infrastructure initiatives. In June, we contracted with the consulting firm KPMG to perform an IT infrastructure health assessment to compare the costs and performance of NRC's infrastructure with industry benchmarks and best practices.

The KPMG assessment found that overall NRC's infrastructure spending is comparable to peers, but cited areas which can be improved. KPMG also noted that even though NRC users expect a higher level of service than peer groups, overall customer satisfaction with IT services being provided is very high and the staff continues to improve the customer service function.

The assessment identified several opportunities for service and cost improvements which included help desk consolidation and moving to a scheduled desktop refresh cycle. KPMG also identified other best practices, world-class organizations, and compared how NRC performed against those practices.

One of these practices is the use of three- to five-year forward business systems plans to guide investment decisions and information technology. And I will return to this topic a bit later in our discussion.

NRC's production system, such as the reactor program system, electronic mail, external web, and ADAMS, are linked to the performance goals of both NRC offices and the agency. These production systems play a vital role in reaching NRC's strategic goals. Demand on the infrastructure has increased significantly over the last six years as the agency has expanded the use of information technology systems and capabilities in its business processes.

The agency has enhanced office automation capabilities, improved access to the network, and increased support for agency-wide business applications. More than \$16 million has been invested over the last six years to upgrade and improve the agency's desktop systems, service, and networks.

Last year, we developed a centralized customer service function by consolidating several help functions to provide a single point of entry for all requests for assistance. Great emphasis was placed on timely and efficient response to customers. Metrics were introduced across all operations to more effectively manage and track systems and support performance.

In a customer satisfaction survey completed last year, we achieved a 90 percent customer satisfaction rating.

We are continuing to leverage industry best practices to improve our service and operational effectiveness. Some planned near-term actions are moving to performance-based contracting for services, moving to a regularly-scheduled equipment and software refresh cycle, and the improved use of warranties for obtaining maintenance services.

And to further increase availability of systems and ensure continued operation of existing systems and applications, we are consolidating and expanding our applications test facilities.

FTS2001 deals with our migration to agency-wide voice and data services from the current supplier, AT&T, to MCI Worldcom. Voice services include long distance, domestic, and international services. Data services include our network connection to the regions and connections between the regions and resident sites, including the direct access lines to plants used by the Incident Response Center.

Last year, we completed our voice -- we completed migration of our voice lines. The GSA/MCI schedule called for completion of our data services as well, but that did not happen. We are continuing to work on this transaction -- on this transition and are starting to see some progress on the data side.

We also worked with IRO to ensure that there was no interruption in service for the lines needed by the Emergency Response Center. We will continue to work with GSA/MCI and expect migration of data services to be completed early this year. In the interim, bridging contracts are in place that will ensure the continuity of our data services for staff. When complete, the transition to FTS2001 will reduce our annual communications expense by about a million dollars.

Last year, we completed a study to determine if there is a business need to migrate from the current Corel Office Automation Suite, which includes WordPerfect, to another office automation suite, such as Microsoft Office. The study was in response to the increased market share of Microsoft and our need to exchange documents with stakeholders who often use the Microsoft Office products.

From the study, we determined that a migration would be very costly and disruptive and inadequate benefits -- with inadequate benefits to offset an estimated cost in excess of \$5 million.

We will continue to monitor agency requirements and industry shifts in this area.

Next slide, please.

I will now discuss the programs associated with our planning, security, and compliance activities. Public confidence is increased by making NRC information publicly available on the internet and increasing public access. The NRC has been exploring cost effective ways to use the internet to increase access from remote locations.

Last year, we started a pilot program to broadcast Commission hearings, such as we are doing today, on the internet and archive them for one year for public access. This year Admin and SECY, with our support, will evaluate the costs and benefits of this program, so that the Commission may decide whether it merits continuation.

We are moving to a web-based computing paradigm. Industry is moving in that direction, and the public and staff have clearly stated their preference for receiving NRC information through a web browser interface.

Last year, a web architecture study was initiated, which is being completed now. The need for the architecture is to provide the agency a road map to guide future investments as we migrate to a web-based computing model. The architecture will help us to ensure use of proven technology, protect investments in existing technologies, identify security issues, and minimize staff resource impact.

The architecture effort has used an outside consultant and is being guided by -- and is being guided -- excuse me -- and is being guided internally through a senior-level staff steering group. In addition to the above, the architecture effort will provide guidance on standards and tools to use, deploying ADAMS via the web, deploying Starfire via the web, and identifying support issues. After the architecture design is completed, follow-on programs will be proposed.

Cyber attacks and computer hacking are increasing risks to the NRC. Over the past calendar year, several major incidents of cyber attacks, such as denial of service attacks, occurred. Several agencies reported penetration, and on one occasion the EPA web site was temporarily shut down.

Last year, the NRC took specific actions to maintain a high level of security for agency computer systems. An independent security study was completed of the NRC wide area network. The study included a test and evaluation of current NRC security controls and detection mechanisms, which showed that current protection adequately protects the NRC network from outside intrusions.

This year, staff training will continue. We will continue our participation in government-wide computer security protection initiatives, maintain an ongoing vigilance and monitoring initiatives of NRC computers and networks, and assess any additional needs stemming from the web architecture study.

The next two programs deal with some significant recontracting efforts that we are currently going through. The infrastructure services and support contract deals with contracting for infrastructure services. The current operations, maintenance, and support of the NRC's IT infrastructure is outsourced through several contracts.

The largest of these contracts, Next Generation Network, covers about 75 percent of these services and expires in April 2001. We are developing the ISSC, which translates to infrastructure, services, and support contract, to replace these contracts.

Requirements for the ISSC were developed through interviews with senior management, headquarters staff, and regional staff, and reflect recommendations from the KPMG study. The new ISSC contracting approach moves the agency to a seat management approach in which the agency pays the contractor to meet predefined service levels for a fixed price, rather than work on a best effort, cost plus basis. Transition to the ISSC will start in the second quarter of this fiscal year.

The NRC has been fulfilling its requirements for contractor-supported software services and document processing services through its CISSCO contract awarded in 1996. The current CISSCO contract expires in August of 2001. CISSCO II will replace the CISSCO contract and provide contracting services for software development, maintenance, and operations, document processing operations, process improvement initiatives often associated with the Government Performance and Results Act, and IT security services.

Under CISSCO II, individual orders for services will be competed among a group of preselected contractors. The order will then be placed with the contract offering the best value to the NRC. This new contracting approach addresses concerns raised earlier by IG and GAO studies. Transition to

CISSCO II will start in the second quarter of this fiscal year also.

As a federal Commission, NRC must comply with all applicable federal laws and directives. We are committed to leading the agency into compliance with information technology and information management regulations and directives.

Last year, we responded to legislative requirements associated with the Klinger-Cohen Act, Government Paperwork Elimination Act, and Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and participated with program offices in complying with Presidential Decision Directive 63, which deals with critical infrastructure, and Presidential Decision Directive 67, which deals with continuity of operations.

Next slide, please.

There are several challenges that we will be facing this coming year. At this time, I would like to touch on four of these. Where in the past most of our core systems were run from off-site locations such as NIH, today we are providing the support for many of these core systems in-house. As more and more of our agency-wide systems move onto in-house platforms, we will continue to be challenged to provide the availability and reliability of production operations that staff will require.

As we outsource for support services and use commercially-available software products, we need to continue to focus on building relationships with key product and service providers to ensure that our senior management are aware of NRC priorities and are engaged in bringing needed resources to resolve any performance-related issues that we may encounter.

