government purpose to possess the information. Any authorized holder who believes that the designation of specific information as CUI is improper or incorrect, or who believes they have received unmarked CUI, may use this process to formally notify the NRC CUI Senior Agency Official (SAO). The process also allows for the NRC CUI SAO and CUI Program Manager to process such requests and to issue a Final Decision from the CUI SAO.

The CUI Challenge Request Process is not intended to be used to address all disagreements regarding the proper designation of CUI. Authorized holders are encouraged to seek or utilize less formal means when resolving internal good faith disputes over the proper designation of information as CUI, such as discussion with the creator or designator of the information in dispute. Where resolution cannot be achieved through less formal means, the CUI challenge request process is available.

The CUI Challenge Request Process does not supersede any obligations under law or NRC policy to report information spills.

III. Specific Requests for Comments

The NRC is seeking comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?
2. Is the estimate of the burden of the information collection accurate?
3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?
4. How can the burden of the information collection on respondents be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

David C. Cullison,
NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

RG 5.56 was published for comment in March 1978 to provide guidance on the development of safeguards contingency plans for transportation. This guide supports meeting NRC physical protection requirements for transportation of special nuclear material (SNM). In addition, it supports meeting the NRC licensing requirements to transport formula quantities of strategic SNM (also referred to as Category I quantities of strategic SNM). The NRC is withdrawing RG 5.56, “Standard Format and Content of Safeguards Contingency Plans for Transportation,” because the guide no
The withdrawal of RG 5.56 does not alter any prior or existing NRC licensing approval, or the acceptability of licensee commitments made regarding the withdrawn guidance. However, RG 5.56 is outdated and is not satisfactory for developing contingency plans for the transportation of Category I strategic SNM today without DOE, the staff would evaluate the need for additional physical protection, given the current threat environment, and provide approval to the licensee or applicant, as appropriate, on a case-by-case basis. The likelihood of such a proposal is expected to be remote. Other general NRC guidance on the development of contingency plans can be found in NUREG/CR–6667, “Standard Review Plan for Safeguards Contingency Response Plans for Category I Fuel Facilities,” and such guidance could be useful in developing a contingency plan for transportation of Category I quantities of SNM.

II. Further Information

The withdrawal of RG 5.56 does not alter any prior or existing NRC licensing approval, or the acceptability of licensee commitments made regarding the withdrawn guidance. Although RG 5.56 is withdrawn, current licensees referencing this RG may continue to do so, and withdrawal does not affect any existing licenses or agreements. However, by withdrawing RG 5.56, the NRC no longer approves use of the guidance in future requests or applications for NRC licensing actions.