1.0 OPENING SESSION

1.1 Opening Remarks

1.1.1 Pil-Soo Hahn Director NSRW

Mr. P-S Hahn, Director, Division of Radiation, Transport and Waste Safety opened the meeting. In particular he reminded TRANSSC of the budget constraints the Agency works under and challenged TRANSSC to see the next three years as the key time to improve implementation of the transport standards.

For details of his opening remarks see Annex 1.

1.1.2 Chair – Bill Brach

The chair also welcomed the meeting participants. He noted that two key actions, final approval of SSR-6 and TS-G-1.1, had recently been completed; and the documents were completed in parallel within two years for the first time. Mr. Brach also highlighted important TRANSSC 24 agenda topics including review of Fukushima lessons learned relative to transport, transport of UF6 samples <100 grams, plans for the next SSR-6 review cycle, and multiple safety standards for TRANSSC approval.

For details of his opening remarks see Annex 2.

2.0 ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

2.1 Conduct of the Meeting

2.1.1 Agenda – Bill Brach

Two additions were made under agenda item 7.2 to discuss the September 2012 Nuclear Forum in St Petersburg, Russia, and PATRAM 2013 in San Francisco, California, USA in August 2013.

TRANSSC DECISION TRANSSC approved Rev 3 of the agenda with the two additions to 7.2

2.1.2 Terms of Reference – Bill Brach

TRANSSC DECISION TRANSSC accepted the Terms of Reference as posted on the TRANSSC 24 web page

2.1.3 Administrative Meeting Arrangements – Jim Stewart

Administrative announcements were given.

2.2 Review of previous meetings

2.2.1 Previous meeting report– Bill Brach
TRANSSC DECISION TRANSSC accepted the meeting report for TRANSSC 23 as posted on the TRANSSC 24 web page.

2.2.2. Action Record Sheet – Jim Stewart

TRANSSC DECISION TRANSSC accepted the Action Record Sheet as presented by Mr. Stewart

2.2.3. Feedback from the Commission on Safety Standards (CSS 31) – Dominique Delattre

Mr. Delattre provided a summary of IAEA safety standards in process of being published. He also summarized the 1st meeting in March 2012 of new 5th term of the CSS and mentioned that there were many new members. He outlined the CSS priorities for the next few years and noted that there were many CSS actions of relevance to the four safety standards committees. Mr. Delattre’s presentation was posted on the TRANSSC 24 web page.

2.2.4. Chairs meetings (Feb & Mar 2012) – Bill Brach

The Chair summarized two meetings of the four safety standards committee chairs. The first meeting in February 2012 focused on review of Fukushima lessons learned gap analysis and the preliminary list of safety guides to receive priority for review. The second meeting in March 2012 focused on harmonization of chairs’ CSS presentations, draft Terms of Reference for the new security committee (NSGC), revisions to SPESS addressing CSS responsibilities. An Information Paper on the two chairs meetings was posted on the TRANSSC 24 web page.

2.3. Three Year Action Plan

2.3.1. Overview of Three Year action plan – Bill Brach

For the benefit of the many new members of TRANSSCC and as a refresher for others, the Chair provided a brief overview of the TRANSSC Three Year Work Plan. A copy of the presentation was posted on the TRANSSC 24 web page.

2.4. Topical briefing

2.4.1. Scrap metal code of conduct – Eric Reber

Mr. Reber provided a briefing on the background and content of the draft metal recycling code of conduct. He discussed the multiple meetings and evolution of the draft code of conduct over the past four years including direction from the General Conference to develop a non-binding agreement and draft code of conduct to address metal recycling. The draft code of conduct has been distributed to all Member States for comment by 31 July. Mr. Reber commented that based on comments received to date he anticipates another meeting to discuss the draft document will be necessary. The draft code of conduct and Mr. Reber’s presentation were posted on the TRANSSC 24 web page.

2.4.2. Recent incidents – open discussion
UK welcomed Mr. Reber’s report and noted the increasing number of incidents involving contaminated imports, including for example 2 Tonnes of tea spoons, 1 Tonne of dog feeding bowls and other contaminated items. In addition some contaminated bolts are consolidated, with a dose of about 10mSv per hour inside container. The UK asked can the process be speeded up?

UNECE/SCETDG commented that they have worked on the subject since 2000. In 2002 recommendations were established to help address the issue and were published in 2006 for monitoring of scrap. In addition a strategy for training was developed in 2007, including capacity building. Additional information is available on the UNECE website.

Canada also reported an increase in cases. The draft code of conduct presently addresses “semi-finished products” and Canada asked if there is the potential for inclusion of finished products. Canada also asked if the code can include carriers since they will often not return the material once it is identified as contaminated. Mr. Reber noted the draft is presently open for comments.

Activity limits in code lower than in transport regulations – what effect will this have on transport. GC asked for values to be acceptable in trade – RS-G-1.7, copied into interim edition of BSS. Values are trade values not transport values. Jim – not clear who made this comment?

Document distributed in Brazil. Terminology in document is different to safety standards. Potential for problems, so a note should be developed to provide clarity. Need to be careful with understanding, particularly with the use of term “investigation” which could have negative connotations.

