



Tool: Checklist template for
identifying relevant Source Regulators
(Step 1. Identify relevant Source Regulators)

Introduction to the tool

This tool (*Checklist Template for Identifying Relevant Source Regulators*) is intended to support implementation of Step 1 of the process introduced in the IAEA TECDOC-2098, *Collaborative Reviews and Effective Leveraging* [1].

When the Recipient Regulator (Regulator B in Ref. [1]) wishes to leverage information from other regulatory bodies, the first step is to identify relevant Source Regulators (Regulator A in Ref. [1]). This tool describes a set of criteria/questions to be answered to facilitate such an identification exercise and serves as a guide for identifying the appropriate Source Regulators. Although it addresses the key criteria, the checklist is designed to be tailored to specific needs. The number of tick marks for each regulatory body can serve as a starting point for the Recipient Regulator to initiate further contacts. A higher number of tick marks would indicate a higher likelihood that the Recipient Regulator would choose to interact with one of the Source Regulators, or a higher degree of suitability of the Source Regulator’s review results for leveraging.

General considerations for using the checklist

- **The Recipient Regulator** is free to add any criteria suitable for their purposes or remove some of the criteria mentioned.
- **Adding weight to a criterion:** The Recipient Regulator is free to assign more weight to any criterion, but the caveat of adding weight is that the results can be biased depending on the weight. Equally, it is important to note that significant but standalone criterion points (e.g. has the same design as the one being considered by the Recipient Regulator?) can be masked if given the same weighing, as criterion points which prompt multiple tick marks due to their structure (i.e. they have multiple sub-criterion points).
- **Review, licensing, pre-licensing:** Although the term ‘review’ is used throughout the checklist, the checklist can also be used for licensing, pre-licensing, Generic Design Assessment (GDA), etc.
- **NPP, SMR or other nuclear facilities:** Criteria for both traditional nuclear power plants (NPPs) and small modular reactors (SMRs) are included. The Recipient Regulator is free to apply all of them or limit the list to SMRs only. However, experience in reviewing NPP-related activities can be seen as an asset and as a sign of a higher degree of maturity of the regulatory body.
- **Like-minded:** ‘Like-minded’ regulatory bodies imply that there is a certain degree of similarity between the Recipient Regulator and the other regulatory bodies. Such similarities could be related to nuclear energy policy, regulatory framework, safety requirements, etc. For example, the countries in Western European Nuclear Regulators Association (WENRA) may have the ‘like-minded’ regulatory bodies.

Checklist for identifying relevant Source Regulators (partially filled in as an example)

Criteria	Source Regulator 1	Source Regulator 2	...
• Reviewed the same design as the one being considered by the Recipient Regulator	✓		
• Has experience of reviewing and/or licensing new nuclear power plants (NPPs)	✓	✓	
– Is this experience recent (less than ten years have elapsed) and of substantive duration (in years)?		✓	
– Is the number of new NPPs reviewed two or more?			
– Are the NPPs of the same technology as the one being considered by the Recipient Regulator (e.g. pressurized water reactor (PWR), boiling water reactor (BWR), lead fast reactor (LFR))?	✓		
• Has experience of reviewing and/or licensing SMRs	✓		
– Is this experience recent (less than ten years have elapsed) and of substantive duration (in years)?			
– Is the number of new SMRs reviewed two or more?			
– Are the SMRs of the same technology as the one being considered by the Recipient Regulator (e.g. molten salt reactor (MSR), molten fuel reactor (MFR), water cooled reactor)?			
• Has experience regulating operating NPPs and/or other nuclear sites	✓	✓	
• Has experience of regulating nuclear sites hosting SMR technologies	✓		
• Involvement in international fora, initiatives and agencies relevant to nuclear safety in general	✓	✓	
• Involvement in international fora, initiatives and agencies, relevant to SMR technologies in particular	✓		
• Has experience reviewing against requirements other than their own, including participation in joint regulatory activities			
• Has experience of joint regulatory activities			
• Has available resources for leveraging activities	✓		
• Published regulations, standards, guidance, criteria and processes	✓	✓	
– Are these regulations available in the language of the Recipient Regulator or in a common language?			
• Published regulations, standards, guidance, criteria and processes, relevant to the assessment of SMR technologies	✓		
– Are these regulations available in the language of the Recipient Regulator or in a common language?			
– Are the outcomes of a recent Integrated Regulatory Review Service (IRRS) mission to the Source Regulator available?	✓		
• Does the Recipient Regulator have a basic knowledge of the Source Regulator’s way of working?			
• Does a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the regulatory bodies already exist?			
– If so, does this MoU mention modalities related to information sharing and information disclosure?			
• Is it a ‘like-minded’ regulatory body?			
• Is the designer/vendor the same for both the Source Regulator and the Recipient Regulator, or, if they are different applicants, are they ready to work together?			
• Willingness of regulator to participate in meetings and discussions			
...			
Total number of tick marks	12	5	

References

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY, Collaborative Reviews and Effective Leveraging — The IAEA’s Nuclear Harmonization and Standardization Initiative, IAEA-TECDOC-2098, IAEA, Vienna (2025), <https://doi.org/10.61092/iaea.psrj-fkjj>