

IOLB REVIEW OF INITIAL LICENSING EXAMINATIONS

A. Purpose

To provide guidance for reviewing the regions' preparation, administration, grading, and documentation of initial operator licensing written examinations and operating tests. These reviews will emphasize examination consistency, quality and compliance with the guidance in NUREG-1021, "Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors." The reviews may include the observation of on-site activities but will also allow for post-examination audits that can be conducted from the program office. By conducting these audits and reviews, the Operator Licensing Branch (IOLB) will verify that examination reliability, and therefore examination validity, remains at acceptable levels.

B. Background

1. IOLB is responsible for ensuring that the regional operator licensing examinations are administered in accordance with the applicable revision of NUREG-1021 (i.e., the Examination Standards (ES)).
2. The applicable ESs for administering initial examinations are ES-201, "Initial Operator Licensing Examination Process;" ES-301, "Preparing Initial Operating Tests;" ES-302, "Administering Operating Tests to Initial License Applicants;" ES-303, "Documenting and Grading Initial Operating Tests;" ES-401, "Preparing Initial Site-Specific Written Examinations" or ES-401N, "Preparing Initial Site-Specific Written Examinations;" ES-402, "Administering Initial Written Examinations;" ES-403, "Grading Initial Site-Specific Written Examinations;" and ES-501, "Initial Post-Examination Activities." The reviewer shall evaluate the preparation, administration, grading, and documentation of the examinations to the extent required to confirm compliance with the ESs, and to assess the consistency and quality of examinations among the regions. The reviewer shall also evaluate NRC examination changes in order to verify that compliance with the ES guidelines has not been compromised and to ensure consistency and uniformity of initial operator examinations.
3. Secondary goals of the IOLB initial examination reviews include providing feedback to individual examiners and the regions relative to the intent and objectives of the ESs, and promoting more efficient implementation of the operator licensing process.
4. The results of the initial examination reviews shall be incorporated with the findings of the quadrennial regional assessment (per OLMC-310, Regional Office

Review Procedure). The reviews shall not be for the purpose of personnel performance appraisals, which are the responsibility of regional management.

5. On-site examination activities may be observed during the examination week and/or the preparatory/validation week. Most other reviews will be conducted post-examination from the program office to allow for a larger sample of examinations. The IOLB reviewer will make appropriate arrangements with the chief examiner and/or regional operator licensing branch chief ahead of time for any needed assistance.

C. Implementation Procedures

Specific information and requirements regarding sample selection can be found in OLMC-330, "Operator Licensing Oversight Program." Note that reviews are limited to examinations for which there are no members of the IOLB program office serving in a chief examiner capacity. If on-site activities will be observed, the IOLB reviewer will contact the chief examiner approximately 90 days (if possible) before the scheduled start of the examination observation to plan the review. This should be sufficient time to ensure the IOLB reviewer completes all necessary documentation for unescorted access to the facility, if necessary.

1. Applicable portions of Attachment 1 are performed for any examination assessment that is performed on-site.
2. Applicable portions of Attachment 2 are performed for all examination assessments.
3. Follow-up discussions between the IOLB reviewer and the examiner(s) being reviewed will take place to provide feedback to the examiner(s) and to improve the reviewer's understanding of the practices applied in the administration of the operating tests. The reviewer may also note those aspects of the simulator examination that he/she thought were particularly well-designed and implemented. The discussions shall not be used to review the performance of the applicant(s), and the reviewer shall not discuss with the examiner the pass/fail decision(s) to be made prior to the licensing decision.

D. Documentation Required

1. Any amplifying remarks or comments should be documented in the examination assessment memorandum. See Attachment 3 for an example.
2. The IOLB reviewer should also document any feedback related to consistent and efficient examination administration in the examination assessment memorandum.

3. Observations or deficiencies that require regional office response will be documented in the applicable enclosures to the examination assessment memorandum. Items that are significant, widespread, or repetitive require regional office response.
 - a. Significant – Single observation or group of observations that would have required program office consultation if it had been identified before licensing decisions were made.
 - b. Widespread – Multiple observations across all facets of the examination that would have required post-examination changes or changes to operating test grading.
 - c. Repetitive – An observation that would have required post-examination changes or changes to operating test grading that has occurred multiple times in multiple audits since the last office review.
 4. If this review is part of the quadrennial regional assessment visit, the IOLB reviewer shall forward all comments and remarks to the Team Leader assigned for the quadrennial regional assessment.
 5. If this review is not part of the quadrennial regional assessment visit, a memorandum using the template in Attachment 3 will be completed for transmittal to the appropriate regional management.
 6. These reports, either the quadrennial regional assessment or the individual plant initial operator licensing examination assessment, will generally be signed by the Director (or Deputy) of the NRR Division to which the OL program office is currently assigned.
 7. For observations requiring regional response, the region may document any corrective actions taken in a memorandum from the regional branch chief to the IOLB branch chief.
- E. Attachments
1. On-Site Review of Examination
 2. Off-Site Examination Records Review
 3. Initial Licensing Examination Assessment Template

