

ADAMS USER GROUP MEETING
October 17, 2001

Published Agenda for the Adams Users Group Meeting

- 1) Introductions (1:05-1:15 p.m.)
Opening remarks - Tom Smith, Moderator
- 2) General announcements (1:15-1:30 p.m.)
How the meeting will be conducted for
 - persons present
 - persons on the telephone bridge
- 3) Action items from the 7/18/01 meeting update (1:30-1:45 p.m.)
 - Announcement on plug-in
 - Report on all 8 items
 - Q&A
- 4) Issues related to ADAMS Release 3.3
 - Empty packages update
 - Text searching update
 - PDR testing of PARS outside the firewall
 - Testing future releases/enhancements
- 5) Status on BRS and the Legacy Library (1:45-2:00 p.m.)
 - Discussion of the hardware platform
 - Where we stand with maintenance issues
 - Status of the Legacy Library
 - Q&A

BREAK (2:00-2:10 p.m.)

- 6) Public Interface Prototype (PIP) status update (2:10-2:25 p.m.)
 - Training by NRC staff at Convera
 - Screen design
 - Q&A
- 7) Discussion of ADAMS problems (2:25-2:40 p.m.)
 - ADAMS title field issues
 - LER descriptions
 - Q&A
- 8) New business (2:40-3:00 p.m.)
 - Plans for next meeting
 - Set a date
- 9) Adjournment (3:00 p.m.)

Meeting Minutes

The ADAMS Users Group met on October 17, 2001, at the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Headquarters in Rockville, Maryland. The meeting started at 1:00 p.m. Thomas E. Smith, Chief, PDR/Library Section, moderated. Lynn Scattolini, Director of the Office of the Chief Information Officer/Information Records & Document Management Division was also in attendance.

Introductions were made by those seated around the table followed by introductions from AUG members attending on the NRC Telephone Bridge. People calling on the 800 number complained that they could not get through using the telephone number that they were given. It was discovered that the published telephone number had two digits transposed. It was announced that minutes from the previous meeting will be posted on the NRC Website along with the minutes from this meeting. **(Action Item)**

Action items from the previous meeting were discussed.

Since the NRC Web site has been down (October 11, 2001), the public has encountered numerous problems with accessing ADAMS. The PDR staff can and will assist persons with the installation of the CITRIX client plug-in for accessing ADAMS and e-mail the files and instructions for installing the CITRIX client.

The pricing for reproduction of documents was discussed. The PDR contractor charges by page for any reproductions of documents from paper, microfiche, and ADAMS. The best way to charge for ADAMS documents copied to CD-ROM format is still being investigated. In preliminary discussions on a pricing structure for documents from ADAMS to CD-ROM, the contractor suggested a per-page charge instead of \$10 per CD-ROM. This suggestion was rejected. Any suggestions from the audience for an alternate pricing structure would be welcome.

Beth Hayden from the Office of Public Affairs was introduced. Ms. Hayden has been working with the public on issues related to the NRC website. Since the web site was shut down and brought up again, only press releases, public meetings and employment information have been available to the public. Ms. Hayden reported that meetings have been held agency-wide to determine what NRC information should be released. There has been an increase in the number of calls and e-mails from the public trying to obtain information previously available on the website.

Mindy Landau, Office of the Executive Director of Operations, was introduced next. Ms. Landau is chairing a group that provides NRC staff with guidance on the categories or types of information that can be released. Criteria received from the Department of Defense (DOD) is used to help determine the kind of information that would be useful to a terrorist and therefore should not be released. The documents placed in the public ADAMS should follow the same criteria. NRC staff is doing a complete review of what was previously on the web and incrementally rebuilding the site.

Some attendees felt that requests should be evaluated on the basis of a need to know rather than the type of information requested. One attendee's company had been asked to do an analysis of steam generator replacement issues and were denied access to updated safety analysis reports (UFSARs), that are now being withheld. Concerns were voiced over the

economic impact of denying access to documents and Ms. Scattolini indicated that she would pass these concerns along to NRC management. **(Action Item)**

The following questions were asked by those present: Does this aforementioned document exist in a paper format? Is this a category of information that the agency wants to make available? The options are to either restrict access to safety analysis reports (FSARs and UFSARs) or pull them from the PDR. It was noted that the PDR is restricting from public access some microfiche and is currently screening all requests.

One member of the audience asked: Will a need to know be considered? Ms. Scattolini said she would discuss this issue with the NRC executive management team. It was suggested that requesters use the Freedom of Information Act process to try to obtain copies of documents currently being withheld, by demonstrating a need to know. Some participants on the telephone bridge said they are also screening information. It was mentioned that the NRC has a long history of making information available to the public; but because of recent events, it must reconsider the criteria for what should be publicly available. NRC staff are working to determine guidelines. Concerns related to the classification of these documents criteria will be passed on to the NRC executive management team especially the economic impact for some users.

Another participant asked: Have documents that are in PARS/ADAMS come under this scrutiny? No, they have not.

One question that came up from the audience was: Could PARS be shut down? Ms. Scattolini indicated that, yes, it could. Documents in PARS are profiled as to whether or not they should be released, taking 8-10 minutes to change a document's availability from public to non-public. An evaluation is being made of the level of effort involved, so that management will understand how much work is involved in pulling and evaluating documents.

Another member asked: Are we checking to see if the NRC documents exist outside the agency? Information dissemination is reviewed so that we know where the documents are located and where they are available.

