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NUSSC AND WASSC JOINT MEETING
IAEA HEADQUARTERS, VIENNA
02-03 July 2012

NW.1 NUSSC/WASSC JOINT SESSION – GENERAL ISSUES

NW.1.1 Opening of Meeting

Mr J. Lyons, DIR-NSNI, and Mr P. Hahn, DIR-NSRW, welcomed the NUSSC and WASSC Members to their respective 33rd Meetings. Both Mr Lyons and Mr Hahn commented on important issues to be conveyed to the Committees. Updates of importance occurring since the last NUSSC and WASSC meetings include:

- Progress on the implementation of the IAEA Nuclear Safety Action Plan after the Fukushima accident: an International Experts’ Meeting in March 2012 (reactor and spent fuel safety), an International Experts’ Meeting in June 2012 (enhancing transparency and communication effectiveness in the event of a nuclear or radiological emergency). Forthcoming: Meeting on Protection against Extreme Earthquakes and Tsunamis (September 2012) and another one on Decommissioning and Remediation after a Nuclear Accident (in January 2013).

- CNS Extraordinary Meeting (EM), to be held at the end of August 2012, on post Fukushima actions.


- INSAG: publication of INSAG 26 (Licensing the First Nuclear Power Plant). INSAG is also preparing a report on “leadership and management for safety”. The INSAG Forum will take place in September 2012 and will be on the evaluation of the progress of nuclear safety at the international level.

- Review services proposed by the IAEA: IRRS missions in Sweden, Greece, Slovakia and shortly Finland; OSART missions in China (Honghianhe), in France (Cattenom) and soon in Brazil, Mexico, Switzerland, Czech Republic, Bulgaria, India, France) as well as an expert mission to Korea (Kori).

- A new Section Head for the Research Reactors Section (Mr A. Shokr replacing Mr H. Abou Yehia).

- The contribution of NUSSC and WASSC on the consideration for the development of safety standards following the first lessons from the Fukushima Daichi accident. The discussion on DS462 DO is to that end very expected.

- The issue of the remediation of contaminated sites after an accident is to be discussed in detail at the Senior Regulators Meeting. Additionally, during this meeting, the DPP for the revision of the existing Safety Guide on Remediation Process for Areas Affected by Past Activities and Accidents Safety Guide (WS-G-3.1) is in the Agenda for discussion and approval to be forwarded to CSS.
NW.1.2 Chairmen’s Remarks

NUSSC Chairman, Mr F. Feron remarked that in terms of review of safety standards, only a few documents are on the Agenda, as in the previous meeting. It is therefore expected that upcoming meetings could be busier. Following this, Mr Feron highlighted the items in relation to both Committees such as:

- The revision of the definition of “nuclear installations” will probably generate an increase of the number of safety standards to be reviewed by NUSSC and WASSC.

- The accident at the TEPCO Fukushima Daichii Power Plant in Japan, is still on-going and, will obviously have consequences on the safety standards elaborated by the IAEA. Even if drawing all the conclusions of this accident will take several years, it is important to start as of now to draw lessons in the safety standards that are under preparation and to identify the safety standards already published that need to be updated. A meeting of a NUSSC Working Group took place in January 2012 and enabled to review a table prepared by the IAEA linking the first lessons (106) from the accidents and the safety requirements published by the IAEA. The results of this review have been presented at the meeting of the Four Safety Standards Committees and then to the CSS in March 2012. The establishment of some 30 new requirements and the update of some 20 existing requirements have been proposed. The needs for evolution are shown in the DS462 DO which is on the agenda of the meeting. The mechanism for revision is “original” because this DO covers several safety standards and identifies the paragraphs to be revised or created. This might mean new modes of update. The Secretariat would like to forward this DO to the CSS for its endorsement during its October 2012 meeting.

- If a thorough examination has been conducted by the IAEA for the safety requirements, this does not apply to the safety guides. Only a preliminary macroscopic analysis has been conducting until now (see the NUSSC Working Group meeting). CSS in its letter dated 31 May 2012 to the IAEA DG, underlines the effort that should be taken in order to update the guides to handle simultaneously the evolutions of the safety requirements and the evolution of the requirements linked to the lessons learnt from Fukushima. The meeting will be the occasion of a first discussion with the IAEA on that matter.

- CSS in its letter dated 31 May 2012 to the IAEA DG clearly expresses the necessity to focus on clear actions:

In particular, the CSS members perceive and emphasize the necessity of staying focused on a few most significant issues that have already clearly emerged as lessons from the accident at TEPCO’s Fukushima Dai-ichi Nuclear Power Plant. I would like to mention at least some of these:

- The further strengthening of defence-in-depth by better taking into account extreme natural hazards that may exceed the levels taken into account in the current design basis and in the current safety requirements. Such situations can result in the devastation and isolation of the site, an event of long duration, unavailability of numerous safety systems, simultaneous accidents at several plants including their spent fuel pools, and the occurrence of radioactive releases.

- The importance of means for maintaining containment integrity, which is critical as the last barrier to protect people and the environment against radioactive releases resulting from a nuclear accident and the importance of means for maintaining core cooling and spent fuel cooling as critical safety functions.
Recently, a new Committee — Nuclear Security Guidance Committee (NSGC) — was established in order to advise the IAEA on the elaboration of security standards. The establishment of such a Committee, whose 1st meeting took place in June 2012, was recommended by the Task Force CSS-AdSec which has been functioning over several years.

