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1. OPENING OF THE JOINT RASSC/WASSC/TRANSSC MEETING

The Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the Radiation Safety Standards Committee (RASSC), the Twenty-Seventh Meeting of the Waste Safety Standards Committee (WASSC) and the Eighteenth Meeting of the Transport Safety Standards Committee (TRANSSC) was opened in a joint session on 29th June 2009, by Ms. E. Amaral, Director of NSRW. She introduced the Chairmen, Mr. Pather (WASSC Chair) and Mr. W Brach (TRANSSC Chair) and thanked Mr. Ian Robinson, the acting chair of RASSC, for standing in for Mr Sig Magnusson for this meeting. Mr. Magnusson’s apology was noted.

Ms. Amaral, in her opening speech, emphasised the management of disused sealed sources (DSS) at the end of their useful life, highlighting the two meetings held in 2007 and 2008, as part of the formalized process for the exchange of experience and lessons learned in implementing the Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources. In this regard she also suggested that Member States could make use of the synergies within the Code of Conduct and the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management.

A copy of Ms. Amaral’s opening remarks was made available to Committee Members and uploaded to the Committees web page.

2. CHAIRMEN’S REMARKS (jointly with RASSC/TRANSSC)

The Chairmen welcomed all participants to the meeting. It was noted that this was the first time that the three committees had met in a joint session. The members were asked to provide feedback on the effectiveness of the joint meeting.

3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA FOR THE JOINT SESSION

An updated agenda of the joint session was adopted, and is presented in ANNEX 1.

4. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE MEETING (jointly with RASSC/TRANSSC)

Mr Stewart provided administrative arrangements for the meeting on behalf of the three co-ordinators (T. Boal, G. Siraky and J Stewart)
5. GENERAL SAFETY STANDARD ISSUES (jointly with RASSC/TRANSSC)

5.1. Feedback from the Commission on Safety Standards:

Mr. D. Delattre presented feedback on the CSS25 meeting. He reported that all draft publications submitted to CSS25 were approved. He added that a key discussion took place on the BSS, and that the CSS decided that the BSS should be in the new format, when it is submitted to Member States for comment.

He reported on the first joint CSS/AdSec meeting, to discuss safety and security issues, and that a task force was set up to look at short term objectives and long term goals. In the short term, the task force will focus on the legal basis and process for security related publications and develop practical steps for cross-verification of documents. In the long term, it will look at the feasibility of a joint safety and security series with full coverage of both safety and security issues.

He further reported that the CSS had discussed a paper from the chairs of the Safety Standards Committees on stakeholder involvement, which is expected to be complemented in the future by a paper from the secretariat. An update was provided to the CSS on the glossary.

Mr. Delattre also reported that a paper had been presented to the CSS showing that the sequencing of meetings should produce significant savings on the time to develop safety standards. While quality was the primary driver, the process should not delay the production of Safety Standards.

Questions regarding the process for the task force and the work on stakeholder involvement were responded to by Mr Delattre.

5.2. Strategies and Processes for the Establishment of Safety Standards

Mr. K. Mrabit presented the document “Strategies and Processes for the Establishment of Safety Standards (SPESS)”. He gave the background for the development of the document. It was noted that a draft was presented to the CSS in June 2007. Draft 0.1 was submitted to the committees in 2008, and draft 0.2 was prepared as a result of comments received.

Several policy issues were discussed in 2008 and incorporated into the draft as draft 0.3. Draft 1.0, was produced based on comments from the four chairs and the coordination committee, to ensure a top-down approach is applied to the development of Safety Standards. The draft was made available to the committees.

Mr. Mrabit gave a breakdown of the structure of the document. Section 1 includes the mandate, section 2 the strategy, section 3 covers the processes, section 4 the process for keeping SPESS up to date, and important policy papers are set out in Annexes. This document will be maintained and will provide information and aid understanding on how safety standards are produced.

Mr. Brach noted that the potential use of addendum pages in Safety Standards was
5.3. Reference Set of Safety Guides for the Long Term

Mr D. Delattre presented the history of the development of the long term structure for safety guides and the final “reference set” that had been provided with the agenda papers. All DPPs presented to the Committees in the future will reflect this reference list, but changes to the reference list remain possible when justified.

He noted that a transition table is annexed to the reference set.

5.4. Update on Revision of Safety Glossary

Mr. D. Delves presented a short overview of the status of the revision of the safety glossary. He elaborated the long term goal of moving from a bottom up approach to a top down approach. He also gave a description of the possible use of electronic tools to assist this approach and potential developments in the future. Further feedback was welcomed by Mr Delves, even though the closing date had passed and he also noted that the process for revising the glossary was still considered.

Committee Members commented that harmonization should not be an end in itself, and that the top-down approach would need transparency. Mr. Delves agreed on the issue of harmonization, and stated that he was not suggesting standardization, but harmonization. He further noted that the top-down approach would not be imposed immediately, and possibly the next version would not be top-down. Mr Delves suggested indeed, that nothing should be imposed through the glossary, but the terminology in the future drafting and revisions of standards should be checked against the safety glossary. He also noted that the glossary would be submitted to the Committees and the CSS for approval prior to publication.

Mr Brach noted that the CSS had agreed that a definition of terms section could be included in Safety Standards if the lead Safety Standards Committee for the document concluded a definition section is needed. The definition section must be harmonized with the Safety Glossary.

6. CURRENT ACTIVITIES OF IAEA ON EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE (jointly with RASSC/TRANSSC)

Mr. W. Stern’s presentation on emergency preparedness and response focused mainly on preparedness, with some aspects on response. He noted that there was ongoing work ensuring the chapter on Emergency Exposure Situations of the BSS was consistent with ICRP 103, GS-R-2 and the recent ICRP report on Emergency Exposure Situations. Mr Stern gave information on the First Responders Toolkit. He explained the concept of three response phases and the fact that the extended response document was currently being developed. He added that there has been ongoing work in the development of public information for the event of an emergency.

He also presented RANET, the Response Assistance NETwork, listing the assistance available from Member States that may be provided to others. A new unified reporting
system is being developed related to ENAC and NEWS to allow a single point of reporting for events whether assistance is requested or not.

7. REPORT ON THE MEETING OF THE JOINT CONVENTION ON THE SAFETY OF SPENT FUEL MANAGEMENT AND THE SAFETY OF RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT

Mr. D. Louvat gave a presentation reporting on the results of the third Review Meeting of the Joint Convention. He noted that there were important States that had not yet accessed the Joint Convention. He added that 45 of 48 contracting States attended the Review Meeting, with more than 500 participants in attendance. The participants were grouped into six country groups.

Constructive exchanges between contracting parties took place, with experiences shared in an open and frank manner. It was noted that many parties had initiated or enhanced actions since the last meeting, and that every party has challenges. The small increase in the number of contracting parties since the last meeting (from 42 to 48) was of concern and it was suggested that action should be taken in this area. Further it was suggested that there could be additional meetings between the main review meetings, including topical workshops involving all Member States on issues identified by the third review meeting.

A promotional meeting will take place in the last quarter of 2009 in Morocco for Arab states. A comment was made on the suggested way of asking neighbours to access the Joint Convention.

Mr. Louvat outlined the programme for the next review cycle and closed the session by welcoming Portugal as the 49th contracting party.

8. RAIS: ITS USE AND STATUS IN MEMBER STATES

Mr. H. Suman gave a short presentation on the Regulatory Authority Information System (RAIS), a software system provided to Member States to assist them with their regulatory activities. He provided a demonstration of the system during the lunch break.

9. TOPICAL SESSION: INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE CONTROL AND MANAGEMENT OF INADVERTENT RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL IN SCRAP METAL, 23-27 FEBRUARY 2009, TARRAGONA, SPAIN (jointly with RASSC/TRANSSC)

Mr E. Reber presented details of the conference and highlighted some issues, e.g. scrap steel at clearance level can activate portal monitors at borders; and regulatory systems that vary from state to state.

The conclusions of the conference included the fact that inadvertent radioactive material in scrap material is a global problem, particularly regarding trans-border issues. There was a consensus that a binding international protocol should be developed in this area.
Attendants further reinforced the importance of the issue. Mr. D Louvat also reinforced the report by outlining the Secretariat plans for moving forward with the issue.

10. REVIEW OF DOCUMENTS UNDER DEVELOPMENT (jointly with RASSC/TRANSSC)

10.1. DS415 - Safety Requirements: Governmental and Regulatory Framework for Safety – GS- R-1

Mr. H. Suman gave an overview of the document, including, where its placed in the structure of Safety Requirements, how it had been developed and its current status. The current document incorporated all comments received following its submission to Member State for comment. He outlined how some comments had been resolved.

