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Introduction (1)

• DDP approved in 2009 by CSS.

• Aim to provide a general structured approach to facilitate development of REIA in line with SF, BSS and other IAEA requirements, promoting a common understanding of the process, definitions and methodologies.

• Useful for (nuclear) Authorization processes and for other processes that include considerations on impact to the environment (for example, EIA processes).
Introduction (2)

• In parallel the ‘system of environmental protection’ was being developed by the ICRP.

• In parallel BSS were being updated, incorporating new considerations on radiological protection of the environment.

• Authoritative documents were being published: ICRP 108 (2009), BSS 2011, ICRP 124 (approved 2013, being published).
Introduction (3)

• Consultants; consultancy meetings; Technical Meeting (TM) were conducted for discussion of issues and drafting.
• Comments from TM incorporated.
• Final draft submitted to NUSCC, RASCC, WASCC:
  • 237 comments from Sweden, Germany, USA, France, Japan, Argentine, Finland, Ukraine and ENISS.
Summary of comments received & resolutions

• 19 general (contents; structure; scope, missing related safety guides and ICRP publication)
• 75 refers to editorial; grammatical; typo mistakes
• The rest (about 143) refers to paragraphs for deletion; completion; expansion; clarification; addition.
• Statistic of resolutions (applies to the total 237 comments):
  • 141 accepted
  • 83 accepted but modified or being considered
  • 20 rejected

(please don’t checksum, some comments involve more than one issue)
General conclusions from comments received (1)

• The adequate en practical guidance on the topics included in this safety guide was noted from the beginning as a necessity and at the same time a challenging task (this conclusion comes not only from the Secretariat but from all the experts participating as consultants and representatives to the TM during the drafting work).

• The main reasons, new topics (protection of flora and fauna), approaches not applied uniformly in all Member States (consideration of potential exposures), the different frameworks (nuclear regulatory versus broader environmental regulators), the different target audiences (experts, regulators, government, stakeholders, public) .
General conclusions from comments received (2)

• The Secretariat notes that the resolution of the “accepted” and “accepted but modified” comments will contribute substantially to the improvement of clarity and achievement of aims of the Safety Guide in preparation.

• The Secretariat would like to discuss in the current set of meetings of the 3 involved Committees some technical issues which needs your views and feedback.
General conclusions from comments received (2)

- After discussions in the Committees and the incorporation of comments and the Secretariat would send to the next period of meetings a new version of DS427 for approval for submission to Member States.
Technical issues needing feedback from Committees (1)

• Is REIA a confusing acronym which needs to be changed? (considering the EIA is an established acronym outside the nuclear world).

• Despite similarities in the assessments methods but bearing in mind the important differences amongst a nuclear regulatory authorization process (SA) and an EIA process, more clarification and distinctive presentation would be necessary to be added.
Technical issues needing feedback from Committees (2)

- Should the scope be more clearly limited to activities and facilities which discharge? (avoiding the consideration of disposal facilities, where releases, if any, are foresee in the very long term)

- Should the need of assessment of impacts in general and transboundary impacts in particular be cut off by a criteria? (for example, the assessment of impacts should be no-necessary when doses or the risk are below a certain cut-off value?)
• Should potential exposures (e.g., consideration of potential severe accidents) should be treated differently in a nuclear regulatory authorization process (SA) than in an EIA process? (considering the different target audiences) (for example, that in a EIA the details of the assessment of potential exposures are not presented but a general description of the approach and the general results are illustrated)
Next steps

• To receive the advice from the committees and produce a new reviewed version in time for the next set of meetings in 2014.

• To discuss under request during that review period any of the resolutions elaborated by the Secretariat (already uploaded in the SC web page).
If NUSCC would have any question regarding the resolutions uploaded in the web, I will be happy to answer.

Thanks for your attention.
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