

POLICY ISSUE
(Notation Vote)

January 2, 2002

SECY-02-0002

FOR: The Commissioners

FROM: William D. Travers
Executive Director for Operations

SUBJECT: REVISION OF GASEOUS DIFFUSION PLANT
RECERTIFICATION STANDARD REVIEW PLAN CHAPTER ON
FOREIGN OWNERSHIP AND FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this paper is to request guidance on revising Chapter 16 on foreign ownership and financial requirements in the draft "Standard Review Plan for the Recertification of the Gaseous Diffusion Plants," NUREG-1671 (SRP).

BACKGROUND

In a staff requirements memorandum (SRM) dated October 29, 1996, the Commission instructed the staff to formulate a process to address certain mandates of the U.S. Enrichment Corporation (USEC) Privatization Act regarding certification of USEC or its private corporation successor. In response to this SRM, the staff provided SECY-97-071, which included a draft SRP chapter on foreign ownership and financial requirements. Further Commission guidance on content of the SRP chapter on foreign ownership and financial requirements was provided in SRMs dated June 10, 1997, and November 24, 1997.

CONTACT: Timothy C. Johnson, NMSS/FCSS
(301) 415-7299

The February 1999 draft NUREG-1671 guidance applicable to “reliable and economical” reviews (see Attachment 1) provides for reviews that would be undertaken for (1) routine recertifications; (2) for changes to the previous review basis; (3) for changes in ownership or control; and (4) for changes applicable to certificate conditions on foreign ownership. Detailed financial and business characteristics analyses (similar to those performed for USEC in 2000) would be performed if USEC, or other entities taking ownership or control, do not have investment-grade corporate bond ratings. These analyses would each require about \$150K in technical assistance resources and 0.5 full-time equivalent (FTE).

On September 11, 2000, Chairman Meserve provided Representative Thomas Bliley with the Commission’s findings on the staff’s financial review of USEC. In the letter, Chairman Meserve stated that the “reliable and economical” concern reflected in Section 193(f)(2)(B) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is principally directed to the possibility of foreign entities gaining control and undermining United States domestic enrichment capabilities in the privatized USEC. He also added that it is not clear that assessments and findings on the “reliable and economical” issue are a recurring obligation that needs to be addressed at the time of routine recertification for the gaseous diffusion plants or in connection with other events that do not involve a change in ownership.

DISCUSSION

The staff is proposing to revise Chapter 16 of the draft “Standard Review Plan for the Recertification of the Gaseous Diffusion Plants,” NUREG-1671 consistent with the Chairman’s September 11, 2000, letter to Congressman Bliley. The staff did not consider the issue of “reliable and economical” as part of its review of the recent Paducah High Assay Upgrade Certification Amendment. There are three primary alternatives that could be used for these revisions (see summary table in Attachment 2). All of these options are based on the need to focus principally on the possibility of foreign entities gaining control and undermining U.S. domestic enrichment capabilities. The triggers for each of these actions to perform a reliable and economical review would be for changes in ownership or control consistent with 10 CFR 76.65¹. In addition, if a report is made pursuant to the certificate conditions related to foreign ownership and control (Conditions 11 and 12 of the Paducah and Portsmouth Certificates), a review would be conducted to determine if there was a change in control that requires a certification to be issued pursuant to 10 CFR 76.65², in which case a reliable and economical review would be performed. The alternatives for revising Chapter 16 of the SRP are:

1. Option 1 - Business and Financial Review. This option would change the triggers for review and focus the purpose of the review. The substance of the review in the February 1999 draft NUREG-1671 applicable to “reliable and economical” reviews would not change. The SRP would be modified to incorporate revised triggers. The purpose of the review would be to determine if the change in ownership or control would likely result in operating the gaseous diffusion plants in a manner that would undermine the

¹These triggers are consistent with the November 14, 2001, Commission decision in U.S. Enrichment Corporation (Paducah, Kentucky), CLI-01-23.

²The review would focus on the foreign ownership process in the NUREG-1671 SRP which is consistent with the guidance for reactors in “Final Standard Review Plan on Foreign Ownership, Control and Domination” issued on September 28, 1999 (64FR 52355).

U.S. domestic enrichment capability³. These analyses would each require about \$150K in technical assistance resources and 0.5 FTE.

