

Table 1 – IIS Ratings

| IIS RATING GUIDE G/INS/008 | | Inspection Observation | Assessment Observation | Interactions Observation | Expected Action |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Purple | Exemplar 1 | Meets and exceeds guidance requirements. Practical solutions exist to address intractable problems encountered elsewhere. | Submission of safety case in advance of programme. No regulatory intervention required. Frequent examples of standards being used as a reference at national / international level. Use of innovative methods and cutting edge technology. | Licensee is proactive and positive Licensee brings forward information, proposals and judgments that exceed expectation Licensee argues on the basis of well accepted facts and puts these arguments helpfully | Positive statements on site encouraging continued search for refinement. Commended to colleagues as worth emulating. |
| Blue | Good Standard 2 | Generally exceeds, guidance requirements. Site alert to and actively pursuing, potential improvements. Any suggestions from site inspector considered on merits. | Few minor issues raised. Timely submission of safety case. No regulatory intervention required. Often exceeds current industry sector standards. High technical quality. | Licensee is generally proactive and positive Licensee shows sound judgment most of the time. License avoids spurious arguments and conflict | Positive statement on site. Recognition of improvements. |
| Green | Adequate 3 | Arrangements meet guidance requirements. Some opportunities for improvement under ALARP. Areas for improvement known, but being addressed only slowly. Site inspector able to identify minor points for improvement. | Issues raised for clarification. Safety case submitted on time. Meets relevant national technical standards. Methods are often complex. Some development of standards. | Licensee is largely proactive on most matters. Licensee shows good judgment most of the time. License can be helpful when pressed Licensee argues on irrelevancies infrequently | Identify areas for improvement from inspection at debrief. Encourage steps to improve. |
| Yellow | Below Standard 4 | Fundamental requirements met but some specific procedural weaknesses identified or examples seen of failure to follow procedures. Failure of site to recognise problems may exist. | Several issues raised requiring regulatory follow-up. Submission of safety case late. Improvements required to agreed programme. Methods are mostly routine. Some evidence of meeting current industry sector standards. | Licensee can be proactive but needs to be prompted Licensee can show reasonable judgment but lapses regularly There are spurious or irrelevant arguments. | Weaknesses of procedure or application identified. Specific action required at site debrief. Consider need to put in writing. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;">Orange</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Significantly Below Standard 5</p> | <p>Procedures or practice flawed such that one or more important requirements missed or not delivered. Failure of site to recognise problems may exist. Site willing to adopt a strategy to bring about the required level of improvement.</p> | <p>Many technical issues requiring follow-up Submission of safety case well past agreed deadline. Issue of IN or LI requiring improvement to safety case. Methods generally fall short of current industry good practice. Limited scope and depth of technical content.</p> | <p>Licensee is not proactive and lacks sound judgment. Arguments poorly judged.</p> | <p>Concern should be expressed at debrief, prior to the Site Inspector leaving site, identifying NII concern about the lack of adequate compliance with legal requirements. An action plan should be established to resolve these concerns, to probably fairly short timescales. A follow up inspection will be required.</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Red</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Unacceptable 6</p> | <p>Seriously deficient arrangements or failed application such that fundamental objectives not achieved or safety prejudiced. Failure of site to recognise need for improvement or a very defensive response to NII position adopted.</p> | <p>Multiple issues requiring frequent regulatory contacts. Safety case severely delayed. Safety case inadequacies require prompt regulatory intervention. Serious shortfalls below accepted industry good practice.</p> | <p>Licensee needs to be pushed into meeting regulatory expectation. Judgments are made at an emotional level and unjustified.</p> | <p>Licensee advised at debrief to the significant concern that exists. EMM invoked which may result in enforcement action being taken or a letter being issued to specify regulatory requirements</p> |