Attachment 1

On-Site Review of Examination

Region: _____ Chief Examiner: _____
Facility: _____ Examination Dates: _____

NOTE: The presence of an asterisk (*) indicates a comment related to that item in Section C, below.

A. Written Examination Activities

1. If NRC proctored the written examination and auditor was present during administration, mark each of the following. Otherwise, mark each of the following as not applicable.

a) Each examinee was briefed on the policies and guidelines for taking NRC written examinations according to Appendix E. (ES-402 D.2.c)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

b) The NRC verified each applicant's identity and examination level against the approved "List of Applicants." (ES-402 D.1.d and Form ES-201-4)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

c) All applicant questions regarding specific written examination test items and all statements of clarification were documented (verbatim if possible) for reference by the NRC in resolving grading conflicts. (ES-402 D.3.b)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

d) All applicants signed their exam cover sheet before leaving the examination room (ES-402 D.4.a)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

e) The NRC chief examiner periodically monitored the facility's examination administration. (ES-402 C.2.b)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

2. If auditor present at validation week, mark each of the following. Otherwise, mark each of the following as not applicable.

- a) The chief examiner reviewed the facility's examination security and administration policies for compliance with the guidelines in NUREG-1021. (ES-201, Attachment 1 and ES-402 C.1 & D)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- b) The NRC chief examiner inspected the examination facilities during prep week to ensure their adequacy (ES-402 C.2.b)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

B. Operating Test Activities

1. If auditor is present during the validation activities, mark each of the following. Otherwise, mark each of the following as not applicable.

- a) An NRC examiner briefed the applicant(s) in accordance with parts A, C, D, and E of Appendix E before beginning the operating test. (ES-302 D.1.a)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- b) The chief examiner confirmed with the facility licensee that the instructor's station, programmer's tools, and external connections cannot compromise operating test security while conducting examinations. (ES-302 D.1.m)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- c) Each scenario and each job performance measure (JPM) was validated on the simulator. (ES-302 D.2.a & D.3.a)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- d) The examiners reviewed the scenarios together and discussed the required procedures, technical specifications, and special circumstances related to the scenarios. (ES-302 D.3.d)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- e) Forms ES-D-1 and ES-D-2 reflect any changes made to the scenario events or the expected operator actions as a result of scenario validation runs. (ES-302 D.3.c)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

2. If auditor present during administration week, mark each of the following. Otherwise, mark each of the following not applicable.