In partnership with program and support offices, we will continue to focus on our oversight role, and in the near term to obtain good terms and conditions for the key agency contracts that are up for recomplete and on minimizing the transition issues.

ADAMS is a large and intricate system serving the needs of a diverse group of stakeholders and satisfying a range of regulatory and operational requirements. The ADAMS action plan identifies 10 challenge areas with associated activities and timelines to bring about improvements to the ADAMS program.

The action plan focuses on reducing the burden of NRC staff in implementing an electronic management system and accelerating the benefits of having electronic records available in a centralized repository for staff and the public use.

Although work has not been executed at the pace initially identified in the action plan, progress is being made in several substantive challenge areas, in accordance with the ADAMS steering group direction. For example, we have recently completed a two-month pilot of a new agency approach to submit NRC-generated documents to OCIO for further processing into ADAMS, and will shortly be implementing this approach at headquarters.

OCIO is strongly committed to working with the agency to complete all elements of the ADAMS action plan.

I mentioned earlier that KPMG, in their infrastructure health assessment, encouraged the creation of use of business systems plans to rationalize and guide investments and information technology. Business systems plans tie information technology needs to organizational business plans and can provide valuable guidance for both tactical and strategic investment decisions regarding information technology.

Business systems planning ties nicely to our PBPM initiative by asking the question of, how can information technology be used to support our office's business goals? Developing a business system's plan will typically require executive sponsorship be carried out by affected offices and supported by the OCIO.

We have and will continue to encourage offices to assess their need for a business systems plan. Currently, some of our offices have such plans in place. Others are in a startup mode, and others may need to refresh previous work or consider the need for such plans.

This concludes our prepared remarks, and I will now turn it back to Bill.

DR. TRAVERS: Thanks, Stu.

Mr. Chairman, that completes the staff's presentation this morning.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Good. I'd like to thank you. That was certainly a lightning tour through a diverse range of activities. Appreciate that.

I'm sure that all of us have many questions. Let me turn first to Commissioner McGaffigan.

COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: Let me talk to you a bit about ADAMS, and one of the questions I have -- I've talked to you privately about this -- but, clearly, ADAMS has cost us more and delivered less than we originally expected in the CPIC analyses. And yet when we have to report things to OMB, you know, information technology system is in trouble or something, it manages never to hit a threshold.

I think it's a matter of maybe the OMB reporting requirement not being right, because it strikes me that ADAMS should have hit a threshold, given how -- you know, how much the offices -- I mean, there are costs that -- cost savings that were projected in the CPIC analysis that just weren't -- weren't realized.

In fact, there were tremendous costs on the staff as they tried to -- tried to implement ADAMS -- costs for external stakeholders, frustration of external stakeholders, if you put all of the, you know, hours that they put in to try to figure out how to -- how to access ADAMS, and that isn't captured.

So how does -- I mean, I know we're trying to fix ADAMS, and we're hoping to someday have a web-based ADAMS, and all that, but how -- how can a system as troubled as ADAMS was not breach these OMB thresholds? And have we done anything to -- to advise OMB how to better -- better draft their threshold, so that they capture troubled systems like ADAMS in other agencies?

MR. REITER: Well, the response to the OMB requirement, the 300(b) requirement, that we complied with lays out how OMB requests the agency to provide information, and what characteristics of an application -- the cost, for example -- to provide. And our submission to OMB followed those guidelines, and it did not take into account some of the cost considerations that you've mentioned.

COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: And OMB doesn't. I'm just suggesting at some point we've -- we probably should tell OMB that you need to look at this sort of thing because it -- because there are hidden costs in some of these information technology -- when the CIO Council gets together and you talk about, you know, whether programs are succeeding or failing, I'm not sure the OMB guidelines are the right guidelines to use is all I'm saying.

MR. REITER: Yes. There are -- in the private sector there are different capabilities and different procedures that I'm familiar with. And there are capabilities, for example, to more exactly track individual costs, resources, human resources, that are associated with development or user training of systems.

And we don't have that kind of accounting or reporting capability. So in terms of the 300(b), I'm not aware that there have been any discussions at that CIO Council, but this is certainly something that can be brought up.

You touch on the other question of the savings for ADAMS, and your observations are correct that the ADAMS CPIC did identify significant savings that would be achieved through work avoidance on the staff. And what we've seen today is extra effort on the staff in order to deal with it, and the savings not being available at this time. And this is one of the reasons, of course, why we did the ADAMS assessment and the resulting action plan, to work with offices to identify the steps that are needed.

COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: The other -- that's good enough for that. In looking at the CPIC analysis, I mean, you're doing this lessons learned study on ADAMS. When does the CPIC analysis have to be redone? What is the threshold? I mean, not just for this, but there are various other systems that we've put in place that are less famous than ADAMS, or infamous, that, again, didn't turn out anywhere near what the CPIC analysis suggested, at least to a lay person.

And what is the -- when you're in the midst of something, what is the trigger for saying, "Gosh, this just isn't -- doesn't look like it's turning out right. We sold it -- we sold our customers X, and we're going to deliver Y," and Y is a small shadow of X, and it's time to redo CPIC?

MR. REITER: The procedures -- the CPIC analysis at project initiation -- the CPIC represents the business case, and the decision was made to go forward with the project, be it ADAMS or

Starfire or any other project that follows.

The management directive then -- once that approval is achieved, you're into the controlled phase that's defined in the management directive, and I think it's Management Directive 2.2. And the control phase, for internal NRC purposes, says that if the project is going to exceed costs by five percent, then it has to come back for review and discussion. And depending on the size of the project, it will go to the CIO or it will go to -- what we've had in place up to now has been the Executive Council -- for review.

And in the situation of both ADAMS and Starfire, that has happened. And in the case of Starfire, for example, they had some particular, as you're aware, issues with software delivery. And they had to recast the scope and objectives of that project, and that's consistent with the kinds of actions that would be taken in the controlled phase.

So it's a management directive that really provides guidance to the sponsoring office as how to proceed as the program actually goes to its development.

COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: I'm trying to recall a document. I didn't bring it with me. But the registration program, the software for the registration program for generally licensed devices, that ended up costing a fair amount of money, right? Did it come in on budget, or over budget, or -- or -- if you remember. Maybe that's not fair to ask you. Maybe that's an NMSS item that you support. But I know you had to do a CPIC analysis on it.

MR. REITER: Yes. We've worked with NMSS on GLTS, and Moe can help contribute on this. The development of GLTS, as we got into the test phase for GLTS, the -- it was determined that the product was not compliant with our requirements. The product, as delivered from the contractor, was not compliant with our requirements.

Working with NMSS we had many discussions with the contractor to understand why and then what the corrective actions would be. And a result of that -- there was an adjustment to the delivery plan for GLTS. A contractor agreed to absorb a significant amount of costs to effect the corrective action, and it was also determined to some extent there were some what we would say requirements creep that NRC absorbed.

And I also believe that NMSS notified, as per our procedures, that there would be -- there would be some overage over the original CPIC amount. But I think the experience with GLTS illustrates the need for oversight of our contractors to pick up issues early on and then to make sure that program offices ourselves work with the contractors to come up with what would be a satisfactory resolution of these issues to the NRC.

Moe, would you add anything to that?

MR. LEVIN: No, that's pretty much --

COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: I don't want to take -- one last question. I'm just trying to figure out how to do IT planning. Everybody says it's a problem -- GAO, our IG. You know, as I said when I -- at your all-hands meeting, both of those organizations regard IT institutions across government, including your own, as target-rich environments for audits.