In order to facilitate the management of the safety/security interface, a so called Interface Group (IG) will be established. It will be composed of the four Safety Standards Committees Chairmen (NUSSC, RASSC, TRANSSC, WASSC) and the four NSGC representatives. The first meeting will be held at the end of September 2012.

WANO is participating as an observer for the first time in a NUSSC meeting. This follows the Memorandum of Understanding between the IAEA and WANO signed after the Fukushima accident.

This NUSSC Meeting, partially joint with WASCC, is the occasion to promote a collective discussion between NUSSC and WASSC (and eventually between the NUSSC and WASCC representatives from a same country). This also avoids the IAEA to have repetitive presentations and similar discussions on several documents for which both NUSSC and WASCC need to be consulted.

Mr G. Williams, Chair of the WASSC, reinforced the important role of joint sessions of Safety Standards Committees to construct common views and better utilize the resources of Member States and the Secretariat. He also referred to the successful experience of WASSC having joint sessions with RASSC. Finally, Mr Williams noted that with the change in the definition of “Nuclear Installation” to include predisposal waste management facilities in the definition, would imply also having most probably more joint WASSC and NUSSC meetings to discuss topics of common interest.

NW.1.3 Adoption of the Agenda for the Joint Session

Both Committees approved the Draft Agenda without objection.

NW.1.4 Administrative arrangements for the meeting

The administrative matters for the joint session were communicated by both Scientific Secretaries.

NW.1.5 Interaction with other Committees

NW.1.5.1 Report from the previous meetings of the 4 Chairs (February & March 2012)

Since the last NUSSC/WASSC meetings, two meetings of the four Committees’ Chairs took place, the first in February 2012 and the second in March 2012, just before the CSS meeting. During those two meetings, the issues discussed were:

- The importance of harmonized approaches to support international trade, including for commodities and foodstuffs.
- The need for a justification process and optimization criteria for remediation and rehabilitation as well as advice on the transition from an emergency to a post-emergency phase.
• The methodology to identify and process the impacts of the first lessons from the Fukushima accident on the IAEA safety standards. In particular, the conclusions of the NUSSC Working Group in January 2012 and the WASSC WG report of October 2011 were discussed;

• The issues to study in priority during the new mandate of the CSS;

• The Terms of Reference and the modalities of work of the future Interface Group (IG). The four Chairs requested the IAEA to conduct a comparison of the Terms of Reference of the IG and of the four Committees in order to obtain consistency and to avoid any unjustified difference;

• The experience feedback on the preparation of BSS (GSR Part 3) on sponsorship. The SPESS document shall be updated;

• The Chairmen underlined the benefits coming from the “overarching requirements” (formally established or to be established) in the identifications of the needs for evolution of the safety requirements due to the first lessons learnt from the Fukushima accident. They requested the IAEA to develop an electronic tool in order to “visualize” the links between the Safety Requirements and the Safety Guides;

• The benefit to define the modalities to know which version of the safety glossary (and thus which definition) was in force when a safety standard was developed. This reflexion follows the discussions on the creation of new definitions (in the new BSS or SSR 2.1, etc.) or potential changes in definition (e.g. nuclear installation).

NW.1.5.2a Report of the 31st CSS Meeting

The main topics discussed at the 31st CSS Meeting (March 2012), first meeting of its fifth term (2012 - 2016) were outlined as follows:

• Designation of the new CSS president (D. Drabova – Czech Republic);

• Report on the CSS work during its previous mandate, including the definition of the long term structure of the safety standards, the task Force CSS-AdSec and the first actions taken following the Fukushima accident;

• Progress of the Nuclear Safety Action Plan following the Fukushima accident;

• Discussion on the impact of the first lessons drawn from the Fukushima accident on the safety standards, including the method followed and the progress in its implementation;

• Conclusions of the Task Force CSS-AdSec;

• Work done by NUSSC, RASSC, TRANSSC and WASSC since the last meeting;

• Priorities for the new CSS mandate (including the finalization of the General Safety Requirements, the improvement of the process of experience feedback from the application of safety standards, radon exposure, medical exposure, the application of the justification principle for exposure, the harmonization of criteria for exemption and clearance of radioactive material, the knowledge management, taking into account the human factor in the regulatory system, the interface safety/security, the recommendations for the PSA and the management of severe accidents…)

4/42
Concerning the Safety Standards, the CSS approved:

- The publication of:
- The DPPs on:
  - The Safety Guide on Radiation Safety and Regulatory Control for Consumer Products (DS458 DPP);
  - The Safety Guide on Management of Radioactive Residues from Mining, Mineral Processing, and other NORM Activities, revision of WS-G-1.2 (DS459 DPP);
  - The Safety Guide on Safety in Medical Uses of Ionizing Radiation (DS399 DPP);
  - The Safety Guide on Protection of the public against indoor exposure to natural sources of radiation (DS421 DPP);

More generally, the CSS thinks that all General Safety Requirements will most probably be published by the end of 2013 and that the Specific Safety Requirements will most probably be published by the end of 2015.

**NW.1.5.2b  Progress Report on the Review of Safety Standards. CSS Chair’s letter to IAEA DG**

Under Action 6 of the Action Plan, exchange of letters between the IAEA DDG and the CSS Chair at the beginning of summer 2011 confirmed the need for an action in terms of safety standards with the objective to have an inventory of Safety Standards to review by June 2012. Following the CSS meeting in March 2012, the CSS Chairman submitted a letter stating the progress. The progress made will again be reviewed after the CNS EM and the IAEA GC.

