Transactions of the Korean Nuclear Society Autumn Meeting
Changwon, Korea, October 30-31, 2025

The Light and the Shadow of Research Reactor Licensing in Korea

Kanghee Lee [a*], Seungwoo Kim[a], Eojin Jeon[a], Jongmin Lee[a]

[a]*Deaduck dero 989bungil-111, Deajeon Korea, 43210,*
Korea Atomic Energy Research Institute, Multi-Purpose SMR development
[*]*Corresponding author: leekh@kaeri.re.kr*

***Keywords :** research reactor, licensing, inspection, graded approach, nuclear innovation

1. Introduction

Unlike commercial power plants, research reactors are designed with fundamentally different objectives-from primarily serving academic, experimental, and technological development purposes, further to the realization of new type of reactor concept.

Research reactors support neutron beam research in physics, radioisotope production for medical industry, materials testing for the science, and operator training. Naturally, their design reflects these flexibilities: configurations are often modified, further safety demands frequently changed the design, and entirely new systems may be implemented for validation.

This divergence in mission naturally leads to a different design maturity: research reactors often incorporate innovative systems or flexible configurations that have not been fully standardized or industrially validated[1~2].

Nevertheless, despite their exploratory nature, research reactors are subject to stringent regulatory reviews aimed at ensuring nuclear safety. These licensing processes, originally modeled after commercial nuclear power plant frameworks, often do not accommodate the inherently uncertain, evolving and developing characters of research reactor design.

This paper explores both the “light” and “shadow” of the licensing landscape, highlighting its potential for supporting innovation and its limitations in the face of unproven technologies, in general sense.

2. The light

In principle, research reactors benefit from differentiated regulatory consideration. Because they operate under lower power ratings and within strictly controlled research environments, there is conceptual space for regulators to adopt ‘graded approaches’. Such flexibility could permit the trial of next-generation fuel types, small-scale passive safety systems, or digital instrumentation platforms under controlled conditions, even more on the some safety system validation.

South Korea’s HANARO reactor is typical example [3]. Licensed in the mid-1990s, it has since served as a versatile platform for isotope production, neutron radiography, and fuel testing. Over the years, design modifications—such as the introduction of new irradiation facilities—have been incorporated through a licensing strategy that allowed performance improvements without compromising safety.

Similarly, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has enabled experimental upgrades at the NIST reactor in Maryland [4]. The facility, originally commissioned in 1969, has continuously adapted to accommodate advanced neutron scattering experiments and instrumentation upgrades under a licensing framework that balances flexibility with safety.

In these cases, licensing has acted as an enabler of technological advancement. Through transparent regulatory engagement and well-scoped safety justifications, developers and regulators have worked together to realize innovations that would not have been possible under the constraints of commercial nuclear licensing regimes. But, in the case of research reactor licensing, Korea and Us have very different regulatory environments and rules.

3. The Shadow

One of the most significant challenges—or shadows—of research reactor licensing lies in the treatment of novel technologies. In cases where there is no clear precedent or regulatory guidance, even safety-enhancing innovations can face severe inspection. Ironically, the absence of prior examples, rather than encouraging exploratory review, often acts as a discouragement to innovation.

For example, passive safety systems or advanced cooling mechanisms—despite offering superior safety margins—can be subject to skepticism if they diverge from established regulatory expectations. This creates a paradox where new safety features must first survive the licensing process before being allowed to demonstrate their safety benefits. Moreover, the licensing process often devolves into a matter of persuasion rather than objective analysis. Sound engineering arguments may waver or become unstable if the regulatory staff is unconvinced due to subjective interpretations based on institutional caution or safety regulation philosophy.

The Jules Horowitz Reactor (JHR) project in France illustrates some kind of similar paradox [5]. Designed as a state-of-the-art materials test reactor, JHR incorporates several first-of-a-kind (FOAK) systems, including high-flux neutron environments and advanced cooling channels. Licensing delays have persisted for over a decade, largely due to difficulties in validating new safety concepts that fall outside existing regulatory experience. Despite the scientific consensus on the reactor's safety features, the licensing process has been prolonged by uncertainty in interpretation and institutional caution.

These examples underscore the subjective dimension of regulatory approval. Engineering certainty does not always translate to regulatory confidence. Licensing decisions are influenced by the perspectives, experience, and even risk tolerance of individual reviewers or agencies. In effect, the process becomes one of persuasion and negotiation—not merely technical validation.

4. Conclusions

Despite these challenges, the role of research reactors in advancing nuclear science remains irreplaceable. Licensing systems must evolve to recognize their unique contributions and support innovation without compromising safety. This requires ongoing policy innovation, greater integration of risk-informed regulatory approaches, and the cultivation of regulatory cultures that reward rather than penalize safe experimentation [6].

As nuclear technologies diversify and societal needs shift, the licensing of research reactors must transform from a barrier to a facilitator of progress. Balancing light and shadow is not merely a 'metaphorical task'—it is the future of nuclear innovation.

As the nuclear sector looks toward smaller, modular, and more innovative designs, the research reactor licensing framework must evolve accordingly. While safety must remain paramount, so too must the recognition that rigid regulatory models can suppress the very innovation these reactors are designed to support.

Ultimately, the light and shadow of research reactor licensing is a reflection of how regulatory systems handle uncertainty. To illuminate the path for future breakthroughs, licensing must be a platform—not a barrier—for experimentation, learning, safe technological advancement and validation of new system.

REFERENCES

[1] International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Safety of Research Reactors: Safety Requirements, IAEA Safety Standards Series No. SSR-3, Vienna, 2016.

[2] Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). Regulatory Framework for U.S. Research and Test Reactors, NUREG-1537, Parts 1 and 2, U.S. NRC, 1996/2012.

[3] KAERI, Year-2020~2024 HANARO and Utilization Facility Management, Technical Report, KAERI/MR-706~910/2021~2024.

[4] Tracey Honney, US NRC authorizes restart of research reactor in Maryland, Nuclear Engineering International Article, March 17, 2023.

[5] CEA, Jules Horowitz Reactor Status Report, CEA Publications, 2022.

[6] R. Sam et al, Licensing small modular reactors: A state-of-the-art review of the challenges and barriers, Progress in Nuclear Energy, Vol 164. No. 104859 (2023)