But has any CPIC analysis ever come in too high? Or are we always surprised -- you do a CPIC analysis, and whether it's GLTS, Starfire, ADAMS, you name it, has there ever been a CPIC analysis in the history of the agency where the actual deliverable came in low, and we got more than we thought we were going to get?

MR. REITER: Let me ask Jesse Cloud to comment on that.

MR. CLOUD: Let me respond to that. Through the history of the CPIC process, which has been in the agency for three years, approximately 10 percent of the investment proposals have been withdrawn when the cost estimates have been improved through additional scrutiny.

We've learned that the benefits simply don't justify the cost that'll be required. So that's --

COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: Once we're into a program, once it's past CPIC, we say we're going to do it, how often -- it strikes me -- I used to tell this to under secretaries of defense when they used to call on Senator Bingaman, that, you know, anything your IT people tell you multiply it by a fudge factor. And I'm not sure whether it's two or three or something, but they never deliver what they say they're going to deliver.

John Beattie was the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition. I remember telling him that in 1989, and I proved to be a prophet. I know nothing about your business, except that I know, whether it's the Pentagon or here, things get overpromised and underdelivered and undercosted.

I mean, if people always getting mid-year reviews or needing reprogrammings, or whatever, in the IT area. And I -- and it just strikes me there's something wrong with the planning process, where we just have to put in a wedge, given the uncertainties in IT development are something that, you know, you go through the analysis, you do it, everything you need -- I don't know what the wedge is, 25, 33, 45 percent more money, and 15 months extra time to actually, you know -- to get a realistic --

MR. REITER: I'll give some feedback, but I see Moe is -- would like to --

MR. LEVIN: Yes. It's been my experience here, we have had many systems, many projects, that have actually come in on or under budget. Some of them may have not gone through CPIC, but they've all had one characteristic that the systems we've had or the projects we've had that have been in trouble didn't have, and that is they were well-known requirements up front.

We were rewriting systems that already existed. We were doing Y2K, which is about 100 systems which we brought in well ahead of schedule and under budget. But in each of those cases when we rewrite or were fixing -- fixing, we knew it wasn't new technology, and we knew the requirements.

In almost every case where we have misjudged on the CPIC it has been because we were entering uncharted territory. And that comes along with -- with that.

COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: Okay.

MR. CLOUD: Getting back to your question, a number of projects under CPIC have come in at budget level. Probably the largest one is the reactor program system at NRR.

I think a big part of that is that the project has been highly modularized with deliverables coming throughout -- at a regular pace throughout the years instead of waiting until the very end to do one large lump of deliverables, and they have been very successful in managing their project to the benefits and to the schedule and to the cost.

MR. REITER: I think the -- I think the lessons learned in general on delivering information technology projects are well-known and have been discussed and have been documented. And one of the major issues is the execution of those lessons learned in any given project. And one of the key ingredients for executing those lessons learned is having effective project management and senior management support.

Often projects find themselves with unrealistic timeframes to be accomplished because of some constraint that they don't have any control of, and this can create a problem. But project management is always a key factor in bringing any of these programs in.

COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: All well known. I hope we can avoid them.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Commissioner Merrifield?

COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I've got both some questions and some comments. I'll start off with some of -- some of the latter.

First, as was mentioned in Dr. Travers' opening statement, the Commission has recently made a change in the management structure of where the CIO falls in our management system. Speaking only for myself, I think that was something that I felt -- I agree with the recommendations of the EDO and the other Commissioners that we should make that change.

But I think it's important that the CIO -- members of the CIO who are here today, at least from my standpoint, recognize that in no way denigrates from the significant importance that we have on CIO functions here in the agency, nor does it denigrate from the important tasks that have been undertaken and

the excellence which we have achieved in many of the functions we have that fall within the CIO.

From my own perspective, I think the ability of the EDO and the CIO to integrate more closely many of these cross-cutting activities will in effect enhance many of the ways in which the CIO efforts can penetrate far into the reaches of our -- of our community here at the NRC. So I did want to, for my own part, make that statement.

Following up on a couple of things that Commissioner McGaffigan stated, you -- he talked a little bit about the general license tracking system that was initiated as a result of efforts by Commissioner Dicus and others.

I have to say, I would recommend to my -- my fellow Commissioners, if you get the opportunity to go over to White Flint Two and get a demonstration, I did recently, and I think, although there were some contracting issues associated with it, I think the end product that has been developed as a result of the cooperatives efforts with NMSS or CIO is a good product for us to have, and something that we should really focus on.

The other comment of Commissioner McGaffigan I would -- I would play off of is the budgetary concern. Having litigated government contracts previously, not only is it a case of some of the IT systems, but I think government-wide any time you're involved with cutting-edge technology there are issues of attention between promises that are made, ability to keep those, and costs.

And so I -- you know, for my own part, I recognize there are some difficulties for the CIO's office, and those we should certainly be mindful of.

We talked a little bit about ADAMS -- Commissioner McGaffigan did -- and I think there is sort of the internal versus the external concerns. I know even as of last week I had had discussions with stakeholders who remain concerned that the combination of the change to the ADAMS system, in concert with our decision to close our public documents room, was, in the eyes of some stakeholders, shutting some of the public out.

That's very important. That perception out there I think is difficult and certainly goes against our desire to increase public conference. And so I'm wondering if you could briefly go over some of the efforts that you're making or think you should be making to reach out outside of the agency to try to enhance that loss of public credibility that has occurred over the course of the last year or so.

MR. REITER: Well, there are two things that come to mind. One, we are -- we are also concerned about that. And as I mentioned, we've recently gone out and tried to get some feedback from the local public document rooms on their experiences. And I'll ask Fran to comment on that.

There was a decision made some time back as to how we would provide public access to ADAMS, and a particular technology path was chosen, and that has not worked that well for us at all. And this is the -- using CITRIX, because that technology presents a Windows-based application. And over time people have become very, very comfortable with the web interface, and that's what they want to work with.

And this other technology also had some download requirements, so things that really were not -- not at all conducive to our external stakeholders, except in certain cases where people are regular users of ADAMS, and they've had the drive, the incentive to overcome that learning hurdle and can work with the system. But other users have just been turned away from it.

To compensate for that, we're looking at this web interface capability, which we'd like to bring on board as quickly as we can, but we need to be able to get over some technology hurdles on that. And if we can do that, then we think we can make very big gains in turning around the public's view of the interaction with the environment by providing a different interface for them to work with, which would make it much simpler.

In terms of the feedback that we've gotten, and what we might do to outreach, what we have done for outreach, let me ask Fran to --

MS. GOLDBERG: We, as Stu mentioned, are very much concerned with serving the public and making sure that service is good and that they're satisfied. We have recently undertaken a kind of informal survey of the LPDRs. As you know, at the end of FY99, the LPDR program, as sponsored by NRC, was ended.

And of the 73 former LPDRs that held our comprehensive microfiche collections, 54 elected to retain them and the other 19 collections were moved into libraries of the Government Printing Office, Federal Depository License Program. So all of the records are still out there and available in these libraries.

Our feeling in terms of ending the LPDR program -- that is, stopping the sending of microfiche -- was really as a result of, of course, switching over to ADAMS. And our intentions were the best; we felt that Adams would make our information much more readily available to people throughout the country.

They wouldn't have to go to the local LPDRs. They'd be able to download, view, print, copies of documents at no cost from their local library or their place of work or their homes and schools and many other places. So that was our intention in changing the LPDR program and moving to the ADAMS environment.

We recently surveyed, as Stu mentioned, both the libraries that retained the collections and the libraries that gave up the collections. And of the 92 libraries polled, we got a 49 response -- 49 percent response rate. Forty-five of them responded.