2. Option 2 - Financial Aspects of Health and Safety Review. This option would change the triggers for review and would change the “reliable and economical” considerations to be similar to 10 CFR Part 70 financial qualification reviews oriented to ensuring health and safety. The “reliable and economical” review would be undertaken only for changes in ownership or control. The SRP would be modified to incorporate the trigger changes and adopt the guidance for financial qualification reviews in the Part 70 SRP (see Attachment 3). Financial qualification reviews are reviews of general, not detailed, financial statements and business plans, and would be oriented to ensuring that sufficient financial resources would be available to conduct health and safety programs so that the U.S. domestic enrichment capacity will not be undermined. Under this option, a financial qualification review could be conducted by NRC staff, without technical assistance support, for about 0.2 FTE.
3. Option 3 - Foreign Ownership and Control Review. This option would change the triggers for review and would redefine “reliable and economical” to apply only to foreign ownership. The financial and business characteristics review of option 1 would be eliminated, since “reliable and economical” would be subsumed by the foreign ownership reviews. Under this option, no detailed financial or business analyses or financial qualification reviews would be performed. The SRP would be modified accordingly.

Upon receiving Commission direction, the staff will revise Chapter 16 of the SRP and provide the revisions to the Commission for review. After Commission approval, the staff will issue a Federal Register Notice indicating that changes have been made to Chapter 16. Because the Commission will have provided direction on the revisions, there is no need to request public comment.

RESOURCES

Resources to apply the existing SRP under the status quo option or to revise and apply the SRP under Options 1 and 2 are not currently factored into the Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 budget but would be reprogrammed to accommodate the option selected by the Commission. Resources to implement Option 3 will be available as part of the routine fuel facility budget for FY 2003.

³While the focus is principally on foreign interests, domestic interests can also undermine the domestic industry. For example, the prohibition could reach a domestic entity seeking to purchase the right to operate the GDPs with the intent to close both plants, because the entity opposed the nuclear option or does not want to compete with the nuclear option, thereby undermining the domestic enrichment capability of the United States. The economic review would provide evidence that the entity intended to maintain a domestic enrichment capability by demonstrating that it has the financial capacity to operate the facility.

COORDINATION:

This paper has been coordinated with the Office of the General Counsel, which has no legal objection. The Office of the Chief Financial Officer has reviewed this paper for resource implications and has no objections.

/RA/

William D. Travers
Executive Director
for Operations

Attachments:

1. Standard Review Plan, Chapter 16.0 (Status Quo)
2. Summary Table Options
3. Draft Standard Review Plan (Option 2)

ATTACHMENT 1

16.0 DETERMINATION OF FOREIGN OWNERSHIP, CONTROL, OR DOMINATION, COMMON DEFENSE AND SECURITY, AND RELIABLE AND ECONOMICAL SOURCE OF DOMESTIC ENRICHMENT SERVICES

16.1 Responsibility for Review

16.1.1 Primary: As designated

16.1.2 Secondary: Facilities Security Specialist/Safeguards Technical Analyst

16.1.3 Supporting: Material Control and Accounting Inspector/Resident Inspector

16.2 Purpose of Review

The purpose of this review is to determine that an applicant for certification is not owned, controlled, or dominated by an alien, a foreign corporation, or a foreign government; that issuance of a certificate would not be inimical to the common defense and security of the United States; and that issuance of a certificate would not be inimical to the maintenance of a reliable and economical domestic source of enrichment services.¹

16.3 Areas of Review

General

An application to transfer certificates will be reviewed to examine the changes proposed in the application for the transfer from that which is currently approved or permitted under the existing certificates.

Foreign Ownership, Control, or Domination

Information submitted by the applicant, as specified in "Foreign Ownership, Control, or Influence Guidance Documents for the Privatization of the United States Enrichment Corporation," will be reviewed. This information includes, but is not limited to:

1. Portions of securities held by foreign entities or held by means that prevent the identification of the beneficial owner

¹ Note: the procedures in this SRP for a statutory determination of foreign ownership, control, or domination, are not to be used to determine foreign ownership, control, or influence (FOCI) for granting access to classified material. The NISPOM is the governing document for determining FOCI and the granting of access to classified material.

