Changes since last time we spoke to SAC.

Key: Request has been addressed	Request is in process	Request may not be able to be met	Request cannot be met	
Request				**Comments**
SITE ACCESS				
1. Scientists classified as business visitors should have access to all office and collaboration spaces by default without requiring an escort.				We have made improvements that allow for and facilitate collaboration. Unescorted access is now allowed for all badge holders to office spaces in WH, IERC, IARC, FCC, and ICB (and SiDet once card readers installed on external doors). In addition, we expanded access so that Users and Affiliates now have 24/7 access in the same manner as lab staff. The business visitor access type is broad and includes invited speakers, VIPs, reviewers, auditors, vendor visits, etc. Providing expanded unescorted access may make sense in some instances but not all. We are in the process of updating access process and authorities for business visitors and will explore the possibility of providing temporary active badge with a limited access scope (e.g. WH) when appropriate (e.g. reviewers).
2. Definitions of visitors, users, affiliates, etc should be more clear. People requesting access to Fermilab cannot be expected to know our vocabulary				These definitions are provided at https://get-connected.fnal.gov/ The instructions and language used for the recently released Single-Form access request was developed with the assistance of an outside Communications vendor who helped identify confusing terminology, phrasing, etc.
3. Single access form: should be streamlined to request the minimum number of questions necessary based on the access category and country of origin.				The Single-Form access request was released in December. An effort was made to eliminate or make optional as many questions as possible. We anticipate making additional improvements based on feedback roughly quarterly.
4. Scientists request to see the report or at least the recommendations from the DOE site access assist visit. We know that sharing the full report is not within the SASC authority, but we would appreciate SASC assistance in requesting that the report is released.				We have posted to the SASC website a summary of the findings from the assist visit and our responses.
5. In several unrelated scenarios, individuals have been required to redo the FNAP/FNSP process multiple times over a short period of time. We request that this process be applied only when required and always efficiently.				Based on feedback from the assist visit and the benchmark exercise, we proposed changes to the UFNAP process. These changes were approved in March and implemented in April. These changes significantly simplify and streamline approvals.
6. Sunrise-sundown policy affects some of the users onsite, should be revisited.				We standardized business hours, defined standard public access hours to WH and Lederman Science center, and made changes to allow users & affiliates 24/7 access to those areas they have

		approved access to (e.g all the standard office spaces as well as any buildings or labs associated with their work).
7. FNAP hosting expectations are unclear and/or unreasonable: Are hosts responsible for potential bad actions by visitors?		Hosts are responsible to ensure foreign nationals under their responsibility understand and follow requirements for facility access. If the host identifies an issue, it should be reported to their management and to Security. The host training was updated, including feedback from several active hosts, this past spring. In addition, the changes we made to the UFNAP process has also resulted in a reduced work burden for hosts and has expanded the list of eligible hosts.
8. Visitor escort expectations are unclear and/or unreasonable: are escorts expected to escort visitors to the restroom?		New Safeguards and Security training has been implemented consolidating several elements that had previously each been treated separately, including expectations for escorts. Escorts are expected to accompany their guests as appropriate to ensure their visit is productive, professional, fulfills its intended purpose, and is done in a safe and secure manner. Hosts are not expected to escort visitors into the restroom but should be knowledgeable of where the visitor is during their stay and should escort them as needed during their stay.
9. There was clear consensus that defining PPA as precisely as possible is essential for solving current site access problems. For efficient classification of areas as PPA, lab employees must be involved in the process.		We proposed a short list of PPAs to the Site Office based upon a Security Risk Assessment, confirmation of security concerns with lab employees (e.g. area lab managers, export control office, radiation protection), feedback from the Assist Visit, and replies from the benchmark exercise with peer labs. This was approved in March and reduced the PPA footprint from about 6200 acres to several specific offices and/or lab spaces across the site.
10.For the purpose of carpooling, parking lots and roads should be accessible for employees' families and domestic partners. This could be addressed with "family badging.		In March we received approval to significantly reduce the PPA footprint at the lab as well as expand the number of roads and parking lots labeled as "Public" to allow this kind of access. In those instances a badge is not needed – they'll only need to present a REAL-ID at the gate. For the Village, there are badging options for those that live there as well as for those who utilize the Daycare.

