

Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP)

Directive 5.6

Contents

Policy	1
Objectives	1
Organizational Responsibilities and Delegations of Authority	2
Deputy Executive Director for Nuclear Materials Safety, Safeguards, and Operations Support (DEDS)	2
Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS) and Director, Office of State Programs (OSP)	2
General Counsel	2
Director, Office for Analysis and Evaluation of Operational Data (AEOD)	3
Regional Administrators	3
Applicability	3
Handbook	3
References	3



U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Volume: 5 Governmental Relations and Public
Affairs

NMSS/OSP

Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) Directive 5.6

Policy (5.6-01)

It is the policy of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to evaluate the regional materials programs and Agreement State radiation control programs in an integrated manner, using common performance indicators, to ensure that the public health and safety is being adequately protected.

Objectives (5.6-02)

- To establish the process by which the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards and the Office of State Programs conduct their periodic assessments to determine the adequacy of the licensing and inspection programs in the NRC regions and Agreement States. (021)
- To provide NRC and Agreement State management with a more systematic and integrated approach to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of their nuclear material licensing and inspection programs. (022)
- To provide significant input in the regulatory decisionmaking process and indicate areas in which NRC and the Agreement States should dedicate more resources or management attention. (023)

Organizational Responsibilities and Delegations of Authority

(5.6-03)

Deputy Executive Director for Nuclear Materials Safety, Safeguards, and Operations Support (DEDS)

(031)

- Oversees the integrated materials performance evaluation program (IMPEP). (a)
- Chairs management review boards. (b)
- Signs final reports issued to each region and Agreement State. (c)

Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS) and Director, Office of State Programs (OSP)

(032)

- Implement the IMPEP within NMSS and OSP. Provide staffing support and training for review teams. (a)
- Establish a schedule and develop a detailed review regimen for conducting the reviews in each region and Agreement State. (b)
- Monitor the IMPEP process; evaluate and develop IMPEP policy, criteria, and methodology, and assess the uniformity and adequacy of the implementation of the program. (c)
- Issue draft reports and prepare final reports for each region and State for consideration by the management review board and signature by the DEDS. (d)
- Participate on management review boards. (e)
- Coordinate with Agreement States to staff IMPEP reviews and the management review board with appropriate Agreement State representatives. (f)

General Counsel

(033)

Participates on management review boards.

**Director, Office for Analysis and
Evaluation of Operational
Data (AEOD)**
(034)

Participates on management review boards.

Regional Administrators
(035)

- Implement the IMPEP within their respective regions. (a)
- Provide staffing support for review teams, as needed. (b)

Applicability
(5.6-04)

The policy and guidance in this directive and handbook apply to all NRC employees who are responsible for and participate in the IMPEP.

Handbook
(5.6-05)

Handbook 5.6 describes the performance indicators that will be used, the performance standards against which these indicators will be evaluated, and the frequency and process sequence to be employed. The "Glossary" in the handbook also defines some of the key terminology.

References
(5.6-06)

- Code of Federal Regulations*, 10 CFR 35.2, "Purpose and Scope."
NRC Inspection Manual, Chapter 1245, "Inspector Qualifications."
—, Chapter 1246, "Materials License Reviewer Qualification."
—, Chapter 2800, "Materials Inspection Program."

***Integrated Materials
Performance Evaluation
Program (IMPEP)***

***Handbook
5.6***

Contents

Part I

Evaluation	1
Evaluation Frequency (A)	1
Evaluation Process Sequence (B)	1

Part II

Performance Indicators	3
General (A)	3
Programmatic Indicators (B)	4
Performance Indicator 1—Status of Materials Inspection Program (1)	4
Performance Indicator 2—Technical Staffing and Training (2)	4
Performance Indicator 3—Technical Quality of Licensing Actions (3)	5
Performance Indicator 4—Technical Quality of Inspections (4)	6
Performance Indicator 5—Response to Incidents and Allegations (5)	6