Determination of Foreign Ownership

2. Management positions held by non-U.S. citizens
3. Ability of foreign entities to control the appointment of management positions
4. Contracts and other agreements with foreign entities
5. Finance and revenue sources involving foreign entities

Common Defense and Security

The following items will be reviewed for compliance with NRC regulatory requirements to protect the common defense and security:

1. Physical Security Plan
2. Security Plan for the Protection of Classified Matter
3. Fundamental Nuclear Material Control Plan
4. Inspection, event, and resident inspector reports dealing with facility and transportation physical protection, material control and accounting, information security programs, and control of classified material
5. Information regarding the impact of the Russian HEU Agreement, and any related contracts, on the financial viability of the applicant
6. An assessment of the performance of the applicant as the executive agent of the U.S. for the Russian HEU Agreement in consultation with members of the HEU Oversight Committee

Reliable and Economical Source of Domestic Enrichment Services

Assessments of the financial viability of the applicant will be reviewed. The assessments will be based on the actual or estimated credit rating of the applicant, a standard used by the financial community to objectively measure an entity's financial condition, and its ability to meet its obligations, and other economic, financial and business characteristics. The current public credit rating of the applicant, published by a recognized credit rating agency (e.g., Standard & Poor's, Moody's Investor Service, Duff & Phelps, or Fitch), will be reviewed. If (i) the applicant does not have a current public credit rating, or (ii) in the case of a transfer of the certificates, a public credit rating would not apply to the applicant after the transfer, then an assessment of the financial viability of the applicant, based upon an estimate of the applicant's credit rating, will be reviewed. This estimated credit rating will be based on quantitative and qualitative analyses of the financial and business risks of the applicant.

16.4 Review Procedures

Determination of Foreign Ownership

The reviewer should determine whether the applicant is subject to any of the criteria set forth in 10 CFR Part 76.22, "Ineligibility of Certain Applicants."

16.4.1 Foreign Ownership, Control, or Domination

An applicant is considered to be foreign owned, controlled, or dominated whenever a foreign interest has the power, direct or indirect, whether or not exercised, and whether or not exercisable, through the ownership of the applicant's securities, by contractual arrangements, or other means, to direct or decide matters affecting the management or operations of the applicant.

A foreign interest is defined as any foreign government, agency of a foreign government, or representative of a foreign government; any form of business enterprise or legal entity organized, chartered or incorporated under the laws of any country other than the U.S. or its possessions and trust territories; any person who is not a citizen or national of the U.S; and any U.S. interest effectively controlled by one of the above foreign entities.

The reviewer should assess the following items to determine if the applicant is foreign owned, controlled, or dominated:

1. The applicant should provide answers to the following questions. If any of the answers are affirmative, the applicant should furnish detailed information that describes all conditions that exist. The information will be considered in the aggregate and the fact that some of the below listed conditions may apply does not necessarily render the applicant company ineligible for certification.
 - a. Does a foreign interest own or have beneficial ownership in 5% or more of your organization's voting securities?
 - b. Does your organization own 10% or more of any foreign interest?
 - c. Do any foreign interests have management positions such as directors, officers, or executive personnel in your organization?
 - d. Does any foreign interest control or influence, or is any foreign interest in a position to control or influence the election, appointment, or tenure of any of your directors, officers, or executive personnel?
 - e. Does your organization have any contracts, binding agreements, understandings, or arrangements with a foreign interest(s) that cumulatively represent 10% or more of your organization's gross income?
 - f. Is your organization indebted to foreign interests?
 - g. During your last fiscal year, did your organization derive 5 percent or more of its total revenues or net income from any single foreign interest or in the aggregate 30 percent or

Determination of Foreign Ownership

more of its revenues or net income from foreign interests?

- h. Is 5% or more of any class of your organization's securities held in "nominee shares", in "street names", or in some other method which does not disclose beneficial owner of equitable title?
 - i. Does your organization have interlocking directors/officers with foreign interests?
 - j. Are there any citizens of foreign countries employed by, or who may visit, your offices or facilities in a capacity which may permit them to have access to classified information or a significant quantity of special nuclear material?
 - k. Does your organization have foreign involvement not otherwise covered in your answers to the above questions?
2. The reviewer should obtain a foreign intelligence threat assessment. This assessment will be conducted through the Intelligence Community and others, and will be coordinated by the Department of Energy. The reviewer may obtain the assessment by contacting the DOE representative to the HEU Oversight Committee.
3. If the applicant submits any affirmative information listed in section 16.5.1, steps 1.a through 1.k above, or the foreign intelligence threat assessment contains information, that the applicant may be foreign owned, controlled, or dominated, the reviewer shall determine:
- a. the nature and extent of foreign ownership, control, or domination, to include whether a foreign interest occupies a controlling or dominant minority position;
 - b. the source of foreign ownership, control, or domination, to include identification of immediate, intermediate, and ultimate parent organizations; and
 - c. the type of actions, if any, that would be necessary to negate the effects of foreign ownership, control, or domination to an acceptable level.
4. If it is determined that an applicant company may be considered to be foreign owned, controlled, or dominated, or that additional action would be necessary to negate the foreign ownership, control, or domination, the applicant shall be promptly advised and requested to submit a negation action plan. In cases that involve foreign ownership, a plan may consist of one of the methods described in Chapter 2, Section 2-306, of the NISPOM. When factors not related to ownership are present, the plan shall provide positive measures that assure that the foreign interest can be effectively denied control or domination. Examples of such measures include: modification or termination of loan agreements, contracts and other understandings with foreign interests; diversification or reduction of foreign source income; demonstration of financial viability independent of foreign interests; elimination or resolution of problem debt; assignment of specific oversight duties and responsibilities to board members; adoption of special board resolutions; and other actions that negate foreign control or domination.