During its two previous plenary meetings and its sub-group meeting in January 2012, NUSSC examined the analysis conducted by the IAEA which consists of a list of lessons drawn from the Fukushima accident and of a “gap analysis” at the safety requirements level and a list of safety guides to be potentially updated or drafted.

Regarding the safety requirements, the inventory, resulting from the NUSSC work with the review by RASSC, TRANSSC and WASSC members, was presented to the CSS in March 2012. This resulted in the document DS462 DO as well as in the letter of the CSS Chairman dated 31 May 2012.

The IAEA also presented the CSS point of view as expressed in the letter.

Generally:

- 106 lessons were identified by the IAEA;
- No important gap was identified at the level of the 450 “overarching requirements”;
- It was suggested to create 31 related requirements and to modify 20;
The needs for additional requirements concern:

- Situations involving long term loss of electrical power;
- Identification of external events, including those that may affect the infrastructure around the nuclear installations.
- To maintain at all times the information on key parameters characterizing the status of the installation.

During the meeting, the discussions were about:

- How the results of the meetings at the end of August and in September will be taken into account in the DS462 DO. For the IAEA, there are no a-priori reasons to think that it might be affected. Notwithstanding this, the text of the future requirements shall take into account the conclusions of those meetings;
- The potential consultation of MS in 2013 and the eventual adjustments of DS462 DO. The IAEA indicates that the process will be the same as for any other Safety Standard but that the DO is much more precise because it targets the issues that will have to be revised.

**NW.1.6 Presentation on the Status of the Fukushima Daiichi NPP’s, including regulatory and decommissioning/remediation matters**

Two presentations were given by NISA staff, namely Mr. Maki from NUSSC and Mr. Oue from WASSC. They covered:

- The state of the installations at the TEPCO Fukushima Daichii power plant;
- The measures adopted for the treatment/circulation of highly contaminated waters;
- The current actions to better characterize the state of the installations (endoscopes, robots…);
- The doses recorded for the workers (some 30 workers with doses higher than 100 mSv, 4000 with doses higher than 20 mSv and more than 17000 with doses lower than 20 mSv);
- The investigations/approaches in progress to understand the causes of the accident. As of today, some 30 clauses that would have helped to better face the accident were identified.
- Stress tests in Japan (including an IAEA mission on that issue in January 2012);
- Solutions envisaged to withdraw the fuel stored in the pools of reactors 3 and 4;
- Solutions envisaged to manage the solid radioactive waste on site;
- The extent of contaminated areas around the site, the partial release of evacuation measures and the approach related to the decontamination of affected zones;
- The volume and the envisaged management of waste in the contaminated areas or coming from the decontamination operations;
• The reform of the Japanese institutions ensuring the oversight of nuclear safety (creation by the end of summer 2012, within the Ministry of Environment, of a Nuclear Regulatory Commission, composed of four Commissioners, one Chair, supported by MEXT, METI, NSC and JNES;

• Regulatory evolutions that happened in June 2012 (lifetime limit — 40 years — taking into account severe accidents, retroactivity conditions "backfitting rule"…) and to come in 2013, as well as new safety requirements to come, taking into account current NSC guides and the lessons from the Fukushima accident and IAEA safety standards.

Following questions, it is indicated that the stress tests are on-going on the installations for the spent fuel reprocessing but there are differences between stress tests for NPPs and for spent fuel reprocessing. The reprocessing plant is currently shut down. The Japanese representative indicates that the two main causes of the accident are an underestimation of the tsunami risk and the absence of “backfitting rule”.

**NW.1.7 Implementation of the IAEA Action Plan on Nuclear Safety (including information on International Experts Meeting, March 2012)**

Following the Ministerial Conference in Vienna in June 2011, two main working areas appeared:

a) One presented to the Board of Governors and GC in September 2011 which is related to a set of actions concerning assistance missions and safety standards;

b) The other one, more focused on safety standards will have to be approved by the CSS.

The Action Plan of the IAEA described in the document GOV/2011/59-GC (55)/14 was approved during the 2011 GC. It defines a programme of work in order to reinforce safety globally. It sets up actions based on the Ministerial Declaration of June 2011, the conclusions and recommendations of working groups and the experience that they reflect, notably the INSAG letter-report (GOV/INF/2011/11) following the Ministerial Conference in June 2011, but also measures to facilitate consultations with MS.

The Action Plan contains **12 main actions**, composed of various elements devoted to:

1) Safety assessments in the light of the accident at TEPCO’s Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant (Undertake assessment of the safety vulnerabilities of nuclear power plants in the light of lessons learned to date from the accident);

2) IAEA peer reviews (Strengthen IAEA peer reviews in order to maximize the benefits for Member States);

3) Emergency preparedness and response;

4) National regulatory bodies (Strengthen their effectiveness);

5) Operating organizations (Strengthen their effectiveness);

6) **IAEA Safety Standards (Review and strengthen IAEA Safety Standards and improve their implementation)**;

7) International legal framework (Improve its effectiveness);
8) Member States planning to embark on a nuclear power programme (Facilitate the development of the infrastructure necessary for Member States embarking on a nuclear power programme);

9) Capacity Building;

10) Protection of people and the environment from ionizing radiation (Ensure the on-going protection of people and the environment from ionizing radiation following a nuclear emergency);

11) Communication and information dissemination (Enhance transparency and effectiveness of communication and improve dissemination of information);

12) Research and development (Effectively utilize research and development).

