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1. OPENING SESSION

1.1. Opening Remarks

1.1.1 Mr. Pil-Soo Hahn, Director, NSRW
Mr Hahn welcomed all participants. He identified the revised TRANSSC meeting agenda that was restructured in response to the recommendations of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) internal review of the transport safety program, and suggestions from TRANSSC members. He noted that Mr Stewart, Transport Safety Unit Head will be departing IAEA at the end of the TRANSSC meeting, and complimented and thanked Mr Stewart for his outstanding work at the IAEA. A full copy of his opening statement is included at Annex 1.

1.1.2 Bill Brach, TRANSSC Chair
Mr Brach also welcomed the participants and thanked Mr Stewart for his service at the IAEA and for his many accomplishments to improve the international transport safety program. Mr Brach welcomed new TRANSSC members participating in the TRANSSC Mentor Program. He also provided a brief summary of comments offered by Mr Amano, IAEA Director General, on the importance of global harmonization of the international transport regulations. A full copy of his opening statement is included at Annex 2.

2. ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

2.1. Conduct of the Meeting

2.1.1 Conduct of meeting and Agenda – Bill Brach
Mr Brach identified the restructuring of the TRANSSC meeting agenda in response to the following OIOS and TRANSSC member recommendations:
- Post documents for discussion at least two months in advance of TRANSSC
- Post information documents a minimum of two weeks before TRANSSC
- Restructure the TRANSSC agenda into two distinct segments:
  - The first segment dealing with the review/revision of standards
  - The second segment dealing with specific technical issues,
- Reduce non-essential meeting items and circulate these items by email or web posting

Further, Mr Brach identified four additional agenda items: 1) presentation on UN Packing Groups under agenda item 4, and the following three additional agenda items under item 6: 1) feedback on the revised TRANSSC meeting
structure, ii) proposals for change to the 2014 – 2016 TRANSSC Terms of Reference, and iii) plans for future TRANSSC meetings including discussion of Brazil’s offer to host TRANSSC in 2014. The revised agenda is attached as Annex 3.

TRANSSC APPROVED the revised Agenda

2.2. Review of Previous Meetings
2.2.1 Previous meeting report – Bill Brach
No comments were offered on the draft TRANSSC 25 meeting report. The TRANSSC 25 meeting report is attached as Annex 4.

TRANSSC APPROVED the report of TRANSSC 25

2.2.2 Action Record Sheet – Jim Stewart
The Action sheet was presented and updated. The revised action sheet was approved and is attached at Annex 5

TRANSSC APPROVED the revised Action Record Sheet

2.3 Plenary Questions/Clarification on Posted Information Papers – Bill Brach
Clarification was provided by the Secretariat in response to general questions on the TRANSSC 26 Information papers (INF). Mr Delattre provided an information presentation on recent IAEA considerations on how to address the safety and security interface in nuclear safety and nuclear security documents, and he provided a brief summary of the March 2013 CSS meeting. A copy of Mr Delattre’s presentation was posted on the TRANSSC 26 web page.

TRANSSC ACTION Mr Delattre to provide the safety security interface document as a working paper to post 2 months prior to TRANSSC 27

2.4 Preparation for July Technical Meeting
2.4.1 UN Packing Groups – Kristel Vermeersch
Ms Vermeersch provided a presentation on UN packing groups, noting that Class 7 and some other dangerous goods classes were not subject to the UN packing group requirements. The presentation and discussion on future consideration of packing groups for Class 7 was raised as a possible topic for further discussion at the July Technical Meeting (TM). A copy of Ms Vermeersch’s presentation was posted on the TRANSSC 26 web page.

2.4.2 Routine/Normal Conditions of Transport, and
2.4.3 Agenda for July Meeting – Marie-Therese Lizot
Ms Lizot provided a presentation on the history of routine and normal conditions of transport and identified candidate topics for discussion at the July TM. She also provided an overview of the draft agenda for the TM. Numerous comments were offered on the need to be objective in reviewing the changes in the transport environment and transport practices, but that caution should be exercised with regard to maintaining the stability of the transport regulations. Some participants noted that an acceptable outcome of such a review would be that the current regulations are adequate. A copy of Ms Lizot’s presentation was posted on the TRANSSC 26 web page.
3. DENIAL OF SHIPMENT

3.1. Actions Passed to TRANSSC from ISC – Serge Gorlin

Mr Gorlin provided an information presentation on the outcome of the 8th and final meeting of the International Steering Committee on Denial of Shipment (ISC) held the week of June 11 – 14, 2013. Mr Gorlin summarized the ISC proposal for IAEA future activities to address denial of shipment including a proposal to form a Denial Working Group of 5–10 members comprised of TRANSSC members and ISC management team members. The Denial Working Group would be under the auspices of the ad hoc Inter-Agency Group on radioactive material transport and would provide the Inter-Agency Group periodic updates and recommendations for actions to address denial of shipment. The Inter-Agency Group would provide TRANSSC updates on denial and would, as appropriate, propose recommended actions to TRANSSC or other organizations to address denial issues. TRANSSC would consider such recommendations, and if accepted by TRANSSC, the action would be prioritized and added to the Transport Work Plan. A copy of Mr Gorlin’s presentation was posted on the TRANSSC 26 web page.

3.2. Evidence of Denial – Jim Stewart

Mr Stewart discussed the denial reporting forms and the outline of information to be periodically provided to TRANSSC on updates on denial of shipment issues and status. TRANSSC had no comment on the denial form or the outline of information/updates to be provided to TRANSSC.

4. THE DEVELOPMENT OF DOCUMENTS/PRODUCTS

4.1. DPP Approval

Mr Brach summarized the practice TRANSSC would use in reviewing/approving all proposed Document Preparation Profiles (DPP) and draft safety standards. If there are no TRANSSC member comments submitted on the documents during the requested comment period, TRANSSC would conclude the document is acceptable and would approve the DPP or draft safety standard without any further discussion, presentation, or review. The following DPPs were approved by TRANSSC following this review/approval process:

TRANSSC APPROVED DS 472 Safety Guide – Organization, Management and Staffing of a Regulatory Body
TRANSSC APPROVED DS473 Safety Guide – Regulatory Body Functions and Processes
TRANSSC APPROVED DS474 Safety Guide – Arrangements for the Termination of an Emergency
TRANSSC APPROVED DS 475 Safety Guide – Arrangements for Communications in Preparedness and Response for a Nuclear or Radiological Emergency
TRANSSC APPROVED NST020 Implementing Guide – Sustaining a Nuclear Security Regime
TRANSSC APPROVED NST041 Implementing Guide – Preventive and Protective Measures Against Insider Threats
TRANSSC APPROVED NST043 Implementing Guide – Developing Computer Security Regulation

Following TRANSSC approval of the above DPPs, the Secretariat requested TRANSSC to review/approve a new DPP, DS 477 Safety Guide Management System for Predisposal and Disposal of Radioactive Waste. The document was posted by the IAEA in May but the posting did not meet the TRANSSC criteria that all documents to be reviewed/approved must be posted 60 days in advance of the TRANSSC meeting. The Secretariat asked if TRANSSC would consider review by correspondence and provide comments on the IAEA web page by 16 August, which is 60 days from the date of the TRANSSC 26 meeting. TRANSSC agreed with the request.