Determination of Foreign Ownership

5. The reviewer shall arrange to meet with, or otherwise communicate these findings to, the principal members of the HEU Oversight Committee and obtain their comments.
6. The reviewer shall ensure that NRC remains informed regarding foreign ownership, control, or domination by preparing certificate conditions of the following types:

If, at any time after the privatization date, the Corporation obtains information reasonably indicating changes described in the National Industrial Security Program Operating Manual, DOD 5520.22-M, January 1995 (NISPOM), Chapter 1, Section 3, 1-302(h), to the information previously submitted to NRC, described in the NISPOM, Chapter 2, Section 3, 2-302 b. (1) through (11), the Corporation shall notify NRC in writing within 15 days.

If the Corporation enters into negotiations for the proposed merger, acquisition, or takeover by a foreign person, the Corporation shall submit notification to NRC, in writing, within 15 days of the commencement of such negotiations. The submission shall include the type of transaction under negotiation (stock purchase, asset purchase, etc.), the identity of the potential foreign person investor, a plan to negate foreign ownership, control, or domination, and copies of any related loan, purchase and shareholder agreements, annual reports, bylaws, articles of incorporation, partnership agreements, and reports filed with other federal agencies.

16.4.2 Common Defense and Security

1. The reviewer should determine that the applicant's Physical Security Plan and Fundamental Nuclear Material Control Plan have been reviewed and approved by the appropriate NMSS personnel.
2. The reviewer should consult with the Division of Facilities and Security to determine that the applicant's Security Plan for the Protection of Classified Matter has been reviewed and approved.
3. If the applicant has previously been issued a certificate of compliance, the reviewer should ensure that NRC inspection reports and resident inspector reports do not indicate a general failure to protect the common defense and security interests of the United States.
4. The reviewer should consider the impact of executing contracts associated with the Russian HEU agreement on the financial viability of the applicant. The analysis of the applicant's financial viability, described below, should include information concerning the cost of procuring Russian material, the amount of material the applicant has contracted to procure, the costs of enrichment services provided by the applicant, and current market prices. This information should allow the reviewer to gauge whether executing such contracts might be a significant economic disadvantage, or favorable to an extent that would motivate the applicant to reduce the production of domestic enrichment services.
5. The reviewer should arrange to meet with, or otherwise consult with, the principal members of the HEU Oversight Committee to obtain the committee's assessment of the applicant's

Determination of Foreign Ownership

performance as the U.S. Agent for the Russian HEU Agreement.

6. The reviewer shall ensure that NRC remains informed regarding the applicant's performance as the U.S. agent for the Russian HEU Agreement by preparing a certificate condition of the following type:

USEC, or its successors, as the Executive Agent for the United States for implementing the Russian HEU Agreement, shall notify NRC in writing within 15 days, if at any time and for any reason, including actions of third parties, USEC or its successors become aware of, or anticipate, any change in the provisions of, or in the implementation of, the terms of the "Memorandum of Agreement Between the United States Acting By and Through the United States Department of State, and the United States Department of Energy and the United States Enrichment Corporation, for USEC to Serve as the United States Government's Executive Agent Under the Agreement Between the United States and the Russian Federation Concerning the Disposition of Highly Enriched Uranium Extracted from Nuclear Weapons," entered into as of April 18, 1997.

16.4.3 Reliable and Economical Source of Domestic Enrichment Services

Issuance of a certificate of compliance should be considered inimical to the maintenance of a reliable and economical source of domestic enrichment services if the applicant does not have a sufficiently strong financial condition to allow the expectation that it can remain viable for at least five years.

The review should consist of the following procedures. (If the staff elects to have a contractor conduct these procedures, the staff should review the contractor's analysis and findings and either concur with the findings or specify the staff's basis for taking a different position.)