- a) The same JPMs and simulator scenarios were not repeated on subsequent days. (ES-301 D.1.a)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- b) Applicants at a facility qualifying for dual or multiunit licenses were tested on differences between the units during the walk-through portion of the operating test. (ES-301 D.1.g)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- c) Simulator operating tests for each applicant were not divided among examiners. (ES-302 D.1.f)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- d) Every applicant received a complete set of JPMs. (ES-302 D.1.d & D.1.f)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- e) Any JPMs subsequently altered or replaced after on-site validation were validated before use on the operating test. (ES-302 D.2.a)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- f) Performance-based follow-up questions during any part of the operating test complied with the criteria provided in Attachment 1 of ES-301 for guidelines regarding open-reference questions. Examiners only asked JPM follow-up questions when warranted. (ES-301 D.1.k & ES-302 D.2.f)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- g) The simulator setup matches the conditions specified for each JPM. (ES-302 D.2.b)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- h) The chief examiner had the simulator operator record selected parameters on the facility's safety parameter display system and retained the recordings. (ES-302 D.3.f)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- i) The examiners had the simulator operator advance any strip chart recorders. The examiners marked the recorders with the date, time and their initials. (ES-302 D.3.h)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- j) The examiners reviewed the scenarios with the simulator operator before beginning the simulator tests. This review included the examiner cautioning the simulator operator to only provide information specifically requested by the applicants and not to compromise the integrity of the examination. The simulator operator was provided with an up-to-date copy of Form ES-D-1. (ES-302 D.3.e & D.3.j)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- k) If time compression was used during the operating test, applicants were informed during the briefing. (ES-302 D.3.g)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- l) The examiner in charge of each scenario ensured communications with the simulator operator to insert scenario events did not cue applicants. (ES-302 D.3.g)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- m) Examiners monitored conversations between the simulator operator and the applicants to identify inappropriate cuing. (ES-302 D.3.j)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- n) After completing each scenario, the examiners conferred to compare notes and to verify that each applicant performed the required number of transients and events. Planned events were not removed inappropriately, and additional events/scenarios were run as necessary. (ES-302 D.3.o)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- o) Examiners collected any sketches, flow paths, or other illustrations made by the applicants when answering follow-up questions for JPMs and/or scenarios. Examiners had the simulator operator provide and retain copies of any logs, charts, or other materials to assist in documenting the applicant's performance when necessary. (ES-302 D.2.c & D.3.p)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- p) No facility staff, other than simulator operators, observed an operating test without the chief examiner's permission. No applicant was allowed to witness another applicant's operating test. Surrogate operators were used in accordance with NUREG-1021 and use of shift technical advisors was consistent with in-plant practice. Both surrogates and shift technical advisors were briefed on their expected actions. (ES-302 D.1.l)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- q) The chief examiner obtained operator licensing program office approval for outside organizations (e.g., Institute of Nuclear Power Operators' representatives) to observe any portion of an operating test. Observer's activities were controlled in accordance with program office guidance. (ES-302 D.1.l)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- r) Any simulator fidelity issues identified during the operating tests were documented and attached to the final examination report. (ES-302 D.3.q & ES-501 E.3.b-c)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

C. Comments and Notes on the On-Site Activities

Section and Item #: (Provide comment or evaluation for the associated item number)

Attachment 2

Off-Site Records Review

Region: _____ Chief Examiner: _____

Facility: _____ Examination Dates: _____

NOTE: **The presence of an asterisk (*) indicates a comment related to that item in Section D, below.**

A. Examination Documentation Review

1. Confirm that the ADAMS examination package contains properly completed and signed copies of the following with the appropriate release date, as applicable (ES-501 F.1):

- ES-201, Attachment 4, "Examination Approval Letter," with updated Form ES-201-4, "List of Applicants."
- Form ES-201-1, "Examination Preparation Checklist"
- Form ES-201-2, "Examination Outline Quality Checklist"
- Form ES-401-1, "BWR Examination Outline", Form ES-401N-1, "ABWR Examination Outline", Form ES-401-2, "PWR Examination Outline", or Form ES-401N-2, "AP-1000 Examination Outline"
- Form ES-401-3, "Generic Knowledge and Abilities Outline" or Form ES-401N-3, "Generic Knowledge and Abilities Outline"
- Form ES-401-4, "Record of Rejected K/As" or Form ES-401N-4, "Record of Rejected K/As"
- Form ES-401-6, "Written Examination Quality Checklist" or Form ES-401N-6, "Written Examination Quality Checklist"
- Form ES-401-9, "Written Examination Review Worksheet" or Form ES-401N-9, "Written Examination Review Worksheet"
- Form ES-403-1, "Written Examination Grading Quality Checklist"
- Draft written examination
- Final written examination and answer key
- Operating test outlines
- The proposed operating tests
- The as-given scenarios and the as-given JPMs
- Form ES-301-1, "Administrative Topics Outline"
- Form ES-301-2, "Control Room/In-Plant Systems Outline"
- Form ES-301-3, "Operating Test Quality Checklist"
- Form ES-301-4, "Simulator Scenario Quality Checklist"
- Form ES-301-5, "Transient and Event Checklist"
- Form ES-301-6, "Competencies Checklist"

- Form ES-301-7, "Operating Test Review Worksheet"

YES ___ NO ___

2. As documented in the examination report, no more than 30 days elapsed between the written examination and operating tests without obtaining NRR/NRO program office concurrence (ES-402 C.2.b)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

3. As documented in the examination report, the examiners audited approximately 10% of the license applications. (ES-202 C.2.e)

YES ___ NO ___

4. Generic strengths and weaknesses, significant written examination grading deficiencies, examination security issues, and any examination delays or time extensions are appropriately documented in the examination report. (ES-501 E.3.a)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

B. Written Examination Review

1. The written examination outline does not overemphasize any systems, evolutions, or generic topics and the justifications for deselected or rejected knowledge and ability (K/A) statements are appropriate. (Form ES-201-2)

YES ___ NO ___

2. Perform an independent review on 10 - 20% of the written examination questions, including reactor operator / senior reactor operator questions, a sampling of bank, modified and new questions, and a sampling of questions identified as U, E, and S on Form ES-401-9 or ES-401N-9.