USA commented that the draft code is theoretically good but practically not realistic. Senders not licensed, so how can they have material returned to them – carriers will not carry the shipment. No advice on who should ship the material. Concern over investigation – how extensive should it be? Who should the point of contact be? Very hard to decide – agencies have different clearance levels. Surface contaminated objects are not included. Also raises question on obligations for import/export.

Russia asked what procedure for joining will be used, and the response was that it had not been decided.

Spain raised a comment on the return of material. Current draft says the State must ensure it is transported “consistent” with transport regulations, and commented that the code should be clearer in this regard.

2.5. CSS Main Priorities for 2012-2015

2.5.1. TRANSSC Consideration – Bill Brach

CSS assigned an action to the four safety standards committees to review the status of committee actions to address the CSS main priorities for the 5th term, 2012 – 2015. The Chair provided a mapping of the CSS main priorities with the existing TRANSSC work plan. The Chair believes that the applicable CSS priorities are addressed by TRANSSC actions that are either already underway or planned. There
was general TRANSSC agreement and Spain noted that “justification of practices” should not be included since that is primarily a radiation protection consideration.

TRANSSC DECISION TRANSSC agreed with the CSS priorities applicable to TRANSSC taking into account the Spanish comment.

2.6. Supported Projects Following PATRAM 2010

2.6.1. Information on Projects – Betty Bonnardel-Azarelli

Ms. Bonnardel-Azarelli, WNTI, informed TRANSSC how funds from PATRAM 2010 are being managed, and what the funds are being used for. She reported that two projects had been finished and others ongoing. She identified that support to the non-nuclear sector is important. Documents describing the mechanism for obtaining funding will be distributed by WNTI [Jim, or did George Sallit volunteer to distribute this material?]

3.0 REVIEW OF SAFETY STANDARDS FOLLOWING FUKUSHIMA

3.1. Implementation of the IAEA Action Plan on Nuclear Safety (including information on International Experts Meeting, March 2012)

3.1.1. Status report – Gustavo Carruso

Mr. Carruso gave a brief overview of the development of the IAEA Action Plan on Nuclear Safety. He gave details of the overarching actions and how information was being made available. He noted that transport was not included explicitly, however transport is clearly important. Mr. Stewart noted that transport is included in the IAEA Safety Standards Action Plan which is included as an element of the IAEA Action Plan on Nuclear Safety.

3.2. Safety Standards Action Plan

3.2.1. Presentation of plan – Dominique Delattre

An in-house review of IAEA safety standards had been performed to determine any gaps. This was then processed through the coordination committee, the four safety standards committees, the four chairs and the CSS. The NUSSC committee has lead for this activity.

CSS sent a letter to the DG in June on the status of the IAEA Action Plan for review of the IAEA safety standards. The implementation of the plan is a long term process and will take into account many important meetings such as the August extraordinary meeting of the CNS, and Member State reports on lessons learned from Fukushima.

Mr. Delattre identified that most of the lessons learned were covered by existing overarching requirements, but there were areas where the requirements could be strengthened or guidance enhanced. The process is to update specific items in standards to support a detailed review of additional safety requirements by the committees late in 2012.
A copy of Mr. Delattre’s presentation was posted on the TRANSSC 24 web page.

3.2.2. DS 462 Revision through addenda of GSR Part 1, NS-R-3, SSR-2/1, SSR-2/2 and GSR Part 4

On the basis of the DPP (DS 462) there are 31 additional safety requirements proposed and 20 existing safety requirements are proposed to be strengthened. This supports the need for revision. Mr. Delattre identified the process for revising the five safety requirements by addenda, and emphasized that the review would be through addenda changes that cover specific items in several standards in a single safety standards committee approval process.

The DPP includes an indicative table of changes in an annex for each of the five safety requirements. Potentially the final proposed revisions could be sent to the BoG by 2014. The comments on the DPP from Member States were presented, and the decisions and resolution on them were highlighted. Some key issues such as the need to ensure consistent terminology in addenda and the main body of standards were noted.

**TRANSSC DECISION** The DPP for DS 462 was approved

3.3. Status reports

3.3.1. Report of TRANSSC Member from Japan


3.4. Transport Safety Standards

1. Review of Transport Safety Standards

A presentation on the review of transport standards was made, summarizing the view that there was no urgent need for changes to the requirements. A summary report from a March 2012 meeting of consultants that reviewed the Fukushima lessons learned relative to transport was posted on the TRANSSC 24 web page. The consultants concluded no urgent action was needed, but they did identify some additional actions for longer term consideration.

2. Gap analysis

The review of the gap analysis prepared by Japan was summarized in brief. It was noted that there were two major areas of work identified, one related to the transport environment and the other related to emergency response. It was noted that these two items would be addressed later in the agenda, and that under these items the specific issues would be need to be considered in the context of planning for the July 2013 Technical meeting to address the transport environment and in the review of the DPP outlining plans to revise the transport safety guide on emergency preparedness and response (TS-G-1.2).
Any remaining items in the gap analysis, such as hydrogen generation, would be considered under agenda item 7. A copy of the gap analysis report and recommendations was distributed to TRANSSC.