TRANSSC ACTION TRANSSC members are to review DS 477 and provide comments on the IAEA web page by 16 August 2013.

4.2. Draft Safety Standards Approval
Following the TRANSSC process described in 4.1 above:
TRANSSC APPROVED DS 462 Addendum to GSR Part 1
TRANSSC APPROVED DS 462 ADDENDUM to NS-R-3
TRANSSC APPROVED DS 456 GSR Part 2 – Leadership and Management for Safety
TRANSSC APPROVED DS 457 GSR Part 7 – Preparedness and Response for a Nuclear or Radiological Emergency

4.3. Final Document Approval
4.3.1 Following the TRANSSC process described in 4.1 above:
TRANSSC APPROVED DS 450 GSR Part 6 – Decommissioning of Facilities

4.3.2 Discussion of DS 461 Safety Guide – Schedules of Provisions of the IAEA Regulations for the Safe Transport of Radioactive Material – Nancy Capadona
Ms Capadona presented a summary of comments received on the proposed final draft of DS 461. She noted that some Member State comments were received within the requested 120-day comment period, while other Member State comments were submitted late. In addition she noted comments from WNTI, an observer but not a member of TRANSSC, were also received. She asked TRANSSC for guidance and direction on how to handle the comments on the proposed revision of the Schedules (2012 Edition). After much discussion on the consideration of late comments, WNTI comments, the role of WNTI in participating in TRANSSC meetings, and noting that the revised safety guide on Schedules (2012 Edition) would be presented to TRANSSC 27 for review/approval, TRANSSC agreed to the following action. A copy of Ms Capadona’s presentation was posted on the TRANSSC 26 web page.

TRANSSC ACTION the Secretariat will consider all comments, convene a consultancy, if needed, and provide a final proposal for the safety guide on Schedules (2012 Edition) 60 days in advance of TRANSSC 27.
4.4. Document Development

4.4.1 Technical Basis Document – Chris Bajwa

Mr. Bajwa presented an update and status on the development of the Technical Basis Document. He noted that since the April posting of the draft document on the TRANSSC 26 web page two additional revisions were made. The document is envisioned to be a “living document” and will be continually updated. The document will be available electronically, but hard copy/printing is not planned. Mr. Bajwa identified some “missing” reference documents and asked if a TRANSSC member has a copy to please provide electronic or paper copies to him, along with any comments TRANSSC members may have on the document. A copy of Mr Bajwa’s presentation was posted on the TRANSSC 26 web page.

**TRANSSC ACTION** TRANSSC Members provide the Secretariat any comments on the draft Technical basis Document, and electronic or paper copies of the missing reference documents by end of August

4.4.2 Preliminary Review of Comments from Member States on SSR-6 – Jorge Lopez-Vietri

Mr Lopez-Vietri presented a summary of comments received from Member States and non-governmental organizations during the 120-day comment period on SSR-6 (2012 edition). He categorized the comments in 13 groups of issues. The purpose for the presentation was to give TRANSSC an early view on the comments, significance of the issues, and proposed changes to SSR-6. He also noted that many of the proposals were not complete; some were missing regulatory text or a clear proposed resolution of an issue. TRANSSC 27 will review and decide whether to start a new SSR-6 “revision” cycle or to carry the comments and proposals forward for further study and consideration in the next review cycle in 2015. A copy of Mr Lopez-Vietri’s presentation was posted on the TRANSSC 26 web page.

4.5. Documents from Other UN Bodies

4.5.1 UNECE Papers of Relevance for Upcoming UNSCETDG Meeting

Messrs Stewart, Kervella, and Bajwa led a discussion of the papers posted on the UNSCETDG web page that may be of interest and relevance to TRANSSC members and the IAEA Regulations for the Safe Transport of Radioactive Material. Mr Kervella identified some specific papers of interest and Mr Stewart noted additional papers. There were no specific issues or concerns identified by TRANSSC during the plenary discussion, but it was suggested that this matter may be discussed in more detail in Working Group 1.

4.5.2 ICAO Update and Status – Katherine Rooney

Ms Rooney provided a status update for ICAO in advance of TRANSSC 26 that was posted as INF 8. In addition to the ICAO status update, Ms Vermeersch summarized an issue involving transport of empty radioactive material transport packages that had been discussed at a recent ICAO Dangerous Goods Panel meeting. Ms Vermeersch identified the difficulty encountered in transporting the empty packages with surface contamination, or empty packages that do not contain radioactive material contents but the package contains depleted shielding material. In addition, Mr Brennan identified an issue in the
documentation requirements in the new SSR-6 (2012 Edition) as highlighted in INF 16, and he described the confusion or possible problem in providing the required information in the transport documents.

4.6. Application of Standards

4.6.1 Results of Mini-TranSAS Missions – Nancy Capadona

Ms Capadona provided an overview of three recent mini-TranSAS missions that have been conducted in 2013. She identified seven missions planned for the remaining months in 2013 with a possibility of seven more missions to be scheduled. The Secretariat had previously requested TRANSSC members to identify potential transport experts who could assist the IAEA in the planning and conduct of mini-TranSAS missions, and Ms Capadona reiterated that request. She then introduced Mr Abdelmounin Farid, Morocco, and Mr John Otieno Opar, Kenya, to provide a summary and profile of the radioactive material industry and the type and extent of radioactive material transport in their respective country. The presentations by Mr Fraid and Mr Opar were very informative and well received by TRANSSC. TRANSSC members commented that given both the emerging status of their national regulatory program and the limited scope of the present radioactive material transport, a shorter, more concise set of regulations focused on their transport activities, and associated guidance material, could be very helpful to them. Mr Farid and Mr Opar participated in the Working Group 2 that focused on emerging Member State ambitions. Copies of Ms Capadona’s and Mr Farid’s presentation were posted on the TRANSSC 26 web page. Mr Opar provided an oral report on the program and transport of radioactive material in Kenya.

TRANSSC ACTION TRANSSC members inform Secretariat of transport experts who could assist the IAEA as trainers by TRANSSC 27

4.6.2 Feedback from Member State on Approval Requirements for Transport

4.6.2.1 Russia – Vladimir Ershov

Mr Ershov provided an overview of the complexities involved in obtaining all the competent authority approvals, certifications, licenses, and authorizations to complete radioactive material transport in Russia. Existing practices vary greatly and include licensing of designers, manufacturers, shippers, consignors, and carriers, along with requirements for certificates for package design, manufactured packages, shipment routes, shipment, and conveyances. He concluded his presentation with a call for collecting information on competent authority forms and rules in Member States to facilitate a broad IAEA review that could lead to the development of a new safety guide to help harmonize international practices. The Secretariat asked TRANSSC members to volunteer to provide feedback on their country’s regulatory program at a future TRANSSC meeting. A copy of Mr Ershov’s presentation was posted on the TRANSSC 26 web page.

TRANSSC ACTION TRANSSC members notify the Secretariat of availability to provide TRANSSC feedback on their country’s program for approval of transport.