1. If the applicant has one or more current credit ratings issued by a recognized rating agency (e.g., Standard & Poor's Corp., Moody's, Investors Service, Duff & Phelps Credit Rating Co., or Fitch Investors Services, L.P.), the reviewer should determine whether the lowest such rating is of investment grade (e.g., AAA, AA, A, or BBB as rated by Standard & Poor's, or Aaa, Aa, A, or Baa as rated by Moody's) or below investment grade (e.g., BB, B, CCC or lower as rated by Standard & Poor's, or Ba, B, Caa or lower as rated by Moody's).
2. If the applicant does not have a current credit rating issued by a recognized rating agency, the reviewer should conduct an independent analysis to estimate a credit rating and determine whether the estimated credit rating is of investment grade. The estimated credit rating should be based on quantitative and qualitative analysis of information provided by the applicant, including information regarding the applicant's parent company or companies, to the extent that they might affect the financial condition of the applicant.
 - a. The reviewer should ensure that NRC has received the following information from the applicant:

Determination of Foreign Ownership

- (1) The types, amounts, and holders of debt and the types and amounts of equity of the applicant. In the case of the privatization of USEC, the method of financing to be used to purchase USEC (if applicable), and the types, amounts, and holders of any debt and the types and amounts of equity of the privatized entity;
 - (2) A five-year business plan addressing the applicant's enrichment business line as well as other anticipated business lines, including alternative enrichment technologies such as AVLIS, that will require investments of capital (including working capital) by the applicant, and the portion of projected revenue, for each of the five years, covered by contracts in existence at the time of the application;
 - (3) All significant business and economic assumptions underlying the plan;
 - (4) Pro forma financial statements for the applicant for each of the next five years;
 - (5) Current financial statements (if applicable) for the applicant, and in the case of privatization, for USEC, along with an independent certified public accountant's opinion on the financial statements;
 - (6) Identification of the applicant's proposed directors and officers and a discussion of their qualifications to provide financial and business management;
 - (7) The organizational structure of the applicant and its relationship to corporate parents and other affiliates; and
 - (8) Information on the financial condition of the applicant's corporate parents, including credit ratings, profiles prepared by the investment industry, and/or audited financial statements reflecting the three most recently completed fiscal years.
- b. The reviewer should ensure the items specified above are consistent, and that they provide a comprehensive and reasonable picture of the applicant. If pro forma financial statements are based on inconsistent or unrealistic assumptions, it may be necessary to discuss with the applicant the basis of the projections.
- c. The reviewer should quantitatively assess the financial characteristics of the applicant relative to available historical benchmarks. Some corporate financial analysis expertise will be necessary to complete this step. The reviewer may wish to obtain one or more financial texts for reference, such as Standard & Poor's "Corporate Ratings Criteria." The reviewer's analysis should include the following measures:
- (1) Size Measures
 - Net sales
 - Net income
 - Total assets
 - Net worth

Determination of Foreign Ownership

(2) Capital Structure Ratios

- Total debt ÷ capitalization
- Total debt ÷ equity
- Long-term debt ÷ capitalization

(3) Coverage Ratios

- Net income plus depreciation and other noncash items ÷ total debt
- Pretax income plus interest expense ÷ gross interest
- Pretax income plus depreciation and other noncash items plus interest expense ÷ gross interest

(4) Profitability Ratios

- Net income ÷ total assets
- Pretax income plus interest ÷ total assets
- Net income ÷ equity
- Operating income ÷ sales

Other ratios and measures, addressing the above categories or other financial characteristics may be used if they provide a measure of the applicant's financial condition (e.g., see "Corporate Ratings Criteria").

- d. The reviewer should also consider qualitative factors in light of the financial analysis. Factors to be assessed include the applicant's competitive position, market environment, quality of management, and financial and business risks. These factors should be considered in proportion to their potential impacts on the applicant.
- e. The reviewer should evaluate the financial condition of the applicant's corporate parents and affiliates to the extent that they might affect the applicant's financial condition. The financial condition of corporate parents or affiliates should be should be considered in proportion to the potential impact on the applicant.
- f. Based on the preceding steps, the reviewer should establish an estimated credit rating of the applicant. In establishing the estimated rating, the reviewer should first determine what the estimated rating would be if it were based solely on an analysis of the applicant's financial ratios and size measures relative to available benchmarks. The reviewer should then adjust the estimated credit rating based on other considerations identified above. Adjustments should be proportional to each factor's potential impacts on the applicant. Assignment of a specific estimated rating (e.g., AA versus A) is not necessary if the reviewer is able to determine that the estimated credit rating is investment grade. Assignment of a specific rating may be necessary if the estimated rating is below investment grade.