Those 12 main actions are broken down into 39 sub-actions which lead to approximately 170 activities (i.e. approximately 650 tasks).

The IAEA established a team to coordinate and follow the progress of the action plan, within the IAEA and with other stakeholders (WANO, etc.). This team, led by Mr G. Caruso, is composed of staff from IAEA NS and NE Departments.

Since the Action Plan has been launched, the IAEA has:

- Developed a methodology for the stress tests, available for interested MS;
- Organized support missions to Japan;
- Organized dedicated meetings (International Expert Meeting – IEM) like the one in March 2012 on reactors and spent fuel safety (44 States and four International Organizations ~ 230 participants), the one in June 2012 on transparency and communication in the event of a nuclear or radiological emergency (53 States and International Organizations ~160 participants) or the one to be held in September 2012 on Protection against Extreme Earthquakes and Tsunamis or in April 2013 on effective nuclear regulatory systems…
- Included a “Fukushima” module on IRRS and EPREV missions and reinforced the issue of severe accidents management in OSART missions;
- Increased the publications related to the results of peer review missions;
- Worked to reinforce the international capacities for response to emergency situations (RANET, JPLAN…);
- Started the process of reviewing the safety standards;
- Set up a formal cooperation with WANO (e.g. to better coordinate the OSART missions and the WANO peer review);
- Reinforced its actions for countries embarking on a nuclear power programme.

At the meeting, Committee members discussed the following issues:

- The updating of the IAEA Self-Assessment IRRS guide in order to include the Fukushima additions. The new version of the guide will be available for fall;
- The modalities enabling to decide upon the need of an IEM;
• The provision of presentations delivered during IEM. It appears that as at the moment, those presentations are only available on a website where you have to pay.

• Presentations of the International Expert Meetings related to the Fukushima Dai-ichi Accident should be made available on the Internet and easily downloaded. NUSSC and WASSC asked the Secretariat to clarify whether the presentations delivered during the IEM are available for interested person free of charge.

The CNS 2nd Extraordinary Meeting will be held at the end of August 2012. This meeting will focus on the actions by the CPs following the Fukushima accident.

NW.1.8 Nuclear Security Committee (current development)

Mr I. Barraclough, Scientific Secretary of NSGC, made a presentation on the NSGC. In the Nuclear Security Series, several documents have already been published by the IAEA and some 20 documents are currently under preparation. Before publication, the documents were submitted for comments to the MS (120 days) and reviewed by the AdSec even though it was not strictly in its mandate. Moreover, the AdSec members are appointed personally and not as representatives of their country. In 2009, the Task Force AdSec-CSS was established and gave its conclusions at the end of 2011.

Based on these conclusions, the IAEA decided to establish the Nuclear Security Guidance Committee (NSGC) which held its first meeting in June 2012 (the next meeting is foreseen from 10-14 December 2012). The NSGC, where 53 MS are represented, is chaired by Mr G. Emi-Reynolds (Ghana).

Its implication in the different steps of the preparation of a document (from the DPP till the publication) is largely similar to the Safety Committees for the safety standards. However, it does foresee a fast track option and the deletion of some intermediary consultation steps.

In order to facilitate the interface between the Safety Standards Committees and the NSGC, an “Interface Group” (IG) is going to be established and will be composed of the four safety committees’ chairs and four NSGC representatives. This group’s mandate will be to review draft DPPs in order to identify the Committee(s) (NSGC, NUSSC, RASSC, TRANSSC, and WASSC) to be associated for the preparation of the document and to identify the leading Committee for that document. This work will be done on the basis of IAEA preliminary conclusions (to be confirmed or not).

As of today, the IAEA has 55 DPPs available (in all collections) and all of them will be on the agenda of the first IG meeting (24-25 September 2012).

In terms of developing documents of the Nuclear Security Series, the following steps, besides the establishment of the Interface Group include: updating of the roadmap of the documents to be issued, the thoughts on the participation (as observers) of international organizations, the creation of a document similar to the SPESS one and the elaboration of a Security Glossary.

During the meeting, the discussions were about:

• The vocabulary used in the Safety Series and Security Series documents (safety Glossary and security glossary). It was noted that terminology used in different fields might not be the same and harmonization was needed.
The possibility of including “sensitive” information in the Security Series documents. The IAEA confirms that those documents, which are supposed to be public, should not include such information.

The role of the IG and the CSS in the validation of the Nuclear Security documents;

The fact that the IG members represent their committee and not their country. For the IAEA, the composition of IG could evolve over time, and finally be composed of the committees’ chairs;

The notion of interface between safety and security. The IAEA indicates that including cross-references does not constitute an interface. There is an interface when specific paragraphs are to be written about safety in a security document or vice-versa;

The fast track option for the lowest category (which would not be the equivalent of safety guides for safety standards). This process does not require the MS consultation and does not receive the approbation from NSGC;

The utilisation of the IAEA website for the NSGC and the possibility to have less access restrictions. The IAEA indicates that so far the protections will be kept but in the longer term, it will tend to get closer to the modalities of the other committees.

NUSSC and WASSC took note with satisfaction of the establishment of a process for the elaboration of security series documents largely similar to the process in place for the safety standards and affirm their will to work in harmony with this committee.

