A PEST Analysis Based on the U.S.–Japan Nuclear Cooperation Agreement: Policy Implications for Korea–U.S. Nuclear Cooperation

Jiyoung Kim*, Dong Hoon Lee, Keonhee Lee, Jihwan Lim, Eunju Jun
Global Policy Research Section, Korea Atomic Energy Research Institute
*Corresponding author: jiyoungkim@kaeri.re.kr

***Keywords : Nuclear Cooperation, NPAS, Nonproliferation, PEST Analysis, Nuclear Cooperation Agreement**

1. Introduction

The United States has pursued nuclear cooperation agreements under Section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act (AEA) to balance nonproliferation objectives with peaceful nuclear energy cooperation. The U.S.–Japan Nuclear Cooperation Agreement represents a unique case in which advance long-term consent was granted for sensitive fuel-cycle activities, including reprocessing.

In contrast, the Republic of Korea, through revisions to the Korea–U.S. nuclear cooperation agreement, has expanded cooperation in spent fuel management and established a pathway for cooperation on enrichment, yet advance consent for enrichment and reprocessing activities has not been granted. This difference reflects not merely technological capability, but a complex interaction of nonproliferation credibility, security environment, policy transparency, and international cooperation roles.

This study analyzes the policy rationale underlying the U.S.–Japan agreement and identifies key factors emphasized in granting advance consent. Based on this analysis, a PEST framework is applied to assess the current Korea–U.S. nuclear cooperation environment and derive policy implications.

2. Key Features of the U.S.–Japan NPAS and Basis for Advance Consent

During the negotiation of a nuclear cooperation agreement, the Secretary of State submits a Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (NPAS) to the President evaluating whether the agreement meets statutory and nonproliferation requirements and assessing its implications for proliferation risk, safeguards and material control, peaceful use assurances, physical protection and retransfer controls, and consistency with U.S. national security and nonproliferation policy.

The U.S.–Japan NPAS established an institutional framework under the U.S.–Japan Agreement for Cooperation and its Implementing Agreement that enables long-term advance consent for sensitive fuel-cycle activities, including the reprocessing of spent fuel. Such advance consent is premised on the requirements of Section 131 of the Atomic Energy Act (AEA), namely that the activities do not result in a significant increase in proliferation risk and that conditions ensure the United States can obtain timely warning in the event of diversion.

The U.S.–Japan NPAS emphasizes Japan's adherence to the NPT and IAEA safeguards, advanced safeguards technology cooperation, robust physical protection measures, democratic governance and strong anti-nuclear norms, and the security framework provided by the U.S.–Japan alliance. Japan's transparency and extensive international cooperation were also critical in establishing nonproliferation confidence.

3. PEST Analysis and Comparison with Korea

The programmatic consents granted under the U.S.–Japan nuclear cooperation framework were enabled not by a single factor, but by the combined influence of political-security conditions, economic and industrial structures, societal attitudes, and technological capabilities. To systematically examine these enabling conditions, a PEST analytical framework is applied, and a comparison with the current situation in the Republic of Korea is conducted to derive relevant policy implications.

3.1. Political factors

Japan operates under the U.S. nuclear umbrella within a stable alliance framework and maintains a policy of rejecting the development and possession of nuclear weapons. These institutional and societal constraints reinforce the credibility of its nonproliferation posture.

Korea similarly relies on the U.S. alliance and extended deterrence, but faces persistent security uncertainty due to North Korea's nuclear program. Periodic domestic debates over nuclear deterrence options reflect this distinct strategic environment, which influences external perceptions related to fuel-cycle autonomy.

In particular, Korea's security environment introduces a more dynamic and less predictable political context compared to Japan, affecting the consistency of nonproliferation signaling in the context of nuclear cooperation.

3.2. Economic factors

Japan pursued fuel-cycle autonomy as part of a long-term strategy to enhance energy security in the context of limited domestic resources. Reprocessing and MOX utilization were integral to sustaining long-term nuclear fuel supply stability.

Korea possesses globally competitive reactor construction and export capabilities, while spent fuel management and fuel supply resilience remain central policy concerns. Compared to Japan's focus on fuel-cycle independence, Korea's policy drivers emphasize industrial competitiveness and backend fuel management solutions.

This indicates that while Japan's economic rationale centers on energy security through closed fuel cycle strategies, Korea's approach is more closely aligned with export-oriented growth and practical spent fuel management needs.

3.3. Social factors

Japanese society has developed a norm rejecting the development and possession of nuclear weapons, shaped by historical experience and contributing to enduring public opposition to nuclear weapons. This societal consensus strengthens long-term nonproliferation credibility.

In Korea, public attitudes toward nuclear weapons tend to fluctuate in response to changes in the security environment. This variability introduces an additional dimension to external perceptions of long-term policy direction.

As a result, Korea's social environment presents relatively lower predictability compared to Japan, which may influence international confidence in long-term policy consistency.

3.4. Technological factors

Japan has accumulated comprehensive capabilities across the nuclear fuel cycle, including reprocessing, plutonium management, MOX fuel fabrication, and fast reactor research, while actively contributing to international safeguards technology development.

Korea maintains world-class capabilities in reactor design, construction, operation, and fuel fabrication, and is pursuing advanced spent fuel management technologies such as pyroprocessing. However, commercial reprocessing experience and plutonium fuel utilization remain areas of difference.

While both countries possess advanced nuclear technology, Japan's full-cycle experience contrasts with Korea's strength in reactor technology and emerging backend solutions, highlighting different technological pathways.

4. Conclusion

The U.S.–Japan NPAS demonstrates that advance consent for sensitive fuel-cycle activities is not determined solely by technological capability, but by a comprehensive assessment of nonproliferation credibility, security conditions, policy transparency, and international cooperation behavior.

The comparative PEST analysis shows that Japan and Korea share strong alliance-based security structures and advanced nuclear capabilities, but differ significantly in security environment stability, economic policy priorities, societal consensus on nuclear weapons, and the maturity of fuel-cycle technologies. These differences collectively explain the variation in the level of advance consent granted under U.S. nuclear cooperation agreements.

Table 1. PEST comparison of consent frameworks

Factors	Japan	Korea
Political	Policy of rejecting the development and possession of nuclear weapons	Alliance-based security with North Korean threat context
Economic	Fuel-cycle autonomy for energy security	Nuclear export competitiveness and spent fuel management
Social	Strong anti-nuclear identity	Energy acceptance with variable nuclear weapons sentiment
Technology	Full fuel-cycle experience and safeguards leadership	Advanced reactor technology; developing backend solutions

Japan's anti-nuclear principles, democratic governance, alliance-based security environment, active support for the global nonproliferation regime, and mature fuel-cycle capabilities collectively established the foundation for programmatic consent.

Korea, while possessing advanced nuclear technology and strong industrial capacity, operates within a distinct security context and policy priority structure shaped by North Korean nuclear threats and spent fuel management challenges. These differences reflect variations in strategic environment and policy objectives rather than differences in nonproliferation reliability.

This comparison suggests that future Korea–U.S. nuclear cooperation may benefit from strengthening transparency, enhancing contributions to the global nonproliferation regime, and expanding technical cooperation in spent fuel management and safeguards innovation. The Japanese case illustrates how sustained policy consistency and international nonproliferation leadership can support broader cooperation frameworks.

REFERENCES

[1] DOS, Analysis of consents and Approvals Agreed Upon In conjunction with the Proposed New Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United states of America and the Government of Japan Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, 1987

[2] DOS. AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY. 2015