3. If the actual or estimated credit rating is of investment grade, the reviewer should find that

Determination of Foreign Ownership

the applicant has sufficiently strong financial condition to allow it to remain viable for at least five years, and that issuance of a certificate of compliance would not be inimical to the maintenance of a reliable and economical source of domestic enrichment services. If the actual or estimated credit rating is below investment grade, the reviewer should consider whether any other economic, financial, or business characteristics (e.g., contracts adequate to support the applicant's operations over a five-year time period, financial guarantees provided by a parent company, compelling business prospects) exist that provide reasonable assurance of the applicant's viability for at least five years. If the reviewer finds that such factors exist, and that the applicant is expected to remain viable for at least five years, then the reviewer should find that issuance of a certificate of compliance would not be inimical to the maintenance of a reliable and economical source of domestic enrichment services. However, if the reviewer finds that such factors do not exist, then the reviewer should find that issuance of a certificate of compliance to the applicant may be inimical to the maintenance of a reliable and economical source of domestic enrichment services.

16.5 Acceptance Criteria

16.5.1 Regulatory Requirements

10 CFR § 76.22 addresses the ineligibility of applicants for certification if the Commission determines that:

1. The Corporation is owned, controlled, or dominated by an alien, a foreign corporation, or a foreign government; or
2. The issuance of such a certificate of compliance would be inimical to:
 - a. The common defense and security of the United States; or
 - b. The maintenance of a reliable and economical domestic source of enrichment services.

10 CFR § 76.33 provides for NRC to require the applicant to supply additional information as necessary.

10 CFR § 95.15 addresses the collection of information necessary to determine that the applicant is not owned, controlled, or dominated by an alien, foreign corporation, or foreign government.

10 CFR Parts 76 and 95 contain and reference applicable regulatory requirements necessary to protect the common defense and security.

16.5.2 Regulatory Guidance

Regulatory guidance applicable to the areas of review in this chapter are:

1. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NUREG/CR-5734, "Recommendations to the NRC on

Determination of Foreign Ownership

Acceptable Standard Format and Content for the Fundamental Nuclear Material Control (FNMC) Plan Required for Low-Enriched Uranium Enrichment Facilities," Nov. 1991

2. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Reg Guide 5.67, "Material Control and Accounting for Uranium Enrichment Facilities Authorized to Produce Special Nuclear Material of Low Strategic Significance," Dec. 1993
3. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, "Security Plan Format and Content Guide for NRC Licensees, Certificate Holders, and Related Organizations," March 1994

16.5.3 Regulatory Review Criteria

The application is acceptable if the following criteria are met:

Foreign Ownership, Control, or Domination

After a review of the potential foreign involvement information in accordance with the Review Procedures, section 16.5.1, the reviewer determines that no foreign interest has the ability, direct or indirect, whether or not exercised, to direct or decide matters affecting the management or operations of the applicant.

The following additional criteria are applicable in the case of privatization of USEC:

1. Foreign competitors of USEC are precluded from participating in any acquisition of USEC.
2. Entities with a substantial commercial relationship with foreign enrichment providers, with respect to uranium and uranium products, are precluded from participating in any acquisition of USEC.
3. Foreign interests own no more than 10 percent of the outstanding voting securities of the applicant.
4. Foreign sourced financing of an acquisition of USEC is no more than 10 percent of the purchase price.

Common Defense and Security

1. The applicant's Physical Security Plan has been reviewed and approved.
2. The applicant's Security Plan for the Protection of Classified Matter has been reviewed and approved.
3. The applicant's Fundamental Nuclear Material Control Plan has been reviewed and approved.
4. If the applicant has previously been issued a certificate of compliance, a review of NRC

Determination of Foreign Ownership

inspection reports and resident inspector reports does not indicate a general failure, by the applicant, to protect the common defense and security interests of the United States.

5. Consultation with the principal members of the HEU Oversight Committee indicates that the applicant's performance as the U.S. Agent for the Russian HEU Agreement is acceptable.

Reliable and Economical Source of Domestic Enrichment Services

1. The applicant's current actual or estimated public credit rating is investment grade (e.g. Standard & Poor's AAA to BBB, Moody's Aaa to Baa); or
2. The applicant's current actual or estimated public credit rating is not investment grade, but other economic, financial, or business characteristics exist that strongly indicate the entity's viability for at least five years.