In addition to the two slides presented by the IAEA, NUSSC and WASSC would like to have a few-page document introducing the process of elaboration of a security series document and of documents which have interfaces between safety and security, as foreseen today. Of course, this could evolve depending on the experience.

NUSSC and WASSC encouraged the IAEA to gather in a single document (SPESS or other) the processes of elaboration of safety standards and of safety series.

NUSSC and WASSC underline the importance to harmonize as quickly as possible the terminology. The actions in progress on the revision of the safety glossary must be the first step in that direction.

**NW.1.9 Report on the Joint Convention Review Meeting and 2nd Extraordinary Meeting Preparation**

The 4th JC RM was held in May 2012 and involved over 600 delegates from 63 Contracting Parties (CPs). Its preparation led to more than 3200 questions on the CPs’ national reports.

The IAEA Secretariat of the Joint Convention has made the Summary Report of the Review Meeting available via the following link:

[http://goto.iaea.org/jointconvention](http://goto.iaea.org/jointconvention)

Improvements for future review meetings, as well as other arrangements to ensure continuity between review meetings, were identified through the deliberations and were approved at the Review Meeting. Proposals were agreed on enhancing the continuity of on-going dialogue between review meetings and on a mechanism to ensure coherence between the Joint Convention and the Convention on Nuclear Safety.
The CNS 2nd Extraordinary Meeting, as decided in April 2011 during the 5th RM of this Convention, will be held in August 2012. Over a period of 5 days, it intends to enhance safety through exchanges on lessons learnt from the Fukushima accident as well as to look at the efficiency of the CNS. For the first objective, exchanges will take place around 6 topics (see CNS public web: http://www-ns.iaea.org/conventions/nuclear-safety.asp?s=6&l=4).

NW.2 NUSSC/WASSC JOINT SESSION – REVIEW OF DRAFT SAFETY STANDARDS

NW.2.1 DS407 SG on Criticality Safety in the Handling of Fissile Materials in Facilities and Activities

Mr G. Jones gave a presentation on the draft. The DPP for this guide was approved end of 2007. Consultation of MS took place by the end of 2010; it led to 600 comments. A consultancy meeting took place in June 2011 to handle those comments. The draft guide was reviewed again by the technical editors which led to its version 7.

Prior to the NUSSC, some 300 comments were formulated. A version (v8), taking into account those comments was put online a few days before the meeting. 80% of those comments were accepted by the IAEA.

The IAEA indicates that the first lessons from the Fukushima accident and their impact on the requirements known as of today do not imply so far, any change to the content of that guide.

During the meeting, Committee members discussed the following:

- The title of the document. It seems better to go back to the previous title (Criticality safety in facilities and activities handling fissile material) or to have a shorter one (Criticality safety in the handling fissile material).
- The second sentence under 1.1 should be deleted. The IAEA accepts that deletion.
- Definitions put as footnotes. The IAEA considers this acceptable and that there is no need to add those in the Safety Glossary.
- A few explanations on the passive/active systems or administrative provisions;
- Provisions mixing internal and external transport;
- Provisions specific to the manufacturing of MOX fuel appear to be insufficient for ENISS (§5.10). The ratio PuO2/total quantity of oxides will be inserted.

As a result, the following conclusions were reached:

- NUSSC and WASSC suggest that the title becomes “Criticality safety in the handling fissile material”.
- NUSSC and WASSC draw TRANSSC attention to sections 5.73 to 5.75.
NUSSC and WASSC agreed the document, with NUSSC/WASSC comments implemented, can be submitted to the CSS.

NW.2.2 DS446 SG on Commissioning for Nuclear Power Plants

Mr Martynenko gave a presentation on the draft. The DPP for that guide was approved in the mid of 2010. The Member States’ consultation took place end of 2011. Prior to the NUSSC meeting, some 200 comments were expressed. The review by IAEA technical editors also took place. The comments were largely accepted by the Technical Officer and a new version of the document was posted on the IAEA website before the meeting of the Committees.

During the meeting, the following exchanges took place:

- Follow-up on some comments;
- Comments that Germany didn’t submit in time, essentially editorial; and
- Paragraph 2.3 that sets the objectives allocated to the start of testing, and in particular the last two bullets – it was agreed to merge the two bullets.

NUSSC and WASSC agreed that the document, with NUSSC/WASSC comments incorporated, can be submitted to the CSS.

NW.2.3 DS450 SR on Safe Decommissioning of Facilities

Ms M. Wong, WES-NSNW, introduced the draft Safety Requirement on Decommissioning (DS450), addressing the suite of safety standards applying to decommissioning and the recent history of development of the revised Safety Requirements document.