5. INFORMAL WORKING GROUP DISCUSSIONS
5.1 Working Group Introductions
TRANSSC members selected and participated in four working groups:
- Working Group 1 – UN Issues
- Working Group 2 – Emerging member State Ambitions
- Working Group 3 – Operational Issues
- Working Group 4 – Future Regulatory Developments

5.2 Working Group Deliberations
Working deliberation took place from 18 June 0900 – 19 June 1000.

5.3 Working Group Report To Plenary

5.3.1 Working Group 1 – Chair Peter Girkens, Germany
The working group covered 4 topics:
   i) Subsidiary Risk – Guidance should be prepared by a correspondence working group. Subsidiary risk for UF6 needs to be reviewed.
   ii) UN Packing Requirements – no specific actions identified.
   iii) Excepted Packages Activity Limits – Activity limits should remain, but potentially improve specification of instruments and articles.
   iv) New Documentation Requirements for Excepted Packages – new issues come from subsidiary risk.
The Working Group 1 report was posted on the TRANSSC 26 web page and a copy is attached as Annex 6.

5.3.2 Working Group 2 – Chair Chris Ardouin, New Zealand
The Working Group provided guidance on establishing a regulatory body for transport. The working group report provided a list of suggested actions that should be considered. It was noted that there is a link to the code of conduct related to scrap metal. It was suggested that this work could provide good input in relation to the need for safe transport. The need for personal radiation monitoring was noted. A copy of the Working Group 2 report was posted on the TRANSSC 26 web page and is attached as Annex 7.

   TRANSSC ACTION – the working group report should be provided by the Secretariat to the drafters of the Code of Conduct on scrap metal.

5.3.3 Working Group 3 – Chair Michele Sampson, USA
The group dealt with three topics:
   i) International Applicants Guide – The PDSR guide with IAEA references to 2009 and 2012 Editions of the Regulations was considered a good starting format. A schedule to complete a guide by TRANSSC 29 was agreed by the working group.
   ii) Scope of Inspections – The current information available in Member States was noted as a potential improvement to TS-G-1.5
iii) Licensing of Carriers – A wide range of practices exist – Belgium will explain their system to the next TRANSSC meeting.
A copy of the Working Group 3 report was posted on the TRANSSC 26 web page and is attached as Annex 8.

5.3.4 Working Group 4 – Sylvain Faille, Canada
The Working Group looked at seven topics:
i) Transportable Reactors – It was noted that there may be a need for new regulations for these reactors in transport, particularly where active systems are concerned. This could accommodate the links between reactor safety and transport safety. More detailed information is needed.
ii) LSA-III Material – A meeting will be set up in Cologne to deal with the issue and report to TRANSSC 27
iii) Large Objects – this is subject to a proposal in the current review cycle
iv) Special Arrangement – The primary issue may have been related to the use of special arrangement rather than the name itself.
v) Segregation Tables for Air Shipments – a review of the original parameters should be considered
vi) Isotope Specific Limits in Emergency – it was suggested this should be an issue for overall emergency rather than just transport.
vii) Future Electronic Process for Safety Standard Feedback – The potential for using the software to track changes between SSR-6 and the Orange Book could be advantageous.
A copy of Working Group 4 report was posted on the TRANSSC 26 web page and is attached as Annex 9.

5.4 Plenary Discussion
A number of issues were discussed related to the output of the working groups. For example, it was noted that there is both confusion over use of the term consignor, and questions on who is to be identified as the consignor in certain transport papers in contrast to current practice as discussed in air transport. It was also discussed that the Regulations are not clear in some cases such as for excepted package documentation.

TRANSSC ACTION – Secretariat to initiate discussion with other UN bodies on which of the excepted package requirements are conditional on being in another class, and to discuss paths forward for SP 290 and SP 172.

6. REVIEW OF DRAFT MEETING REPORT (and other items)

6.1 New agenda items added on day one of TRANSSC 26

6.1.1 TRANSSC Member feedback on the revised TRANSSC meeting structure and segmented agenda (Part A Business, Part B Technical issue Discussion)
TRANSSC members were generally very positive on the revised meeting structure and agenda. Suggestions for consideration in planning for the next TRANSSC meeting included:

- Reverse the order of the meeting to have technical discussions on the proposals and suggested changes to SSR-6 the first 2 – 3 days of the meeting, then follow with the TRANSSC 27 business segment that would decide on the recommendations resulting from the technical discussions (similar to concept of a review panel meeting followed by TRANSSC meeting).

- With shorter TRANSSC meetings, have more working group discussion to benefit from large participation of international transport experts and expertise present for the meeting.

- Identify working group Terms of Reference, topic and chair in advance to allow chair to prepare/refine working group agenda and identify topics and papers for discussion.

- Allow TRANSSC members to register in advance for a working group; this will also support early preparation.

- Reference INF papers to an agenda item. For INF papers not specifically on the agenda for discussion, include an agenda item for TRANSSC member comments or questions on INF papers not specifically referenced to another agenda item (did the pendulum swing too far from extensive discussion to no discussion of INF papers?)

- Consider a standing working group of “Competent Authorities” to support dialogue and sharing.

- Clearly state plans for the TRANSSC meeting in the IAEA Note Verbale.

6.1.2 TRANSSC member comments on changes to consider in Terms of Reference for next TRANSSC term, 2014 – 2016

TRANSSC member suggestions for consideration in revising the Terms of Reference for the next term included:

- Review need to have two TRANSSC business meetings each year, given availability of email correspondence to review/approve draft documents.

- One TRANSSC business meeting per year with other transport Technical Meetings and working groups may meet TRANSSC and transport safety needs.

6.1.3 Plans for future TRANSSC meetings, including consideration of offer from Brazil to host meeting in 2014

Current plans are to move TRANSSC 27 from the week of 28 October to week of 11 November. Preliminary plans are for the first three days to be technical working group discussion with primary focus on review of proposed changes to SSR-6. The TRANSSC business meeting would follow after the technical working group discussion.
TRANSSC members were supportive of the offer from Brazil to host a TRANSSC meeting in Brazil in the October – November 2014 time frame. Brazil would provide meeting facilities and TRANSSC members would be responsible for their travel costs. TRANSSC members noted the anticipated benefit of regional meetings to encourage participation by countries in the regional area.

6.2 Review of Meeting Report

The draft TRANSSC 26 meeting report was posted on the web page on the morning of 19 June. The draft report was reviewed in plenary. Revisions and comments are reflected in this revised draft final meeting report. TRANSSC APPROVAL TRANSSC members agreed with the TRANSSC actions and approvals as listed in the draft TRANSSC 26 meeting report.

7. CLOSE OF MEETING

7.1 Closing Remarks

7.1.1 Bill Brach, TRANSSC Chair

Mr Brach thanked everyone for their participation and also for their feedback on the revised TRANSSC meeting structure and plans for TRANSSC 27. He reiterated “Thanks and Best Wishes” to Jim Stewart as he leaves IAEA and returns to the UK. Mr Brach stated that he looks forward to seeing many of the TRANSSC members at PATRAM 2013 and wished all a safe journey home.