TRANSSC ACTION Include discussion of plans for July 2013 TM at TRANSSC 25

3. Input to Safety Standards Action Plan

No items were identified at this point.

4.0 THE DEVELOPMENT OF DOCUMENTS/PRODUCTS

4.1. Transport Safety Standards update and approval as required

1. SSR6 (TS-R-1) and TS-G-1.1 - Jim Stewart

SSR-6 would be edited by 17 August and publication should be in the September/October timeframe. A request had been made to publish the revised TS-G-1.1 on a similar schedule and this would require publication in A4 format.

2. TS-G-1.2 - Jim Stewart

A DPP will be presented later under agenda item 4.2.2.

3. TS-G-1.3 - Jim Stewart

A CS had advised that no changes to TS0G-1.3 were urgently needed. TRANSSC agreed to this way forward.

4. TS-G-1.4 - Nancy Capadona

No actions are planned to revise this safety guide, consistent with the TRANSSC Three Year Work Plan.

5. TS-G-1.5 - Nancy Capadona

No actions are planned to revise this safety guide, consistent with the TRANSSC Three Year Work Plan.

6. TS-G-1.6 - Nancy Capadona

The proposed schedule for the full revision of TS-G-1.6 to conform to the 2012 Edition of SSR-6 was presented. TRANSSC 23 approved the DPP for the complete revision of TS-G-1.6 and the CSS approved the DPP at their March 2012 meeting. Ms. Capadona identified that the schedule in the DPP calls for TRANSSC 25, October/November 2012, to review the draft of TS-G-1.6 2012 Edition for approval to issue Member States for their 120-day review.

7. Technical Basis of Regulations

7.1. A1/A2 values – Tibs Cabianca
Mr. Cabianca presented an overview of a recently completed UK study of the basis of A1, A2 and exemption values. The report addresses changes that had occurred over the years, including consideration of the recently revised Basis Safety Standards (BSS) and the possible need for change in SSR-6. Mr. Cabianca noted the public availability of the report and the software methodology (referred to as SEAL) on the web. In response to a question from TRANSSC, the UK offered to make available to TRANSSC members the report, calculational software SEAL, and a copy of the new draft revised A1 and A2 values derived as a result of the study.

New Zealand suggested that there would always need to be a range of values for emergency response.

Russia pointed out the existing discrepancy between the Pu and U ratios for A values and exemption values.

The UK study did not identify an urgent need to change the A1 or A2 values at this time.

TRANSSC ACTION on UK A copy of the report of the study will be made available. The software SEAL will be made available as well as a table of the new calculated values.

7.2. NORM CRP – Kasturi Varley

A brief update was given. Two options were explained for production of the final NORM CRP report. One option is to publish the final report as a separate TECDOC; and the second option is to include the final report as an electronic file in the Technical Basis Document library and maintained as reference material. It was agreed that it is agreeable to include the final NORM CRP report in the Technical Basis Document. However, the means of publication was decided under agenda item 7.3, below.

7.3. Technical Basis Document – Jim Stewart

Mr. Stewart provided an overview of the recent consultants meetings supporting development of the technical basis for the transport regulations. TRANSSC members requested a copy of the current draft Technical Basis document and noted that under agenda item 8, we should consider discussion of this document at TRANSSC 25. TRANSSC also discussed the current status of the final reports of the Air Transport CRP and the NORM CRP. Copies of the two final CRP reports were requested by TRANSSC, and TRANSSC advised the Secretariat to proceed with publishing the final reports as TECDOCS.

TRANSSC ACTION: A draft of the technical basis document will be made available by 17th August to TRANSSC members.

TRANSSC ACTION: Both the CRP report for NORM and the CRP for Air accident severity report would also be made available in draft by 17th August.

TRANSSC ACTION: Both the CRP report for NORM and the CRP for Air accident severity report will also be proposed as TECDOCS in the meantime.

8. Training programme – Jim Stewart
Mr. Stewart provided an overview of the IAEA transport training program and noted that as the technical basis document is finalized, the training will need to be revised to include reference to and an expanded explanation as may be appropriate of the origin and reference base for some of the transport requirements.

**TRANSSC DECISION** that the revised training material on the technical basis was not to be considered until the technical basis document was reviewed.

4.2. DPP Approval

1. **DS 460 Communication and consultation with interested parties in regulatory activities**

No TRANSSC member comments were submitted on DS460, and following TRANSSC practice, the DPP was approved with no plenary discussion.

**TRANSSC DECISION** The DPP for DS 460 was approved.

2. **Revision of TS-G-1.2 – Kasturi Varley**

Ms. Varley presented the proposed DPP for revision of TS-G-1.2. Based on the earlier discussion on Fukushima lessons learned relative to transport and noting the significant number of resulting recommendations on emergency preparedness and emergency response, Ms. Varley and Mr. Stewart offered that the DPP needs to be revised to address Fukushima lessons learned.

**TRANSSC ACTION** A revised DPP will be presented to the next TRANSSC, including specific reference to the 28 lessons learned from the Fukushima gap analysis in terms of a wider scope.