11. There were requests for employee families and friends to be allowed to visit office spaces, in particular kids.		Family visits in public areas of Wilson Hall and outside are allowed. Visits to business areas, including office and laboratory space are not currently permitted. We are currently working to obtain approval for an updated tour policy to address current shortcomings/ambiguities. The focus of this update is on public and business tours. Personal tours (e.g. family and friends) will be the focus of a future discussion.
12. There were suggestions to reopen public/family access to village/user's center, including short term plans to provide as much access as possible e.g. by fencing the lab areas in the village.		As part changes approved in March that reduced the PPA footprint at the lab, the Village is now designated as a Business Area. There are plans for moving lab space out of the Village that will enable the possibility of re-labeling Village space as Public.
13. Consider providing waiting area and welcoming environment for visitors while their access issues are being figured out (short term plan at Aspen East before we have FWAC in place)		This is the purpose and current function of the Aspen East FWAC. It is also being used for subcontractor training and badging.
14. Lab should have a "rapid response" team/office that solves site access problems in real time and has discretionary authority to grant reasonable exceptions to the letter of the rules in support of the intent of the rules and the mission of the lab. For example, other labs allow access with non-REAL ID driver license + copy of passport for access when passport is temporarily unavailable, exceptions that other labs allow.		This is now in place at Aspen East FWAC. Business visitors and incoming users/affiliates with ID issues can be processed at this location. During non-business hours, the Security Operations Center is contacted. We have also expanded the list of documents that can be provided to satisfy the REAL-ID requirement.
15.SASC could assess application and retention rates for scientific and engineering positions to confirm anecdotal reports that people are not applying or leaving early due to the current lab environment. SASC could consider crowd-sourcing a compilation of anecdotes to create better data on impacts of lab policies.		We are interested in collecting feedback on the user-experience with respect to the site access and badging process. Perhaps the SAC could assist in the development of this. Concerning application and retention rates, exit interviews may provide some information; however, it will be difficult to draw any definitive conclusions given the many factors impacting hiring and retention post-pandemic. While this is beyond the scope of the SASC, we did interact with HR to learn that through FY2023 the turnover rate at the lab was consistent with historical average at about 5-6%, comparable to other labs. Concerning site access specifically, we have been providing metrics on various aspects of site access on the Site Access Steering Committee website for several months. These are updated monthly.
16. The scientific staff is spending more and more of their time in dealing with complications from the changing lab policies and less on science.		We believe that the improvements we identified and implemented for site access, have resulted in a reduction of effort associated with site access. We are hopeful that the

		remaining improvement will further address remaining frustrations.
17. Data should be routinely presented regarding site access efficiency. We understand that SASC is committed to improving communications quality and frequency.		We are currently tracking requests and throughput times and have begun posting metrics on the recently launched SASC web page. These will be updated monthly.
COMMUNICATIONS		
1. We request better communication regarding changes to lab policies including motivation for the change and/or specific DOE rules related to the change.		There is a relatively new Policy Oversight Board that includes representatives from the scientist and engineering community who review/comment on policies before being finalized. In addition, upcoming Policy changes are circulated for comment prior to finalizing them.
2. We request that scientists be allowed to give input on policy changes before they occur rather than feedback after changes are implemented. Input on any proposed changes must be obtained from all relevant groups before the changes are enacted following best practice stages of proposal, development, and implementation.		As discussed above, there is a procedure that is intended to allow for that. For site access, a concerted effort has been made to broaden the groups of stakeholders engaged ahead of significant changes. However, it is important to note that there are some changes that are stipulated by the DOE and for which the process described is not practical.
3. We request a quantitative summary of the risk analysis motivating policy changes that hinder the lab's science mission. Many risks currently being used to explain policy changes seem highly subjective. In addition, some risks seem not taken into account. Risk of loss of reputation from security incident is accounted for, but loss of reputation from broken collaboration and from denying access to reviewers and seminar speakers seems to be ignore.		While we understand the spirit of the comment, it is not practical. Contractual policy changes driven by DOE do not have a risk-benefit element for the labs once they are enacted. The feedback from the Assist Visit and benchmarking exercise have been helpful in identifying places where we appear to be out-of-step with peer laboratories. This has provided an opportunity to revisit these items with the site office. We have a seat at the table as new site security policies are being developed/modified, which is a step in the right direction.
4. We received a comment regarding the Officially Designated Security Authority (ODSA). Fermilab does not seem to have one. We would be interested in understanding the motivation for this choice.		This is not our decision to make. It is the prerogative of the DOE.
5. PEMP review reports were requested but are already available, but they could be better advertised. https://web.fnal.gov/organization/cas/PEMP/SitePages/Home.asp		The PEMP was discussed at the all-hands meeting in December. The reports are available on the Fermilab website.
6. Scientists should contribute to classification of lab activities related to S&T threat matrix, export control, CUI, etc. and help identifying sensitive areas. - Need guidance and understanding of rules and what is considered sensitive		This is already the case. Sensitive Subjects are items that are either export controlled or listed as "restricted" in the S&T Risk Matrix. Export control assessments are managed by the Export Control Program Manager in the General Counsel's Office in collaboration with the Chief Research Officer and the Principal

		Investigator for the work. Determination and implementation of the S&T Risk Matrix is managed by the Chief Research Officer and the Principal Investigator for the work.
7. Expectations and tracking responses to messages sent to staffquestions@fnal.gov (similar to Service Desk RITM)		The new Site Access Website includes a FAQ based upon questions posed to the SASC. These are revisited on a monthly basis and updated as warranted. The inquiries sent to the staff questions mailbox are responded to on a regular basis. The Communications department tracks the questions and the replies.