7.1.2 Pil-Soo Hahn, Director, NSRW

Mr Hahn noted how productive TRANSSC had been at the meeting, highlighting the TRANSSC approval of: 7 Document Preparation Profiles, 4 draft safety standards to be submitted for 120-day Member State review and comment, and 1 final safety standard for CSS approval and publication. Mr Hahn also recognized and thanked Jim Stewart for his outstanding support of TRANSSC, Transport Safety Unit and support of the safe international transport of radioactive material. He also wished all a safe trip home.

List of Annexes

1. Opening Remarks by Mr Hahn, Director, NSRW
2. Opening Remarks by Bill Brach, TRANSSC Chair
3. Revised TRANSSC 26 Meeting Agenda
4. Final Approved TRANSSC 25 Meeting Report
5. Revised TRANSSC Action Record Sheet
6. Working Group 1 Report
7. Working Group 2 Report
8. Working Group 3 Report
9. Working Group 4 Report
Good morning Ladies and Gentlemen.

Welcome to the 26th meeting of TRANSSC
As you know there was an OIOS review of the transport work during your last meeting. As a result we are implementing several changes to accommodate your expressed desires.

For example all working papers for this meeting were produced 2 months in advance, and information papers 2 weeks in advance.

We have removed all administrative items from the agenda. This allows us to compress the meeting into approximately one day.

Following the meeting there will be workshops discussing topics of your choice.

You will hear at this meeting about the follow on from the international steering committee on denial of shipment. While you will be involved in this I do not believe it will result in a significant change in your workload, or require a change in your terms of reference. Denial is not over, but the work of the steering committee is – they have provided us with excellent tools to manage denial.

As I said we have been asked to keep administrative items to a minimum, so I will say no more, but simply wish you all the best for the meeting – and pass the floor to your chair, Bill Brach.
ANNEX 2

OPENING REMARKS FOR THE 26th MEETING
OF THE TRANSPORT SAFETY STANDARDS COMMITTEE
(TRANSSC)
BILL BRACH, CHAIRMAN

I want to “Thank” Mr. Hahn for opening our 26th meeting of TRANSSC.

I too want to welcome everyone to our TRANSSC meeting and extend a special welcome to those who are attending their first TRANSSC meeting. This meeting marks the start of the new IAEA TRANSSC Mentoring Program. This program is an initiative developed by Mr. Stewart to assign a Member State transport expert to assist new Member State participants to gain familiarity with TRANSSC and with the Regulations for the Safe Transport of Radioactive Material. In this capacity, Mr. John Cook, USA, is serving as a mentor to our new TRANSSC members. Welcome, and Thank You John for serving in this capacity.

As Mr. Hahn noted, the agenda and structure for this TRANSSC meeting is markedly different from our previous TRANSSC meetings. I believe that you will recognize that many of the OIOS recommendations resulted directly from your input and suggestions provided to the OIOS review team during our TRANSSC meeting in October 2012.

I will discuss the conduct of this meeting and the revised format and agenda for the meeting in more detail under agenda item 2.1.1. However, I do want to ask that you now to start thinking about views, suggestions and comments that you may offer on the revised meeting structure and agenda to help us in planning for our next TRANSSC meeting later this year.

Last week the International Steering Committee on Denial of Shipments held its 8th and final meeting. Later in this meeting we will hear about the outcome of the Steering Committee meeting. I want to mention briefly that the IAEA Director General, Mr. Amano, closed the Steering Committee meeting and offered some closing comments that I would like now to share with you. He commented that the original solution for denials and delays of shipments was considered to be global harmonization of the transport regulations. He further stated that this continues to be a very important part of the solution and he specifically asked the appropriate committees to make this their main goal. I believe that message was also intended for us, for TRANSSC.

Everyone here, I believe, is aware that this is the last TRANSSC meeting for Mr. Stewart as he completes his five year term as Head of the Transport Safety Unit. Under his leadership, the Transport Safety Unit and TRANSSC have achieved some major accomplishments during the past five years. I want to name just a few:
• Completed and published for the 1st time the entire suite of IAEA Transport Safety Standards (TS-R-1, now SSR-6, and the six associated Safety Guides, TS-G-1.1 – 1.6)
• Completed the 2012 Edition of SSR-6 in 24 months from the date of CSS approval of the DPP to date of BOG approval to publish (March 2010 – March 2012)
• For 1st time prepared proposed revisions to Safety Guide TS-G-1.1 in parallel with revised transport regulations
• Developed and implemented a new procedure for TRANSSC and Transport Safety Unit engagement with the Subcommittee of Experts on Transport of Dangerous Goods to improve the harmonization of the international transport regulations
• Planned and co-led the October 2011 International Conference on the Safe and Secure Transport of Radioactive Material

The list goes on, but I believe just these few accomplishments exemplify the significant impact and positive outcomes achieved under Jim’s leadership. I can state that in my role as TRANSSC Chair, I have very much appreciated working with Jim. His knowledge and expertise in transport safety is outstanding. I believe that all of the Transport Safety Unit and TRANSSC can take pride in the accomplishments that Jim led over the past five years. We will have a chance this evening for all of us to make additional comments; however, Jim, from some of the side comments I have overheard, it sounds like there will definitely be a roast this evening, but it may not be the food that is roasted.

I believe that at this time we need to move on to discuss the changes in the format and agenda for this meeting. We have a full agenda for the first part of this TRANSSC meeting, as well as some very stimulating Working Group discussion topics. So we can now move to our next agenda item, item 2.1.1, which is conduct of TRANSSC 26 and review and approval of the TRANSSC 26 meeting agenda.

Thank you!
TRANSCC 26 AGENDA

ANNEX 3

OPENING 17 JUNE 2013 1000
CLOSE 20 JUNE 2013 1700

IAEA, BOARD ROOM

NOTE: TRANSSC WILL MEET IN TWO SESSIONS
   Monday – Formal Session
   Tuesday to Thursday – Informal technical discussions in working groups (NOT REPORTED)
   NOTE – It is possible that the formal session will extend to Tuesday morning

INFORMATION PAPERS ARE LISTED AT THE END OF THE AGENDA. THEY
WILL NOT BE PRESENTED UNLESS MEMBERS HAVE QUESTIONS OR NEED
CLARIFICATION AS PROVIDED UNDER AGENDA ITEM 2.3, OR REQUEST AND
AGREE TO THE TOPIC BEING ADDED TO THE AGENDA.

ITEMS IN ITALICS ARE VERBAL PRESENTATIONS, NO PAPERS ARE
EXPECTED IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING

WHERE DOCUMENTS ARE PLACED IN THE “DRAFT FOR COMMENT” FOLDER
ON THE TRANSSC WEB PAGE, THE NEED FOR TRANSSC REVIEW IS
IDENTIFIED IN THE LIST ON THE LEFT SIDE OF THE PAGE. IF NO COMMENTS
FROM TRANSSC MEMBERS ARE UPLOADED BY THE DUE DATE THEN
TRANSSC WILL BE ASKED TO CONSIDER THE DOCUMENT APPROVED
WITHOUT PRESENTATION OR DISCUSSION IN THE MEETING. DPPs WILL
ALWAYS BE DISCUSSED.