Four of the libraries have installed ADAMS in the library. There were three complaints -- a total of three complaints over the past year, which is a low number we feel. And they dealt with the ease of use of ADAMS. Twelve of the 45 libraries -- only 12 of them had any requests for NRC documents during the past year.

The libraries that don't have ADAMS stated that they preferred to refer their patrons to the PDR for assistance with ADAMS, or to the web site where many of our documents are currently available. So we feel that the level of usage is about what it was. It wasn't much higher than this prior to the change.

And we feel that the complaint rate is -- you know, obviously, we'd like to have no complaints, but there's not a high level of complaints out there.

We do feel that there continue to be concerns, as you mentioned, Commissioner, by the public overall. And much of the focus, in general, seems to be about the firewall issue, which we're planning to address through this -- a new pilot project that would give web access to the public.

We note that usage is actually up quite remarkably in the past several weeks. It may be the California energy crisis, but we've had in one case 500 user sessions. And we had been averaging between 200 and 300, so -- and yesterday I think we had 418. So usage is up, and people are using the system despite some -- some problems.

MR. REITER: Let me also say that the -- we have gotten a number of compliments from outside stakeholders thanking the PDR staff for the help that they've provided and working with them.

And I recall last year when we talked about ADAMS and the challenges that we were going to be facing with ADAMS, I think I made the comment that we're not making house calls yet. Well, this year we've offered to make house calls.

COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: I think that kind of -- that level of outreach is important, because it's hard -- I recognize that some of the statistics you've given, it's hard for me to determine yet whether the comments I'm getting are the tip of the iceberg or the iceberg. And I just -- I sort of leave that one out there.

Our web site redesign -- I had a couple of specific comments. At what point do you anticipate that we will actually be able to roll this thing out? I mean, what is the dateline for that? And what are your big picture goals, however small they may be, in terms of -- of that redesign?

MR. REITER: Fran, do you want to --

MS. GOLDBERG: Yes.

MR. REITER: -- on Phase 1 and Phase 2.

MS. GOLDBERG: Given no major surprises in our planning, we expect to roll this out during

the fourth quarter of this fiscal year this summer. Our major goals are really to enhance the ability of the public to do -- to participate in the regulatory process, to provide them with the information they need to do that, to be responsive to the information that they would like to see on the web site as opposed to what we've been comfortable putting there, or what's been easy to put there.

So we are taking very seriously the input from the stakeholders and trying to be responsive to their concerns and their requests for information.

We have a Steering Committee that's been set up to help us with this, and they have been just a tremendous help, as has been the working group that's been formed.

Another goal that we have is to enhance the ability of stakeholders to do business electronically with the agency, both through the EIE programs which will, of course, have the web as an entry point, and also for things like contracting, submitting job applications, giving a boost to our employment recruiting programs through an effective web site that gives people a good idea of what they can expect when they come to the NRC.

So those are some of the goals that we have. We want to improve the navigability, the ease of navigation, of the web site. We want to make it easier to use for people, make it very transparent, how to find things, not getting lost, a few clicks to get to information, top-down organization, logical, an appealing design that is inviting particularly to new users who want to look at our web site. Those are some of the goals.

MR. REITER: In terms of the question that you asked about vision, I'd point out that we very much rely on the steering group and the agency to provide -- because we view the web as really the agency's web site. We are facilitators and help get it there.

In terms of the web, and through the whole process to date, there were lots of requirements and requests that surfaced for what the web might do for us. And we were also up against the sense that while we need to get something out there, from just a project point of view and a project management point of view, we broke the program into two phases.

Phase 1 is now scheduled for fourth quarter this fiscal year, and then Phase 2 will follow that.

COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: I have had an opportunity, thanks to Fran, to take a look at the Phase 1 demo, and I was -- I was very pleased with what I saw at least.

The final question for this round, I have -- there has been an increasing use of personal digital assistant devices, Palm Pilots, here at the agency. This is -- I know that there is some development of trying to see if there's a methodology for getting this technology in the hands of some of our inspectors, whether they be resident inspectors or other inspectors, for use in various facilities, so that they can do some of their inspection activities on that and download it back into the system on their way back.

It strikes me that in many of the areas the CIO's office is the driving force towards many of our IT solutions. This may be one of those cases where the IT -- maybe do a little bit of catch up -- I get the sense that some of the regions are very aggressive in their attempts to get out there and utilize these devices for a variety of applications.

I'm wondering if you could touch a little bit on -- in terms of where you are and where you see us going in that regard.

MR. REITER: Well, I think you may be right in this case of us being a little bit in a catch up mode. And it's not that this has not been on our radar screen. It's just that we've had other issues that we've actually talked about around this table that have taken our attention.

But Moe has been involved, and one of the things that we wanted to get started off earlier was to get engaged with the regions and the offices in terms of opportunities for wireless computing.

Moe, do you want to touch on some of --

MR. LEVIN: Yes. We had planned, if things had worked out, by now to have had a focus group meeting with the regions, representatives from all of the regions, to discuss the potentials for the technology.

There was a matter of resources and competing priorities. We still plan to do that, plan to do that soon if we can, but it all boiled down to resources. So we actually started this a year ago, our mobile computing focus group efforts. It's just been resources.

COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: There may be -- and I appreciate the issue of resources. There may be others in the agency who on their own, without the knowledge of either you or us, may also have some expertise in this area. So you may want to do that. Cast as broad a net as you can, because a lot of ideas may come of it.

Mr. Chairman, that's -- I may have additional questions later on, but I don't want to --

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Thank you.

I know in the ADAMS context the intention and objective is to use the action plan as a vehicle for addressing the concerns, and that there are a series of steps that you envision. I'm curious as -- the extent to which as people have grown more experienced or more familiar with ADAMS in its present incarnation, whether you're seeing that the -- that some of the initial employee concerns are diminishing, and whether some of the concerns you're hearing from outside are diminishing.

MR. REITER: Let me ask Lynn to initially respond to that.

MS. SCATTOLINI: Well, in some respects, the picture has changed and that's natural, because people have become more familiar with the system. At the time the action plan was developed, we were only two months into ADAMS being the official recordkeeping system. And for many of the offices they had just begun to interact with the system. So they were just becoming familiar with the software.

What we have found for the secretaries, in particular, that have invested the time to learn the software, that many of them feel very comfortable entering documents into ADAMS. We particularly got that feedback from the NRR secretaries, and they were early adopters and users of the system.

There, of course, still are concerns with regard to the amount of time that it takes to enter documents into ADAMS, but I'm just talking about the process itself. It doesn't seem that daunting to people anymore.

In terms of search and retrieval, I see people -- we're just at the tip of the iceberg. There has been so much focus on getting information into the system that people are just now beginning to focus on getting information out of the system. And we're still in the formative stages of the staff doing that.

So I think there is still -- there are many issues in that area, and the issues range from the unfamiliarity of the staff with how to effectively formulate search strategies, unfamiliarity with how the data is structured itself, both of which can lead to not very successful search results, and then the integrity of the data in the system, which needs to be improved.

But these are all issues that can and will be addressed.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Let me say that I think that -- that we all envisioned that the action plan would be a living document, in the sense that there's sort of a moving target we have here.

And I think that as the concerns of agencies' employees change, and external stakeholders change, with growing familiarity with a system, we ought to make sure that the focus of our efforts on the action plan are ones that address the issues that remain, and that matters that have become less significant over time are not given the priority they might initially have had.