NUSSC had already reviewed and approved DS415, and had rejected some proposed changes, such as to paragraph 3.2, which they felt was too specific. Their views on the proposed changes were provided to the meeting.

RASSC, WASSC and TRANSSC approved DS415 for submission to the CSS for endorsement.

Action: Secretariat to submit DS 415 to the CSS for endorsement.

10.2. DS416 – Safety Guide: Licensing process for nuclear installations

Mr. S. Calpena gave a presentation providing an overview of DS416. This entailed where it sits in the new structure, how it had been developed and its current status. He also outlined the content of the document. He noted that only one comment had been rejected, and that NUSSC had approved the document. The RASSC member from Brazil provided some editorial comments to Mr. Calpena.

RASSC, WASSC and TRANSSC approved DS416 for submission to the CSS for endorsement.

Action: Secretariat to submit DS 416 to the CSS for endorsement.

10.3. DS411 - Safety Guide: Orphan Sources and Radioactively Contaminated Material in the Metal Recycling Industry

Mr. E. Reber gave a presentation emphasizing the scope of DS411. He identified some key issues for consideration, such as the change in title, which had been supported in comments made, in particular, that the title should include the term “Orphan Sources”. One broad issue that he raised was in relation to referencing of documents, which means that DS411 may be able to reference the revised GS-R-1 (since it may be published soon), but may not reference the revised BSS if it is not nearing completion at the time that DS411 is published. Several comments were made, including editorial issues.

RASSC, WASSC and TRANSSC approved DS 411 for submission to Member States for
comment, subject to clarification of the relationship with the draft BSS.

*Action: Secretariat to submit DS 411 to Member States for comment, after incorporating comments received.*

### 10.4. DS424- Safety Guide: Establishing a National Nuclear Installation Safety Infrastructure

Mr. D Graves provided an overview of DS424 for committee consideration. He explained that it was an overarching document that addressed the national infrastructure for developing a nuclear power programme. The document attempts to describe the three phases of introduction of the IAEA safety standards during the development of a nuclear power programme. He noted that there are three bodies involved, the Government, the Regulatory Body and the operating organisation. Mr Graves also gave examples and details of how comments had been resolved.

Comments on the level of detail were made, and the response was that the document attempted to cover the full scope of all the safety standards and therefore needed to be concise. RASSC, WASSC and TRANSSC approved DS 424 for submission to Member States for comment.

*Action: Secretariat to submit DS 424 to Member States for comment, after incorporating comments received*

### 11. REVIEW OF DOCUMENT PREPARATION PROFILES (jointly with RASSC/TRANSSC)

#### 11.1. DPP on DS429 - Safety Guide: External expert support on safety issues

Mr G. Philip presented the background to the development of the DPP, for which NUSSC is the lead committee. He explained the DPP that was being presented to all committees. NUSSC had approved the DPP but asked that it would be restricted to cover only regulatory bodies. RASSC, WASSC and TRANSSC approved the DPP for submission to CSS for endorsement.

*Action: Secretariat to submit DPP on DS429 to CSS for endorsement*


Mr T. Boal presented an outline of the DPP. He presented the background of the document including why it is needed. It will be a new safety guide, and Mr. Boal noted that it is included in the reference list of Safety Guides described by Mr. Delattre earlier in the meeting. Its development will be linked to that of the revision of the BSS and to the Safety Guide DS427 currently under development. Comments had been made prior to the meeting regarding the inclusion of “the
environment” in the scope of the guide. There was a discussion on whether or not to include the environment in the scope, and it was considered that this should be further discussed in the separate meetings of the Committees.

*Action: The DPP should be considered in RASSC and WASSC, and the consensus brought to TRANSSC during this meeting.*

### 12. OTHER BUSINESS

#### 12.1. Technical issues supporting German proposal to exclude certain small training and research reactors from the application of the 1997 Vienna Convention and the 1997 Convention on Supplementary Compensation

Mr G. Schwarz presented the proposal for exclusion of small reactors from the Vienna Convention and the CSC, noting that a similar proposal had been made with regards to the Paris convention of the OECD. Mr Schwarz made a proposal to exempt small reactors which were “intrinsically safe”.

Committee Members asked whether the concerns from the previous meeting had been met. It was explained that the issue before the committee was whether there was sufficient information provided to allow discussion. It was suggested that defining the criteria was the essential starting point.

*Action: German Proposals to be supplemented to provide additional supporting technical information and a 'working group' of a few RASSC/WASSC/NUSSC/OLA members be convened to review and provide any technical recommendations for the Committees to consider.*

#### 12.2. Technical issues supporting German proposal to exclude nuclear installations being decommissioned from the 1997 Vienna Convention and the 1997 Convention on Supplementary Compensation

Mr G. Schwarz presented a similar proposal for decommissioning activities.

Again it was questioned whether criteria need to be developed first. It was emphasized that the term “nuclear damage” needs to be explained in any proposal.

*Action: German Proposals to be supplemented to provide additional supporting technical information and a 'working group' of a few RASSC/WASSC/NUSSC/OLA members be convened to review and provide any technical recommendations for the Committees to consider.*

### 13. CLOSING REMARKS

The Draft report was presented to the committee who accepted the decisions and accepted
the report in principle, subject to corrections to be supplied in the following three weeks.

Mr Brach thanked the participants and closed the session.
W1. OPENING OF WASSC MEETING AND ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Mr T. Pather opened the WASSC meeting on the 30 June 2009. He gave an overview of the agenda and informed the committee on updates. The agenda was approved by the committee, and the updated version is attached as Annex I. Mr T. Pather reported that the Safety Requirements on Predisposal Management of Radioactive Wastes, GSR Part 5 and the Safety Requirements on Safety Assessment for Facilities and Activities, GSR Part 4, had been published. He also mentioned that during the meeting the committee would spend a fair amount of time discussing DS354 noting that this document was to be approved for endorsement by CSS. Mr T. Pather noted that time would also be spent identifying documents that would need more detailed discussion at the next WASSC meeting. He also noted the aim to consolidate WASSC views on certain documents before the joint meeting with TRANSSC.

W2. CHAIRMAN’S REPORT FROM 26TH MEETING AND ACTIONS ARISING

Mr T. Pather asked the committee for any corrections, or comments for the 26th Meeting Report. There was general agreement on the Meeting Report. He noted that a large amount of actions had been taken from the last meeting. Mrs Siraky presented the status of accomplishment of actions arising out of the 26th WASSC meeting. She noted that 4 sets of comments were received from WASSC members for the Safety Glossary review.

W3. RESULTS OF RECENT WES ACTIVITIES

W3.1 Workshop in Thailand

Mr Louvat gave a brief presentation on the outcomes of the Thailand workshop which covered the topic of sustainable management of disused sealed sources (DSS). Mr Louvat noted that the workshop involved presentations from a number of countries on national strategies for disposal options and also involved working group sessions. Mr Louvat informed that his presentation on the workshop in Thailand had been supplied to the members and more details of the outcomes and recommendations were available on the IAEA website.

Following Mr Louvat’s presentation there was a question from a WASSC Member asking whether specific recommendations were given for the management of disused sealed waste in relation to the public. A discussion followed on the disposal of DSS in borehole facilities. The
W3.2 Workshop in Korea

Mr Louvat gave a brief presentation on the outcomes of the Korea workshop which covered the topic of safety assessment and strategy disposal options for radioactive waste. Mr Louvat reported on the main conclusions coming from the workshop, such as, that disposal is specific to the country and additional guidance on specific information should be added to safety guides. Mr Louvat informed that his presentation on the workshop in Korea had been supplied to the members and more details of the outcomes and recommendations were available on the IAEA website.

Other news

Mr Louvat reported on the upcoming planned events of WES. He noted that last year NSRW began to organize round table discussions at the General Conference on important issues relating to radiation protection and waste safety. The issue discussed last year was safety of Uranium mining, co sponsored by the Australian mission in Vienna, which was very successful. This year WES will have a round table, on licensing of geological disposal co sponsored by the Swedish mission, during the General Conference in September. Mr Louvat encouraged members to attend. Mr Louvat also informed the committee on workshop on Licensing of Geological Repositories, a one day meeting in Capetown.

W4. CURRENT ISSUES

W4.1 Status of Waste Safety Standards

Mrs Siraky gave an overview of the waste safety standards under development and under review. She presented the status of the waste safety guides i.e. those that have been recently published, are under development, or review. Mrs Siraky also talked about changes in the documents relating to the new structure and documents that need to be consistent with other documents.

It was reemphasized by Mr T. Pather, the need for the committee to take time to read over each document in detail. He also reminded the member’s on their obligation to represent the national position of their member states through their comments and feedback.