16.6 Evaluation Findings

After evaluating the application and the supporting information, and determining the information to be adequate and the acceptance criteria to be met, the reviewer will prepare a statement, similar to the following, for inclusion in the Certificate Evaluation Reports:

On the basis of the staff's review and evaluation of the application for certification, the staff has found no cause to determine that:

1. the applicant is owned, controlled, or dominated by an alien, a foreign corporation, or a foreign government; or
2. issuance of a certificate of compliance would be inimical to the common defense and security of the United States; or
3. issuance of a certificate of compliance would be inimical to the maintenance of a reliable and economical domestic source of enrichment services.

16.7 References

U.S. Department of Defense, "National Industrial Security Program Operating Manual (NISPOM)," DOD 5520.22-M, Jan. 1995.

U.S. Department of Energy, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, U.S. Enrichment Corporation, "Foreign Ownership, Control, or Influence Guidance Documents for the Privatization of the United States Enrichment Corporation."

GDP STANDARD REVIEW PLAN CHAPTER 16 OPTIONS

	Review Triggers ²	“Reliable and Economical” Considerations	Comments
Status quo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recertification; - Change in previous review basis; - Change in ownership or control; - Change applicable to certificate conditions on foreign ownership 	Business and financial characteristics	<p>No change from February 1999 draft NUREG-1671¹ guidance applicable to “reliable and economical” reviews. The SRP currently in place would not be modified.</p> <p>Cost per analysis: \$150,000 and 0.5 FTE</p>
Option 1 Business and Financial Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change in ownership or control 	Business and financial characteristics	<p>Changes triggers for review and focus of the review, but does not change the substance of the review guidance from February 1999 draft NUREG-1671 applicable to “reliable and economical” reviews. The SRP would be modified to incorporate revised triggers and focus.</p> <p>Cost per analysis: \$150,000 and 0.5 FTE</p>
Option 2 Financial Aspects of Health and Safety Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change in ownership or control 	Simplified financial qualification review	<p>Changes triggers for review and changes “reliable and economical” considerations to be similar to 10 CFR Part 50 and 70 financial qualification reviews oriented to ensuring health and safety. The SRP would be modified to incorporate the trigger changes and adopt the guidance for financial qualification reviews under the Part 70 SRP.</p> <p>Cost per analysis: 0.2 FTE</p>
Option 3 Foreign Ownership and Control Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change in ownership or control 	Subsumed in foreign ownership and control review	<p>Changes would eliminate corporate financial and business reviews.</p> <p>Cost: No Additional Cost</p>

NOTES:

1. The current SRP was issued as draft NUREG-1671, "Standard Review Plan for the Recertification of the Gaseous Diffusion Plants," February 1999.

2. Potential Trigger Levels:
 - Recertification: review under Chapter 16 would be conducted each time the certificate is recertified. Routine recertification takes place every 5 years.
 - Change in review basis: review under Chapter 16 would be conducted if there is a significant change in the basis of a prior determination (similar to the staff's review initiated in February 2000).
 - Change in ownership or control: review under Chapter 16 would be conducted whenever another entity takes ownership or control of the gaseous diffusion plants (GDPs). Ownership and control are defined as when an entity has the power, direct or indirect, whether or not exercised, through ownership of the securities, by contractual arrangements or other means to direct or decide matters affecting the management or operations of the GDPs. (see Section 16.4.1 of NUREG-1671, February 1999). Staff will seek confirmation from the Commission of this definition along with Commission review of the SRP options.
 - Change in certificate conditions on foreign ownership: review under Chapter 16 would be conducted when changes described in foreign ownership and control certificate conditions occur. These conditions involve changes described in the National Industrial Security Program Operating Manual or if the GDP operator enters into negotiations for a proposed merger, acquisition, or takeover by a foreign entity,

DRAFT

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION STANDARD REVIEW PLAN OFFICE OF NUCLEAR MATERIAL SAFETY AND SAFEGUARDS

1.2 INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

1.2.1 PURPOSE OF REVIEW

The purpose of this review is to establish that the license application includes adequate information identifying the applicant, the applicant's characteristics, and the proposed activity.

1.2.2 RESPONSIBILITY FOR REVIEW

Primary: Licensing Project Manager

Secondary: None

Supporting: Office of the General Counsel; Office of Administration/Division of Security

1.2.3 AREAS OF REVIEW

Information provided for review should include the identity and address of the applicant's facility and corporate headquarters; corporate information sufficient to show the relationship of the applicant's organization relative to other corporate entities; the existence and extent of foreign ownership or influence; financial information sufficient to indicate the resources available to the applicant to pursue the activities for which the license is sought; the site location as legally described in land records; a description of each proposed licensed activity in the form of requested authorized uses; the type of license being applied for; and the type, quantity, and form(s) of material(s) proposed to be used at the licensed facility.