Part III

Evaluation Criteria	7
Indicator 1—Status of Materials Inspection Program (A)	7
Satisfactory (1)	7
Satisfactory With Recommendations for Improvement (2)	8
Unsatisfactory (3)	8
Category N (4)	8
Indicator 2—Technical Staffing and Training (B)	8
Satisfactory (1)	8
Satisfactory With Recommendations for Improvement (2)	9
Unsatisfactory (3)	10
Category N (4)	10
Indicator 3—Technical Quality of Licensing Actions (C)	11
Satisfactory (1)	11
Satisfactory With Recommendations for Improvement (2)	11
Unsatisfactory (3)	11

Contents

Part III (continued)

Category N (4)	12
Indicator 4—Technical Quality of Inspections (D)	12
Satisfactory (1)	12
Satisfactory With Recommendations for Improvement (2)	12
Unsatisfactory (3)	13
Category N (4)	13
Indicator 5—Response to Incidents and Allegations (E)	13
Satisfactory (1)	13
Satisfactory With Recommendations for Improvement (2)	14
Unsatisfactory (3)	14
Category N (4)	14

Part IV

Programmatic Assessment	15
General (A)	15
Findings for Agreement State Programs (B)	16
Finding 1—Adequate to Protect Public Health and Safety and Compatible (1)	16
Finding 2—Adequate to Protect Public Health and Safety and Not Compatible (2)	16
Finding 3—Adequate, But Needs Improvement and/or Not Compatible (3) ..	16
Finding 4—Inadequate to Protect Public Health and Safety and/or Not Compatible (4)	17
Findings for NRC Regional Programs (C)	17
Glossary	18

Part I

Evaluation

Evaluation Frequency (A)

NRC will review the performance of each region and each Agreement State on a periodic basis. The schedule for conducting each regional or Agreement State visit will be developed by the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS) and the Office of State Programs (OSP) in coordination with the regions and States. Approximately 10 to 12 reviews will be scheduled in most years. Under normal conditions, this would allow evaluations of NRC regions every 2 years, and Agreement States every 3 years. However, these frequencies can be adjusted upward or downward on the basis of the findings from the last review or in light of significant program changes in a particular State or region. In addition, this schedule provides for review of certain NMSS functions on an as-needed basis.

Evaluation Process Sequence (B)

The typical evaluation process for the review team is summarized below:

- Develop review schedule for the year. (1)
- Assemble and train team members. (2)
- Designate team leader and members for each scheduled review. (3)
- Review completed licensing actions on an ongoing basis to help focus reviews. (4)
- Transmit questionnaires to affected regions and States. (5)

Evaluation Process Sequence (B) (continued)

- Provide copies of questionnaire responses and most current performance data summary to team members. (6)
- Assess a sample of inspections at different types of licensed facilities by accompanying the inspectors. (7)
- Conduct onsite portion of IMPEP, using the criteria specified in this handbook and any performance review procedures in conjunction with any customized review elements. (8)
- Prepare draft IMPEP report, with recommendation for overall performance evaluation, for office director's signature. (9)
- Issue the draft report. (10)
- Review and consider written comments received from the regions or Agreement States. (11)
- Prepare proposed final report for consideration by the management review board (MRB). (12)
- Conduct MRB meeting. (13)
- Issue final reports, include the written responses received and any changes to the report based on consideration of the written responses, and a summary of MRB findings. (14)

Part II

Performance Indicators

General (A)

A description of the performance indicators to be evaluated for each region and each Agreement State is given in (B) of this part. The evaluation criteria (i.e., performance standards) against which these indicators are to be assessed are described in Part III of this handbook. These reviews determine program adequacy and compatibility in the Agreement States and are instrumental in improving State and NRC regional performance, thus ultimately leading to improved licensee performance. (1)

The performance indicators should be used as a starting point of inquiry. This, in turn, should lead program evaluators to a more careful examination of the underlying conditions, or root causes, of potential problem areas. Evaluators may find correlations exists between two or more performance indicators. In this situation, the impact of individual performance symptoms could be compounded when combined with others. Conversely, a regulatory program measured as potentially weak against one particular indicator, nonetheless, could be rated as strong overall if there are sufficient mitigating factors with respect to other indicators. (2)

