

## **ON-SITE SUMMARY DISCUSSION GUIDANCE**

IMPEP TEAM

[LIST TEAM MEMBERS]

\_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_

AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY

[AS APPROPRIATE]

- Team Leader
- Technical Staffing and Training
- Status of Materials Inspection Program
- Technical Quality of Inspections
- Technical Quality of Licensing Actions
- Technical Quality of Incident and Allegation Activities
- Legislation, Regulation, and Other Program Elements
- Sealed Source and Device Evaluation Program
- Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Program
- Uranium Recovery Program

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

NRC Management Attending, \_\_\_\_\_

### OPENING REMARKS - Team Leader Guidance

NRC management will present a short synopsis of IMPEP and introduce the team.

Team Leader should cover the following points:

- The team and I want to thank you and your staff for your cooperation and patience during our review.
- The team will be recommending to the Management Review Board (MRB) that the Program be found [ADEQUATE; ADEQUATE, BUT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT; OR NOT ADEQUATE; AND COMPATIBLE OR NOT COMPATIBLE].
- At this time, I will ask each of the team members to briefly summarize their results for the indicators that they reviewed. I want to emphasize that these ratings are preliminary and may be changed as the report is written. If a rating does get altered, I will inform you of the change before the draft report is issued.

## COMMON PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

### TECHNICAL STAFFING AND TRAINING - Principal Reviewer Guidance

- The team will recommend to the MRB that the Program be found [SATISFACTORY; SATISFACTORY, BUT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT; OR UNSATISFACTORY] with respect to the indicator, Technical Staffing and Training.
- The criteria for [SATISFACTORY; SATISFACTORY, BUT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT; OR UNSATISFACTORY] finding, include: [EVALUATION CRITERIA FROM MD 5.6, PART III]
- The team looked at the Program's response to the IMPEP questionnaire relative to this indicator, interviewed program management and staff, and considered any possible backlogs in licensing or compliance actions.
- [SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS, IF ANY]
- [SPECIFIC GOOD PRACTICES, IF ANY]

### STATUS OF MATERIALS INSPECTION PROGRAM - Principal Reviewer Guidance

- The team will recommend to the MRB that the Program be found [SATISFACTORY; SATISFACTORY, BUT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT; OR UNSATISFACTORY] with respect to the indicator, Status of Materials Inspection Program.
- The criteria for [SATISFACTORY; SATISFACTORY, BUT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT; OR UNSATISFACTORY] finding, include: [EVALUATION CRITERIA FROM MD 5.6, PART III]
- The team focused on five factors in reviewing this indicator: inspection frequency, overdue inspections, initial inspection of new licenses, the timely dispatch of inspection findings to licensees, and the performance of reciprocity inspections. The team looked at the computer generated reports of inspection tracking, as well as [NUMBER] individual license files.
- [SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS, IF ANY]
- [SPECIFIC GOOD PRACTICES, IF ANY]

### TECHNICAL QUALITY OF INSPECTIONS - Principal Reviewer Guidance

- The team will recommend to the MRB that the Program be found [SATISFACTORY; SATISFACTORY, BUT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT; OR UNSATISFACTORY] with respect to the indicator, Technical Quality of Inspections.
- The criteria for [SATISFACTORY; SATISFACTORY, BUT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT; OR UNSATISFACTORY] finding, include: [EVALUATION CRITERIA FROM MD 5.6, PART III]

- The team looked at [NUMBER] inspections reports conducted during the review period, for all of the Program's materials inspectors and covered a sampling of the higher priority categories of license types as follows: [LIST TYPES OF LICENSES]. [NUMBER] inspectors were accompanied. The team also reviewed the laboratory facilities and equipment available to the program.
- [SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS, IF ANY]
- [SPECIFIC GOOD PRACTICES, IF ANY]

