



Working Group Charter Approval

IMPEP Lessons Learned Working Group

Issue Date: July 11, 2001

/RA Frederick C. Combs Acting for/

*Paul H. Lohaus, Director
Office of State and Tribal Programs*

07/06/2001

Date

/RA Martin J. Virgilio/

*Martin J. Virgilio, Director
Office of Nuclear Safety and Safeguards*

07/06/2001

Date

/RA Kathy Allen/

*Kathy Allen, Chair
Organization of Agreement States*

0710/2001

Date

NOTE

The contents of this charter should not be revised or altered without prior approval from the parties listed above.

WORKING GROUP CHARTER

Joint NRC/Agreement State Working Group To Evaluate the Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP)

PURPOSE

On completion of the first cycle of IMPEP reviews for the Agreement States, a working group consisting of representatives from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and the Agreement States will evaluate Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) experiences for additional enhancements and lessons learned to strengthen the IMPEP process.

BACKGROUND

In FY 1996, NRC began implementation of IMPEP in the evaluation of Agreement State and Regional materials programs to assure that public health and safety are adequately protected from the hazards associated with the use of radioactive materials and that Agreement State programs are compatible with NRC's programs. The IMPEP process employs a team of NRC and Agreement State staff to assess both Agreement State and NRC Regional Office radioactive materials licensing and inspection programs. All reviews use common criteria in the assessment and place primary emphasis on performance. Additional areas have been identified as non-common performance indicators and are also addressed in the assessment. The final determination of adequacy of each NRC Regional Office and both adequacy and compatibility of each Agreement State program, based on the review team's report, is made by a Management Review Board (MRB) composed of NRC managers and an Agreement State program manager who serves as the Agreement State liaison to the MRB.

At the end of FY1999, NRC completed its first round of IMPEP reviews for all Agreement States. Regional reviews originally were performed every 2 years and are now performed every 4 years. Agreement State reviews occur at frequencies of 2-4 years. From its inception, IMPEP has been an iterative process. As the program progressed from the pilot, through interim implementation to final implementation, NRC staff has factored in experience, comments and suggestions to enhance IMPEP. At the completion of this first cycle of reviews, NRC management believes that an independent examination by a working group of the IMPEP experiences to date could further enhance this program.

SCOPE OF WORK

The NRC/Agreement State Working Group will examine the IMPEP process as conducted from FY1996 through the present and identify issues or enhancements to improve the process.

TASKS

In examining the IMPEP process, the working group should address the following tasks. Each substantive working group recommendation should be evaluated and prioritized in the context of the four NRC performance goals¹.

1. Evaluate the program's performance for additional enhancements, including whether the set of IMPEP elements is complete and sufficiently focused, whether changes are needed in the indicator criteria, and whether there are any patterns or issues identified from MRB review, discussions during MRB meetings or changes to draft IMPEP reports that should be addressed (e.g., Whether the reviews and reports can be enhanced to better address the technical quality of inspections. Whether additional inspection accompaniments may be desirable when significant areas of improvement are identified in a region or state inspection program.)
2. Examine how to best utilize the performance data in NMED and reported as outcome measures, in preparing for and focusing reviews, and the extent to which the goals, measures, and metrics of the strategic plan can be used as key issues or questions to focus the review of each common and non-common performance indicator. Additionally, evaluate whether IMPEP review criteria should be added or expanded to assess the outcome of program initiatives to bring licensees into compliance with rules, license conditions, and to prevent recurrence.
3. Examine the effectiveness of between-IMPEP interactions, such as the value of periodic meetings, the need for any modifications to the periodic meeting process, and the effectiveness/use of structured program self-audits between IMPEP reviews.
4. Identify areas that should be considered for specific examination during IMPEP reviews, based on the review experience to date, such as the handling of complex or controversial licensing actions.
5. Reevaluate making the OAS Agreement State Liaison to the Management Review Board (MRB) a voting member of the MRB.

The working group collectively will be responsible for developing a final charter, establishing a work plan, monitoring progress, and preparing drafts of minutes and other products.

REPORT TIME FRAME

Complete and file report to the Deputy Executive Director for Materials, Research and State Programs by October 8, 2001.

¹ NRC Performance goals (NUREG-1614, Vol. 2, Part 2, *U.S. NRC FY2000-2005 Strategic Plan*):

1. Maintain safety, protection of the environment, and the common defense and security.
2. Increase public confidence.
3. Make NRC activities and decisions more effective, efficient, and realistic.
4. Reduce unnecessary regulatory burden on stakeholders.

WORKING GROUP ORGANIZATION AND OPERATIONS

Initially the following personnel will be on the working group.

NRC Personnel:

Kathleen Schneider, STP, Co-Chair
Charles Cox, NMSS
Lance Rakovan, STP

Agreement State Personnel:

William Silva, TX, Co-Chair
Terry Frazee, WA

Resource Representatives:

James Lynch, Region III
George Deegan, NMSS

Logistical and travel support for working group meetings, including travel and per diem expenses for Agreement State members, will be provided by NRC.

Interactions with the National Materials Program Steering Committee should take place as necessary.

Working group meetings are not subject to the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) but they will be announced in advance through the NRC Public Meeting Announcement System. Maximum use will be made of other appropriate media for facilitating interaction with the working group, e.g., conference calls, facsimiles, and electronic mail. Working group meetings will be open to the public and will be held in the Washington, DC area or other locations as agreed upon by the working group members. Other persons attending working group meetings will be welcome to provide comments to the working group for its consideration in either written form or orally at times specified by the working group chairs. Meeting minutes and draft and final documents produced by the working group will be publicly available from the NRC electronic Public Document Room.