1.2.4 ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

1.2.4.1 Regulatory Requirements

The regulations applicable to the areas of review in this SRP are 10 CFR 70.22, "Contents of applications", §70.65(b)(1), (2), and (3), "Additional Contents of Applications," 10 CFR 70.33, "Renewal of Licenses," and 10 CFR 95, "Security Facility Approval and Safeguarding of National Security Information and Restricted Data."

1.2.4.2 Regulatory Guidance

There are no regulatory guides that apply to institutional information for a fuel cycle facility.

DRAFT

1.2.4.3 Regulatory Acceptance Criteria

The application is acceptable if the following criteria are met:

1. Corporate Identity

The applicant has furnished its full name and address. The address of the fuel cycle facility is provided if it is different from that of the applicant. If the application is for renewal, the applicant identifies the number of the license to be renewed. A full description of the plant site location (State, county, and municipality) is given. The State where the applicant is incorporated or organized and the location of the principal office are indicated. If the applicant is a corporation or other entity, the names and citizenship of its principal officers are provided. The application shall include information known to the applicant concerning the control or ownership, if any, exercised over the applicant by any alien, foreign corporation, or foreign government. Primary ownership and relationships to other components of the same ownership are explicitly described. The presence and operations of any other company on the site to be licensed are fully described.

2. Financial Qualifications

A description of financial qualifications demonstrates the applicant's current and continuing access to the financial resources necessary to engage in the proposed activity in accordance with §70.22(a)(8) and §70.23(a)(5).

3. Type, Quantity, and Form of Licensed Material

The elemental name, maximum quantity, and specifications, including the chemical and physical form(s), of the special nuclear material the applicant proposes to acquire, deliver, receive, possess, produce, use, transfer or store are identified. For special nuclear material, the specifications include the isotopic content and amount of enrichment by weight percent.

4. Authorized Uses

A summary, non-technical narrative description is provided for each activity or process in which special nuclear material is proposed to be acquired, delivered, received, possessed, produced, used, processed, transferred, or stored. The authorized uses of SNM proposed for the facility are described and are consistent with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, et seq. The description is consistent with more detailed process descriptions submitted as part of the ISA summary reviewed under Section 3.0 of this SRP.

If the application is for a renewal, the applicant states the period of time for which license renewal is requested, and why the renewal application should be considered timely in accordance with 10 CFR 70.

DRAFT

5. Special Exemptions or Special Authorizations

Specific requests for exemptions or authorizations of an unusual nature should be listed in this section and justified in the appropriate technical section of the application.

6. Security of Classified Information

If applicable, applicant has requested and received a facility security clearance in accordance with 10 CFR 95.

1.2.5 REVIEW PROCEDURES

1.2.5.1 Acceptance Review

The staff review starts with a determination by the primary reviewer that the is complete and addresses each issue in Subsection 1.2.3, "Areas of Review."

If significant deficiencies are identified in the application, the applicant will be requested to submit additional material before the start of the safety evaluation.

1.2.5.2 Safety Evaluation

The material to be reviewed is for the most part informational in nature, and detailed technical analysis is generally not required beyond the acceptance criterion. The reviewer requests review assistance, as needed, from the Division of Security and the Office of the General Counsel in the review of corporate and financial information.

1.2.6 EVALUATION FINDINGS

If the information provided is consistent with the guidance of this SRP, the staff will conclude that this evaluation is complete. The staff can document its review as follows:

The staff has reviewed the institutional information for [name of facility] according to Standard Review Plan Section 1.2. Based on the review, the NRC staff has determined that the applicant has adequately described and documented the corporate structure and financial information, and that the applicant is in compliance with those parts of 10 CFR 70.22 and 70.65 relating to other institutional information. In addition, in accordance with 70.22(a)(2) and (4), the applicant has adequately described the types, forms, quantities, and proposed authorized uses of licensed materials to be permitted at this facility as follows:

<u>Material</u>	<u>Form</u>	<u>Quantity</u>	<u>Authorized Use(s)</u>
-----------------	-------------	-----------------	--------------------------

The applicant's proposed activities are consistent with the Atomic Energy Act. The applicant has provided all institutional information necessary to understand the ownership, financial qualifications, location, planned activities, and nuclear materials to be handled in connection with the requested license.

DRAFT

1.2.7 REFERENCES

Code of Federal Regulations, Title 10, Part 70, Domestic Licensing of Special Nuclear Material,
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC.