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Two Safety guides on Radiation Safety in Well logging (DS419) and Nuclear Gauges (DS420) were planned few years ago as part of a set of safety guides to support GSR Part 3.

The draft Safety Guide DS419 was considered by RASSC in 2015 Nov to approve for submission to CSS.

Committees: RASSC (lead), EPReSC, TRANSSC, WASSC and NSGC

Previous TO presented the details of MS comments and resolution.

Safety-security interface was agreed upon and one section covers this aspect in the draft.

Merging of the document with DS420 (Nuclear gauges) was discussed and Committees decided to develop two separate guides as target audiences are different.
Scope

To provide recommendations on how to meet the requirements of the BSS with regard to the use of radiation sources and radiation generators in well logging.

- Covers radiation safety issues associated with well logging
- Provides information on the need for appropriate nuclear security measures

- Out of scope – NORM in well logging industry
1. Introduction
2. Duties and responsibilities
3. Safety assessment
4. Radiation protection programme
5. Training and qualification
6. Individual monitoring of workers
7. Workplace monitoring
8. Control of radioactive sources
9. Nuclear security considerations
10. Safe handling of radioactive sources and radiation generators
11. Site operation
Structure

12. Transport of radioactive sources
13. Emergency preparedness and response

References

Annex I. Overview of radioactive sources used in well logging
Annex II. Considerations for safety assessment for well logging
Annex III. Information on radiation safety of neutron generators
Annex IV. Calculation of radiation shielding
Annex V. Suggested structure of well logging local rules
Annex VI. Examples of incidents involving radiation sources in well logging
Previous discussion

• Following resolution of comments received from Member States, Committees provided further 69 comments.
• Most comments were accepted and very few comments rejected.

• US noted that the draft lacks topic-specific detail in relation to regulation.

• Australia supported the observation.
RASSC - Previous decision

• Committee advised the Secretariat:
  – to review the draft further
  – undertake technical editorial review and
  – submit back to the Committees for reconsideration.

• Action from Secretariat
  – Technical editorial review (NSOC)
  – Review by the Technical officer
  – External review by a consultant to incorporate further practice specific guidance (Feb.2018)
  – Further review by the technical officer
  – Re-review in NSOC by Standards specialist
Review changes

- Consistency with DS420 ensured.
- Significant technical editing.
- Some annexes deleted and some modified.
- MS comments – all accepted but not easy to locate word by word because text has been significantly reworked.
## Comments by the Committee – second review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Organization</th>
<th>No. of comments</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments and Resolutions

Most comments are editorial (formatting/words etc)

Resolution table — posted on website.

**comments on consistency:**
Resemblance of the two documents are well known to the committees. Consistency was ensured during technical editing. Any oversight will be rectified.

Formatting/spell checks/ terms etc. will be thoroughly checked before publication process.
Rejected comments

• Rejected comments
  – Mostly quotes on BSS requirements and cannot be changed.
  – Where no clear proposals are suggested.
  – Not to the context

• No comments from WASSC
• RASSC 44 : Approval and would like to see the final text after incorporating any further comments from other committees.

• TRANSSC 36 : Approved the draft.

• EPReSC 6: Approval (similar to RASSC)

• NSGC 13 : Approved the draft.
You are kindly requested to approve the submission to the CSS
Many thanks!