Mr T. Pather asked WASSC members, at the end of the meeting on the first day, how the committee can move forward on the inclusion of the environment in the DPP of DS432. He suggested that the members read over the DPP and think about how they can agree on what can be amended in the DPP to address the issue of the environment.

W4.2 Discussion on Strategies And Processes For The Establishment Of Safety Standards

This topic of the Agenda was tabled by the Chair, to complement the presentation made by Mr. Mrabit at the Joint meeting with the views of the Committee Members. WASSC members were requested to provide their feedback by the end of August 2009.
W5. REVIEW OF DOCUMENTS UNDER DEVELOPMENT

W5.1 DS422: Safety Guide: Evaluation of Seismic Hazards for Nuclear Facilities

Mr Godoy presented background information on the guide, such as the importance of the siting of nuclear facilities away from fault lines. He noted that there were three guides relating to seismic safety, covering the whole lifecycle of nuclear facility. Mr Godoy also noted that the document had been approved by NUSSC. Mr Godoy also gave an overview of the comments received from Member States, which consisted of 291 comments from 21 countries and national organisations, WASSC and NUSSC members. The main issues related to the use of values and new changes in the proposal. He also noted that revision 6 is final draft which includes resolution of all comments so far.

No objections or further comments were made by WASSC members regarding the document. The document was accepted for submission to CSS.

*Action: Secretariat to submit DS 422 to the CSS for endorsement.*

W6. DETAILED DISCUSSION ON STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL

W6.1 DS354 Safety Requirements- Disposal of Radioactive Waste

Mr Metcalf gave a brief introduction to the document, reporting on the key comments and the feedback of the Subgroup of WASSC-ICRP meeting to address the issues arising from the document. Mr Metcalf went through the document section by section allowing members to comment on any issues arising and to also resolve them. Key comments/issues included:

- Changes to terminology in the first section; in particular, third bullet on paragraph 1.13, should begin with Intermediate level waste disposal, and the word facility to be deleted.
- Comments surrounding the issue of interdependency of retrievability and safety (paragraph 1.21).
- Section 2.7, on planned exposure situations and the use of the terms and criteria.
- The background and reason behind paragraph 2.12 on public exposure and intrusion scenarios. Also to requirement 5, relating to the closure of facilities.
- Requirements 10 and 22, their interrelations and changes in wording for clarity, relating to near surface disposal, exposure, depth of disposal and use of the term geological;
- Requirement 19 and restricted use of land.
- Release of a site after institutional control, as it is not the objective of disposal and discussed also the differences to the concept of clearance.
- Periodic review of facilities – whether a period of the 10/20 years would be applicable. It was agreed to leave to Regulatory bodies the definition of the periodicity of review.
Approval of the revised draft was obtained to go forward to CSS, noting that considerable amount of time had been spent going over the document. Mr Metcalf noted that the revised document would be placed on the website for members to check over the revisions. Mr T. Pather noted that the document would be presented to the joint RASSC/WASSC meeting, and stressed that no major deliberations were foreseen there, considering that WASSC was the lead group and had already spent considerable time deliberating over the document.

**Action:** Secretariat to include all comments received on DS354 at WASSC27 and to submit it to the CSS for endorsement.


Mr Rowat presented an overview on DS357. He noted that the document allows the ability to be consistent across all facilities. Mr Rowat reported that there will be an international workshop in France in September covering issues on environmental monitoring and surveillance. He noted that most experience to date relates to near surface facilities, with less experience existing on geological disposal. Mr Rowat gave an overview of the contents of the safety guide, 48 comments in total were received, with most accepted. Most of the comments related to the monitoring and surveillance of the post closure phase, such as the difficulties in monitoring. A suggestion was given for realistic time scales for monitoring. Another comment related to changes to the annexes.

Mr Rowat noted that the draft still needs some work to incorporate the latest comments. A suggestion was made that perhaps comments should be taken after the results of the workshop are available. A discussion followed on whether the document is ready or not to go for Member States comments. It was agreed that the document will be delayed and approval of the document for Member States comments will be taken at a forthcoming WASSC meeting.

### W6.3 DS371 Safety Guide: Storage of Spent Fuel

Mr Metcalf gave feedback on DS371. He focused mainly on the process rather than in the comments. The document was restructured after incorporating Member States comments, of which 535 were received. The significant changes suggested in the comments were: use of discreet requirements, more prominence on management system aspect, to avoid intrusive inspection into dry storage casks, dual use of a cask for storage and transport. Comments from committee members were resolved. No conflicting comments or substantial disagreements. Most comments were on clarification and reordering. Mr. Metcalf noted the need to address a lot of comments very close to the NUSSC meeting, and reminded committee members to use the prescribed form in Word format to make process easier. Current document is the modified document.

The approval of the document was sought from the committee. One committee member commented that was originally not in agreement with the document, but seeing that most of their comments had been dealt with, he approved the document going forward. Another WASSC member commented that they hadn't had opportunity to see if all of the comments of his country had been dealt with. Mr Louvat noted that the discussion needed to take place with regard to the use of references in relation to GSR5. A committee member made further comment regarding
minimum staffing levels. A committee member noted that he would like NUSSC members to see the modified document. Mr T. Pather discussed the process and noted that WASSC, as the leading committee, is happy with the document and will allow NUSSC a certain period before NUSSC28 to check over the resolutions of the comments but not for new comments to be added. A comment was received from a committee member asking for a clarification of whether this document is a guidance or requirement. This was answered by Mr Louvat, that it is a guidance document for the requirement document GSR5. More discussions took place regarding requirement and guidance documents. One Committee Member touched upon the incorporation of their comments in the document and a clarification question was made regarding length of storage. Another Committee Member raised an issue, regarding the content of the safety assessment (section 5.22). This issue was discussed in detail and resolved.

The document was approved for submission to CSS providing NUSSC has to inform the Secretariat before NUSSC28 about the satisfactory resolution of their comments, however no new comments will be taken.

**Action:** Secretariat to include all comments received from NUSSC and WASSC, and to upload to Committees web page a revised version for NUSS28 revision, clean copy and track of changes copy, and submit it to the CSS afterwards for endorsement.

**W7. PROGRESS REPORTS ON STANDARDS UNDER DEVELOPMENT**


Mr Metcalf gave feedback on DS284. The two main comments received until now were that the document was very broad in scope and difficult to therefore get specificity and to derive a graded approach. To deal with this situation they are working on providing some examples involving different facilities. Mr Metcalf reported that they would like to accept the document as it is but complemented with a series of safety reports to illustrate the use of the guidance. The document will be presented at a forthcoming WASSC meeting to request approval with this modification (at least one test case example)

Committee members asked questions, in particular on the timing of a test case.


Mr Rowat presented an update on document DS334. He reported that the guide is well advanced, and is currently being slightly modified to align with safety guide DSS354. Mr Rowat noted that as the document only requires minor adjustments it will be ready for request WASSC approval to submit the document to CSS for endorsement at the next WASSC meeting in November.

Mr Metcalf gave an update on this document. He noted that a great deal of comments had been received for this document and that they had a consultants meeting in April this year. He noted that they hope to finalize the incorporation of comments in August and therefore be able to request final approval to go to CSS in November at WASSC27 meeting.


Mr Rowat presented an update on document DS356. He noted that the document had been reviewed once by WASSC and parallels the same process as DS334. He also noted that there shouldn’t be too many changes, but some in light of discussions held during this meeting in relation to DS354. Furthermore, Mr Rowat reported that the document will be ready for request to be sent to Member states for comment at the next WASSC meeting in November.

W7.5. DS421 Safety Guide: Protection of the public against exposure to natural sources of radiation including NORM residues

Mr Edge presented an overview of document DS421. He outlined the background of the document and noted that this document is the result of merging two draft documents to avoid overlapping. He informed on the content of the guide. He addressed the issue of radon and mentioned the types of residues the document would cover. Mr Edge anticipated that some modeling and calculations would be required before finalizing the draft.

Comments were received from participants from the meeting. One committee member asked about the time frame of when WASSC will get to make a decision on the document. The answer stated that the document is linked to the BSS, then, after BSS approval the document should be finalized soon, but not before sometime next year. Another comment was given regarding airline crew and passengers and cosmic exposure. In response to this question it was noted that a future decision has to be made on how natural exposure recommendations are managed for such cases.

W7.6. Documents on Decommissioning and Residual material – Safety Guides: DS402/DS403/DS404

Mr Ljubenov gave an overview of the current status and the background of the three safety guides. He outlined the main topics of revision, these included the concept graded approach; safety assessment for decommissioning; and provision taken at early stages of facilities life cycle in facilitating decommission. He noted that the main work was done in two consultancies in 2008. That another consultancy round is planned for October and a final one to finalize the draft, targeted for Feb 2010. Mr Ljubenov noted that he is planning to present the documents at WASSC29 with a target publication date in 2012.