Ms Wong highlighted the issues that were identified at a previous Technical Meeting held in January 2012 to gain feedback on the experience of applying the decommissioning safety standards, and the input from SSC’s members, on the following:

- **Decommissioning strategies**, in particular entombment, considered as a strategy in which all or part of the facility is encased in a structurally long lived material with no further decommissioning action. Notwithstanding this, entombment is not currently considered to be a justifiable option for normal planned shutdown. It could only be considered under exceptional circumstances for existing facilities;

- **Timeframes** for two relevant steps in the decommissioning planning: The first one related to the periodic review of the initial decommissioning plan by operator and reviewed by regulatory body, set in WS-R-5 to at least every five years or as prescribed by the regulatory body. The second one, related to the final decommissioning plan is submitted for approval within two years of the cessation of authorized activities, unless an alternative schedule is prescribed by the regulatory body; and

- **The Title of the document**

Ms Wong also informed the SSC’s on the comments received by from the SSC’s members: a total of 146 comments were received from Belgium, Germany, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom, USA
and ENISS. From them 102 were accepted. Ms Wong informed SSC’s on the main topics identified in the comments and their resolution as:

- Redrafting of Safety Requirement 1 on radiation protection, to “Exposure during decommissioning shall be considered as an authorized planned exposure situation and the requirements of the Basic Safety Standards (BSS) shall be enforced during decommissioning”;
- Use of Terminology: as stated in the Safety Glossary, and there is no need to include a definitions chapter;
- Definition of “terminating the authorization” as “Termination involves the demonstration of compliance with the conditions of the authorization for decommissioning the facility, removal of this authorization, and the release of the facility for restricted and unrestricted use.”
- The implementation of specified timeframes for conducting decommissioning actions is needed because it can impact on safety and furthermore, the regulatory body requires these timeframes to carry out inspections.
- Inclusion of the possibility of decommissioning a part of the facility (i.e., partial decommissioning).

After the presentation of the document, the following items were discussed:

- SSC’s members expressed its views that the simple title “Decommissioning” is preferred, instead of the recently amended title “Safe decommissioning of facilities”;
- “Entombment” should not be included as a decommissioning strategy but should be kept in the document as a “remediation option” or some type of option;
- There were agreements on keeping the timeframes in the document;
- Suggestions to address operational facilities at disposal facilities were received;
- Suggestions were received to avoid inconsistencies regarding the treatment of operational waste in the draft document;
- The revision of the initial Decommissioning Plan every five years was identified as best practice by several SSC members. Canada, Belgium, and Czech noted they are doing updating every five years.

The NUSSC and WASSC members agreed that the draft Safety Requirements, with the incorporated comments should be sent to WASSC (leading Committee) Chair for approval before sending it to Member States for comments.

NUSSC and WASSC agreed that the document, with NUSSC/WASSC comments implemented, can be sent to MS, after the approval of WASSC Chairman.
NW.3 NUSSC/WASSC JOINT SESSION – REVIEW OF DOCUMENT PREPARATION PROFILES (DPPs)

NW.3.1 DS460 DPP for SG on Communication and Consultation with Interested Parties

Mr J-R. Jubin gave an update on the abovementioned DPP. This document is intended to facilitate the implementation of the requirement 36 of GSR Part 1 ("The regulatory body shall promote the establishment of appropriate means of informing and consulting interested parties and the public about the possible radiation risks associated with facilities and activities and about the processes and decisions of the regulatory body").

Prior to the NUSSC meeting, more than 80 comments were formulated and some 15 comments were accepted by the IAEA. An updated version of the DPP was posted on the IAEA website a few days before the meeting.

During the meeting, the discussions were about:

- The use of the term “stakeholder” which is defined in the IAEA Safety Glossary;
- The concepts of transparency and openness to stakeholders;
- The title of the document, notably mentioning or not the regulator. After discussion the title would be “communication and consultation with interested parties”;
- The importance of communication and consultations directly conducted by the operator;
- The fact that this guides does not apply to communication during emergency situation. This is consistent with the Requirement of GSR Part 1. Moreover, the IAEA has also started actions related to communication in emergency situations (June IEM).
- Taking into account publications from OECD/NEA on that issue;
- The potential aspects related to the interface safety/security.

NUSSC and WASSC agreed that the DPP can be sent to CSS.

NW.3.2 DS462 Document Outline (DPP) Revision through addenda of GSR Part 1, NS-R-3, SSR-2/1, SSR-2/2 and GSR Part 4

Mr Delattre gave a presentation based on the DS462 DPP. The document follows the work started since the Fukushima accident in order to identify the necessity to revise some safety requirements and to create new ones. It is based on the "gap analysis" realized by the IAEA during 2011 and its review by the Committees, in particular, by the NUSSC Working Group in January 2012. It suggests the update of 20 requirements and the creation of 31.

The IAEA indicates that the all committees and the NSGC will be associated to the review of this document because it deals with requirements. WASSC already provided its inputs on the safety requirements for waste management (WASSC WG meeting in October 2012, Ref: WASSC 33 Report).
Prior to the NUSSC meeting, more than 24 comments, mainly editorial, and 15 were not accepted. The rest was integrated.

During the meeting, the discussions were about:

- The timetable foreseen by the IAEA, which could be a bit optimistic;
- The interface with other recommendations (safety guides) and their update. The IAEA indicates that the recommendations have to evolve if the requirements do so but that the recommendations could also evolve while the requirements wont if it appears that some additional recommendations are needed;
- Glossary: the term DEC (design extension condition) is now used in SSR 2.1 while the Annex of the DPP often uses the BDBA (beyond design basis accident). The IAEA indicates that it will try to use the new terminology, notably in SSR 2.2. This issue will be checked on a case by case.

The following agreed points concluded the discussion:

**NUSSC and WASSC approved the transmission of the DO to CSS.** NUSSC and WASSC underlined that the schedule (new requirements discussed by the Committees in Oct/Nov 2012 and consultation by the MS starting Dec 2012) could be optimistic.