I'd like to follow up. You made this -- you discussed the KPMG study, and in one of the -- one of the recommendations that struck my eye was that the -- the recommendation to change the refresh program from the -- which I take to mean the replacement of equipment and --

MR. REITER: Right.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: -- because I know there's unique terminology that's in this area. To go from a -- sort of a 15 percent rate that we have to something that's on the order of 25 to 33 percent rate.

The basis for that comparison, as I understood it, was with industry, in that that was the

benchmark against which they assessed our program. I'm curious of a couple of things -- how we stand against other federal agencies with regard to our upgrading of equipment, whether you see the need for us to increase the refresh rate. I mean, the fact that we don't do it as fast as others ought not to be the determinant factor. It ought to be whether we get it -- there are gains in efficiency that justify the cost.

And, if so, are we going to see a budget increment that you will be recommending to us in this area?

MR. REITER: I'll give you some initial reactions to it, and then I'll ask Jim to give some feedback also.

I don't have specific data on other agencies, but I believe KPMG indicated, both within the private and the federal sector, that people were going to a prescheduled refresh rate as compared to a "fix it when it's broken" type of situation.

In going to a refresh rate, the business incentive is -- it's -- it rests on a business case, although the business case may be difficult to develop. And it relates to, you know, the amount of time that you need to allocate your people resources to repair equipment that's a little bit older, or difficulty in getting parts for older equipment, and things like this.

Jim, can you --

MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes. We've actually been out and talked with a number of agencies, and basically have found that some agencies are recognizing the problems with having outdated desktops. And a lot of them are introducing two- to three-year refresh rates.

Now, we've looked in the NRC at three to four, what would best meet our needs? And what -- we also found, and KPMG indicated, is that about 80 percent of the life-cycle costs for the desktop is really the services, the support services associated with maintaining those desktops. And when you start keeping machines around for more than three years, they find that your support costs increase.

So, and from a budget impact, the concept is you replace the machines more frequently, and then they break less and your support costs are lower. That's one of the things we're looking at now in terms of the ISSC contract.

Our hope is that we can introduce a -- you know, a three-year refresh rate and offset those increased hardware costs by lower service costs. And a number of agencies -- NASA has introduced that, and they've seen a lot of the benefits. ATF and Peace Corps have had -- you know, brought these programs on board and have seen very good results. So that's our hope as well.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: On the FTS2001, when do you anticipate that the new contractor will be providing all of the services that were promised?

MR. REITER: The date that we're looking at now is April.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: That's for everything.

MR. REITER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: What sort of incremental cost have we incurred as a result of the fact the contractor was unable to provide the services in the time when it was promised?

MR. REITER: That's the cost of that bridging, the incremental cost on the bridging contract.

MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes. We're right now looking -- depending on how close we may meet the April date, we're looking at about \$400-, \$600,000 of additional costs. They roll the costs back to January I guess of '99 where, you know, we don't take advantage of certain discounts they provided.

In addition, there's also a transition fee, an \$8 million transition fee that they're allocating against the agencies that still are using the bridge services. So right now we're estimating about \$400- to \$600,000.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: And do we have any opportunity to recover that cost from the contractor for failing to meet their commitment?

MR. SCHAEFFER: We have brought this issue up with GSA, and they're having discussions with the contractor. And, you know, they understand that, you know, we want some recovery on this, but we haven't gotten any feedback from that on that yet, but we are pursuing that.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Okay. Commissioner Dicus?

COMMISSIONER DICUS: Thank you.

The concern that has been raised, and that you mentioned on the length of time it takes to put documents into the system, is that going to improve over time? Is there a way to improve -- to make it less burdensome? Because it goes back to, you know, it's a cost in resources and time, people who are having to do it. It goes back to something Commissioner McGaffigan was talking about --

MS. SCATTOLINI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DICUS: -- hidden costs in the system.

MS. SCATTOLINI: The solution to this is the new approach to processing NRC-generated documents, which has the staff doing a minimal profile if the document is in electronic form, and the contractor completing the profile and doing the rest of the work. And if the portion of the document is in paper form, the contractor does all of the work.

So, in effect, the work is shifting, or a portion of the work is shifting, from the NRC staff to the contractor.

COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay. So, in fact, this document profiling is improving, and the process is improving.

MS. SCATTOLINI: It will take less time on the part of the staff and -- but at the same time, because it will be done by a small cadre of people, we will be able to improve data integrity.

COMMISSIONER DICUS: So what about --

MS. SCATTOLINI: Which, in turn, will affect search results.

COMMISSIONER DICUS: What about the contractor costs, then? If contractors are doing this.

MS. SCATTOLINI: Correct. What is the question?

COMMISSIONER DICUS: Well, the question is, what are the costs of the contractors? What is it costing us to have contractors do this?

MS. SCATTOLINI: It costs -- it costs the Document Processing Center about \$27 to process a document that's in paper form and \$16 to process a document in electronic form. And this is -- of course, we've had the Document Processing Center in place for the past 22 years.

I mean, they were the contractor group that processed documents under NUDOCS, so this is simply a continuation of their activities. And for incoming documents to the agency, they did the processing under ADAMS, as they did under NUDOCS.

COMMISSIONER DICUS: But if we didn't have a time-consuming issue with the documents being entered in the system so that the administrative staffs, secretarial staffs, could do it, there was to be a savings there, wasn't there?

MS. SCATTOLINI: Well -- and so we don't have that savings now. Either that or I'm not understanding.

COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay.

MS. SCATTOLINI: The savings was not ever in entering documents into the system. No matter how good the system performance is, it still takes time to index a document. If you don't index it, you don't have the information to retrieve it. That was never a savings of ADAMS.

The savings in ADAMS was the time that the -- the staff would save in having the documents in electronic form in a repository, so they could use them to cut and paste, and they could view them at their desktop rather than have to go to the file center and other locations to identify them.

COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay. I'll leave from this for the time being, but I don't have a real comfort level with it. I think at this point let me go to the GLTS change a little bit. I know we had problems with it. I haven't had the demonstration. But where are we now? I mean, is it being -- is it usable? Are we working using it?

MR. REITER: Yes. Moe can give us the most up-to-the-minute update on it.

MR. LEVIN: We have been using it for some time --

COMMISSIONER DICUS: -- my heart.

MR. REITER: We know that.

MR. LEVIN: For some time we have been entering data into the system in preparation to I guess issuing registrations. We just went through the acceptance testing on the latest release, which is our production -- full production release, which will allow registrations.

The testing was very good. Unless there are some unforeseen problems, we expect to have the final product delivered and accepted by the end of next week. So far, everything is looking promising. It looks like we're on schedule. If there's --

COMMISSIONER DICUS: No one is shaking their head no.

MR. LEVIN: No. I was looking to see if --

COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay. Let me go to -- back to the PDR now. When we relocated our PDR out here to White Flint, I know there were some concerns raised at the time it wasn't as convenient to use. Are those concerns still being voiced, or have they pretty well gone away?

I know we had the -- we've had the work with the LPDRs. But I'm talking about when we moved from downtown here.

MS. GOLDBERG: We haven't seen any significant changes, I don't believe, in the usage. We're certainly getting more phone calls, more e-mails, than we did. But that was really more a matter of the changeover from the old environment to ADAMS where more people are accessing these documents from their own computers, and then just calling in --

COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay.

MS. GOLDBERG: -- rather than visiting the LPDR to pick up paper copies or look at the microfiche. So it's a different environment. It's a little bit hard to compare.