4.3. Draft Safety Standards approval

1. **DS 450 Safe Decommissioning of Facilities - Vladan Ljubenov**

Mr Ljubenov presented the draft of the revised Safety Requirements for Decommissioning (DS450), which will supersede the WS-R-5. His presentation covered the reasons for the revision, work done after the approval of the DPP in May 2011, the structure of the final version of DS450, comments received by WASSC, NUSSC and RASSC and their resolution. The DS450 submission to the Member States for comments has already been approved by RASSC, NUSSC and WASSC at their meetings in June and July 2012. The document was presented to TRANSSC, noting that some changes would be made which would need to be approved by the WASSC chair.

**TRANSSC DECISION** TRANSSC approved the document for Member State review.

4.4. Final document approval

1. **DS 407 Criticality Safety For Facilities And Activities Handling Fissile Material – Geoff Jones**

DS407 Version 8 has been revised in response to Member State comments from the 120-day comment period and from the four safety standards committees. The presentation by Mr. Jones covered the
development of the document, a report on the changes proposed by the IAEA’s technical editor and members of the safety standards committees during their final review. His presentation was made seeking TRANSSC approval to send the document to the CSS. Mr. Jones noted that NUSSC, RASSC and WASSC have already given their approval.

TRANSSC DECISION TRANSSC approved the document for submission to the CSS.

2. Addendum to TS-G-1.6 Schedules – Nancy Capadona

Ms. Capadona presented the proposed revision of TS-G-1.6 to conform to the 2009 Edition of the transport regulations, TS-R-1 (now referred to as SSR-6). She noted that although TRANSSC and the CSS had approved the DPP to develop an addendum to TS-G-1.6, a new edition of TS-G-1.6 had been suggested by the internal agency process. TRANSSC discussed the suggestion proposed by the internal agency process and reconfirmed the previous TRANSSC decision to prepare an addendum to TS-G-1.6 to be consistent with the 2009 Edition of TS-R-1. TRANSSC 23 had already decided that a new complete revision of TS-G-1.6 to conform to the 2012 Edition of SSR-6 would be initiated.

TRANSSC DECISION TRANSSC decided a full revision would not be appropriate, that an addendum to reflect the 2009 Edition of TS-R-1 would be appropriate as originally decided by TRANSSC and the CSS.

TRANSSC ACTION Secretariat to make addendum available by 20 July.

TRANSSC ACTION Members to make comments within 30 days.

4.5. Work with others

1. TRANSSC work with WASSC on extended storage followed by transport - B Droste

An overview of the work of the joint WASSC/TRANSSC group was presented. The product of this joint work will be two documents, one focusing on technical issues and another on regulatory issues. TRANSSC was very receptive to the joint WASSC/TRANSSC work, and several member states expressed an interest in supporting the work. TRANSSC members also expressed interest in reviewing the two documents to be produced in this effort and it was suggested that WASSC and TRANSSC could have valuable input to the working group documents.

2. TRANSSC work with RASSC on commodities, exemption values – Jim Stewart

Mr. Stewart noted the ongoing collaboration with RASSC in the development of a safety guide on commodities (TRANSSC 23 approved the DPP). In addition, Mr. Stewart provided an overview of some of the issues resulting from Fukushima, and in particular radiation protection issues such as transport of a contaminated person.

4.6. Information from other UN/International bodies on their documents

1. UN papers of interest – Jim Stewart

1.1. UNOB changes based on SSR-6 2102 Edition – Akiko Konnai
Ms. Konnai discussed the UN Subcommittee of Experts on Transport of Dangerous Goods (SCETDG) paper that identified changes to UN Orange Book text to conform to the 2012 revision of the transport regulations, SSR-6 2012 Edition. She also highlighted some of the issues related to effective and accurate transfer of SSR-6 regulations to the UN orange Book. Copies of and links to the UN SCETDG papers were posted on the TRANSSC 24 web page.

1.2. UF6 – Olivier Kervella

The process of development of the UN SCETDG paper on UF6 and the outcome of recent discussions at UN was presented.

1.3. Working Groups discussion of UN papers

Previous TRANSSC meetings have discussed the need for TRANSSC involvement, review and approval of changes to the UN Orange Book that address the transport of radioactive materials (Class 7). TRANSSC 23 approved a new procedure for TRANSSC review of such changes to the UN Orange Book and the new review process was implemented at TRANSSC 24.

To facilitate this review, three working groups were established to look at:

- UF6 less than 100g
- UN Orange Book chapters 1-5
- UN Orange Book chapters 6-7

1.4. Plenary discussion of WGs

1.4.1 WG on UF6 less than 100g

The issue of primary and subsidiary hazard had been addressed [text from France? Jim, do you have the insert?]

The working group recommends:

- Class 8 would be the primary class with class 7 as the subsidiary class.
- Appending the phrase RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL, EXCEPTED PACKAGE to the end of the proper shipping name.
- Secretariats of IAEA and UN SCETDG to draft new special provision 369.

TRANSSC DECISION TRANSSC endorsed the recommendations of the working group

TRANSSC ACTION secretariats to prepare a paper for UN and TRANSSC on UF6 by end August.