ITEMS MARKED IN RED ARE NOT YET AVAILABLE

ALL AVAILABLE DOCUMENTS ARE HYPERLINKED
1. OPENING SESSION (Monday 1000-1015)

| Purpose | • To Welcome Participants  
|         | • To provide TRANSSC Direction for the Meeting |
| 1.1. Opening Remarks | 1. Director, NSRW  
|                  | 2. Chair – Bill Brach |
| Output Required | • None – For information only |
SECTION A – FORMAL TRANSSC BUSINESS

2. ADMINISTRATION ITEMS (Monday 1015-1130)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>2.1. Conduct of the Meeting</th>
<th>2.2. Review of previous meetings</th>
<th>2.3. Plenary questions/clarification on posted information papers</th>
<th>2.4. Preparation for July Technical Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To adopt the agenda</td>
<td>1. Conduct of meeting and Agenda – Bill Brach</td>
<td>1. Previous meeting report – Bill Brach</td>
<td>2. Action Record Sheet – Jim Stewart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To make people aware of key discussion topics</td>
<td>2.2. Review of previous meetings</td>
<td>2.3. Plenary questions/clarification on posted information papers</td>
<td>2.4. Preparation for July Technical Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To provide follow up to previous meetings and related administrative matters</td>
<td>2.3. Plenary questions/clarification on posted information papers</td>
<td>2.4. Preparation for July Technical Meeting</td>
<td>2.4. Preparation for July Technical Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To review Agenda for transport environment July meeting</td>
<td>2.4. Preparation for July Technical Meeting</td>
<td>2.4. Preparation for July Technical Meeting</td>
<td>2.4. Preparation for July Technical Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Output Required

• Approved agenda
• Approved TRANSSC 25 Meeting Report
• Updated action record sheet
• Revised agenda for July TM

3. DENIAL OF SHIPMENTS (Monday 1130 - 1230)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>3.1. Actions passed to TRANSSC from ISC</th>
<th>3.2. Evidence of denial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To inform TRANSSC on the end of the work of the steering committee on delay and denial</td>
<td>1. Report from ISC 8</td>
<td>1. Denial reporting method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To provide TRANSSC information on the instances and causes of denial</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. TRANSSC summary of denial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Output Required

• A list of denial actions to be monitored by TRANSSC
## 4. THE DEVELOPMENT OF DOCUMENTS/PRODUCTS (Monday 1330-1700)

| Purpose |  
| --- | --- |
| **To comment on and decide on whether to approve documents sent to TRANSSC** |  
|  |  
| **4.1. DPP Approval** |  
| 2. DS 473 Safety Guide - Regulatory Body Functions and Processes |  
| 3. DS 474 Safety Guide - Arrangements for the termination of an emergency |  
| 4. DS 475 Safety Guide - Arrangements for Communications in Preparedness and Response for a Nuclear or Radiological Emergency |  
| 5. NST020 Implementing Guide - Sustaining a Nuclear Security Regime |  
| 6. NST041 Implementing Guide - Preventive and Protective Measures against Insider Threats |  
| 7. NST043 Implementing Guide - Developing Computer Security Regulation |  
| **4.2. Draft Safety Standards approval** |  
| 1. DS 455 [not available for TRANSSC 26] |  
| 2. DS 462 Addendum to GSR Part 1 |  
| 3. DS 462 Addendum to NS-R-3 |  
| 4. DS 456 GSR Part 2 - Leadership and Management for Safety |  
| 5. DS 457 GSR Part 7 - Preparedness and Response for a Nuclear or Radiological Emergency |  
| **4.3. Final document approval** |  
| 1. DS 450 GSR Part 6 - Decommissioning of Facilities |  
| **4.4. Document development** |  
| 1. Technical Basis Document INF 12 |  
| 2. Preliminary review of comments from MS on SSR-6 |  
| **4.5. Documents from other UN bodies** |  
| 1. UNECE (papers of relevance for upcoming UNSCETDG meeting) |  
| 2. ICAO (revision of TI) INF 08 |  
| 3. IMO (revision of IMDG Code) |
| 4.6. | Application of Standards | 1. Results of mini-TranSAS  
2. Feedback from MS on approval requirements for transport  
2.1. Russia  
3. Discussion on lessons learned from presentations on applications of the standards |

**Output Required**  
- Approval of DPPs for submission to CSS  
- Approval of draft documents for MS review/comment  
- Approval of documents to send to CSS  

SESSION A END
## SESSION B – TECHNICAL DISCUSSIONS

### 5. INFORMAL WORKING GROUP DISCUSSIONS (Tuesday 0900 – Thursday 1600)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>5.1. Working groups introduction</th>
<th>5.2. Working group deliberations</th>
<th>5.3. Working group report to plenary Thursday 1330</th>
<th>5.4. Plenary discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To discuss detailed topics identified by TRANSSC members in informal working groups</td>
<td>1. As required</td>
<td>1. WG 1 to WG 4</td>
<td>1. <em>Open discussion on WG reports</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.</td>
<td>1. WG 1 UN ISSUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Subsidiary risks (IAEA package types, UN packing groups)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. WG 2 EMERGING MEMBER STATES AMBITIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Simplified guidance on basic regulatory infrastructure and oversight to support the progressive application of requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. WG 3 OPERATIONAL ISSUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1. Scope of inspections; harmonised approach; what is and what is not being done in each State; sharing of resources / information / intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2. The international applicants guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. WG 4 FUTURE REGULATORY DEVELOPMENTS (HORIZON SCANNING)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1. Transportable reactors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2. LSA-I, LSA-III (<em>Germany</em>) (<em>France</em>) INF 05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3. Large items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4. Special Arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5. The development of segregation tables for aircraft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6. Isotope specific contamination – in particular wrt Emergency measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7. Creating a map of relationships between the many IAEA guides and standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>REVIEW OF DRAFT MEETING REPORT (Thursday 1630 - 1645)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>• To approve the list of actions and decisions by TRANSSC and address additional items added to agenda at TRANSSC 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.</td>
<td>TRANSSC comments on revised meeting structure and agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>TRANSSC comments on revised TOR for next term, 2014 - 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Plans for future TRANSSC meetings, including consideration of Brazil to host TRANSSC meeting in 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Review of Meeting Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Output Required** | • TRANSSC input on revised meeting structure, TOR and plans future meetings  
• Approved report |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.</th>
<th>CLOSE OF MEETING (Thursday 1645-1700)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Purpose** | • To summarise the meeting results  
• To thank participants for their work |
| 7.1. | Closing Remarks |
| | 1. Bill Brach  
2. Director NSRW |
| **Output Required** | • None – For information only |

INFORMATION PAPERS PROVIDED TWO WEEKS IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING
1. The transport three year workplan
2. Committee Chairs Meeting
3. Interface Group Activities
4. TRANSSC Review of CSS Main Priorities
5. German Comments on French considerations
6. DPC Report 20130531 version
7. DPC (FINAL) TRANSSC and WASSC Recommendations
A. The dates of the meeting are 17\textsuperscript{th} June 2013 – 20\textsuperscript{th} June 2013

B. Plenary will convene in the IAEA Board Room, side rooms M0E67, M0E68 and M0E69

C. The working times for the meeting will be:
   - 1000 to 1700 on Monday,
   - 0900 to 1730 on Tuesday to Wednesday.
   - 0900 to 1700 on Thursday

D. Breaks will be taken mid-morning (around 1030) and mid-afternoon (around 1530) each day.

E. Lunch will be from 1200 hours to 1330 hours each day or at alternate times at the discretion of the Meeting Chair.

F. You are kindly requested to be at Checkpoint 1 of the Vienna International Centre (VIC) at least one hour before the meeting starts to allow adequate time for our Pass Office to issue your photo badge. The Pass Office opens at 08:00.