Comments were taken from the meeting. One WASSC member commented about the timing of the document. Another issue was raised regarding whether the documents will cover financial
aspects. Mr Ljubenov responded that they do, but they are not sure yet if there will be room in the guides for examples.

W8. DISCUSSION ON WASTE AND TRANSPORT COMMON ISSUES (FEEDBACK FROM WASSC MEMBERS)

Ms Siraky presented an overview on the common issues/topics identified by a Subgroup of WASSC and TRANSSC on Waste and Transport. Ms Siraky gave the background to the setting up of the working group, which addressed to develop common issues on waste and transport. She reported that nominations were received from WASSC and TRANSSC, but the process was quite timely. Additionally a consultancy was set up in January this year with one representative from TRANSSC and one former member from WASSC to identify further common issues, conflicts and gaps in the implementation of current safety standards.

Ms Siraky reported on the working group’s first meeting in March, and presented the main topics that were identified by the consultants and agreed on and further elaborated by the working group. The main topics included the differences in safety approach of waste and transport standards; on exemptions; characterisation and classification of waste; large components of waste to be transported; dual use of casks for spent fuel and radioactive waste; disused sealed sources and recovered sources. Ms Siraky noted the main findings. She emphasized that there were lots of differences but no real conflicts between the respective standards, and also a need to think about issues holistically.

Ms Siraky noted that the findings from the group had more a Transport focus and there was a need for Waste and Transport specialists to work together to have a common approach.

Meeting participants were asked to comment on the working papers uploaded to the Committee Members web page. One of the WASSC members noted that transport is an issue for Waste as well, and supported the close connection with TRANSSC. It was also noted that when waste is stored for a long time (50-60 yrs), there is the issue of whether it needs to be re characterised before it’s transported and if the package needs to be re-certified. Another committee member made a comment on waste characterisation. Further comments regarding the classification and regulations for the transport of waste and the integration of waste perspectives were added by Mr Pather. A WASSC member added that there needs to be a compromise between the numbers for the exemption values and with respect to waste and transport. Another WASSC member recalled the different concepts of exemption addressed by the Transport regs and by the BSS and RS-G-1.7. Mr Pather commented that there needs to have pragmatic solutions so that transport can still be achieved. More comments were received about facility specific criteria and clearance and exemptions also as they relate to the BSS. The WASSC Chairman noted that there was a need for more representation from WASSC in the working group.

Comments were asked relating to the identified topics. One Committee Member commented that it is adequate to have dialogue on the identified issues (or at least those that are the most controversial) but too large a task for committee to form a position at this stage. Another Committee Member commented that most issues from waste view are adequately addressed at a requirements level, so need to address them (if there is a need for any resolution) at the guidance level. It was also suggested that the next round of revision of predisposal guidance would allow a chance to implement these issues as a potential way forward. Another Committee Member noted that there were a lot of questions, so it had to be thought about what would be the best mechanism
for the committee to come to a decision. Mr T. Pather suggested the approach would be to get the working groups to address these issues at the time of the next revision of the related safety guides.

**W9. DETAILED DISCUSSION ON DPP’S FOR APPROVAL (REF: JOINT AGENDA ITEM 11.2)**


Views were asked from meeting participants regarding the proposal of the document preparation profile for DS 432 as a carry over from the joint session. The comments received are summarized in the following paragraphs.

There was general agreement within the WASSC, in favour of keeping the environmental aspect within the scope of the document. Notwithstanding this, committee members expressed concern on how the environment would be defined in the document. It was stressed that careful drafting is required to ensure both protection of the people and the environment would be dealt at the same time and not separated, as associated objectives. Another committee member expressed his reservation in the sense of causing endless delay of the document approval because of consensus building of different approaches. Committee members were asked about any specific changes WASSC would like to be added to the DPP. Committee members reemphasized the need for clarity of the environment definition to avoid controversy.

Mr Louvat commented on the criteria of this planned guide, to focus on people and environment protection as it was presented in the Safety Fundamental Principles SF-1. He noted that the issue of the environment is an evolving field and that nothing more is indicated by the title than is included in Principle 7 of the Safety Fundamentals that has already been adopted by Member States. A suggestion was made that the relevant section from the safety fundamentals (that has already been accepted) should be used to define the environmental issue.

Another comment was raised in relation to that the document only offers a generic statement not an actual guidance. The Chairman noted that SSC’s have a role to create useful guidance, not just generic statements.

**W10. CONCLUSIONS OF THE SESSION**

Mr Louvat closed the session referring particularly to the work of the committee. WASSC had been asked to devote more time during this meeting to comment documents and provide feedback to the Secretariat, taking into account that this is the main role of the committee members. Mr Louvat noted that he would be convenient that the committee continues with in-depth discussion on documents in the future. One committee member commented on the degree of documents discussions, suggesting that discussion should be based on substantial issues and not merely editorial.

Mr T. Pather noted that there was lots of value, particularly at the requirements level documents, but now WASSC needs to focus more on guidance documents. He commented that the joint meeting, is valuable, but they also need to allocate WASSC only time to interrogate documents in detail. Comments were received from WASSC members that there was not enough focus on waste issues in the joint meetings. The Chairman supported the structure of this meeting,
suggested by the Secretariat, and proposed that in future meetings to have discussion initially as a 
WASSC only session then have that joint session with RASSC later in the week rather than at the 
beginning to achieve resolution in the joint meeting. This would allow WASSC to submit focused 
proposals on draft documents. A committee member endorsed this approach and commented that 
the joint meeting is too large to be interactive.
JOINT WASSC/TRANSSC MEETING
HELD IN ROOM C02-I
IAEA HEADQUARTERS, VIENNA

1st July 2009

WT1. OPENING OF MEETING

The joint session the Twenty-Seventh Meeting of the Waste Safety Standards Committee (WASSC) and the Eighteenth Meeting of the Transport Safety Standards Committee (TRANSSC) was opened by D. Louvat, Section head of IAEA’s Waste and Environmental Safety Section on 1st July 2009.

WT2. CHAIRMEN’S REMARKS

The chairmen of WASSC and TRANSSC welcomed the members and noted that this is the first time the two committees had met in joint session. It was noted that there were no conflicts, but there were opportunities to work together. The emphasis was placed on working together to better understand waste and transport concerns rather than reaching conclusions on issues.

WT3 ADOPTION OF AGENDA FOR THE JOINT SESSION

The agenda was adopted, and is presented in ANNEX 1..

WT4. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE MEETING

Ms Siraky and Mr Stewart provided updated administrative arrangements for the meeting.

WT5. WORKING PAPERS ON COMMON ISSUES

Ms Siraky presented the development of the issue papers elaborated by the Joint WASSC/TRANSS working group. She identified the key topics that were further elaborated in the working papers, but noted that the issue of clearance and exemption would be resolved during the development of the BSS. The issues were further discussed by Mr. A. Orsini and discussed with committee members:

5.1 Characterization/Classification of Radioactive Waste

It was noted that transport does not mention the purpose of the radioactive material being transported. A holistic approach was suggested when considering the transport options for waste.

It was noted that there was reasonable harmony in relation to the requirements. The suggestion was that there was no need for requirement changes, although there was a suggestion that there could be additional transport or waste guidance in the longer term.
5.2 LSA/SCO Material
Since LSA and SCO are definitions in transport requirements of materials which are often wastes it was suggested that the models for LSA/SCO be revisited to see if they could be made more suitable in relation to the practicalities of waste characterisation.

The conclusion was that there is no real need to change the requirements in the short term.

5.3 Fissile Material
The working group had suggested that the fissile exception criteria being considered by TRANSSC seem to be heading in the correct direction and would address concerns on transport of waste with very small quantities of fissile materials. The encouragement for involvement of the waste community was noted.

5.4 Recovered Sources / Orphan Sources / Disused Sources
The issue of old sources with no special form approval and the problems with the acceptability of special arrangements was presented. There was concern over the prospect of using orphan sources as the “good cause” that would encourage regulations to be avoided (on the basis that there were many more good causes).

Discussions covered whether the sources should be declared as waste, and in this respect the recent views of the Code of Conduct meeting were mentioned.

The overall view was that the transport requirements should be met in the recovery of these sources.

5.5 Large Components Waste
The problem of the transport of large objects such as steam generators, the problems demonstrating meeting the transport regulations, the problem of segmentation (or size reduction) and the growing need for this type of move was discussed. The concept of moving toward a new regulatory category through firstly providing guidance for people was put forward. The correspondence group including WASSC and TRANSSC participation was considered a good way forward.