1.4.2 WG of chapters 1-5 of UNOB.

A few problems were identified. Some minor editorial issues were noted (some had already been identified and corrected by the Secretariat of UN SCETDG). One or two more significant issues that
could benefit from more time to check because of complexity were noted, but no major issues were identified in Chapters 1 - 5.

1.4.3 WG of chapters 6-7 of UNOB.

Seven or eight items of particular issue were highlighted where corrections are needed. Note was made of some UN Orange Book text that was possibly better than IAEA text, for example, UN text states “water leakage” versus IAEA text of “leakage of water.” The WG noted that cross references could not be followed due to time limitation.

TRANSSC DECISION The text of chapters 1-7 were was acceptable, subject to some editorial correction.

TRANSSC ACTION The Secretariat to establish a small working group to review the approval text to give feedback to the UNECE and TRANSSC, reporting by 17th August.

2. Interface with the UN – Jim Stewart

2.1. UNOB changes originated by SCETDG

Several papers of interest from the recent UNECE meeting were presented to TRANSSC. Although the UN SCETDG papers are available on the UN SCETDG web page, TRANSSC members asked that the papers also be made available by the IAEA. TRANSSC 25 will need to review and provide feedback to the UN SCETDG on changes that originated by SCETDG that impact radioactive material transport, Class 7.

TRANSSC ACTION Secretariat to distribute UN papers of interest to TRANSSC members by 17 August.

TRANSSC DECISION Cooperation with the UN should be added to the TRANSSC 25 agenda.

3. ICAO (Ms. Katherine Rooney)

ICAO reported that an amendment to Annex 18 regarding inspection and enforcement is available for comment.

Dangerous Goods provisions to become a separate section within ICAO in early 2013.

Training in coordination with IAEA has been requested on two occasions.

ICAO has raised the issue of an Inter-Agency committee recently and believes this would be an effective means of dealing with transport issues including denial of shipment.

4. IMO

IMO representative was not able to participate in TRANSSC 24.

5. Others

UNECE Secretariat for UN SCETDG (Mr. Kervalla)
Conclusion of work cycle in December 2012 on the next Edition of the UN Orange Book will include SSR-6 2012 Edition.

ADR, RID and ADN will be amended and come into force on 1st Jan 2013. The only major change affecting Class 7 will be the inclusion of the security provisions.

ISO (Mr. Malyses)

Two standards are under consideration:

- Leak testing of packages is being revised.
- UF6 package standard is proposed.

ISSPA (Mr. Miller)

Paul Gray, Nordion (Canada) is the new chair of ISSPA. There are 17 members of ISSPA. The next annual meeting will be in late February 2013 in Brussels or Vienna. Source security, especially during transport, has been supported by members.

TIC (Mr. Schwela)

TIC has attended a number of conferences to represent NORM and transport issues. Ethiopia has prohibited mining of Tantalite due to the closure of all transport routes to ship the product from Ethiopia. This restriction represents 8% of the world’s production. This restriction represents the largest direct impact of denial seen to date.

WNA (Mr. Gorlin)

A transport symposium was held in Shanghai attracting many port authorities. A transport forum was organized in New Delhi to encourage members to understand more about regulations in India. A transport seminar will be organized in Singapore.

WNTI (Mr. Decker)

PATRAM legacy projects were being supported by WNTI as discussed earlier in this meeting by Ms. Bonnardel-Azarelli (agenda item 2.6.1), and WNTI continues to support IAEA work in multiple areas such as the technical basis development.

IATA (Mr. Brennan)

For this biennium there are no specific changes to the provisions for Class 7 either from the UN Model Regulations or from the ICAO Technical Instructions. IATA is conducting a review of training materials with a particular emphasis on the training for Class 7. In this respect the IATA Secretariat is liaising with the IAEA Secretariat to integrate the improvements to the training programs. Ground handling agents are an area of particular relevance because of the expansion in the use of contractors in this area – some ground handlers would like a common training package for all areas of the world.
4.7. Plans for next SSR-6 (TS-R-1) review cycle

1. Quality Plan – Jim Stewart

The quality plan for the previous review cycle was presented to TRANSSC, and TRANSSC were informed of the need for input.

2. Background and feedback – Rick Boyle

Mr. Boyle provided background to the review and revision process and identified specific feedback on strengths and weaknesses. Some ideas for the way forward were shared, including re-instituting the revision panel, having longer term research, adopting longer review processes and consideration of how to respond to current issues.

3. Transport Environment – Nancy Capadona

Ms. Capadona discussed the outcome of a recent virtual consultancy on the transport environment. Earlier TRANSSC discussion of Fukushima lessons learned had already identified the need to include the recommendations resulting from the Fukushima lessons learned gap analysis in the planning for the July 2013 Technical Meeting on transport environment. TRANSSC noted that under agenda item 8, we should consider discussion of the outcome of the virtual consultancy and planning for the July 2013 meeting at TRANSSC 25.

TRANSSC ACTION The report of the CS will be made available to TRANSSC members.