- a) NRC examiner's comments are reasonable and appropriate changes were made to address identified deficiencies. (ES-401 E.2.d & E.3.a/ES-401N E.2.d & E.3.a)

YES ___ NO ___

- b) The final version of each sampled question is without latent flaws and meets requirements for level of difficulty, level of knowledge, K/A match, and license level. References do not aid in distractor elimination or cue the correct answer. (Appendix A and B)

YES ___ NO ___

- c) Changes made to modified questions were sufficient to meet NUREG-1021 criteria. (ES-401 D.2.f/ES-401N D.2.f)

YES ___ NO ___

- d) The number of bank questions repeated from the previous two licensing examinations are within program guidance. (Form ES-401-6/ES-401N-6)

YES ___ NO ___

- e) Bank use meets limits. (ES-401 D.2.f / ES-401N D.2.f)

YES ___ NO ___

- f) A technical reference and cross-reference to the facility's examination bank is noted as applicable for each question. (ES-401 D.2.g / ES-401N D.2.g)

YES ___ NO ___

- g) The master copy of the examination was annotated to reflect changes made to questions during administration of the examination. (ES-402 D.3.b and E.1)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- h) The facility submitted formal comments within 20 calendar days after examination administration. The comments were signed by an authorized facility representative and include a facility position for any applicant comments. (ES-402 E.4 and E.6)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- i) The facility comments were properly evaluated and resolved with the resolution and justification documented in the examination report and the master examination file revised accordingly. (ES-403 D.1.a & D.3.a)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- j) If two or more SRO and/or seven or more RO questions were deleted during the grading process, the regional office evaluated the remainder of the examination to ensure it satisfies the test outline sampling requirements in ES-401 or ES-401N and consults with the operator licensing program office if the validity of the examination is in question. (ES-501 C.2.c)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- k) There was no opportunity for examiners to identify and correct psychometric flaws that led to post-administration question changes/deletions during examination development and review. (ES-401 E.2.d)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

C. Operating Test Review

1. The Region's (facility's) draft comments were reasonable and appropriately resolved in the final operating test. (ES-301 E.2.a)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

2. Each candidate was evaluated on the required number of administrative topics and at the required license level (ES-301 D.3.a & c)

YES ___ NO ___

3. Based on the applicant's license level, each candidate was evaluated on the required number of systems from the safety function groupings identified in the applicable K/A Catalog (BWR or PWR) during the test: (ES-301 D.4.a)

YES ___ NO ___

4. Each control room system JPM selected for RO and instant SRO (SROI) applicants evaluate a different safety function (for PWRs, two systems, one primary and one secondary, may be selected from Safety Function 4). The same system is not used to evaluate more than one safety function in each location. (ES-301 D.4.a)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

5. The five systems selected for an upgrade SRO applicant evaluate five different safety functions. The same system is not used to evaluate more than one safety function. (ES-301 D.4.a)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

6. The criteria requirements listed on Forms ES-301-1, "Administrative Topics Outline" and ES-301-2, "Control Room/In-Plant Systems Outline," are within limits for each type of applicant. (ES-301 D.2.a & D.4.b)

YES ___ NO ___

7. All JPMs, individually and as a group, have meaningful performance requirements that provide a basis for evaluating the applicant's understanding of and ability to operate the plant. The level of difficulty of each JPM and the JPM set is acceptable. The JPMs do not have latent flaws that would impact the ability to evaluate the applicant's competency. (ES-301, D.1.d, D.2.c, & E.2.a)

YES ___ NO ___

8. Applicants at a facility qualifying for dual or multi-unit licenses are properly tested on the different systems, control board layouts, and any other differences between the units during the walk-through portion of the operating test. (ES-301 D.1.g) Mark this as not applicable if the on-site review was performed.