5.6 Dual use cask for transport and storage of spent fuel and waste
The issue of short term certificates for transport required during storage was discussed. The concept of special certificates for storage that lasts around ten years was put forward. There would be conditions attached. An example of this was given. In addition an example of a holistic approach was given.

The similarity with the sealed source issue was mentioned. The idea of soliciting examples was accepted.

6.0 CLOSING
The chairs summarized the discussion of the six issues, noting the recommendation that a subgroup of WASSC and TRANSSC representatives should be convened to address these issues.

The chairs thanked the participants for their support.
JOINT RASSC/WASSC SESSION
HELD IN BOARD ROOM CO4
IAEA HEADQUARTERS, VIENNA

2nd July 2009

RW1. OPENING OF THE RASSC/WASSC JOINT MEETING
Mr T. Pather (WASSC Chairman) welcomed the co-Chair, Mr. Ian Robinson (UK), and noted Mr Magnusson’s apology.

RW2, RW3 & RW4. CHAIRMEN’S REMARKS & ADDITIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

A change in the order of the presentations was agreed, so the BSS would be the final agenda item, after the documents that require the approval of the Committees.


The acting Chair of RASSC, Mr. I Robinson provided an overview of the discussions on draft 2.0 of the revised BSS during the RASSC meeting. Mr. Robinson began his presentation by outlining the paradigm between UNSCEAR reports, ICRP recommendations and the IAEA Basic Safety Standards being maintained. Mr. Robinson noted that more than 1200 comments were received for draft 1.0 while 500 comments were received for draft 2.0, which indicated that there was an improvement to the draft. He noted that most of the comments received were editorial in that they did not lead to a change of the intent of the document. He noted the additional issues had been raised by RASSC members during their meeting. Mr. Robinson informed the meeting that the resolution tables for the comments submitted would be made available on the website within the next 2 months. Mr. Robinson addressed the comments and issues section by section of draft 2.0 of the revised BSS, noting the conclusions made by RASSC on each of the comment.

General comments:

RASSC agreed that the BSS should only reference publications at the same level, and not reference documents such as IAEA Safety Guides, TECDOCs, documents published by cosponsors at the same level as Safety Guides.

RASSC agreed with the following general comments:

- that the interface between safety and security requires further development;
to use the phrase “is optimized” rather than the phrase “be subject to a process of optimization”;
to review paragraphs that require the graded approach to be used throughout the draft.

**Section 2: General Requirements for Protection and Safety**

RASSC asked the Secretariat:

- To review the text to para. 2.32, to emphasise the need for the regulatory body to keep a register of category 1 and category 2 radioactive sources, records of accidents and incidents and inventories of wastes;
- To make no change to the text for 2.33 in relation to communication by regulatory bodies, but to include in a Safety Guide guidance on communication for licensees of large facilities;
- To resolve the issue on whether to use “strong safety culture” or “safety culture” in Section 2.

RASSC did not support comments that proposed:

- To add the phrase “consistent with licensing requirements” to para. 2.39;
- To add two bullets to para. 2.44 requiring that (i) the organization responsible for safety be independent from the organization responsible for production and maintenance; and (ii) to involve representatives from the radiation safety organization in all aspects of planning and design.

**Section 3: Planned Exposure Situations: Generic Requirements**

RASSC did not support the comments:

- To add a paragraph in relation to exclusion after paragraph 3.9, on the basis that the scope of the revised BSS is given in the scope paragraphs of Section 1;
- To add reference in paras. 3.10 and 3.12 to specific paragraphs in Schedule I regarding criteria for exemption and clearance, as it agreed that all of the paragraphs in Schedule I contain criteria, including those paragraphs that refer to the Tables in Schedule I;
- To add an additional text to the dose-based criteria for exemption without further consideration as it was considered that the suggested additional text was already covered by para. I-1(b);

RASSC requested the Secretariat:

- To revise the text of para. 3.4 (d).
- To review the tables for exemption in TS-R-1 and for exemption of moderate quantities in draft 2.0 of the revised BSS. TRANSSC has requested that the two tables contain an identical set of radionuclides. The review should check if the same methodology was used to calculate the numbers for the radionuclides in the two tables;
- To add a footnote to Table I-2 in relation to building materials, as per RS-G-1.7;
- To add the phrase “government or the” to para. 3.10 so that it reads: “The government or the regulatory body shall determine which practices or sources within practices are to be exempted…….”;
• To develop new text for para. 3.18. There was a proposal to add the phrase “and those specifically authorized by the regulatory body” after “medical exposures” in para 3.18. The proposal was accepted in principle by RASSC, but it was considered that the proposed text need further development;

• To add a requirement relating to immediate reporting of events where dose limit is exceeded (para. 3.42).

In relation to the draft requirements on “Human imaging for purposes other than medical diagnosis or treatment” RASSC agreed:

• To leave the text of para. 3.20 unchanged, i.e. it reads “… shall be deemed to be not justified”;

• That the BSS should include a requirement that information to a person undergoing security screening is to be provided, but that the BSS should not say how it is to be provided;

• That the use of alternative techniques not using ionizing radiation would be considered during the justification process (see para. 3.60(b), and the decision maker would determine if an alternative technique was to be made available to a person undergoing an imaging procedure;

• To revise the text of para. 3.64: It was considered that the use of term “inspection procedures” could create confusion, and to consider using a term such as “detection procedures”.

Section 3: Planned Exposure Situations: Occupational Exposure

RASSC agreed that the use of the following terms should be reviewed:

• “exposure records” versus “dose records”;
• “accredited”, “approved” and “certified”;

RASSC agreed that the definitions of “investigation levels” and “recording levels” should be reviewed.

RASSC agreed that the explanatory material on “monitoring of pregnant worker” should be included in a Safety Guide.

The Secretariat was asked to review whether specific responsibilities for regulatory body should be included in the sub-section on occupational exposure, to make it consistent with the approach taken in the sub-sections on public exposure and medical exposure.

Section 3: Planned Exposure Situations: Public Exposure

RASSC agreed to maintain the current approach in relation to dose limitation (1 mSv, all sources), then establish source related dose constraints below the dose limit, and then optimize below the dose constraints (paras. 3.115, 3.118(b)).

RASSC asked the Secretariat to revise the text of the following paragraphs:

• 3.115: the text to be revised. The unduly restrictive language should be avoided. (e.g. delete “to be used at the design and planning stages”).
3.138: the text to be revised. It was recognized that this paragraph was valid for suppliers of consumer products to provide information to retailers, but it should be clear that it is a safety-related information.

Section 3: Planned Exposure Situations: Medical Exposure

The IAEA Secretariat, WHO and PAHO were asked to develop, clarify, revise or add text in the following areas, based on the discussion:

- 3.143(a): to clarify the text relating to specialization, and the roles of: radiological medical practitioner, medical physicists, medical radiation technologists. The Secretariat to add a footnote to replace the current text in parentheses;
- 3.162 & 3.163: to develop paragraph similar to 3.162 and 3.162 in relation to advice to breast feeding women undergoing nuclear medicine procedures;
- 3.164(b): to add text in relation to verification of calibration for radiotherapy units prior to clinical use;
- 3.166(b)(ii): to develop text on the use of Diagnostic Reference Levels for doses that are very low (for example, look at text in ICRP Publication 105);
- 3.167: to clarify the text. The current text requires the Q.A. programme to be under the supervisory role of the medical physicist, but there were comments that other professionals need to be involved. It was considered that the text should require the active participation of all professionals that are involved in the work;

Section 4: Emergency Exposure Situations

RASSC agreed that there should be no change to the text in relation to iodine blocking.

RASSC decided to defer discussion on Table IV-1 to joint meeting with WASSC, and the review of DS44.

RASSC agreed that:
- the units of Gy be used for RBE weighted absorbed dose;
- the text of para. 4.15(c) would be unchanged (i.e. no need to add footnote on what constituted a “large collective dose”);
- the text of para. 4.11 would be extended to include arrangements for the termination of protection strategies with the consultation of interested parties;

Section 5: Existing Exposure Situations

There was a comment that all of requirements from WS-R-3 (remediation) have not been included in the revised BSS. RASSC decided that this should be discussed with WASSC.

Whilst recognizing previous decision to retain requirements for air crew and space in existing exposure section, it was considered the definition of planned exposure situation requires review.
It was noted that para. 5.18 in relation to residual radioactive contamination, there is no mention about the protection of workers. RASSC agreed that the text be revised to require that exposure of workers to residual contamination is treated as occupational exposure.

In relation to a comment that developing countries may not be able to meet the requirements imposed on government in relation to radon in dwellings, RASSC considered that it was up to each Member States to develop its own priorities.

**New format**

RASSC had been provided with an example of the overarching requirements developed for Section 4 by the Secretariat. RASSC supported the transposition of the BSS from the current format to the new format, and supported the proposal from the Secretariat that the next draft of the revised BSS would contain all overarching requirements, and that it would be submitted by 1 October to RASSC for review at its next meeting.