4. Clarity of Regulations – Jim Stewart

Mr. Stewart provided an overview of a recent virtual consultancy that focused on the clarity of the transport regulations. He provided a few examples where improved clarity of the regulations would be help in avoiding confusion and possibly noncompliances. Although TRANSSC members acknowledged the regulations could be written more simply and clearer, the majority of TRANSSC members called for the need for stability in the regulations. They noted that the transport community is reasonably mature in the use of the IAEA transport regulations and that the present regulations have and continue to provide for safe transport. No further discussion ensued to pursue further work on clarity of the regulations.

5. Proposal by Transport unit – Jim Stewart

Mr. Stewart provided a proposal for TRANSSC to consider a new working alignment and arrangement with the UN SCETDG in revision of the UN Orange Book and in the promulgation of SSR-6. Mr. Stewart proposed that TRANSSC could provide initial technical input on radioactive material transport to the SCTEDG process for revision of the UN Orange Book. TRANSSC would then review and comment on changes proposed by SCETDG during their deliberations on UN Orange Book revisions. Once SCETDG has completed their biennial review/revision process, TRANSSC would initiate a revision of SSR-6 that
would be based on and conform to the latest UN Orange Book revision. This proposal was not accepted by TRANSSC.

6. Discussion – Bill Brach

Following the presentations and discussion under the above agenda items, 4.7.1 – 5, TRANSSC plenary then discussed considerations for future review cycles for SSR-6. Much discussion focused on the need to clearly separate and distinguish between a “review cycle” and a “revision cycle.” The IAEA BoG has directed that TRANSSC conduct a “review cycle” every two years. A review cycle is to consider if a revision of the transport regulations is warranted. TRANSSC has previously developed review/decision criteria to help guide the deliberations and decision if a revision is warranted based on safety and other considerations. The outcome of a review cycle is the decision to initiate or not initiate a revision cycle. A revision cycle is initiated only after a review cycle determines a revision is warranted. The conduct of the revision cycle follows a DPP prepared specifically for the revision.

The need for a Quality Plan to guide the conduct of a review cycle and a separate Quality Plan to guide the conduct of a revision cycle was identified by the Secretariat and TRANSSC. TRANSSC discussed the need to focus more on technical substance in the review of SSR-6 and to identify a path forward to address and resolve technical issues. Following the discussions, TRANSSC decided there should be no delay in starting the next review cycle which should begin in early 2013.

TRANSSC DECISION The current process for the two year review cycle should be continued. More emphasis should be given to technical content and less on editorial issues.

TRANSSC ACTION A revised Quality plan for the review and a revised quality plan for revision of the transport requirements would be made available for the next TRANSSC meeting (by Aug 17) along with the necessary input forms.

5.0 THE DEVELOPMENT OF IAEA SECURITY DOCUMENTS

5.1. New NSGC committee, Interface Group

1. Impact on TRANSSC – Ian Barraclough

Mr. Barraclough provided TRANSSC an update on the newly formed Nuclear Security Guidance Committee (NSGC) which had their first meeting in June. The NSGC has 54 members and 40 Member States participated in their first meeting. Prof G. Emi-Reynolds (Ghana) is the Chair of the NSGC. The next meeting of the NSGC will be 10-14 December.

Mr. Barrclough also briefly discussed the new safety/security Interface Group that is comprised of the chairs of the four safety standards committees (NUSSC, RASSC, TRANSSC, WASSC), NSGC chair and three additional NSGC members. The additional NSGC members are to provide for parity on the Interface Group with four safety and four security members. A main role of the Interface Group is to review DPPs
for safety standards and security series documents to identify safety standards that should have review by the NSGC or security documents that require review by one or more of the safety standards committees. The first meeting of the Interface Group is 24 - 25 September. It is anticipated that a number of security series documents will come to TRANSSC for review.

5.2. Nuclear Security Documents

1. Documents of interest to TRANSSC—Ian Baraclough

See above discussion under item 5.1

5.3. Nuclear Security Update

1. NSNS- Ann-Margreth Eriksson-Eklund

An update on “Methodology to Detect Illicit Trafficking...” was provided. There was information on plans for an implementing guide on transport of nuclear material, which will be the subject of a technical meeting in Vienna the week of 23 July, followed by a 120 day Member State comment period. NSNS is also considering an update NSS No.9, Security in the Transport of Radioactive Material.

NSNS has a training course on transport of radioactive material, which is currently being updated. This year NSNS training courses will be held in Germany, Ghana and Columbia. In addition a training course is being piloted regarding nuclear material this year.

India raised the issue that the records in the illicit trafficking database were not “illicit”, but were informed as inadvertent shipments. The question was raised as to whether it was time to separate illicit events from inadvertent events. In addition it was questioned whether it was appropriate to inform regulatory bodies of full details in the countries of origin to allow further investigation.