NUSSC draws the IAEA attention to the need of using the terms DEC and BDBA appropriately while revising the requirements for nuclear installations;

Creation of a group of NUSSC volunteers to follow the development of revised Safety Requirements (under DS462) should be considered if consensus on the new/updated requirements is not achieved at next NUSSC meeting.

**NW.4 NUSSC/WASSC JOINT SESSION – MISCELLANEOUS**

**NW.4.1 Draft Code of Conduct on the Transboundary Movement of Radioactive Material Inadvertently Incorporated into Scrap Metal and Semi-Finished Products of the Metal Recycling Industries**

Mr. E. Reber introduced this initiative and indicated that the first thoughts on that issue started in 1998 after the incineration by accident of a radioactive source of Cs137 in Spain and as a consequence of this event, Spain established a national system addressing the potential presence of radioactive material in scrap metal. A conference in 2009 in Tarragona (Spain) has enabled to share the experience gained in this area. More recently, in January 2012 the IAEA Safety Guide SSG-17 (Control of orphan sources and other radioactive material in the metal recycling and production industry) was published.

In 2011, during the GC, it was agreed to continue the elaboration of a non-binding document on that issue, which had already been discussed during the 2010 GC. This Code would be the 3rd Code of Conduct after the one on Research Reactors (2004) and the one on the safety and security of radioactive sources (first published in 2001).
At the end of January 2012, an “open-ended meeting” enabled the finalization a project of code of conduct. It was submitted for consultation to MS in spring 2012 (the consultation will end in July 2012).

During the meeting, discussions were about:

- Taking into account comments transmitted by Russia in the past;
- The role of the Committees in the development of those codes;
- The difference between an IAEA guide and a code of Conduct. The IAEA indicated that a Code allows MS that wish to do so to make a commitment. As this is a Code of Conduct it won’t be submitted to the Committees for their approbation. The IAEA indicates that a Code does not replace a safety standard. It’s an intermediary step between a Convention (legally binding) and a safety standard;
- The fact that a formal commitment is expected for the application of a Code of Conduct but not for the application of a safety standard.

To conclude:

Members of NUSSC and WASSC are invited to let their country know, if not done yet, about the consultation in progress of MS in order to have those comments expressed.

NUSSC and WASSC commented on the potential benefits of the possibility to obtain from MSs, for safety standard, commitments equivalent to the ones for Codes of Conduct.

**NW.4.2 Progress report on the Revision of the Safety Glossary**

Mr Delves presented this topic and indicated that the paper version of the IAEA Safety Glossary dates back to 2007. It intends to facilitate a uniform and consistent use of some terms within the safety standards and results in a bottom up approach. The Safety Glossary contains definitions and explanatory notes/examples. There are within the IAEA other safety glossaries but their application is less systematic. It also happens that the terms are defined in the Conventions with a different meaning from the one usually used by the IAEA (e.g. “nuclear facility” in the CNS and Joint Convention).

Several definitions, coming from the BSS revision or from the requirements on the preparation of/response to emergency situations or other reasons (e.g. “nuclear installations”, “siting”), are the reason for the update of the safety glossary, with from now on a “top down” approach, preferably carried by the publication of new safety requirements. It will also be important to progress in the harmonization of the terms used in the safety and security standards. The IAEA recalls that a definition needed for one guide but not made to apply to all safety standards must appear as a footnote in the guide in question. The insertion or the modification of a definition in the safety glossary must be validated during one of the Committees’ Chairs’ meeting.

The IAEA now promotes the use of an electronic version of the glossary, posted on the IAEA website which makes it easier than the paper format. Several persons insist on the benefit to keep stability in the definitions. When an update is available, the IAEA suggests that the Committees’ Chairs validate the new definitions. **If an important revision of the glossary is prepared, it could be useful to involve the Committees.** The IAEA specifies that there is no deadline for a future revision of the glossary and that it will probably not happen before the update of the requirements related to the preparation and response to emergency situations.
NW.5  NUSSC/WASSC JOINT SESSION – CLOSURE

Mr Williams closed the session on behalf of both Chairs thanking everyone for what was a productive joint meeting and a great opportunity to interact both committees. He also commented on the widely shared view that the joint meeting was most effective in operating both SSC’s together to ensure documents are relevant to both groups. Mr Williams concluded by thanking Ms Siraky and Mr Svab for their work done to bring both groups together.
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W.1 OPENING OF WASSC MEETING

The 33rd WASSC meeting was opened by Mr. M. Vesterlind, Head of the Waste and Environmental Safety Section (WES), Division of Radiation, Transport and Waste Safety, Department of Nuclear Safety and Security.

Mr Vesterlind gave the WASSC members an update on the most significant events in the section, which are not covered by other presentations in the agenda. The comprehensive overview of the Agency’s waste management programme was also given at the last two WASSC meetings.