G. An evening event is being planned for Monday 17\textsuperscript{th} June
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Working Group 1: UN Issues

Participants:
- O. Kervella
- K. Vermeersch
- K. Rooney
- D. Brennan
- F. Kirchnawy
- P. Girkens (chairman)
- B. Dekker
- V. Ershov
- S. Trivelloni
- B. Ilijas
- D. Lamarche
- J. Lopez Vietri
- A. Konnai
- M.-A. Charette
- G. Fulford

Subsidiary Risks
- Need for labeling excepted packages for subsidiary risk;
- No need for further clarification;
- Excepted quantities/Limited quantities combined with radioactive materials: not addressed in the UN Recommendations;
- Future consideration to including information of special provisions 172 and 290 in guidance document will be prepared by correspondence working group:
  - O. Kervella
  - K. Vermeersch
  - K. Rooney
  - D. Brennan
  - F. Kirchnawy
  - P. Girkens;
- UF6: no additional clarification from IAEA regarding radioactive properties required. Determination of subsidiary hazards by other UN bodies is needed.

UN Packing Requirements
- UN packing requirements for subsidiary hazards have to be complied with for radioactive materials (see UN 4.1.9.1.5);
- No specific cases identified;
- Test procedures for UN packages: UN Recommendations do not contain all operational details. Guidance for test laboratories is needed for uniform application.

Excepted Packages
- Activity limits for excepted packages with instruments or articles are similar to Type A packages;
• There are no performance test criteria for instruments or articles;
• No significant issue with the transport of instruments or articles is known;
• Assumption: instrument or article provides a certain degree of protection/containment;
• If article/instrument does not provide required degree of protection/containment, additional method to define requirement for this article/instrument or performance criteria;
• “Completely enclosed” proposed definition:
  ➢ Paragraph 426: “enclosed in an inactive sheath made of metal or some other substantial material.”
  ➢ Additional criteria: related only to solids or other substantial materials;
  ➢ Performance test
• We do not see any reasons in practice to change the activity limits of Table 4 (Paragraph 422);

Problems for transport of excepted packages - new provisions introduced in SSR-6 (paragraph 515):

• Names of Consignor and Consignee on shipping document (INF. 15):
  ➢ Problem for air transport because of acceptance procedures. See appendix 1;
  ➢ Definition of consignor;
• Names of consignor and consignee on shipping document (paragraph 546): interpreting who are the consignor and consignee. Need for clarification of the definition of consignor and if there is a need for a transport document for excepted packages containing fissile material excepted under 417(c); this comes from subsidiary hazards harmonization issues with UN Recommendations;
• Clarification about the identification marks for each competent authority certificate on shipping document, for example fissile material excepted under paragraph 417(f), special form approval certificate under paragraph 546(k); member states proposed this amendment;
• Clarification about the need for signature on transport document (paragraph 550);
• The need for container packing certificate for maritime transport (paragraph 552);
Possible solutions:
• Corrigendum to SS-R-6;
• Administrative measures until amendment to SS-R-6;
• Correspondence working group:
  - D. Brennan
  - K. Rooney
  - K. Vermeersch
  - O. Kervella

Appendix 1

Operational Issues – Excepted Packages
1. Custom and practice for the movement of radioactive material, excepted packages is that these move with the only the UN number shown on a
commercial transport document such as a bill of lading or air waybill. While the commercial transport document indicates a “consignor” and “consignee”, in reality this is the name and address of the freight forwarder or cargo agent that has the contract of carriage with the carrier. For fully regulated radioactive materials however there are two documents provided, a dangerous goods transport document that shows the name and address of the “actual” consignor and consignee and describes the dangerous goods and the commercial transport document that will contain the information as shown for excepted packages.

2. The changes in SSR-6 to include a requirement that para 546 intro now also applies to excepted packages brings in a requirement that the name and address of the consignor and consignee must now be on the “transport documents”. This introduces potential conflicts where if current practice continues with only an air waybill or bill of lading, the “actual” consignor and consignee will not be shown, however it is likely that regulatory authorities will expect to see the “actual” consignor and consignee identified. The only way to achieve this is for excepted packages to now be described on a dangerous goods transport document.

3. The solution to this issue is to now require that excepted packages be described on the dangerous goods transport document. However, if this happens then for air transport there will be a significant cost increase for the consignors as excepted packages currently move as general cargo. Dangerous goods on a dangerous goods transport document are subject to additional charges due to the requirements for checks to the documentation and packages. This may also lead to greater problems for consignors of excepted packages due to delays and/or denials.

4. The other additional requirements brought in through reference to para 546(k) which requires that the identification mark of each competent authority certificate must be provided on the transport documents also lends weight to requiring the use of a separate dangerous goods transport document for excepted packages. Commercial transport documents such as bills of lading and air waybills as not designed to have regulatory information such as references to competent authority certificates or package design approvals. This lends further weight to having both the dangerous goods transport document on which the regulatory information is provided and the commercial transport document.

5. If there are certain radionuclides that while meeting the limits for excepted packages none the less require a competent authority approval it is suggested that the requirement for this information to be provided on the document needs to be re-evaluated as the document is not required to identify the isotope or the activity.
WG 2 Simplified Guidance on Basic Regulatory Infrastructure and Oversight

WG 2 Members
E Askitoglu Switzerland
M Richartz Germany
S Vogiatzi Greece
N Capadonia IAEA TSU
O John Kenya
J Cook USA
F Abdelmounim Morocco
C Ardouin New Zealand (Chair)
S Whittingham UK (Secretary)
J Binet European Commission
U Schwela Tantalum-Niobium International Study Centre

Simplified guidance on regulatory infrastructure and oversight

The red text indicates where actions are necessary such as Authorisations. All Authorisations should feature in one of the compliance inspection programmes of the Regulatory Body at a frequency determined to reflect the culture of the Member State and the safety and security risks posed by the authorised activities.

0. SCOPE
It has been assumed that the Member State does not have a nuclear programme and therefore the following guidance relates to the regulatory infrastructure and oversight of industry sectors relating to the medical and industrial use of radioactive material.