6.0 DENIAL OF SHIPMENTS

6.1. Update on Denial and Delay

1. Report from ISCDOS – Serge Gorlin

Mr. Gorlin reported on the February meeting of the ISCDOS and highlighted a number of the decisions and actions including the ISCDOS support for the ICAO recommendation to form an Interagency Committee on Transport (IACT) to coordinate UN transport related-activities. ISCDOS recommended that a number of the tasks in the ISCDOS action plan could be appropriately included in the scope of this new group. Mr. Stewart noted that while the IACT has not been approved, the IAEA Transport Safety Unit’s initiative to coordinate an interagency group is functioning in the interim and would address these ISCDOS tasks. Mr. Gorlin also reported that the ISCDOS will cease after June 2013 and the activities of ISCDOS will be assumed by the interagency group and TRANSSC.
Mr. Gorlin discussed the difficulties with certain port restrictions – reference is to a difference in port restrictions between countries. **Germany is a good example of what?** TRANSSC members should be aware of the ISCDOS effort to identify port restrictions, and note they may be contacted in the near future.

In addition, Mr. Gorlin identified that quite often limitations result from the variation in radiation protection regulations that can contribute to delays and denials. The failure of these regulations (?) to account for transport is a major problem. **Jim context of this statement?** During the discussion of variations, some TRANSCC members noted that in many cases variations may actually be the result of differences in laws/legislation rather than differences how a regulation is implemented in different countries. ICAO reiterated previous requests of TRANSCC members to report variations in the regulations to their aviation counterparts.

**TRANSCC ACTIONS**
TRANSCC members to report variations to their aviation counterpart.

2. Work after 2013 – impact on TRANSCC – Jim Stewart

Mr. Stewart noted that the ISCDOS will cease after June 2013 and future TRANSCC meetings will need to assess how to assimilate the ISCDOS tasks in the TRANSCC Three Year Work Plan. It was noted that some actions such as assimilating the Denial Networks may be a straightforward matter especially noting that in many cases the contact in the network is also a member of TRANSCC. During the discussion of including ISCDOS tasks as well as other Transport Safety Unit work in the TRANSCC Three Year Work Plan, it was acknowledged that the TRANSCC Three Year Work Plan has evolved to include a wide range of transport related tasks and should be renamed as the Transport Workplan.

**TRANSCC DECISION**
The denial network can be included in TRANSCC communication and v.v.

**TRANSCC DECISION**
The TRANSCC 3 Year Workplan should be renamed as the “Transport Workplan”

7.0 TRANSCC WORK NOW AND IN THE FUTURE

7.1. Review of work plans for TRANSCC and Transport Safety Unit to include consideration of Fukushima lessons learned and outcome of October 2011 conference

1. Priorities Jim Stewart

Mr. Stewart noted that the Transport Workplan includes an assigned priority 1 – 4 for all tasks, with primary focus and effort of the Transport Safety Unit directed to Priority 1 and 2 tasks. Acceptance of additional work is heavily dependent on Member State support by taking lead on a task, providing technical expert consultant services, or providing extra-budgetary support.

2. Presentation on updated priority list - Bill Brach
The Chair provided an update of the Transport Workplan, identifying updates to the plan since the last TRANSSC 23 meeting and identifying tasks needing TRANSSC action. TRANSSC also reviewed the recommended actions resulting from the October 2011 transport conference. In March 2012, the IAEA convened a Technical Meeting to review the Conference President’s Findings and to identify the resulting recommended actions. TRANSSC reviewed the overarching seven recommended actions that were complemented with approximately 80 sub-actions. TRANSSC concluded that the Transport Workplan already addresses the overarching recommendations and the majority of the sub-actions. The updated Transport Workplan was posted on the TRANSSC 24 web page.

TRANSSC DECISION: TRANSSC noted that the majority of actions in the list of recommended actions resulting from the March Technical Meeting were covered by the current workplan and there were no objections to the remaining actions, should there be a requirement to include them in the transport unit work.

TRANSSC DECISION The updated plan was accepted.

7.2. TRANSSC member sharing of operational experience

1. Plenary open discussion

Starting with TRANSSC 24, a new “standing agenda” item will be included on all TRANSSC meeting agendas to encourage sharing of operational and regulatory experience among TRANSSC members. The agenda topic is also responsive to the new TRANSSC Terms of Reference for the current term. Germany shared recent experience and review of overheating of UF6 cylinders and the UK shared recent experiences with imports of contaminated steel. Germany shared a paper on the overheating of UF6 cylinders with TRANSSC members and encouraged any feedback from TRANSSC members.


Mr. Ershov provided a brief overview of the 7th Nuclear Forum scheduled for September 2012 in St. Petersburg, Russia. He noted that over 400 participants are expected and encouraged TRANSSC member consideration to attend.

3. PATRAM 2013 – August 2013

Mr. Boyle provided a brief overview of plans for PATRAM 2013 to be held in San Francisco, California, USA in August 2013. He advised the PATRAM web page will soon be available with detailed information on the conference.

7.3. Transport Safety Unit Mentor Program

1. Describe new initiative – Jim Stewart

Mr. Stewart described a new Transport Safety Unit initiative to sponsor a “mentor” program to encourage and engage new TRANSSC members in TRANSSC meetings and deliberations. A senior expert from a Member State has been selected to serve in a consultant capacity to mentor new representatives.
from two Member States beginning at the next TRANSSC 25 meeting in October 2012. All TRANSSC members are encouraged to help new TRANSSC members understand and engage in the IAEA transport safety program and TRANSSC.

