



LAWRENCE  
LIVERMORE  
NATIONAL  
LABORATORY

# Lessons Learned

A. D. Dougan, S.C. Blair

November 17, 2006

## **Disclaimer**

---

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor the University of California nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or the University of California, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by University of California, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract W-7405-Eng-48.

## Lessons Learned

Arden Dougan and Steve Blair, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

LLNL turned in 5 Declaration Line Items (DLI's) in 2006. Of these, one was declared completed. We made some changes to streamline our process from 2005, used less money, time and fewer team members. Below is a description of what changes we made in 2006 and what we learned.

### Forming teams

Many of our core review team had changed from last year, including our Laboratory Director, the Facility safety and security representatives, our Division Leader, and the OPSEC Committee Chair. We were able to hand out an AP Manual to some of them, and briefed all newcomers to the AP process.

### Identifying declaration line items

We first went to the OPSEC Committee and explained what the Additional Protocol process would be for 2006 and solicited their help in locating declarable projects. We utilized the “three questions”<sup>1</sup> from the AP meeting<sup>2</sup> last year. LLNL has no single place to locate all projects at the laboratory. We talked to Resource Managers and key Managers in the Energy and Environment Directorate and in the Nonproliferation Homeland and International Security Directorate to find applicable projects. We also talked to the Principal Investigators who had projects last year. We reviewed a list of CRADA's and LDRD projects given to us by the Laboratory Site Office.

Talking to the PI's proved difficult because of vacation or travel schedules. We were never able to locate one PI in town. Fortunately, collateral information allowed us to screen out his project.

### *Lessons Learned*

- LLNL has no single list of all projects
- A Directorate Resource Manager and Programmatic Manager helped us locate projects
- The “three questions” helped us to cull the list.
- Late summer vacation and travel schedules made interviewing PI's difficult if not impossible.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1. Does this work involve **research and development** with the intended application to the **nuclear fuel cycle**? If the answer is yes, please indicate whether it involves Uranium or Plutonium material at this time.  
2. Does this work involve the **manufacture** of possible nuclear-fuel-cycle, dual-use material, equipment, or components?  
3. Does this activity involve the **export or import** of material, equipment, or components that may be used in the nuclear fuel cycle?

<sup>2</sup> Additional Protocol Coordinator Meeting, Washington, D.C., 11/9/05.

### Using the APRS

We had no problems in downloading new versions of the DWA and DDA. It was helpful for both Steve Blair and Arden Dougan to have *write* privileges. During the time we were working on the project, we had to tag-team the work to allow for travel and vacation schedules.

We had some difficulty locating an “activities block” in the software. This was mentioned as something we needed to fix from our 2005 declaration. Evidently the Activities Block has been removed from the current version of the software.

We also had trouble finding the DLI Detail Report, which we included in our signature process last year. This report had been inadvertently omitted from the version of the software we used. We typed our own version of the Detail Report and the package was sent to signature. The final software was not available in time to include the DLI Report.

#### *Lessons Learned*

- The DLI Detail Reports were helpful in documentation for our signature process.
- Two people were needed for the process. Backups were used for both technical and administrative work.

### Reviewing and approving the declaration line items

We streamlined our review process for the Technical and Security Reviews by sending one letter to each entity instead of getting separate approvals from the subordinates, then getting an approval from the lead reviewer. The Review process took 20 days, far shorter than the 6 weeks it required last year. It will be difficult to shorten the process much more.

One of our projects had associated laboratory work at NIF. This required many discussions with NIF management during the review process and before their paperwork came to them for signature since they were not aware of the Additional Protocol.

### Timeline

Locate projects – 3 weeks

Technical review – Program Associate Director (1 day)

    CAPL review – (1 day)

Security review

    Lab-wide – 1 day (total)

        Classification and Export Control, Personnel Security, SAFE,

OPSEC

    Directorate-Specific

Energy and Environment – 2 days  
NIF – 1 day  
Review and Release – 4 days

Final Review

CAPL – 1 day  
NP Division Leader – 2 days  
NHI Associate Director - 4 days  
Laboratory Director – 3 days  
Field Element Review – 7 days  
Review completed August 29, 2006  
Sent to DOE August 30, 2006 (computer glitch prevented us from sending it August 29)

*Total review time: 20 days (compare to 2005 – 6 weeks!)*

*Lessons Learned*

— New review letter format saved time