1. REGULATORY BODY
The Government of the Member State in accordance with the requirements set out in IAEA GSR series of documents shall establish a Regulatory Body (RB) that shall:

The RB shall:
(i) Be independent of Government;
(ii) Have appropriate MS laws for all activities associated with the ownership and use of radioactive material that protect the person, property and the environment
(iii) Have powers of enforcement set out in MS legislation;
(iv) Be given adequate resources to carry out its functions and tasks;
(v) Ensure the staff are provided with adequate training on an ongoing basis;
(vi) Ensure that appropriate provisions are made to enable individuals, organisations and practices to be subjected to Authorisation and Permitting processes;
(vii) Provide adequate That and To establish
The following activities relating to sealed and unsealed sources have been considered:
A1 Import and export
A2 Emergency response
A3 Transport safety and security
A4 Storage

2. LEGACY INVENTORY
It is necessary to establish what radioactive material currently exists in the MS to bring the material under regulatory control. This can be achieved by several ways including for example sending a questionnaire to industry, hospitals, universities, etc. The objective would be to identify:

(i) orphan sources
(ii) the owners and location of sources in use
(iii) contaminated material

For (i) it is important to develop a procedure to recover orphan sources and a protocol with other MS to repatriate orphan sources.

It may be considered necessary for the Government to own and use packagings for the recovery process.

The RB should make it a requirement to install monitors at metal recycling facilities and metal smelter facilities

3. RADIATION SOURCES (SEALED)

3.1 Procedures, Authorisations and Registers for import and export, namely:
3.1.1 Owners
3.1.2 Users
3.1.3 Location, including temporary (fixed sources)
3.1.4 Carrier
3.1.5 Location, use and storage of mobile sources would be an operator requirement

The transfer of ownership and bankruptcy of operator also needs regulatory provisions

4. UNSEALED SOURCES (medical, research, NORM (non exempt))

4.1 Procedures, Authorisations and Registers for import and export, namely:
4.1.1 User (material and quantities)
4.1.2 Location (material and quantities)
4.1.3 Carrier

5. EMERGENCY RESPONSE ARRANGEMENTS

5.1 NATIONAL PLAN (CBR) – Government threat assessment
5.1.1 Facilities (medical, industrial, storage)
5.1.2 Transport safety
5.1.3 Environment
5.1.4 International collaboration
5.1.5 Transport Security (national and international collaboration)

5.2 National Level

5.2.1 National network of trained (radioactive) responders (Police, Fire, Medical, Military, universities and hospitals)
5.2.2 Emergency exercises (Land, air, sea as appropriate)
5.2.2.1 Procedures
5.2.2.2 Defined responsibilities
5.2.2.3 Communications
5.2.2.4 Equipment
5.2.2.5 Post accident (Recovery operations including national store for waste)

5.3 Industry level

5.3.1 The RB should require operators to have arrangements as 5.2.2 which would operate within the national plan of 5.2

6. TRANSPORT

6.1 PACKAGE DESIGN VALIDATION

The RB staff should be suitably qualified and experienced in technical assessment/evaluation of the mechanical, thermal and radiation protection of package designs. This may be achieved by training and by collaborating with other Competent Authorities for them to undertake the analysis with mentoring. This would be covered by an internal resource plan. Authorisations in the form of package design validations and shipment approvals should follow the IAEA SSR6 prescribed content.

6.2 TRANSPORT OPERATIONS

Having assessed the package design against the regulatory requirements the following aspects of the transport operation also need to be assessed with RB compliance inspections developed accordingly. Those activities marked in red are suggested priorities.

6.2.1 Configuration management
6.2.2 Testing (pre despatch)
6.2.3 Conveyance limits
6.2.4 Emergency arrangements, including operator emergency exercises
6.2.5 Radiation protection programme
6.2.6 Packaging Maintenance
6.2.7 Packaging repairs
6.2.8 Documentation
6.2.9 Quality Management Systems
6.2.10 Transport security arrangements  
6.2.11 Training programmes for operator staff including refresher training  
6.2.12 Package labelling and vehicle placards

7. STORAGE

The above will each require Authorisations and be subjected to a compliance inspection programme. The transport security aspects are cited in the IAEA Nuclear Security #11

(i) National / Regional Store  
(ii) Storage in Transit (airports, ports, etc)  
(iv) Facility storage

Legal Powers for RB Inspectors

It is vital that the RB has legal powers to exercise its duties and meet its responsibilities. It proposed that in line with many of MS the following powers are cited in the laws of the MS:

(i) To seize equipment and documentation  
(ii) Access premises and vehicles  
(iii) Issue legal notices of Prohibition to stop transport taking place  
(iv) Issue legal notices of Improvement to direct improvements to be made to existing practices within defined timescales  
(v) To prosecute through the legal system those individuals and organisations who operate in a dangerous manner placing persons, property or the environment in direct danger due to their working practices

8. COLLABORATION WITH OTHER MEMBER STATES

It is strongly recommended that the Regulatory Bodies responsible for the transport radioactive material form a network of collaboration both regionally and between the MS involved in the transport routes for imported and exported goods.
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WORKING GROUP 3 REPORT OUT:

Agenda Topics –
- Scope of inspections; harmonised approach; what is and what is not being done in each State; sharing of resources / information / intelligence
- The international applicants guide

Additional Item for Discussion –
- Licensing & training of carriers

**TOPIC 1: International Applicants Guide**
Presentation and discussion on:

- European PDSR
- Australian Guidance document RPS 2.2
- Information Paper #6, the “Guidance for Preparation of the Safety Case for Dual Purpose Cask Containing SNF”
- Translation of the Table of Contents for the Japanese guidance document. "Requirements Regarding Context, Structure of Safety Analysis Report"

**Working Group Decisions and Recommendations**
Agreed to use the PSDSR format

From the PDSR, the ADR references will be removed. The 2009 TS-R-1 references will be retained. The 2012 SS-6 references will be added. Discussion of including the UNOB references was tabled, with preference to stay with the IAEA references only for simplicity.

Decisions made to not incorporate UNOB references, not to incorporate security, not to address material approval such as LDM or special form. Special form approval should be reconsidered in the future.

Decision made to add annexes for emergency arrangements and also for codes and standards which are used by/acceptable to Member States.

France will have the overall lead for coordinating the development.

Emergency Arrangements – Australia will draft and send out for comment

Codes and standards annex – France will draft

Schedule from the WG #3 paper was agreed to:
- First step to comment on the current PDSR. Have comments by PATRAM.
- Meet to discuss comments on the margins of PATRAM.
- Draft new annexes by TRANSSC 28.
Complete draft guide document in time to put it on the agenda for discussion at TRANSSC 29

TOPIC 2: Scope of inspections; harmonised approach; what is and what is not being done in each State; sharing of resources / information / intelligence
Working group members discussed their state programs for inspection. Reviewed the U.S. guidance pages referenced in the agenda for this topic. Reviewed and discussed the European Compliance Inspection Guide which is currently under development, and is expected to be final by the end of 2013.

Working Group Recommendations
TRANSSC should consider all available Member State materials to determine what might be useful to develop compliance assurance/inspection guidance.

The checklists being developed by European Association of CAs are more detailed than what is currently included in TS-G-1.5, and perhaps could be a supplement to the existing document.

The US reference sheets could also be considered as supplement to inspection checklists, if modified to reference IAEA paragraphs.

TOPIC 3: Licensing & training of carriers
Member state discussion of current practices related to authorizing transport by all modes. We also discussed the proposed EU regulation to require registration of road, rail and inland waterways carriers of radioactive material. Approaches varied from licensing of all carriers to very limited or no licenses issued to carriers.

Working Group Recommendations
Recommendation that Belgium should share their process for licensing carriers with other Member States at a future TRANSSC meeting.

Working Group Members:
Guy Lourtie, Belgium
Adelia Sahyun, Brazil
Mohd Sobari, Malaysia
Christophe Getrey, France
Marie-Therese Lizot, France
Santtu Hellsten, Finland
Bernhard Droste, Germany
Samir Sarkar, Australia
Michael Wallin, Sweden
Hideki Yagihashi, Japan
Florian Spielmann, WNTI
Michele Sampson, USA
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Summary of Working Group 4 Discussions

Participants:

1. John Miller (ISSPA/USA)  
2. Fernando Zamora (Spain)  
3. David Brennan (IATA)  
4. Wan-Tae Kim (Korea, Republic of)  
5. Ahmed Eshraghi  
6. Jarlath Duffy (Ireland)  
7. Vivien Tran-Thien (France)  
8. S. Gorlin (WNA, UK)  
9. Xavier Van Mierloo (Belgium)  
10. M. Muneer  
11. Pierre Malesys (ISO)  
12. J. Safar  
13. T. Cabianca (UK)  
14. Nat Bruno (Brazil)  
15. R. Boyle (USA)  
16. Anthony L. Patko (USA)  
17. Daiichiro Ito (WNTI)  
18. Kazunori Midorikawa (Japan)  
19. Tonje Sekse (Norway)  
20. Sverre Hornkjol (Norway)  
21. G. Sert (France)  
22. A. Nada  
23. H. Zika (Sweden)  
24. K. Midorikawa  
25. X. Li  
26. F. Cuo  
27. F. Nitsche (Germany)  
28. S. Faille (Canada)

Transportable Reactors (WG4-H)

There is on-going work in the development of transportable nuclear power plant and several issues related to their transportation were outlined. The main difficulties would be for cases where the reactor would be transported with the fuel. One of the big challenge identified was for the merging of operation safety with transport safety; safety issues associated with the transport of a reactor and its fuel may involve more than just the safety issues related to the movement of the reactor but also limitations and restrictions related to the safety for its operation. Some of those may be opposing such as the control rods which would need to be locked in place for transport and free to move for the operation of the reactor.

It was noted that it is very difficult to discuss how these reactors could be transported within the current regulations or which possible changes to the regulations would be needed due to the limited information available on the design of those reactors.

It might be possible to transport those reactors under special arrangements although this is not a viable solution. Also, it was noted that it might be worthwhile looking at previous experience in shipment and use of nuclear propelled commercial ships such as icebreakers.

The current transport regulations may not adequately cover the transport of nuclear reactors and new regulations and/or guidance may be necessary in a near future to address the transport of such reactor.
LSA-III Material (WG4-D, WG4-E, INF-5)

Germany presented a summary of their work related to LSA-III material and their proposal to change the Regulations by removing the need to conduct leaching test for LSA-III Material.

France made a presentation which indicated the need to maintain the leaching test or to develop new provisions to prevent presence of highly radioactive particles or material within LSA-III Material.

It was also noted that there might be an issue related to the calculation method for $A_2$ and exemption values such as decay progeny parameters, secular equilibrium, etc.

A meeting will be held, probably in Cologne Germany, before the next TRANSSC meeting in to discuss the above noted issues. France Germany and the UKHPA indicated that they would participate. Any other person interested in participating in this meeting can contact France or Germany.

Large Objects (WG4-C)

There was no discussions related to this item.

It was noted that the results of the working group have been submitted for consideration within the review cycle for the 2012 Edition of the regulations and that it will be reviewed in details at the next TRANSSC meeting.

Special Arrangement (WG4-G)

The group felt that the concept of special arrangement is sound and important within the regulations. The issue with the connotation of the term special arrangement is not seen in many countries due to the translation of the term which, in some instances, do not have the same perceived connotation as in English. In other cases, the term special arrangement has been replaced by special permit but in all cases, the concept is maintained and it felt that it must remain in future editions of the regulations.

There is some support for looking at changing the term special arrangement but it was felt that a bigger issue might be how special arrangements have been used in the past (i.e. too often).

Another issue has also been raised regarding the use of Type B(M) which might have been used in a ways similar to special arrangements. This is an item that might be worth looking in a near future.

Segregation Tables for Air shipments (WG4-F)

The UKHPA agreed that the use of the segregation tables within the ICAO Technical Instructions was difficult based on their recent experience in applying them for their recent study.
Many of the issues are related to smaller aircraft where the distance between the cargo and the passengers is limited. In many cases, operators have to manage the need for the protection of the workers and passengers from exposure to the radiation by placing the cargo at the back of the plane with the need to quickly offload the material at destination (front of the plane to the back) for immediate delivery due to the short half-life.

Relief for shipment of medical isotopes has been given in some instances. It was noted that the main issue is related to radiation protection and that, it might be advisable to review the parameters used for the development of the segregation tables to see if there is a possibility to modify the parameters if those are found to be too conservative.

**Isotope specific Contamination Limits (Emergency) (WG4-B)**

It was noted that the values currently used in SSR-6 were used as guidance within Europe following Fukushima although those were not designed for this kind of situation.

TRANSSC already devoted a significant amount of work in looking at the introduction of this concept within SSR-6 but a decision was made not to proceed. It was also noted that it might be worth looking at the implementation of the isotope specific exemptions within the regulations to see if moving away from the generic exemption to the isotope specific values was beneficial or not.

It was felt that the use of specific emergency contamination levels should be considered as part of the overall emergency plan and not specific to transport.

**Future IAEA Electronic Process for Collection of feedback on Safety Standards (WG4-A)**

The Secretariat provided a presentation on on-going work to develop an automated process for providing comments and feedback on any of the IAEA Standards. This new system would allow the IAEA to ensure that changes related to specific topics are captured in every documents, avoiding discrepancies between documents.

Although comments could be provided to the IAEA on an on-going basis, set time would be established for looking at the review or revision of a document.

This process would be based on topics rather than specific documents, allowing small, targeted modifications instead of full review of documents.

The Secretariat indicated that this process was very similar to the one by TRANSSC for the review and revision of SSR-6.

Concerns were raised in regard to the electronic process. Items such as ownership, hierarchy of documents and multiple reviewers needs to be well evaluated.

The Secretariat indicated that NUSSC and perhaps RASSC would be the groups that will benefit the most from this new system. The Secretariat also specified that a trial
version of the software will be made available soon and that documents from NUSSC will be used for the trial.

The group enquired about the possibility of including the UN Orange Book to this system once it will be fully implemented since the system would be able to identify all areas in all documents in the system that would be impacted by a change in one document. It was felt that this would greatly simplify the review of the impact of a change to SSR-6 within the UN Orange book and vice versa.

The Secretariat agreed that this was an item that was worth considering in the future.