7.4. Technical Cooperation Projects *Jim you will need to provide details for 7.4 and 7.5*

1. **Asia – Kasturi Varley**

Regional Training Course for Asia/Pacific was held in Amman, Jordan from 13-25 May 2012. The specific objectives of the workshop were twofold. Firstly, share best practices on Compliance Assurance for the Safe Transport of Radioactive Material. The participants were introduced of the Self-Assessment Tool (SAT) Version 3. This tool assists Member States country to determine the extent of a compliance with the IAEA’ Regulations for the Safety Transport of Radioactive Material. Participants had the opportunity to have practical use of SAT.

2. **Africa – Nancy Capadona**

The first coordination meeting of project RAF-9046 was held in Harare, Zimbabwe, from 9 to 14 July, 2012. The project is designed to move toward a sustainable system of mutual support. It is envisaged that this regional project will set up an infrastructure that encourages sharing between states in the region. A key aspect of the strategy is to demonstrate that the sharing produces a net benefit for all states involved, irrespective of support from the IAEA.

Mr Olivier Kervella (in representation of the partnership with UNECE) addressed the following issues: The international structure of UN bodies and document dealing with transport of radioactive material, cross boundary transport and multimodal transport issues, and the benefits of model regulations such as ADR, and

The work performed included: presentation of each country answering questions related to D&D of shipment of RAM, draft self-assessment exercise to find main weaknesses, and project work plan for assessment of needs and agree on the project activities outlines (self assessment on transport issues and regional peer review missions)

3. **Latin America – Nancy Capadona**

At the moment, there are no activities planned to be accomplished during the present year in Latin America region.

7.5. Extra Budgetary funded projects
1. Carribean – Jim Stewart
2. Inter-Agency – Jim Stewart
3. Others – Jim Stewart

7.6. Revision of priority list

1. Open discussion – Bill Brach

Addressed under agenda item 7.1

8.0 AGENDA FOR NEXT TRANSSC

8.1. Items of interest for TRANSSC

1. MS feedback on best practice for disused source return – Jim Stewart

Mr. Stewart suggested the topic of best practices for disused sources for the TRANSSC 25 agenda. There was general agreement to include this on the agenda and ISSPA offered to make a presentation on their experiences with return of disused sources.

TRANSSC DECISION TRANSSC accepted this topic for discussion

2. Recommended TRANSSC 25 agenda items - Bill Brach

The following list of topics for discussion at TRANSSC 25 was recommended by TRANSSC during the TRANSSC 24 meeting and during plenary open discussion of proposed topics for TRANSSC 25.

TRANSSC ACTION the following topics should be included in the agenda of the next meeting:

- Discussion of UN SCETDG papers of interest relevant to Class 7
- Technical Basis Document development status
- NORM and Air Accident CRP report publication status as a TECDOC
- TRANSSC/WASSC interface working group
- Planning for the Technical Meeting for transport environment in July 2013
- The Quality Plan for the next review process to begin in 2013
- Review of Fukushima gap analysis recommendations included in July 2013 TM and DPP for TS-G-1.2, are there any omissions
- UF6 - status of revised paper to UN SCETDG reflecting TRANSSC 24 WG deliberations and TRANSSC Decision
- Review of issues of importance for next review cycle, including for example transport of large items, special arrangements, LSA materials

9.0 REVIEW OF DRAFT MEETING REPORT
9.1. Review of Actions in Meeting Report

1. Report reading – All participants

The draft TRANSSC 24 meeting report with TRANSSC ACTIONS and TRANSSC DECISIONS was made available Friday morning for TRANSSC review during an extended coffee break.

2. Review of actions – Bill Brach

During plenary discussions, TRANSSC focused their review of the draft report on the identified TRANSSC ACTIONS and TRANSSC DECISIONS. A number of changes were made and agreed to by TRANSSC, including for example adding a TRANSSC action missed in the drafting and correcting the wording of others actions and decisions.

TRANSSC ACTIONS and TRANSSC DECISIONS were accepted by TRANSSC

**TRANSSC ACTION** Draft report to be available by 17 August.

10.0 CLOSE OF MEETING

10.1. Closing Remarks

1. Bill Brach

Bill Brach provided a brief overview of TRANSSC 24 noting that many important topics had been addressed in the meeting and over 15 TRANSSC DECISIONS and 15 TRANSSC Actions had been concluded. TRANSSC 24 considered a number of very significant topics including TRANSSC plans for future review of SSR-6, how to address small UF6 samples <100 grams in the UN Orange Book, consideration of Fukushima lessons learned relative to transport, recommendations resulting from the October 2011 transport conference, and multiple draft safety standards. He identified the new initiative started at this TRANSSC meeting to review and approve UN Orange Book changes that resulted from the revision of SSR-6. Mr. Brach also highlighted the very good start in identifying topics for the agenda for the next TRANSSC meeting in October 2012.

Mr. Brach thanked all participants for their active engagement in the meeting discussions and thanked everyone for their patience and support. He wished all a safe trip home.

2. Pil-Soo Hahn

*Jim you have a copy of the remarks you prepared for Pil-Soo*