**WASSC comments**

Mr. Robinson asked WASSC members for their views on paragraph 2.32 relating to the requirement for regulatory bodies to establish, maintain and make retrievable records relating to inventories of radioactive waste and spent fuel. The question was asked where the responsibility lies, i.e. with the regulatory body or the operator. Spain commented that the government might be allocated with the responsibility. Australia noted that there can be confusion on what governmental bodies are responsible in a federal system such as Australia, leading to considerable difficulties. Canada reported that they have a number of inventories however the principal onus is on the operator to maintain the records. There was a comment that this is inline with the DS415. Other comments were made reemphasizing the operator’s responsibility. It was agreed that the current wording of 2.32 was broad enough to cover that other organizations/government bodies might be in charge of keeping the records.

Mr. Robinson introduced the next issue requiring comment by WASSC which related to whether all of the requirements from WS-R-3 had been introduced into the Section on existing exposure situations. Mr. Robinson commented that it was understood that the essential requirements from WS-R-3 had been captured in the BSS, and that those not included were considered to be guidance that would be taken up in a Safety Guide. WASSC requested that the Secretariat check Section 5 to ensure that WS-R-3 is appropriately captured in the BSS.

The final issue presented by Mr. Robinson concerned Table IV-1, and whether it should be included in the revised BSS, or only be in the Safety Guide DS44. Brazil commented that they were not in agreement with the table being included in the BSS. Mr. Robinson reemphasized the complexities of including tables in the requirement document. Australia noted that it is better to include it in the safety guide. Brazil commented that a range of values for the reference level should be used within the document rather than for one value of the reference level. Belgium agreed with the use of a range of values if it was to be included in the BSS. Mr. T. Pather asked if anyone strongly wanted the table in the BSS and there was no response. It was therefore agreed that Table IV-1 should not be included in the BSS.
WASSC members were invited to make further comments on draft 2.0 of the revised BSS. There was a comment to include occupational exposure in relation to residual contamination in paragraph 5.18. There was a further comment on the process and the position of the secretariat relating to the comments submitted by Committee members. The Secretariat responded that the resolution tables for the comments would be placed in the Committees web pages in September. There was a comment regarding including the specific value of 1 tonne in relation to the use of the values for exemption for moderate quantities. The Secretariat responded that an earlier meeting of RASSC and WASSC has concluded that the specific value of 1 tonne should not be included in the BSS.

Concluding remarks on discussion on revision of BSS

It has been agreed by RASSC that the next draft of the revised BSS would be put on the Committees web page by 1st October and that the Committees would be invited to comment until 1st November. Committee members were reminded that comments should be submitted in word documents and not pdf files. RASSC had also requested that an explanatory note that accompanies documents sent to Member States for comment include an explanation of the changes made to the BSS, as it will look very different to the current BSS.

RW6. REVIEW OF DOCUMENTS UNDER DEVELOPMENT

RW6.1. DS413: Safety Requirements: Safety of Nuclear Power Plants: Operation

It was noted that this document had been withdrawn from the agenda, and will be included on the agenda for the next RASSC and WASSC meetings.

RW6.2. DS414: Safety Requirements: Safety of Nuclear Power Plants: Design

Mr. M. Gasparini presented the status of document DS414. He said that the DPP was approved by the Commission on Safety Standards in Nov 2007. He added that the main reasons for revision include: to ensure full consistency with the new safety fundamentals; to take into account feedback provided by its use; to ensure the stability of the current publication; and to ensure consistency with other new Safety Requirements.

Mr. Gasparini said that the draft was submitted to NUSSC and other committees included the following changes:

- A concept of design authority, which was a specific request from the Commission on Safety Standards
- The elimination of many repetitions, in order to keep the document simple.
- Specific requirements on auxiliary systems
- New format for Safety Requirements.

It was noted that to facilitate its review, the original paragraph numbering had been kept alongside the new numbers. Mr. Gasparini noted that 360 comments were received from NUSSC members. He said that the comments in general were very good and didn’t result in any changes to the structure of the document. He stated most of the comments had
been accepted and that the table with resolution of comments had been posted on the website.

Mr. Gasparini concluded by saying that the draft has been approved by NUSSC on 18 June, and by TRANSSC earlier this week, for submission to Member States for comment.

Mr. T. Pather opened the meeting for comments. There was a question seeking clarification about whether the document approved by NUSSC was an earlier draft or the draft currently posted on the website. Mr. Gasparini replied that the draft posted on the website was the document that has NUSSC comments incorporated, i.e. approved by NUSSC.

RASSC and WASSC approved DS414 for submission to Member States for comment.

**Action: The Secretariat to submit DS414 to Member States for comment**

### RW6.3. DS388: Safety Guide: Chemistry Programme for Water Cooled Nuclear Power Plants

Mr. A. Renev presented the status of draft DS388. Mr. Renev informed the meeting on the history of the development of the document, and that the 1st draft was developed in May 2006. He also reported that during the approval process, it was decided to add a chapter on chemistry aspects of exposure minimization. He noted that 330 comments were received from 11 Member States. Mr. Renev reported that there were 57 comments on radiochemistry, of which 41 were accepted.

Mr. Renev stated that a further 189 comments were received from 6 countries after DS388 was submitted to the Committees for approval. He noted that the majority of comments were very valuable. He said that there were 67 comments on radiochemistry, of which 50 were accepted, and Chapter 4 has been rearranged.

RASSC and WASSC approved DS388 for submission to the CSS for endorsement.

**Action: The Secretariat to submit DS388 to the CSS for endorsement.**

### RW6.4. DS44: Safety Guide: Criteria for Use in Planning Response to Nuclear and Radiological Emergencies

Ms. E. Buglova presented Safety Guide DS44. Ms. Buglova reported that the document had been submitted to Member States for comment in November 2008, and that a consultancy meeting was held in April 2009 to address the comments. She noted that the major issues raised in the comments included:

- That the consistency between the new ICRP document on emergency exposure situations and DS44 should be confirmed. Ms. Buglova noted that additional description of the protection strategy elements, consistent with the latest draft of the revised BSS, and clarification of the application of averted dose, had been made to DS44;
• That only one of the terms “generic criteria” and “reference levels” should be used in DS44. Ms. Buglova said that these are different elements of the protection strategy, as in the revised BSS, and both are necessary;

• That Tables 2 and 3 should be revised to improve clarity, and that the unit of RBE-weighted absorbed dose should be Gy. Ms. Buglova said that both Tables had been revised to make them consistent with the application of the ICRP reference level and with the latest draft of the revised BSS, and she agreed that the unit of Gy would be used;

• That a single criteria for sheltering and evacuation is used, in spite of the different levels of risk. Ms. Buglova said that para. 3.11 had been revised so that less disruptive protection actions, such as sheltering, could be implemented at a lower dose;

• That issues dealing with medical follow-ups and use of epidemiological data need to be clarified. Ms. Buglova said that this text had been revised jointly with WHO;

• That there were a number of issues relating to the Appendices, including the use of OILs, plain language explanation, and emergency action levels for light water reactors that had been addressed;

• That the Table on observables had been deleted;

• That the use of terms such as substantial risk, avertable dose, dangerous source and threat categories had been clarified.

Committee members made a number of comments on DS44:

• That the document was greatly improved and that it should be approved for endorsement by the CSS;

• That Table 3, which also appears in the BSS, should not be included in the BSS, as it only provides an example for a particular value of reference level (100 mSv);

• That the new recommendations of the ICRP in relation to emergency exposure situations were not easy to put into requirements and guidance. It was considered that DS44 required further work and should be resubmitted to the Committees for review at their next meetings;

• That the Appendix on observables should be reinstated;

• That DS44 fails to address all issues relating to emergency preparedness and response.

Ms. Buglova responded to these comments and added that the DPP for DS44 had been approved in 1999, and that the development of DS44 had been delayed to ensure that it was consistent with the new ICRP recommendations and the revised BSS. She added that non-technical issues of emergency preparedness and response had been addressed in GS-G-2.1, while DS44 was only intended to address technical issues.

The Chairman noted that there was a request from TRANSSC, Japan and some other members for the appendix on observables to be reinstated in DS44. This was agreed by Ms. Buglova. The Chairman said that there was clearly a need for this Safety Guide, and appealed to the committee members that he was hesitant to further delay its publication. France and Japan asked for their comments to be noted, and that they would not block its approval.
USA asked if the document could be approved and asked if NUSSC could be asked to approve it prior to their next meeting, so that it could be included on the agenda for the next CSS meeting.

RASSC and WASSC approved DS44 for submission to the CSS for endorsement.