But we did switch over from having all of the paper correction on site to having retrieval -- off-site storage and retrieval of the documents. And that service is being used, but, of course, there are fewer and fewer -- there is more of a focus at any time in the last 18 months worth of documents, which more and more is, of course, the documents that are in ADAMS. So we would expect the usage of the paper correction to go down.

So it's a little bit hard to completely assess it, but we -- I don't believe we have had any level of complaints that I'm aware of.

COMMISSIONER DICUS: Okay. That's good. One final question if I could. I know you recently surveyed managers about what their needs might be in IT in FY2003. Given changes that can occur fairly rapidly in IT technology, as I understand it, what ways -- are you being proactive?

When you learn of a new potential application that might be of use to manager -- to an office to -- something that we need in the agency, are you proactively looking at these things and going out to our managers and saying, "Look at this. This might be useful to you"? So tell me a little bit about that.

MR. REITER: Yes. And this relates to Commissioner Merrifield's question on I think wireless technology. And, yes, we view ourselves -- there are two parts to the answer to the question. A new technology such as wireless technology shows up -- we certainly view our role as understanding the technology and if we think there's potential working with the agency, the ITBC, and the offices to be proactive in trying to bring the offices up to awareness of the technology and work to explore with them what the opportunities might be.

In the particular case on wireless technology, we've just found ourselves a little bit on the short side of resources to do that. That's where a specific technology might come into play, but then there's the more general question of how do we -- or how does the Commission have a comfort level that the investments in information technology are being best made by any office or organization, whatever?

And this is where you get into the more formal systems-type planning activities where you try -- and this is -- some of the offices I mentioned have done this and others are looking to start it -- based on your business goals, as to how effectively are my current core systems or technologies helping me achieve my goals? And then, what do I need to do? And move forward from there.

So those are the two tracks. Take a look at it broader -- more broadly -- and then look at specific opportunities that various technologies might bring to you.

COMMISSIONER DICUS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Commissioner Diaz?

COMMISSIONER DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll use the advantage of batting cleanup in here. A lot of my questions have been answered.

I do share my fellow Commissioners' appreciation of the efforts of the CIO to try to improve the way we handle information, as well as the concerns that have been expressed that I guess everybody is very aware of.

I think there is an important need to both solidify our gains, create stability in the way that we use information technology, without falling behind in many of them. I think the issue of stability right now is probably more important than additional gains at the present time. And, of course, that's underscored by ADAMS.

Having said that, let me take a quick look, being an engineer, and not being used to four significant figures --

(Laughter.)

-- to deal with your output measures. You only have three output measures. It's kind of hard for me to say what is what, and my crystal ball doesn't tell me all of this. I might suggest that for the future we might break some of this down in some specific and more distinguishable -- and I wouldn't mind if you used just two significant figures, because I don't know how you can measure 99.55.

You might have a digital clock that tells you the computers were up 99.55 percent of the time. I can assure you that my computer has not been up 99.55 percent of the time, because every time I get in there every once in a while somebody tells me the computer system is out of service, it's going to be down until the weekend, etcetera, etcetera.

But having said that -- yes, sir?

COMMISSIONER McGAFFIGAN: You just got a lemon, that's all.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER DIAZ: I understand. I agree with Commissioner McGaffigan.

MS. GOLDBERG: You need to refresh.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER DIAZ: Absolutely. Absolutely.

(Laughter.)

Keeping on that point, and realizing that, you know, we cannot measure the capability of a system, okay, with that -- I'm going to ask you, you know, four questions. And, of course, the piece de resistance is ADAMS, of course. You don't let me, you know, forget ADAMS, right, Mr. Reiter?

Let me ask the first question. When do you think that the 90 percent of the capability that ADAMS was supposed to provide will be fully functional? 90 percent? Not 99. When would it be here so that, you know, the capabilities? I'm not saying the people are using it. What are the capabilities?

MR. REITER: Well, the question -- the -- if you look at -- it depends what you mean by "capabilities." If we go back to the --

COMMISSIONER DIAZ: Capability for the system to perform its functions as intended, a phrase that the NRC uses quite frequently.

MR. REITER: Okay. Then, that brings us back to the CPIC analysis and some of the functionality that was associated with ADAMS as part of the CPIC analysis. And some of that functionality we have not implemented. So, for example, workflow analysis and other things.

If we just push that aside for a minute, and if we look at what is being implemented -- the document management and search capabilities, and this is largely what the bulk of the ADAMS action plan is focusing on to address those capabilities and get them up to a satisfactory level of performance.

And that relates to both what we have to do from the business process point of view and introducing some of the newer product releases that we have. Then we're looking at a 12- to 18-month kind of timeframe. I hope on the shorter side of that.

On the other part of the question, which is, you know, the capabilities that were put on the side as we went through this implementation, that gets to the directional study that we're about.

I can't give you a timeline on that, but what we want to do with the directional study is have independent expertise come in and take a look at what the agency -- we baseline the agency needs for document processing and give it some guidance on how to move --

COMMISSIONER DIAZ: But I am -- I believe I need -- maybe the rest of the Commission is far more up to date than I am -- but I need to know where is this map? You have to have a map, and I need to know what has been, you know, put aside. You know, I mean, I know your report contains, you know, words to this effect, but I really cannot, you know, go through pages and pages.

I think a summary of where we are -- okay? Are we, you know, obtaining 90 percent on the document handling capability? Are we getting, you know, the -- and when do we get to 99 percent? Which was the next question. If we -- you know, if we are really intended to be at this level of performance that appear to be your targets, which I think, you know, nobody can get you to the last two significant figures, but maybe we want to ensure that 90 percent of the capabilities are there.

We want to make sure that we know when we're going to get to 99 percent of all the capabilities that were intended to be in ADAMS. And I think it's an important thing for us to know which ones are coming in what sequence and what to expect, because there are questions about this system.

We are relying on this system for the major change in the way that we conduct our business. And I think we need to know when is that going to happen and how is it going to happen.

MR. REITER: I would think an appropriate timeframe for us to give you that kind of feedback would be in the second quarter of this calendar year when we will have completed the independent assessment, and then we can -- I think we can be in a better position to put a fuller picture together for you.

In effect, it would be an update of the timeline. The Chairman is correct when he says that the action plan is a living document, but it's worthwhile to take snapshots at every point in time. And that would be an appropriate --

COMMISSIONER DIAZ: It's the second quote. I'm going to hold you to it, because I really want to see this thing finalized. You know, we keep going through it, and there is a time at which we need to finalize the planning, the strategy, and know where we are.

This is a related question. It has been addressed already, but I'd like to put some engineering numbers in there. Okay? And it's a question that affects the office of the EDO as well as the CIO and all of us. When is 90 percent of the NRC staff going to be efficiently and effectively using the capabilities of ADAMS?

I mean, that is a very key question. And if we're not getting it, what do we need to get in there? Do we need to go back and retrain? Do we need to go back and give, you know, rousing speeches in every office? What is it that we need to do to get 90 percent? Not 99.5; 90 percent of our people to be able to use ADAMS effectively.

And I'll tell you what -- why I ask this question. It's because ADAMS has become a distraction in this place. Rather than being something that we actively embrace and use, it has become a distraction. People blame things on ADAMS, and I don't think we should be making or continuing to have ADAMS as a distraction. ADAMS should be a cornerstone of the way we handle information, and that means people have to buy-in on it.

If ADAMS is going to work, which is the first question, then how are we going to ensure that 90 percent of our people are capable of using this system?

MR. REITER: I'll give you some of my views on that, and ask Lynn to share her views on it. I think -- again, I think that the -- I think the answers to your questions in terms of the things that need to get done are contained within the ADAMS action plan.