What are other agencies doing regarding access to NRC documents? The whole subject is being investigated with other federal agencies to see how they are handling access to NRC documents. The NRC must be compatible with the procedures of other Federal agencies. General guidelines about access will be developed and given to outside agencies, the utilities, and the former LPDRs.

The question was posed: Would the PDR staff have to review every page on every fiche requested? The answer was no; but the public will no longer have open access to microfiche collections. PDR staff will continue to review information requests. As a consequence, the public can no longer order directly from the NRC's document reproduction contractor, Qualex, using either BRS or ADAMS.

As a follow-up, a member asked: Would it help to expedite the order process if requesters would be more specific about what parts of a document they wanted? The response was that every order from the public is being reviewed. A person in the audience suggested that the PDR staff review the person requesting the document and their reason for requesting the document rather than review all documents. The response was that the PDR staff will continue

to review all the document requests. In the past, it has been the policy that the caller did not have to give his or her identity.

One person asked: What is the procedure for requesting paper files? The PDR staff reviews the request and provides the material if it can be released. If a requestor is not sure exactly what they want, they should just ask because there are no published criteria guidelines. The NRC does restrict access to certain specified documents.

A member on the telephone bridge asked: How do you determine the date of a document's release? It was answered that in the *Comments* field of the profile the NRC makes detailed notes about any changes to the profile of the document so that the correct date can be determined.

An issue about CITRIX printer support came up: How do ADAMS users change printers on the list? The NRC will be updating the printer list quarterly. If you continue to have problems, or your printer is not on the list, contact Tom Smith.

It was mentioned that members of the Adams Users Group (AUG) should assist in formulating the agenda for future meetings. Tom Smith said he had e-mailed the participants asking for topics to be placed on the agenda for this meeting. A list of members' names and addresses has not been distributed due to a concern for privacy. None of the attendees objected to having that information made available; so the list will be distributed. (**Action Item**).

Additional issues related to Adams release 3.3 were discussed. One problem that surfaced was that some empty packages have appeared on PARS. Technical staff were able to resolve part of the problem with new packages going back to August 14. Full text searching is still a problem. Some ADAMS users report not being able gain access to documents. Sometimes the user cannot find a word within a document even though they find the entire document by using the same word in their search criteria.

It was mentioned that all new releases of ADAMS are being tested both inside and outside the firewall. An Internet service provider has been installed on the PC in Tom Smith's PDR office to more closely emulate what the public is experiencing with PARS. PDR staff can use this PC to test the time it takes to pull up documents. A seven-step script is run four times a day to check the system response time.

After a ten minute break, a BRS issue was addressed.

The maintenance package from Hewlett-Packard (HP) supporting the hardware and software is outdated. The PDR has been able to get an additional maintenance package on most parts, but not the disk drives. BRS hardware and software will continue until December 31.

Teresa Linton was introduced . Ms. Linton has been involved in testing the public legacy library and identifying issues of data migration. The Legacy Library will contain citations to records, rather than the full text/image of the document, as in PARS. The PDR will do everything possible to keep the BRS up and running until the Legacy Library is operational. Tom has obtained some additional maintenance support for BRS. BRS is an antiquated hardware platform. It was suggested by some AUG members who regularly use BRS, that they be included in the testing of the Legacy Library before it goes "live."

Ms. Linton is an expert in searching NUDOCS. In explaining the differences in the two systems, she said the primary difference is not in the data itself but in the searching. NUDOCS has a more hierarchical structure than BRS.

Mr. Smith mentioned that he is not ready to demonstrate the Public Interface Prototype (PIP). He is developing a search demonstration for CIO and NRC upper management. The current focus is on screen designs so that PIP will match the design of the NRC webpage. A simple screen is fairly straightforward. The advanced screen is more complex. It was stated that PIP is not a final product. PIP is just the first stage of a web-based interface for PARS.

Ms. Linton said with regard to PIP that she was impressed with the power of the software and searching. Users should be able to do almost everything that they can do in ADAMS. There are some limitations. You cannot print out a bibliography but you will be able to do screen prints. Ms. Linton said she is very impressed with the feature known as relevancy ranking. She thinks it will be very useful. It was noted that there are three different types of searches that can be done in PIP: concept, boolean, and pattern. The distinctions were outlined. PIP will also be able to search the Legacy Library (when available) and PARS at the same time. Another feature of the software is that it will show exact occurrence of a word within the text of a document. It was further emphasized that PIP is off-the-shelf software with little or no special code.

One AUG member had a question about titles in ADAMS. In order to view the maximum available length of a document title in a hit list, the title field can be expanded by dragging the bar at the end of the title field. The comment was made that staff entering data in the document profile should follow a consistent format. The NRC is working to develop templates to be used by indexers to insure consistency in the title formats. The title field is limited to 256 characters. Because of a lack of consistency, the NRC is in the midst of a cleanup process of the ADAMS database

There may be other document categories that should have more descriptive and consistent titles. It was suggested that plant names and docket numbers should be in the title field. Let Tom know of any document types that need more descriptive titles.

Date of Next Meeting

It was agreed to meet on the second Wednesday in March, March 13, 2002, 1:00-3:00 p.m. Tom Smith was asked to keep everyone informed about progress being made on special projects and security issues. **(Action Item)**

ACTION ITEMS

- 1) Post on the NRC Website the minutes from all AUG meetings.
- 2) Pass along concerns of the economic impact to some users in denying access to NRC documents.
- 3) Distribute a list of AUG members via e-mail.
- 4) Keep everyone informed about progress being made on special projects and security issues