Certain non-reactor functions that continue to be conducted from NRC headquarters, such as fuel cycle licensing, uranium and thorium milling, sealed source and device reviews, low-level radioactive waste disposal licensing, and safeguards activities are excluded from this set of indicators because they are not common to regional and Agreement State activities. These may be incorporated, as appropriate, as noncommon indicators contributing to a performance-based evaluation of a program. (3)

General (A) (continued)

For Agreement States, the noncommon indicators will be legislative and legal authority, compatibility, uranium and thorium milling, sealed source and device reviews, and low-level radioactive waste disposal licensing. (4)

This exclusion does not prohibit the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS) and the Office of State Programs (OSP) from using other indicators and/or performance standards to supplement those described in this directive. (5)

Programmatic Indicators (B)

Performance Indicator 1—Status of Materials Inspection Program (1)

Periodic inspections of licensed operations are essential to ensure that activities are being conducted in compliance with regulatory requirements and consistent with good safety practices. The frequency of inspections is specified in the NRC Inspection Manual, Chapter 2800, and is dependent on the amount and the kind of material, the type of operation licensed, and the results of previous inspections. There must be a capability for maintaining and retrieving statistical data on the status of the compliance program. Information regarding the number of overdue inspections is a significant measure of the status of an Agreement State's or NRC region's materials inspection program, although reviews also should examine specific cases where the inspection frequency has been significantly exceeded (i.e., by more than 100 percent). The terms "materials inspection" and "overdue inspection" are defined in the Glossary to this handbook.

Performance Indicator 2—Technical Staffing and Training (2)

The ability to conduct effective licensing and inspection programs is largely dependent on having a sufficient number of experienced, knowledgeable, well-trained technical personnel. Under certain conditions, staff turnover could have an adverse effect on the implementation of these programs; thus it could affect public health and safety. (a)

For this performance indicator, qualitative as well as quantitative measures must be considered. In particular, the reason for apparent trends in staffing must be explored. Is the rate of turnover and the

Programmatic Indicators (B) (continued)

Performance Indicator 2—Technical Staffing and Training (2) (continued)

degree of understaffing symptomatic of a chronic problem or is it merely a short-term phenomenon? Why is turnover high? What steps are being taken to address this? What effect is it having on other performance indicators? (b)

Review of staffing also requires a consideration and evaluation of the levels of training and qualification of the technical staff. New hires need to be technically qualified. Professional staff normally should have bachelor's degrees or equivalent training in the physical and/or life sciences. Training requirements for NRC inspectors are specified in the NRC Inspection Manual, Chapter 1245, and for NRC materials licensing reviewers, in the NRC Inspection Manual, Chapter 1246. The requirements include a combination of classroom requirements and practical on-the-job training. Some NRC regions impose additional requirements on certain license reviewers or inspectors, depending on their individual responsibilities and the types of licenses they review and/or inspect. (c)

In addition, the qualification process for NRC materials program inspectors includes demonstration of knowledge of relevant sections of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, completion of a qualifications journal, and appearance before a qualification board. Although Agreement States need not follow the NRC Inspection Manual, Chapters 1245 and 1246, they should have a program for training and qualification of personnel, and it should be adhered to in Agreement State programs. The evaluation standard measures the overall quality of training available to, and taken by, materials program personnel. (d)

Performance Indicator 3—Technical Quality of Licensing Actions (3)

An acceptable program for licensing radioactive material includes preparation and use of internal licensing guides and policy memoranda to ensure technical quality in the licensing program (when appropriate, NRC guidance may be used); prelicensing inspection of complex facilities; and supervisory review, when appropriate. (a)

Programmatic Indicators (B) (continued)

Performance Indicator 3 – Technical Quality of Licensing Actions (3) (continued)

This performance indicator evaluates the technical quality of the licensing program on the basis of an in-depth onsite review of a representative cross-section of licensing action for various types of licenses. Technical quality includes not only the review of completed actions, but also an examination of any renewals that have been pending for more than a year because the failure to act on such requests may have health and safety implications. To the extent possible, the onsite review also should capture a representative cross-section as completed by each of the reviewers in the region or State. (b)

Performance Indicator 4 – Technical Quality of Inspections (4)

This performance indicator provides the qualitative balance to Performance Indicator 1, which looks at the status of the inspection program on a quantitative basis. Review team members will accompany a sampling of inspectors at different types of licensed facilities to evaluate the knowledge and capabilities of regional and Agreement State inspectors. These accompaniments will usually occur at a time other than the onsite review of the region or Agreement State to afford the review team sufficient time to observe inspectors at different types of licensee facilities. These reviews focus on the scope, completeness, and technical accuracy of completed inspections and related documentation. Review teams will conduct in-depth, onsite reviews of a cross-section of completed inspection reports performed by different inspectors. In addition, review teams will verify that supervisors generally accompany inspectors on an annual basis to provide management quality assurance.

Performance Indicator 5 – Response to Incidents and Allegations (5)

The quality, thoroughness, and timeliness of the NRC or Agreement State response to incidents, alleged incidents, and other allegations of safety concerns can have a direct bearing on public health and safety. A careful assessment of incident response and allegation investigation procedures, actual implementation of these procedures, internal and external coordination, and investigative and followup procedures will be a significant indicator of the overall quality of the program.

Part III

Evaluation Criteria

NRC regions and Agreement States will be evaluated in their ability to conduct effective licensing and inspection programs using the performance indicators described in Part II of this handbook. The evaluation criteria for each performance indicator are given below.

Indicator 1—Status of Materials Inspection Program (A)

Satisfactory (1)

- Core licensees (those with inspection frequencies of 3 years or less) are inspected at regular intervals in accordance with frequencies prescribed in NRC Inspection Manual, Chapter 2800. (a)
- Deviations from these schedules are normally coordinated between working staff and management. Deviations are generally the result of joint decisions that consider the risk of licensee operation, past licensee performance, and the need to temporarily defer the inspection(s) to address more urgent or more critical priorities. (b)
- There is clear evidence of an organized “get-well” plan to reschedule any missed or deferred inspections. (c)
- Inspections of new licensees are generally conducted within 6 months of license approval, or in accordance with NRC Inspection Manual, Chapter 2800, Section 04-03, for those new licensees not possessing licensed material. (d)
- A large majority of the inspection findings are communicated to licensees in a timely manner (30 calendar days as specified in NRC Inspection Manual, Chapter 0610-10). (e)

Indicator 1 – Status of Materials Inspection Program (A) (continued)

Satisfactory With Recommendations for Improvement (2)

- More than 10 percent of the core licensees are inspected at intervals that exceed the NRC Inspection Manual, Chapter 2800, frequencies by more than 25 percent. (a)
- Inspections of new licensees are frequently not conducted within 6 months of license approval. (b)
- Some of the inspection findings are delayed, or not communicated to licensees with 30 days. (c)

Unsatisfactory (3)

- More than 25 percent of the core licensees are inspected at intervals that exceed that NRC Inspection Manual, Chapter 2800, frequencies by more than 25 percent. (a)
- Inspections of new licensees are frequently delayed, as are the inspection findings. (b)

Category N (4)

- Special conditions exist that provide adequate justification for withholding a rating. For example, an unforeseen event or emergency with significant health and safety consequences may have required a temporary diversion of resources from the core inspection program. However, these programmatic adjustments are well thought out and properly coordinated with the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS) or Agreement State management.

Indicator 2 – Technical Staffing and Training (B)

Satisfactory (1)

Review indicates implementation of a well-conceived and -balanced staffing strategy throughout the assessment period and demonstrates the qualifications of the technical staff. This is indicated by the presence of most of the following features:

Indicator 2—Technical Staffing and Training (B) (continued)

Satisfactory (1) (continued)

- Balance in staffing the licensing and inspection programs (a)
- Few, if any, vacancies, especially at the senior-level positions (b)
- Prompt management attention and review, such as development of a corrective action plan to address problems in high rates of attrition or positions being vacant for extended periods (c)
- Qualification criteria for hiring new technical staff established and followed (Staff would normally be expected to have bachelor's degrees or equivalent training in the physical and/or life sciences. Senior personnel should have additional training and experience in radiation protection commensurate with the types of licenses they issue or inspect.) (d)
- License reviewers and inspectors trained and qualified in a reasonable time period¹ (e)
- Management commitment to training clearly evident (f)

Satisfactory With Recommendations for Improvement (2)

Review determines the presence of some of the following conditions:

- Some staff turnover that could adversely upset the balance in staffing the licensing and inspection programs (a)
- Some vacant positions not readily filled (b)
- Some evidence of management attention or actions to deal with staffing problems (c)
- Some of the licensing and inspection personnel not making prompt progress in completing all of the training and qualification requirements (d)

¹ For the regions, this means there has been, and continues to be, a clear effort to adhere to the requirements and conditions specified in NRC Inspection Manual, Chapters 1245 and 1246, and the applicable qualifications journals, or to receive equivalent training elsewhere. For the Agreement States, equivalent requirements should be in place and followed.

Indicator 2 — Technical Staffing and Training (B) (continued)

Satisfactory With Recommendations for Improvement (2) (continued)

- The training and qualification standards include areas needing improvement (e)
- Some of the new staff hired with little education or experience in physical and/or life sciences, or materials licensing and inspection (f)

Unsatisfactory (3)

Review determines the presence of chronic or acute problems related to some of the following conditions, which cause concerns about their likely effects on other performance indicators:

- Significant staff turnover relative to the size of the program (a)
- Most vacant positions not filled for extended periods (b)
- Little evidence of management attention or actions dealing with staffing problems (c)
- Most of the licensing and inspection personnel not making prompt progress in completing all of the training and qualification requirements (d)
- New staff members hired without having scientific or technical backgrounds that would equip them to receive health physics training (e)

Category N (4)

Special conditions exist that provide justification for withholding a rating. For example, there has been a substantial management effort to deal with staffing problems. NMSS or the Office of State Programs (OSP) has been kept informed of the situation and discernable recent progress is evident.

Indicator 3—Technical Quality of Licensing Actions (C)

Satisfactory (1)

- Review of completed licenses and a representative sample of licensing files indicates that license reviews are generally thorough, complete, consistent, and of acceptable technical quality. (a)
- Health and safety issues are properly addressed. (b)
- License reviewers usually have the proper signature authority for the cases they review. (c)
- Special license tiedown conditions are usually stated clearly and are inspectable. (d)
- Deficiency letters are well written and used at the proper time. (e)
- Reviews of renewal applications demonstrate thorough analysis of a licensee's inspection and enforcement history. (f)
- Applicable guidance documents are available to reviewers in most cases and are generally followed. (g)
- No potentially significant health and safety issues can be linked to licensing practices. (h)

Satisfactory With Recommendations for Improvement (2)

Review indicates that some licensing actions do not fully address health and safety concerns or indicates repeated examples of problems with respect to thoroughness, completeness, consistency, clarity, technical quality, and adherence to existing guidance in licensing actions.

Unsatisfactory (3)

Review indicates that licensing actions frequently fail to address important health and safety concerns or indicates chronic problems with regard to thoroughness, completeness, consistency, clarity, technical quality, and adherence to existing guidance in licensing actions.

Indicator 3 – Technical Quality of Licensing Actions (C) (continued)

Category N (4)

Not applicable.

Indicator 4 – Technical Quality of Inspections (D)

Satisfactory (1)

- Review team members accompanying a sample inspectors combined with an onsite review of a representative cross-section of completed inspection files indicates inspection findings are usually well founded and well documented throughout the assessment. (a)
- A review of inspector field notes or completed reports indicates that most inspections are complete and reviewed promptly by supervisors or management. (b)
- Procedures are in place and normally used to help identify root causes and poor licensee performance. (c)
- In most instances, followup inspections address previously identified open items and/or past violations. (d)
- Inspection findings generally lead to appropriate and prompt regulatory action. (e)
- Supervisors accompany nearly all inspectors on an annual basis. (f)

