

NRCREP - Industry Comments on NRC Electronic Submissions Guidance

From: "KASS, Leslie" <lck@nei.org>
 To: <nrcprep@nrc.gov>
 Date: 09/27/2007 5:11:19 PM
 Subject: Industry Comments on NRC Electronic Submissions Guidance

6/28/07
 72 FR 35521

9

September 27, 2007

Rulemaking, Directives, and Editing Branch
 Office of Administration
 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, DC 20555-0001

Subject: Industry Comments on NRC Electronic Submissions Guidance

Project Number: 689

RECEIVED

2007 OCT - 1 PM 1:35

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
 BRANCH
 10/1/07

The industry subgroup working on combined license applications (COLA) and design certifications (DCD) appreciates the consolidation of previous guidance for electronic submittals. In many areas, the document provides some very good content, such as the example letters.

We did note that the document can be difficult to follow in some places because the guidance is different for various types of submissions. The enclosure provides some clarifications to address specific areas of concern for COLAs and DCDs. However, in future revisions, it might be helpful to consider further separation of different types of submissions into complete sections rather than addressing some areas by exception.

We appreciate your time in reviewing these comments. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me at (202) 739-8115; lck@nei.org.

Leslie C. Kass
 Senior Project Manager, Advanced Reactor Licensing

Nuclear Energy Institute
 1776 I Street NW, Suite 400
 Washington, DC 20006
www.nei.org

P: 202-739-8115
 F: 202-533-0206
 E: lck@nei.org

nuclear. clean air energy.

This electronic message transmission contains information from the Nuclear Energy Institute, Inc. The information is intended solely for the use of the addressee and its use by any other person is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient, you have received this communication in error, and any review, use, disclosure, copying or distribution of the contents of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have

SUNSI Review Complete
 Template = ADM-013
 file://C:\temp\GW\00001.HTM

E-REDS = ADM-03

Add = T. Smith (TES)

10/01/2007

received this electronic transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone or by electronic mail and permanently delete the original message. IRS Circular 230 disclosure: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS and other taxing authorities, we inform you that any tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties that may be imposed on any taxpayer or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

Mail Envelope Properties (46FC1C6C.7C3 : 18 : 55235)

Subject: Industry Comments on NRC Electronic Submissions Guidance
Creation Date Thu, Sep 27, 2007 5:10 PM
From: "KASS, Leslie" <lck@nei.org>

Created By: lck@nei.org

Recipients

nrc.gov
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01
NRCREP

Post Office

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

Route

nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2475	Thursday, September 27, 2007 5:10 PM
TEXT.htm	12227	
09-27-07_NRC_Industry Comments on NRC Electronic Submissions Guidance.pdf	45332	
09-27-07_NRC_Industry Comments on NRC Electronic Submissions Guidance_Enclosure.pdf	12613	
Mime.822	98518	

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
ReplyRequested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered

Junk Mail handling disabled by User
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator
Junk List is not enabled
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled
Block List is not enabled



NUCLEAR ENERGY INSTITUTE

Leslie C. Kass
SENIOR PROJECT MANAGER
ADVANCED REACTOR LICENSING
NUCLEAR GENERATION DIVISION

September 27, 2007

Rulemaking, Directives, and Editing Branch
Office of Administration
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Subject: Industry Comments on NRC Electronic Submissions Guidance

Project Number: 689

The industry subgroup working on combined license applications (COLA) and design certifications (DCD) appreciates the consolidation of previous guidance for electronic submittals. In many areas, the document provides some very good content, such as the example letters.

We did note that the document can be difficult to follow in some places because the guidance is different for various types of submissions. The enclosure provides some clarifications to address specific areas of concern for COLAs and DCDs. However, in future revisions, it might be helpful to consider further separation of different types of submissions into complete sections rather than addressing some areas by exception.

We appreciate your time in reviewing these comments. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me at (202) 739-8115; lck@nei.org.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Leslie C. Kass". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Leslie C. Kass

c: Mr. William D. Reckley, NRC
Mr. K.G. Golshan, NRC
Mr. Thomas E. Smith, NRC
NRC Document Control Desk

INDUSTRY COMMENTS ON NRC ELECTRONIC SUBMISSIONS GUIDANCE

Section 2.9 Settings for Creating PDF Formatted Text and Graphic Files

The setting sample table gives resolution in dpi. This should be updated to ppi. NARA and most software now specifies resolution in ppi.

Section 2.23 Rejection of Submissions

Should item 7 in the checklist have special instructions for COLAs and DCDs since the naming conventions are up to the applicant?

Sections 4.2.1 OSM Content and 8.1 COLA Submission Media and Format

The status of indices as OSM content is unclear. Please provide guidance on how index files will be handled as they pertain to the guidance in 4.2.1 and 8.1. Guidance would also be helpful on how or if index files should be included in the COLA packing slip? Does this go with the associated files being indexed as if they are simply another component of the submission document? The statement at 4.2.2 in Rev. 1 to label the OSM with a Transfer Media Configuration (drive transfer rate) is not understood. Read rates are commonly associated with the OSM hardware, but if such a rate can be associated with OSM, more information on this matter is needed.

Section 8 Special Guidance for COLAs

Should this section be renamed to include that the guidance is applicable for Design Certifications and Early Site Permits? Westinghouse used the packing slip software for its most recent submittal and now GE has indicated that it will use that software for Rev. 4 of the ESBWR DCD.

Section 8.2 Folder Specifications

The paragraph following the bullet list states that the contents of a document "can" reside in a separate folder. It was understood that within the packing slip software each document "must" reside in a separate folder.

Section 8.3.1 Naming Conventions

This section states that PDF file names are not required to follow a specified format. Even so, the example names that appear in the submittal examples in Section 9 uniformly have a three-numeral prefix as specified for non-COLA submittal documents. NRC should develop and include a submittal sample letter for COLAs.

Section 8.3.2 File Linkages

The second check-mark item in the last bullet item refers to a "list of allowable reference documents within ADAMS." Please provide guidance on how applicants should obtain this list.

8.3.4 Composition of OSM Submission

The second bullet does not make clear that this only works if the reference document was submitted by means of a packing slip.

9.1 Submittal Example

It would be helpful to have a sample for a COLA submittal.

10.2 COLA Submittal Hyperlink Example

NRC should make a distinction between actual HTTP links and text-based URL listings.