I think the action plan -- in addition to the action plan, what's even more important is the ADAMS steering group that's associated with the action plan, because that's really putting senior level agency management together to focus on just the issues, the two issues that you've raised. And there are two parts to it.

We have to move the environment so that -- and Lynn touched on this. We have to move the environment so we can get documents into the system effectively, and that we can get documents into the system where we have confidence that they are correctly represented to the system for document integrity and retrieval-type purposes.

And I think we're closing in on that, and we're going to start making some of the transitions of how documents are put into the system over the next several months.

Then, we need to start focusing on the search and retrieval capabilities, and that is going to be an education process. And that's something that we can work, but it's also something that we're going to need to very much partner with the offices, because it's going to say, "Let's start using this. We may have to go to some additional training efforts to refresh people on what they may have, you know, gone through training last year or two years ago."

COMMISSIONER DIAZ: There are always many answers. Okay? I have one question, you know, and I expect that you will work with the EDO and supply to the Commission a simple question. When is 90 percent of the staff in the NRC going to use the capabilities of ADAMS efficiently and effectively? And that, sir, is a direct question that I intend to get an answer for.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I am finished with my questions.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Thank you.

We have a few more minutes. Let me -- we'll just have a quick round of follow-up questions.

COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: In response to one of the questions that the Chairman asked about the KPMG study and 33 percent refresh rate, and all that, the contract that Mr. Reiter mentioned, the infrastructure services and support contract, does that have a refresh number in it?

You said you are going to seat management. It's a contract you're about to let. It'll be in place, I think you said, April or something. But does that -- if you're going to a seat management approach, does that include the computer at the seat?

MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes. One of the concepts that's behind that is today we sort of do a best effort and available funding. With the seat concept, what you do is basically buy a seat, which will include a workstation, a certain level of service, and a certain refresh rate.

COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: So what refresh rate is in the contract?

MR. SCHAEFFER: Well, right now, we're in the process of starting the acquisition. What we will do is we will put in there options for a three-year and a four-year refresh rate to look at what the costs are. And based on the cost and the budget and all of that, we would look to proceed, you know, based on what the agency requirements would be.

COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: So we could be at 33 percent fairly quickly?

MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: A question about ADAMS search capabilities and all of that. There clearly are documents that have been entered into ADAMS that just say "letter" or something like that, and they're almost impossible to find. At least that's what people tell us, at least initially.

My question is, is there a quality control mechanism where if somebody has just put "letter" or something and not much else in any of these fields, and it's in there, somebody goes in and says, "Oops. This has to be redone," and where is the quality control to find those documents that perhaps were not

perfectly entered?

MS. SCATTOLINI: Well, for the documents that -- incoming documents to the agency that are being entered by the document process --

COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: But those are probably in good shape.

MS. SCATTOLINI: Those are in good shape, because they do --

COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: The ones we generate.

MS. SCATTOLINI: Right. The ones that we generate, there is really a multi-prong approach, and there is -- and let me see if I can describe it to you. With the new release that's coming down the road, it has a couple of features that are really going to help us in this regard.

COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: I'm just asking about historically. If we have a bunch of sort of not-so-hot document profiles in there at the current time -- I forget what the number was, it's 2,500 a day or some -- somebody was saying, for putting documents into the thing -- let's say, you know, we're -- we put 10,000 documents in that no one is ever going to find unless somebody goes back and redoes the profile.

Is there any mechanism for finding those 10,000 documents which might be -- I'm just pulling that out of the air, but is there a mechanism to go back and get those properly entered? Or is that almost impossible?

MS. SCATTOLINI: No, it's not impossible. The new software that we have provides us -- what's being delivered provides us with some tools to be able to do that.

COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: To go back and look at the --

MS. SCATTOLINI: To go back and look at it.

COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: So that's part of the update -- that's part of the ADAMS Get Well Program?

MS. SCATTOLINI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: Okay.

MS. SCATTOLINI: You could put it that way.

MR. REITER: There is an effort underway now, and it's been underway, to go back and look at the documents that are in the system and clean up data associated with that. The new software release that we're going to be getting is going to make available to the offices the full text search capability. So without any information about parameters, you'll have that additional search capability for documents.

COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN: Okay. And then, finally -- this is partly my answer to Commissioner Diaz. I think you're not going to get 90 percent of the staff to effectively and efficiently use it until it's -- it's web-based, until you get this out, you know, whatever the -- where it's as easy to use as any other program on your desk or -- when it's that easy, then people will use it. When it's difficult --

COMMISSIONER DIAZ: I'll take in between numbers.

(Laughter.)

MR. REITER: Can we negotiate it?

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Commissioner Merrifield?

COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have just two brief issues.

One, I appreciate the inquiries of Commissioner Diaz. I think he's been asking a variety of questions on ADAMS, but I think he sort of succinctly went at the heart of where some of -- what we're coming from.

I do have a follow up, though, along the lines where Commissioner Dicus was going, because it was unclear to me -- and this goes to -- to Lynn Scattolini. You mentioned that there's a cost associated with individual documents being entered by the Document Processing Center.

Now, originally, we thought that the vast bulk of that task was going to be undertaken by the staff. They would be able to do that, and we would not have to rely on the Document Processing Center to undertake that. Subsequently, the recommendation was made by the CIO's office that we take that -- that requirement from the staff and we give it back to the Document Processing Center.

Presumably, that was not planned for from a budgeting context, and so there was an additional cost associated with it. What is that cost overall? You said --

MR. REITER: I didn't hear --

COMMISSIONER DIAZ: The additional budget allocation was \$300,000.

MR. REITER: That's the number I recall from last year.

COMMISSIONER DIAZ: But I don't know that that's what it is.

MS. SCATTOLINI: No, it's -- it's actually more than that, because we had built money in our budget to begin to do QA of staff-generated profiles in order to address the data integrity issue. And that was already in our budget, so the \$300,000 was an incremental number, not the complete cost.

COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: It didn't sound right, given the large number of documents we processed, and the numbers you talked about -- \$16 versus \$25. If you -- if you could provide a more detailed analysis of what that additional cost -- unplanned cost was relative to the Document Processing Center, I certainly think that would be helpful for my planning purposes.

The final point is regarding videostreaming. We have been undertaking that as a pilot over the past year. I guess I've got a question and a comment. One is, at what -- the question is, at what point are you going to be coming in with a recommendation on -- for us as to whether or not we should continue that program? What are you going to be using as your standards for judging how we have been doing so far?

And the other one is, have you thought at all about, as an alternative or in addition, the use of -- of radiostreaming? Just the voice portions of various meetings of the Commission or the staff, and adding that capability. I know that's a lesser costly application, and it might be useful for some areas where we are not currently videostreaming.

MR. REITER: The pilot program -- SECY Net -- is really -- has more of an overseeing view of it. We're not considering -- we haven't considered anyway -- just radiostreaming, but we have -- we are looking into the possibility of providing just an archive retrieval service, so that the live broadcast won't be telecast but you'd be able to come in and pull up meetings that have been saved on video.

MS. VIETTI-COOK: The pilot ends in the end of March, and then we're going to put together all of the data. And we'll use the data as to how many people actually looked at the system. We have it broken down as to whether they are people outside the NRC or inside the NRC, you know, what the cost of continuing the program is as it is currently, both live and archived. We're looking at costs of doing it -- just archiving, which is substantially less.

And, you know, we also asked a question about people's interests, whether they, you know, had no interest, you know, slightly interested, you know, how interested people are in both live and archived meetings that we'll be using. And we've also received some e-mail feedback where they've actually typed in comments. So we'll be using all of that information to put together a recommendation.

COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: Will that recommendation be made in such a way that the Commission can make its decision and we not have -- if we choose to continue it not as a pilot but as a full-blown program, so that there's not any break in the actual utilization of the services?

MS. VIETTI-COOK: There's going to be a break.

COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: The pilot ends and --

MS. VIETTI-COOK: Yes. There will be a break.

COMMISSIONER MERRIFIELD: There will be a break. Okay.

I would say one last comment on videostreaming. There have been -- and this is -- and this really falls on your data collection. There have been at least two occasions that I have encountered where we have participated in meetings, and by the time I got up to my office, off the elevator, I had already received e-mails from people commenting on things that had been said in the meeting.

So there are people out there who look at these things very carefully. The volume of users might not necessarily be indicative of the value that some of those particular stakeholders have on having the opportunity to participate at distances in excess of 1,000 miles, which both of these individuals were in -- in that distance.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Thank you.

I just have a few sort of nits I'd like to follow up on. On your annual report, page 20 of it, you have an important section that deals with compliance with federal laws. And I'm little puzzled with one of the responses that you assert, and I hope correctly, that for fiscal year 2000 you were "fully compliant with Klinger-Cohen." And then go on to say for fiscal year 2001 you hope to improve compliance.

(Laughter.)

And the question is, are we falling short? Do we anticipate falling short in 2001? And what do we need to do that we aren't doing?

MR. CLOUD: May I take that question?

MR. REITER: Yes. Jesse, go ahead.

MR. CLOUD: The sense we mentioned in there -- there have been a number of studies of how agencies are complying with Klinger-Cohen that have been in the trade press. Klinger-Cohen has a number of requirements. We meet each of the requirements, but we could do so better. More could be done.

Specifically, going back to some of Commissioner McGaffigan's comments on the CPIC process, one thing that many of the studies have found is that while most agencies have a CPIC process, and most agencies are doing a very good job of selecting which investments to fund, many agencies haven't done as much as the law had hoped for in the beginning in terms of being able to manage the projects and ensure that they come in on time and on budget, so that we have hopes to improve in that area.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: All right. Thank you.

Another question -- let me say that, by way of preamble, that one of the challenges I think all of us find in this area is that sometimes the uses of language is not necessarily natural -- usage of language. And it's always -- refresh rate being an example.

One of the areas that was mentioned this morning, something we're trying to do which I think is similarly a little bit puzzling, is that you talk about this -- who this contract -- the ISSC contract, which we're going to move to "seat management" -- that sounds like something my tailor would worry about.

(Laughter.)

MR. CLOUD: You shouldn't touch that one.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: What does that mean? What are we doing?

MR. REITER: Well, the concept behind the seat management is to try to get a -- if you look at your desktop, the PC that's sitting on your desktop or credenza, that PC is an asset. It's connected to some local area network. It's connected to wide area networks. It's connected to server devices. All of those connections and all of those devices require some level of support and maintenance and care and feeding.

Under the current contracting approach that we use, each piece is dealt with on a separate kind of basis. On the seat management type of approach, we say, "Well, this -- I want the service. I'm not interested in hearing about the PC or hearing about my local area network connections. The service I want is that if I need a new PC I want it available in two days. If something is wrong with my PC and if I need it repaired, I want that repair done in four hours. And I don't care if the repair is associated with the PC or if it's associated with a piece of network equipment that's someplace behind the PC." So that's the idea -- that's the concept behind seat management.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Okay. Thanks.

MR. REITER: And you pay for the service on fixed price.

Jim, would you add anything to that?

MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes. Just a couple of things. It's really no different I guess than the services we have today in terms of supporting the desktop and the infrastructure. But what it is, it's a different approach of packaging how you pay for the services. And the advantage to that, it lets us incorporate a lot of the recommendations.

We had a lot of recommendations in the Anderson study, in terms of managed service delivery, and also in KPMG. And what this approach allows us to do, it allows us to incorporate a lot of those in terms of performance-based contracting and managed service delivery, and hopefully improve in terms of refresh rate and things like that.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Thank you.

Commissioner Dicus?

COMMISSIONER DICUS: I want to follow up on a comment that you made on software that's on its way here to help with search of documents. Did I hear that right? We don't have it yet?

Getting it, or recognizing the need for it, was this something that was done like an afterthought, because we realized there were some maybe difficulties in searching for documents? Or was it planned all along? And if it was planned all along, why are we this late in having it when we already have documents in the system?

MR. REITER: The full text search capability was part of the product, and when we started ADAMS up that -- that capability of the product was working. Several months after we turned it on as the official recordkeeping system, it stopped functioning properly because we hit a -- we detected a problem that was a recurring problem, and that's when we shut it off.

The correction to that problem is what's coming now in the next release, which is in the April -- February/April time that we'll be deploying it.

COMMISSIONER DICUS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Commissioner Diaz?

COMMISSIONER DIAZ: Just one quick question. A regulatory issue summary said that people will be able to submit Part 50 documents, you know, using the web or CD. How far behind is -- are we with NMSS or other submittals?

MR. REITER: Moe, do you have a --

MR. LEVIN: We are working with NMSS. Our plan is to -- like I said, we're working with OGC to try and get a direct final rule issued sometime maybe this summer, late summer. And that would allow all materials licensees -- virtually all licensees except -- the only thing it wouldn't cover right now is anything that's dealing with adjudicatory matters and proceeding type matters.

And we're doing a pilot -- we're going to do a pilot to work out some procedures that have to be resolved, and issues that have to be resolved, before we can let them be covered by EIE also.

So everything -- hopefully, by the end of this fiscal year, we will be in a position where -- and it's voluntary -- that virtually all licensees could submit.

COMMISSIONER DIAZ: All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Let me suggest on the adjudicatory matters that there is now a fair amount of experience with regard to electronic submissions in federal courts. And there's a lot -- they've been doing this, so that this is not going to be virgin territory for us.

MR. LEVIN: Yes. And that's one of the things that has changed, why we want a pilot, because a lot of others have learned a lot of things, and we want to build on what they've learned.

MR. BURNS: One thing I might add on that. In effect, in -- on an informal basis, most of our adjudications at the Licensing Board level or the presiding officer level are exchanging documents, briefs and filings, electronically. But, in effect, it's an informal thing. The record -- the record copies, in order to satisfy current service requirements and things, are -- are still filed in paper.

But basically, what the judges have done is said, "Exchange these things electronically to keep things moving," and this would just, in effect, seal it in terms of having the official document

exchange electronic.

CHAIRMAN MESERVE: Okay. Good. Thank you very much. It's been a very informative briefing.

Let me just say that you have had many hard questions that have been presented to you with a particular focus on ADAMS, and that obviously reflects an area in which the Commission has -- no, you, have concerns about making sure that we achieve our objectives for that system.

But I wouldn't want to have you leave the meeting without an acknowledgement that all of us recognize that the activities of the Office of CIO are central to the mission of this agency. You have a very hard job. And I think the concern about ADAMS reflects the fact that when something falls short people -- it really affects how their lives proceed, and we all get worried about it.

And you hear about concerns, but you don't often hear about your successes. And that's unfortunate. But I think we all recognize that you have many systems that are central to the functioning of this agency, that are working well. In fact, they're performing superbly.

We very much appreciate your overall efforts, and I wouldn't want to have you leave the meeting with a sense that in some sense that you're -- you're not fulfilling your obligations. We are very pleased with your efforts and hope that you'll continue.

With that, we stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 11:14 a.m., the proceedings in the foregoing matter were adjourned.)