Satisfactory With Recommendations for Improvement (2)

- Review indicates that some inspections do not address potentially important health and safety concerns or it indicates periodic problems with respect to completeness, adherence to procedures, management review, thoroughness, technical quality, and consistency. (a)
- Review indicates that findings in inspection reports and inspection files are, on occasion, not well founded or well documented. (b)

Indicator 4—Technical Quality of Inspections (D) (continued)

Satisfactory With Recommendations for Improvement (2) (continued)

- Review does not demonstrate an appropriate level of management review. (c)
- Supervisors accompaniment of inspectors are not performed systematically. (d)
- Followup actions to inspection findings are often not timely. (e)

Unsatisfactory (3)

- Review indicates that inspections frequently fail to address potentially important health and safety concerns or it indicates chronic problems exist with respect to completeness, adherence to procedures, management review, thoroughness, technical quality, and consistency. (a)
- Supervisors infrequently accompany inspectors. (b)
- Followup actions to inspection findings are often not timely and appropriate. (c)

Category N (4)

- Not applicable.

Indicator 5—Response to Incidents and Allegations (E)

Satisfactory (1)

- Incident response and allegation procedures are in place and followed in nearly all cases. (a)
- Actions taken are appropriate, well coordinated, and timely in most instances. (b)
- Level of effort is usually commensurate with potential health and safety significance of incident. (c)

Indicator 5 — Response to Incidents and Allegations (E) (continued)

Satisfactory (1) (continued)

- Investigative procedures are appropriate for incident. (d)
- Corrective (enforcement or other) actions are adequately identified to licensees promptly and appropriate followup measures are taken to ensure prompt compliance. (e)
- Followup inspections are scheduled and completed, if necessary. (f)
- Notification to NMSS, the Office for Analysis and Evaluation of Operational Data, or OSP, and others as may be appropriate, is usually performed in a timely fashion. (g)

Satisfactory With Recommendations for Improvement (2)

- Incident response and allegation procedures are in place but occasionally not practiced in a detailed fashion. (a)
- Performance is marginal in terms of resolving potential public health and safety issues, but not as well coordinated, complete, or timely as would be required under the "Satisfactory" performance standard. (b)

Unsatisfactory (3)

Review indicates frequent examples of response to incidents or allegations to be incomplete, inappropriate, poorly coordinated, or not timely. As a result, potential health and safety problems persists.

Category N (4)

Not applicable.

Part IV

Programmatic Assessment

General (A)

A management review board (MRB) will make the overall assessment of each NRC region's or Agreement State's program on the basis of the proposed final report and recommendations prepared by the team that conducted the review of that region or State, including any unique circumstances as well as noncommon indicators. (1)

The MRB will consist of a group of senior NRC managers, or their designees, to include the: (2)

- Deputy Executive Director for Nuclear Materials Safety, Safeguards, and Operations Support (a)
- Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (b)
- Director, Office of State Programs (c)
- Director, Office for Analysis and Evaluation of Operational Data (d)
- General Counsel (e)

The Agreement States also will be invited to nominate a representative to participate in MRB meetings, as a nonvoting Agreement State liaison. In this capacity, the State representative would have full authority to receive applicable documentation and engage in all MRB discussions except for any that might involve the Agreement State liaison's own State. The Agreement State liaison would not have voting authority; this function is reserved solely by NRC. (3)

General (A) (continued)

For an NRC region, the MRB will only assess the adequacy of the program to protect public health and safety. The nature of NRC findings regarding NRC's Agreement State review process is described below. (4)

Findings for Agreement State Programs (B)

Finding 1—Adequate to Protect Public Health and Safety and Compatible (1)

- If NRC staff find that a State program has met all the Agreement State program review criteria or that only minor deficiencies exist, the Commission will find that the State's program is adequate to protect the public health and safety. (a)
- If the NRC determines that a State program contains all required NRC program elements for compatibility, or only minor discrepancies exist, the program will be found compatible. (b)

Finding 2—Adequate to Protect Public Health and Safety and Not Compatible (2)