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

9. Alternate path tasks meet the criteria specified in Appendix C, Section C.
- YES ___ NO ___
10. The initial conditions, normal operations, malfunctions, and major transients are varied among the scenarios and include startup, low power, and full power situations. (ES-301 D.5.c)
- YES ___ NO ___
11. Each scenario set exercises each applicant on the types and quantities of evolutions, failures, technical specification (TS) evaluations, and transients, identified for the applicant's license level, as described on Form ES-301-5, "Transient and Event Checklist," with each event only counted once per applicant. (ES-301 D.5.d)
- YES ___ NO ___
12. For each event listed on Form ES-D-1, Form ES-D-2, "Required Operator Actions," describes the expected communications, actions, and reference material to be used by each operating position on the crew. (ES-301 D.5.f)
- YES ___ NO ___
13. The scenario quantitative attributes are within the target bands established on Form ES-301-4, "Simulator Scenario Quality Checklist." (ES-301 D.1.d & D.5.d)
- YES ___ NO ___
14. Each scenario set adequately evaluates each competency and rating factor. (ES-301 D.5.d)
- YES ___ NO ___

15. Each scenario and scenario set have meaningful performance requirements that provide a basis for evaluating the applicant's competency in the control room and are of an appropriate level of difficulty. The scenarios do not have latent flaws that would impact the ability to evaluate the applicant's competency. (ES-301 D.1.d)

YES ___ NO ___

16. The walk-through and simulator tests are not redundant, nor do they duplicate material on the written examination. (ES-301 D.1.h)

YES ___ NO ___

17. The final simulator scenarios were revised to reflect the "as run" conditions. (ES-303 D.3.a & ES-501 F.1.h)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

18. The facility submitted formal comments within 20 calendar days after examination administration. The comments were signed by an authorized facility representative and include a facility position for any applicant comments. (ES-402 E.4 and E.6)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

19. The facility comments were properly evaluated and resolved with the resolution and justification documented in the examination report and the master examination file revised accordingly. (ES-403 D.1.a & D.3.a)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

20. Using the examination schedule, mark each of the following. If an on-site review was performed during operating test administration, mark each of the following as N/A:

- Confirm that the same JPMs and simulator scenarios are not repeated on subsequent days. (ES-301 D.1.a)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- Simulator operating tests for each applicant were not divided among examiners. (ES-302 D.1.f)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- Every applicant received a complete set of JPMs. (ES-302 D.1.d & D.1.f)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

- No NRC examiner is scheduled to administer more than four complete simulator operating tests in any one week. (ES-201 C.2.f)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

D. Grading Activities

1. Each applicant's original answer sheet was graded and annotated to indicate which questions were answered incorrectly, the correct answer noted and which questions (if any) were deleted. (ES-403 D.2.b)

YES ___ NO ___

2. The results of an independent review of the written examination agrees with the region's results. (ES-403 D.3.b)

YES ___ NO ___

3. Unsatisfactory JPM grading evaluations based solely on follow-up questions are documented in accordance with ES-303. (ES-303 D.2.a and D.3.d)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

4. Any material generated or used by the applicant that contributes to a failure of any portion of the operating test is cross-referenced to the applicable deficiency and attached to the examination package. (ES-303 D.1.a)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

5. All of the examiners' observations are consistent and mutually supportive. A performance deficiency shared by more than one applicant is appropriately documented for those applicants. Documentation for applicants on the same operating crew is consistent. Operating errors that involved more than one applicant in an operating crew are noted by all involved evaluating examiners. (ES-302 D.3.o)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

6. The validity and technical accuracy of any performance-based questions and any simulator test unexpected events or actions have been verified. (ES-303 D.1.b)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

7. All required rating factors were evaluated for every applicant. Any SRO upgrade applicants who acted in the reactor operator or balance of plant positions were graded on SRO Competency 3, "Control Board Operations," even if they were not individually evaluated during the scenario. Rating factors that were "not observed" were limited and properly justified. (ES-301 D.5.d; ES-302 D.1.d; ES-303 D.2.b and D.3.d)

YES ___ NO ___

8. Each documented simulator operating test performance deficiency is assigned to no more than two rating factors. (ES-303 D.1.d)

YES ___ NO ___

9. Performance deficiencies and critical task errors were properly tabulated when determining rating factor scores and competency grades. (ES-303 D.2.b)

YES ___ NO ___

10. Any unsatisfactory grade resulting in a license denial is supported with detailed documentation. (ES-303 D.3.b)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

11. Any deviation from the nominal grading criteria in ES-303 was explained in detail and approved in writing by the applicable NRR or NRO program office. (ES-303 C.2 and D.3.d)

YES ___ NO ___ N/A ___

12. An independent pass or fail recommendation is made by the chief examiner or designee and reviewed by the responsible regional supervisor. (ES-501 D.2.f & D.3.a - b)

YES ___ NO ___

E. Comments and Notes on the Off-Site Records Review

Section and Item #: (Provide comment or evaluation for the associated item number)