Action: The Secretariat to submit DS44 to the CSS for endorsement

RW6.5. DS410: Safety Guide: Methodology for a national strategy for regaining control over orphan sources

Mr. E. Reber presented the safety guide DS410 and discussed its scope, objective, and history of its development. He said that the paragraph 8(c) of the Code of Conduct recommends that every state should have a system of control over radioactive sources that includes national strategies for gaining or regaining control over orphan sources. Furthermore, he added that the conclusions of the Hofburg and Bordeaux conferences encouraged the development and implementation of national strategies for regaining and maintaining control of vulnerable and orphan sources. Regarding the history to the development of DS410, Mr. Reber said that TECDOC 1388, which was published in 2004, forms the basis for DS410, and that the Agency had used the methodology set out in TECDOC 1388 as the basis for a programme of work that included the conduct of 4 national strategies workshops, 19 national strategies missions and at least 27 other Agency missions. He added that very good feedback received from this work was considered in developing the Safety Guide.

Mr. Reber described the methodology: to gather national information to determine the nature and magnitude of the potential problem, to perform a gap analysis, to identify corrective actions, to prioritize them, and then to develop a national plan.

Mr. Reber noted that comments were only received from one country, Hungary, and that of the 8 comments, 5 were accepted and 3 rejected.

There was a comment at the meeting that the parts of DS411, which had been considered earlier in the meeting, that deal with orphan sources related to scrap metal could be incorporated into DS410 as well. However the person making the comment did not want to delay development of DS410.

RASSC and WASSC approved DS410 for submission to Member States for comment.

Action: The Secretariat to submit DS410 to Member States for comment.

RW7. REPORT ON WASSC DISCUSSIONS, ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM RASSC AND DECISION ON APPROVAL

RW7.1. DS354: Safety Requirements: Disposal of Radioactive Waste

Mr. P. Metcalf presented the outcome of the discussion held at WASSC on DS354. He stated that DS354 is based on WS-R-4 on geological disposal but that its scope has been
broadened to include other types of disposal. He reported that there had been a lot of discussion in the WASSC meeting; however, the only significant change was for requirement No. 22, which was generalized to make the review period less specific, i.e. at the discretion of the regulatory body. Mr. Metcalf reported that the document was approved by WASSC to be submitted to the CSS.

RASSC and WASSC approved DS354 for submission to the CSS for endorsement.

*Action: Secretariat to submit DS 354 to Member States for comment, after incorporating comments received.*

**RW7.2. DS371: Safety Guide: Storage of Spent Fuel**

Mr. P. Metcalf, presented the Safety Guide DS371, and the results of the discussion held during WASSC meeting. Mr. Metcalf explained that DS371 doesn’t involve operational storage, and focuses on the long term storage of spent fuel. He also noted that the document has already been submitted to Member States for comment, and that there was more than 500 comments received that had lead to a significant restructure and reorder. He added that the document has been submitted to the committees for review and was considered by NUSSC27 2 weeks ago. A large number of comments had been received from WASSC members. Still needs to go to NUSSC28 for final ratification, however it was approved at the WASSC meeting to go on to CSS. The major change to the document was to introduce requirements into the text. They agreed that the requirements would come from the predisposal waste management safety requirements. They also introduced a lot more material on management systems. Mr. Metcalf reported on issues arising related to the document. These included an issue surrounding intrusive inspection of dry spent fuel storage casks, which was dealt with. Also an issue with dual use of casks, which can be transported (which needs certified) at a future time as well as stored, this issue was also dealt with by addressing the safety case and safety assessment.

The document was agreed by WASSC and RASSC to send it to NUSSC28 for final agreement on the way comments were introduced into the document. At the WASSC meeting it was confirmed that all comments received had been satisfactorily included. A request for approval from the Joint meeting was asked to move the document forward to CSS. Agreement was gained from RASSC to move the document forward, after NUSSC28 to CSS for endorsement.

Mr. P. Metcalf reported afterwards that TRANSSC had approved the document.

*Action: Secretariat to include all comments received from NUSSC and WASSC for DS371, to submit it to the next meeting of NUSSC for approval, and then to the CSS for endorsement.*

The Chairman said that DS357 had been discussed extensively during the WASSC meeting, leading to the decision that additional work was required on the document. Therefore, DS357 will be considered at a future meeting of RASSC and WASSC.

RW8. Review of DPPs


Mr. Pather reported that during the WASSC session, WASSC members stated that they were happy for the document to move forward, on the provision that the sentence in the safety fundamentals related to the intent for the protection of the environment was included in the DPP.

The Chairman, Mr. T. Pather asked for the views of RASSC from the chair of RASSC, Mr. Robinson. Mr. Robinson said that RASSC had not discussed the DPP for DS432, but that he had discussed it with the secretariat and that he had suggested deleting “Generic criteria for” from the title.

Committee members were asked for their views. There were some views to delete environmental protection from the scope of the document. This was supported by another participant, who suggested that there be two separate documents: one to cover protection of the public and the other to cover protection of the environment. The UK stated that they supported the chairman of RASSC proposal that the public and environment be considered together in DS432, but to remove generic criteria from the title of the Safety Guide. Other Committee members supported keeping both protection of the public and the environment together in DS432. Mr. Camper reemphasized the outcome of the lengthy WASSC discussions that the environment is identified in the safety fundamentals and that it is clear on the protection of non human species and that was why WASSC felt strongly for the environment to be included in the scope of DS432. Canada commented that they were in agreement with keeping “generic criteria” in the title. Brazil asked for a strong document on public exposure and didn’t wish to include human and environmental issues in the same document. Japan asked if there was a difference between the Safety Guide DS427 and this document, this was answered that there is a difference and that DS427 deals with a specific situations. Japan also commented on the necessity of including the environment but asked for a refinement of the environmental protection aim of the document.

RASSC and WASSC approved the DPP, with the request that “Generic Criteria for” be deleted from the title, and for the paragraph in the Safety Fundamentals on the protection of the environment be included in the DPP.

Action: Secretariat to make the agreed changes to the DPP for DS432, to submit it to the next meeting of NUSSC for approval, and then to the CSS for endorsement
RW10. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26th CSS meeting</td>
<td>14-16 October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th RASSC meeting</td>
<td>16-20 November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th WASC meeting</td>
<td>16-20 November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th CSS meeting</td>
<td>[17-19 March 2010]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th RASSC meeting</td>
<td>21-25 June 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th WASC meeting</td>
<td>28 June – 2 July 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RW11. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

Ms. E. Amaral thanked all the Committee members and representatives of the international organisations for all of their constructive contributions to the meetings. She thanked both Chairmen for their work in chairing the meetings, and in particular, thanked Mr. Robinson for stepping in at short notice to chair the RASSC meeting.
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Waste Safety Standards Committee (WASSC) – Twenty-Seventh Meeting
Transport Safety Standards Committee (TRANSSC) - Eighteenth Meeting
29 June – 2 July 2009
IAEA Vienna and Austria Center Vienna

Agenda

10 am, Monday 29 June 2009, Austria Center Vienna Rooms GH

RASSC/WASSC/TRANSSC joint meeting

1. Opening of Meeting
   E. Amaral, Dir-NSRW

2. Chairmen's Remarks
   S. Magnusson,
   T. Pather,
   E. Brach

3. Adoption of agenda for the Joint Session
   S. Magnusson,
   T. Pather,
   E. Brach

4. Administrative arrangements for the meeting
   G. Siraky, T. Boal, J. Stewart

5. General Safety Standards Issues
   5.1 Feedback from the Commission on Safety Standards.
   For discussion D. Delattre
   5.2 Strategies and Processes for the Establishment of Safety Standards
   For discussion K.Mrabit
   5.3 Reference Set of Safety Guides for the Long Term
   For information D. Delattre
   5.4 Update on revision of glossary
   For discussion D. Delves

   W. Stern

   D. Louvat

8. RAIS: its use and status in Member States
   H. Suman
9. **Topical Session:**
International Conference on Control and Management of Inadvertent Radioactive Material in Scrap Metal, 23-27 February 2009, Tarragona, Spain