- If NRC finds that a State program has met all the Agreement State program review criteria or that only minor deficiencies exist, the Commission will find that the State's program is adequate to protect the public health and safety. (a)
- If NRC determines that a State has failed to adopt a necessary item of compatibility within the period of time specified by implementing procedures for NRC's compatibility policy statement (i.e., more than minor compatibility discrepancies), the program would be found not compatible. (b)

Finding 3—Adequate, But Needs Improvement and/or Not Compatible (3)

- If NRC finds that a State's program protects public health and safety, but is deficient in meeting some of the review criteria, NRC may find that the State's program is adequate, but needs improvement. NRC would consider, in its determination plans,

Findings for Agreement State Programs (B) (continued)

Finding 3—Adequate, But Needs Improvement and/or Not Compatible (3) (continued)

which deficiencies noted during the review that the State has to address. (a)

- In cases where less significant State deficiencies previously identified have been uncorrected for a significant period of time, NRC also may find that the program is adequate but in need of improvement. (b)
- If NRC determines that a State has failed to adopt a necessary item of compatibility within the period of time specified by implementing procedures for NRC's compatibility policy statement, the program would be found not compatible. (c)

Finding 4—Inadequate to Protect Public Health and Safety and/or Not Compatible (4)

- If NRC finds that a State's program is significantly deficient in some or all the review criteria, NRC would find that the State's program is not adequate to protect the public health and safety. (a)
- If NRC determines that a State has failed to adopt a necessary item of compatibility within the period of time specified by implementing procedures for NRC's compatibility policy statement, the program would be found not compatible. (b)

Findings for NRC Regional Programs (C)

An MRB's findings for regional programs will be the same as those listed above for Agreement States with the exclusion of the findings for compatibility.

Glossary

It is necessary to note that some Agreement States or NRC regions may not define these terms identically. In such cases, the review team will highlight any differences in its review, but draw its conclusions and make its assessments on the basis of the definitions used by that State or region at the time of the review.

Allegation. A declaration, statement, or assertion of impropriety or inadequacy associated with regulated activities, the validity of which has not been established. This term includes all concerns identified by sources such as the media, individuals, or organizations, and technical audit efforts from Federal, State, or local government offices regarding activities at a licensee's site. Excluded from this definition are matters being handled by more formal processes such as 10 CFR 2.206 petitions, hearing boards, appeal boards, and so forth.

Incident. An event that may have caused or threatens to cause conditions described in 10 CFR 20.2202 (old 20.403), 10 CFR 30.50, 10 CFR 40.60, 10 CFR 70.50, or the equivalent State regulations.

Materials Inspection. The definitions in 10 CFR 170.3, and in NRC Inspection Manual, Chapter 2800, Sections 03.03 and 07.01, should be used to determine what constitutes an inspection. In addition, Agreement State hand-delivery of new licenses may constitute initial inspections. The term includes both routinely scheduled and reactive inspections.

Materials Licensing Action. Reviews of applications for new byproduct materials licenses, license amendments, renewals, and license terminations.

Overdue Inspections. Currently, NRC defines this term based on guidance in NRC Inspection Manual, Chapter 2800, especially Sections 04.03 (a) and 05.01 through 05.04. Many States use different definitions. For purposes of this directive, a materials license will be considered overdue for inspection in the following cases:

Glossary (continued)

- A new licensee that possesses licensed material has not been inspected within 6 months of receipt of licensed material, within 6 months of beginning licensed activities, or within 12 months of license issuance, whichever comes first.
- An existing core license is more than 25 percent beyond the interval defined in NRC Inspection Manual, Chapter 2800, Enclosure 1. An existing non-core license is more than 1 year beyond the interval. (An inspection will not be considered overdue if the inspection frequency has been extended in accordance with NRC Inspection Manual, Chapter 2800, Section 05.01, based on good licensee performance.

Determinations of overdue inspections will not be based on any inspection frequencies established by States or regions if those frequencies are more stringent than those contained in NRC Inspection Manual, Chapter 2800. The frequencies provided in NRC Inspection Manual, Chapter 2800, will generally be used as the yardstick for determining if an inspection is overdue.