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

OLMC-320
March 2019

MONTH DAY, 20XX

MEMORANDUM TO: [FIRST M. LAST], Director
Division of Reactor Safety, Region X

FROM: [FIRST M. LAST], Deputy Director
Division of Inspection and Regional Support
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: [INSERT STATION NAME] INITIAL OPERATOR LICENSING
EXAMINATION ASSESSMENT

This memorandum refers to the audit conducted by [REVIEWER NAME] of my staff of the initial operator licensing examinations administered by Region [X] staff from [DATE RANGE], at the [STATION NAME]. [The audit consisted of on-site observation of the administration of the operating test OR written examination, and a post-examination review of the written examination and other examination records.] OR [The audit consisted of a post-examination review of the written examination, operating test, and other examination records]

Include if the examination was determined to be of good quality – [In general, the examination was determined to be of good quality and in compliance with Revision [XX] of NUREG-1021, "Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors." I have enclosed some observations and feedback for your consideration. {Corrective actions to the noted observations shall be provided to the program office for review – Include if necessary}]

Include if the examination had deficiencies requiring regional response – [The audit results identify {multiple instances where the examination did not} {a significant failure to}{a repetitive failure to} meet the requirements of Revision [XX] of NUREG-1021, "Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors." The program office has determined that no evidence exists to suggest that the licensing decisions are invalid; however, these deficiencies must be corrected for future examinations. Corrective actions to the noted deficiencies shall be provided to the program office for review. These deficiencies and additional comments for consideration are enclosed.]

If you have any questions, please contact [FIRST LAST NAME], Chief, Operator Licensing Branch, at (301) 415-XXXX.

Enclosures:

1. Written Examination Review Findings
2. Operating Test Review Findings

CONTACT: [BC FIRST LAST NAME], NRR/DIRS
301-415-XXXX

SUBJECT: [INSERT STATION NAME] INITIAL OPERATOR LICENSING
EXAMINATION ASSESSMENT

DISTRIBUTION:

{Distribution includes the regional branch chief and members of the examination team}

[FLast, RX FLast, RX FLast, RX FLast, RX]

Accession No.: MLXXXXXXXX

OFFICE	DIRS/IOLB	BC:DIRS/IOLB	DD: DIRS
NAME			
DATE			

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

{Items in blue should be updated by the IOLB reviewer. Items in green should be updated/included by the IOLB reviewer as needed. Items in fuchsia should be deleted as these are included to assist in the template formatting and should not be part of the final document. Items in yellow are updated by the administrative assistant.}

Written Examination Review Findings

Deficiencies Requiring Corrective Actions Submitted to Program Office

{In this section put in any items that require corrective actions on the part of the regions be submitted to the program office. Include the applicable portion of the NUREG-1021 that was not met and the basis for requiring corrective action – i.e., significance, how widespread, and/or repetitive nature of the errors in accordance with Section D.2 of this OLMC. Discuss any impact on the examination quality and/or licensing decisions, if necessary. Recommend that this be a bulleted list with reference to the audit worksheet items. If there are no items, insert “NONE” below the title.}

Feedback for Consideration

{In this section put in any feedback for the region’s consideration, including feedback regarding consistent and efficient examination administration. These are items that might or might not be in accordance with the NUREG, but whose impact is minor and while corrective actions may be performed by the region, it is not necessary for the program office to be informed of those actions. Recommend that this be a bulleted list, with reference to the applicable NUREG section if necessary. Note that this is also the location to provide any positive comments on the examination.}

Operating Test Review Findings

Deficiencies Requiring Corrective Actions Submitted to Program Office

{In this section put in any items that require corrective actions on the part of the regions be submitted to the program office. Include the applicable portion of the NUREG-1021 that was not met and the basis for requiring corrective action – i.e., significance, how widespread, and/or repetitive nature of the errors in accordance with Section D.2 of this OLMC. Discuss any impact on the examination quality and/or licensing decisions, if necessary. Recommend that this be a bulleted list with reference to the audit worksheet items. If there are no items, insert “NONE” below the title.}

Feedback for Consideration

{In this section put in any feedback for the region’s consideration, including feedback regarding consistent and efficient examination administration. These are items that might or might not be in accordance with the NUREG, but whose impact is minor and while corrective actions may be performed by the region, it is not necessary for the program office to be informed of those actions. Recommend that this be a bulleted list, with reference to the applicable NUREG section if necessary. Note that this is also the location to provide any positive comments on the examination.}