10. **Review of Documents under development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Reviewers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>DS415</td>
<td>Safety Requirements - Governmental and Regulatory Framework for Safety – GS-R-1</td>
<td>For approval for submission to CSS for endorsement</td>
<td>H. Suman, G. Caruso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>DS416</td>
<td>Safety Guide - Licensing process for nuclear installations</td>
<td>For approval for submission to CSS for endorsement</td>
<td>S. Calpena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>DS411</td>
<td>Safety Guide - Orphan Sources and Radioactively Contaminated Material in the Metal Recycling Industry</td>
<td>For initial review</td>
<td>E. Reber, V. Ljubenov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>DS424</td>
<td>Safety Guide - Establishing a National Nuclear Installation Safety Infrastructure</td>
<td>For initial review</td>
<td>D Graves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. **Review of DPPs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Reviewers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>DS429</td>
<td>Safety Guide - External expert support on safety issues</td>
<td>For approval for submission to CSS for endorsement</td>
<td>G. Philip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>DS432</td>
<td>Safety Guide – Generic Criteria for Radiation Protection of the Public and the Environment</td>
<td>For approval for submission to CSS for endorsement</td>
<td>T. Boal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. **Other Business**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Reviewers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>Technical issues supporting German proposal to exclude certain small training and research reactors from the application of the 1997 Vienna Convention and the 1997 Convention on Supplementary Compensation</td>
<td>For discussion and providing input on technical issues</td>
<td>G. Schwarz, N. Pelzer (TBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>Technical issues supporting German proposal to exclude nuclear installations being decommissioned from the 1997 Vienna Convention and the 1997 Convention on Supplementary Compensation</td>
<td>For discussion and providing input on technical issues</td>
<td>G. Schwarz, N. Pelzer (TBC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Close of session / report of session

S. Magnusson,
T. Pather,
E. Brach
**Tuesday 30 June**  
**WASSC Session, Austria Center Vienna Room G**

**Wednesday 1 July (Morning)**  
**WASSC Session, IAEA, Vienna Room C02 I**

W1. Opening of WASSC session  
T. Pather

W2. Adoption of the Agenda of the WASSC Session  
T. Pather

W3. Chairman’s Report from 26th meeting and actions arising  
T. Pather

W4. Results of Recent WES activities  
D. Louvat

  W4.1 Workshop in Thailand

  W4.2 Workshop in Korea

W5. Current issues

  W5.1 Status of Waste Safety Standards  
  G. Siraky

  W5.2 Discussion on Strategies and Processes for the Establishment of SS  
  T. Pather

W6. Review of Documents under development

  W6.1 DS422 Safety Guide – Evaluation of Seismic Hazards for Nuclear Facilities For approval for submission to CSS for endorsement  
  A. Godoy

W7. Detailed discussion on Standards for approval

  W7.1 DS354 Safety Requirements - Disposal of Radioactive Waste  
  P. Metcalf

  J. Rowat

  W7.3 DS371 Safety Guide: Storage of Spent Fuel  
  P. Metcalf

W8. Progress reports on Standards under development
| W8.5 | DS421 | Safety Guide: Protection of the public against exposure to natural sources of radiation including NORM residues | R. Edge |
| W8.6 | Documents on Decommissioning and Residual material - Safety Guides: DS402/DS403/DS404 | V. Ljubenov |

W9. Detailed discussion on DPP’s for approval


W10. Discussion on Waste and Transport common issues (Feedback from WASSC members) Conclusions of the session | T. Pather |

W11. Conclusions of the session | T. Pather |
**Wednesday, 1 July, AFTERNOON**

*Joint WASSC/ TRANSSC Session, IAEA Vienna Room C02 I*

| WT1. | Opening of the Joint Session | P.Metcalf  
(UH-WM-WES)  
J. Stewart  
(UH-TS-RIT) |
| WT2. | Chairmen’s Remarks | T. Pather, E. Brach |
| WT3. | Adoption of Agenda for Joint Session | T. Pather, E. Brach |
| WT4. | Additional administrative arrangements | G. Siraky, J Stewart |
| WT5. | Working Papers on Common Issues | G. Siraky |
E. Brach,  
SSC members |
| WT7. | Proposals for harmonizing the Waste and Transport SS | T. Pather/ E. Brach,  
SSC members |
| WT8 | Chairmen’s closing remarks | T. Pather, E. Brach |
| WT9 | Closure of joint session | P.Metcalf ,  
J. Stewart |
**Thursday, 2 July**

**RASSC/WASSC joint meeting, IAEA Board Room C04**

| RW1. | Opening of the Joint Session | S. Magnusson, T. Pather |
| RW2. | Chairmen’s Remarks | S. Magnusson, T. Pather |
| RW3. | Adoption of Agenda for Joint Session | S. Magnusson, T. Pather |
| RW4. | Additional administrative arrangements | T. Boal, G. Siraky |
| RW5. | Revision of the BSS (DS379: International Basic Safety Standards for Protection against Ionizing Radiation and for the Safety of Radiation Sources) Report on the discussions in RASSC, additional comments from WASSC | R. Czarwinski |
| RW6. | Review of Documents under development | |
| RW6.1 | DS413 Safety Requirements - Safety of Nuclear Power Plants: Operation Update Yury Martynenko |
| RW6.2 | DS414 Safety Requirements - Safety of Nuclear Power Plants: Design For approval for submission to Member States for comment M. Gasperini |
| RW6.3 | DS388 Safety Guide: Chemistry Programme for Water Cooled Nuclear Power Plants For approval for submission to CSS for endorsement A. Renev |
| RW6.4 | DS44 Safety Guide - Criteria for Use in Planning Response to Nuclear and Radiological Emergencies For approval for submission to CSS for endorsement E. Buglova |
| RW6.5 | DS410 Safety Guide: Methodology for a national strategy for regaining control over orphan sources For initial review E. Reber |
RW7  Report on WASSC discussions, additional comments from RASSC and decision on approval

RW7.1 DS354  Safety Requirements - Disposal of Radioactive Waste  For approval for submission to CSS for endorsement  P. Metcalf

RW7.2 DS371  Safety Guide: Storage of Spent Fuel  For approval for submission to CSS for endorsement  P. Metcalf

RW7.3 DS357  Safety Guide: Monitoring and Surveillance of Radioactive Waste Disposal Facilities  For approval for submission to Member States for comment  J. Rowat

RW8.  Review of DPPs

RW8.1 DS432  Safety Guide: Radiation Protection of the Public and the environment  For approval for submission to CSS for endorsement  T. Boal

RW9.  Conclusions of meeting

RW10.  Dates of future meetings

| 26th CSS meeting | 14-16 October 2009 |
| 27th RASSC meeting | 16-20 November 2009 |
| 28th WASSC meeting | 16-20 November 2009 |
| 28th CSS meeting | [17-19 March 2010] |
| 28th RASSC meeting | 21-25 June 2010 |
| 29th WASSC meeting | 28 June – 2 July 2010 |

RW11.  Closure of RASSC/WASSC meeting  E. Amaral
## ANNEX II – AGREED LIST OF ACTIONS

### ACTIONS FROM WASSC27

#### 1) JOINT WASSC/TRANSSC/RASSC MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM AGENDA</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>WASSC members to provide input on their views on SPESS</td>
<td>WASSC members</td>
<td>End of August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>DS415 – To be sent to CSS for endorsement</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>DS416 - To be sent to CSS for endorsement</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>DS411 – To be sent to MS for comments</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>DS424 - To be sent to MS for comments</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>DPP on DS429 - To be sent to CSS for endorsement</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>DPP on DS432 – See section at WASSC/RASSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1 and 12.2</td>
<td>German proponent to provide clear criteria for exclusion based on risks to be discussed at WG</td>
<td>German Proponent</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretariat to establish WG (RASSC/WASSC/NUSSC/OLA) to analyze German proposal and prepare a position paper to be discussed and agreed by committee members</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>5 October</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2) JOINT WASSC/TRANSSC MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM AGENDA</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WT8</td>
<td>Reflect in the Meeting report the agreement reached</td>
<td>Chairs/Secretariat</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3) JOINT WASSC/RASSC MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM AGENDA</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RW5</td>
<td>DS379 – To send the revised version, with new format to SSCs</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>2nd October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW6.1</td>
<td>DS414 - To be sent to MS for comments</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW6.2</td>
<td>DS388 – To be sent to CSS for endorsement</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW6.3</td>
<td>DS44 - To incorporate Appendix on observables for radiological emergency and to be sent to CSS for endorsement</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW6.4</td>
<td>DS410 - To be sent to MS for comments</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW7.1</td>
<td>DS354 – To be sent to CSS for endorsement</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW7.2</td>
<td>DS371 – To upload version with the changes agreed by WASSC and RASSC, (clean and track of changes version) sent it to NUSSC28 for agreement– Then to be sent to CSS for endorsement</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW7.3</td>
<td>DS357 – Agreed with TO to re-work part of the SG dedicated to post-closure monitoring of Geological repositories and to be sent again for consideration of RASSC and WASSC</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4) WASSC MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM AGENDA</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W5.2</td>
<td>To provide feedback on the Draft document on Strategies and Processes for the Establishment of SS (SPRESS)</td>
<td>WASSC members</td>
<td>By end of August.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6.1</td>
<td>DS422 – To be sent to CSS for endorsement</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>