#### TECHNICAL QUALITY OF LICENSING ACTIONS - Principal Reviewer Guidance

- The team will recommend to the MRB that the Program be found [SATISFACTORY; SATISFACTORY, BUT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT; OR UNSATISFACTORY] with respect to the indicator, Technical Quality of Licensing Actions.
- The criteria for [SATISFACTORY; SATISFACTORY, BUT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT; OR UNSATISFACTORY] finding, include: [EVALUATION CRITERIA FROM MD 5.6, PART III]
- The team looked at [NUMBER] licenses, which included [LIST TYPE OF LICENSING ACTIONS SUCH AS NEW, RENEWAL, AMENDMENTS, AND TERMINATIONS.] The work of [NUMBER] license reviewers was included in the sampling covering the following types of licenses: [LIST TYPE OF LICENSE REVIEWED].
- [SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS, IF ANY]
- [SPECIFIC GOOD PRACTICES, IF ANY]

#### TECHNICAL QUALITY OF INCIDENT AND ALLEGATION ACTIVITIES - Principal Reviewer Guidance

- The team will recommend to the MRB that the Program be found [SATISFACTORY; SATISFACTORY, BUT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT; OR UNSATISFACTORY] with respect to the indicator, Technical Quality of Incident and Allegation Activities.
- The criteria for [SATISFACTORY; SATISFACTORY, BUT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT; OR UNSATISFACTORY] finding, include: [EVALUATION CRITERIA FROM MD 5.6, PART III]
- The team looked at the Program's actions responding to [NUMBER] incidents and [NUMBER] allegations, reviewed the incidents reported for [PROGRAM] in the "Nuclear Material Events Database (NMED)" against those identified by the Program, and reviewed the casework and license files, as appropriate, for these files.
- [SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS, IF ANY]
- [SPECIFIC GOOD PRACTICES, IF ANY]

## **NON-COMMON PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (AS APPLICABLE)**

- The team will recommend to the MRB that the Program be found [SATISFACTORY; SATISFACTORY, BUT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT; OR UNSATISFACTORY] with respect to the indicator, [Legislation, Regulations, and Other Program Elements, Sealed Source and Device (SS&D) Evaluation Program, Low-Level Radioactive Waste (LLRW) Disposal Program, or Uranium Recovery Program].
- The criteria for [SATISFACTORY; SATISFACTORY, BUT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT; OR UNSATISFACTORY] finding, include: [EVALUATION CRITERIA FROM MD 5.6, PART III]
- The team looked at [LIST].
- [SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS, IF ANY]
- [SPECIFIC GOOD PRACTICES, IF ANY]

REPEAT, AS NECESSARY, FOR ALL APPLICABLE NON-COMMON PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

## **SUMMARY GUIDANCE - Team Leader**

- In summary, the team will be recommending to the MRB that the Program be found [SUMMARIZE FINDINGS FOR SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE INDICATORS- NUMBER OF SATISFACTORY; NUMBER OF SATISFACTORY, BUT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT; AND NUMBER OF UNSATISFACTORY]. The team will be recommending to the MRB that the Program be found [ADEQUATE; ADEQUATE, BUT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT; OR NOT ADEQUATE; AND COMPATIBLE OR NOT COMPATIBLE] with NRC's program.
- The draft IMPEP report containing the team's findings and recommendations will be completed in approximately 45 days and provided to you for factual review and comment. We ask that you review the report and provide comments to the NRC within 4 weeks.
- The MRB meeting to discuss the team's findings and recommendations has been scheduled for DATE.
- The proposed final IMPEP report addressing your comments will be provided to you and the MRB in advance of the meeting.
- You or your representative will be invited to attend the meeting. NRC will provide travel for one representative, yet you may send as many as you wish. NRC also has means for video (e.g., Skype) and/or teleconferencing if either of those mediums is preferred.
- The final report will feature the findings and recommendations as decided upon by the MRB, based on recommendations of the IMPEP team, any additional information provided by the Program, and the deliberations within the board. The NRC's goal is to issue the final report within 120 days of the on-site review.

- We welcome any comments you may have on the review of your Program or on the IMPEP process in general.
- Again, I want to thank you and your staff for their cooperation and assistance this week. It has been a pleasure working with you and your staff.