- The projects GEOSAF, EMRAS II and FASA were completed in 2011;
- For GEOSAF the first TM on the follow-up has been held in March 2012. In this project the focus will be on safety during operational phase, transition from construction to operations (WG meetings between Plenaries) and on implications for post-closure safety;
- The project on pre-disposal (CRAFT) and the Joint Working Group on Guidance for an Integrated Safety Case for Dual Purpose Casks for SNF have both held their 2nd TM this year;
- The final annual TM for PRISM (Near-Surface) will be held this year in December;
- The follow-up of EMRAS II—called MORARIA—has been prepared and the first TM will be held in November. This project has several components: a Questionnaire was distributed to interested parties, another component of MODARIA will support the Nuclear Safety Action Plan, as there is foreseen a module for Dose calculation, following accidents (current or past);
- There is no major specific follow-up planned for FASA. There are two projects under the umbrella of the International Decommissioning Network in cooperation with Waste Technology Section. The topics foreseen to be covered are Decommissioning Risk Management and Cost estimation for decommissioning of research reactors;
- A successful workshop for Research Reactor Decommissioning – R2D2 was hosted by Australia in November 2011 and the next will take place in Buffalo, USA in September 2012. Another large event this year will be the workshop and scientific visit to the Grand Junction, USA, in August which is organized under the Regulatory supervision of legacy sites of Uranium production sites.

Finally, Mr Vesterlind called the attention to the International Expert’s Meeting on Decommissioning after Nuclear Accidents, which is an activity under the NSA. This meeting will take place in Vienna in late January 2013 and is organized together with the Waste Technology Section.
W.2 CHAIRMAN’S REMARKS

The Chairman, Mr G. Williams, welcomed all WASSC participants and summarized the main topics to be covered during the WASSC sessions.

He also referred to the good progress being made in the radioactive waste management program and welcomed feedback from the Committee regarding the NUSSC WASSC joint meeting. From Mr Williams’ perspective, he felt it was beneficial to hold a joint meeting and noted that there were differences in the culture of both Committees.

Of major significance in the joint meeting, as noted by Mr Williams, was the approval of DS450, the Safety Requirement on the “Decommissioning of Facilities” for submission to Member States for comments. He noted the importance of this step, in particular for the dissemination of the draft Safety Requirement document for collecting the inputs from experts for subsequent incorporation into this document.

W.3 ADOPTION OF AGENDA FOR THE 33RD WASSC MEETING

The agenda of the WASSC session was adopted without modification. It was noted that there is a need for discussions on how to proceed with the revision of the Safety Guides after the work of the WASSC WG. It was agreed that this topic would be dealt under item W7.1 of the Agenda. The adopted Agenda is attached to this report as Annex I.

W.4 REPORT FROM 32ND MEETING

The meeting approved the WASSC 32nd meeting Report without modification.

W.5 STATUS OF ACTIONS ARISING FROM WASSC 32

Ms G. Siraky, Coordinator of WASSC (WES-NSRW) presented the current status of actions arising from the previous meeting, attached to this report as Annex II. No further questions or issues were raised regarding this item.

W.6 ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE MEETING

Ms G. Siraky informed WASSC members on the administrative arrangements for the meeting. It was noted that the meeting will be paper-free to the extent possible; therefore electronic versions of the presentations made during the session would be posted on the WASSC33 web folder at the end of each day.

W.7 WASTE SAFETY STANDARDS STATUS AND FUTURE STEPS

Ms G. Siraky presented the current status of the Waste Safety Standards and the plan for future related work for the forthcoming meetings. The relevant news in this area was:

The initiation of the work leading to the revision of the Safety Guide on “Remediation Process for Areas Affected by Past Activities and Accidents (WS-G-3.1).

Discussion on the future plans led to the fact that the Safety Guides on Managements systems associated to Waste Management, including its disposal were considered to be merged during next revision, to be performed during 2013 (Reference: Recommendations of WASSC for the List of Safety Guides in the Long Term, WASSC 29 Report, 2010). Due to this reason WASSC members were requested to provide feedback on those documents, to guide the Secretariat in the review/revision process.


**W.7.1 Discussion on strategies for review of Safety Guides in light of the Tepco Fukushima-Daiichi accident**

The starting point of the discussion was the report of the WASSC Working Group meeting held on 27-28 October 2011 which was discussed and agreed by WASSC32 (December 2011). As a result of discussions at both meetings, it was highlighted that the Safety Requirement documents on Waste Safety are robust enough, and that there is no need to revise them in light of the Tepco Fukushima-Daiichi accident.

Regarding the review of Safety Guides, the common understanding was that in the waste safety area, the lessons to be learnt will largely be derived from the remediation activities and management of the large quantities of waste arising after the Tepco Fukushima-Daiichi accident. In addition, the following approach to review/revise the Safety Guide on Storage of Spent Fuel (IAEA-SSG-15) was proposed and agreed:

A preliminary internal review of the SG highlighted some points that might need further discussions in light of the lessons learnt from the accident. The Waste and Environmental Safety Section in the Division of Radiation, Transport and Waste Safety is now organizing a consultancy meeting to address these points and to provide elements to the decision on the need for the revision of SSG-15. This meeting is scheduled for September 2012 and a report on its results will be presented to WASSC34 for discussion and feedback.

From the discussion, the WASSC WG was asked to revisit the Safety Guides with the objective to establish a ranking of their priority for revision. In this regard, the importance of feedback from the WASSC members regarding the stress tests being performed on spent fuel and radioactive waste management facilities was noted.

The importance of collecting the lessons learnt by experts, consultants and WASSC members for the management of large amounts of waste, from remediation and decommissioning activities after severe accidents were also recognized by WASSC members. This collection should not only focus on the Tepco Fukushima-Daiichi accident, but also on other historical situations (i.e. Chernobyl, and related activities in Ukraine and Belarus).
WASSC members agreed on the following:

1. To nominate the WASSC Coordinator as a Point-of-Contact within the Agency to collect relevant information on lessons learnt on waste management, remediation and decommissioning from the Tepco Fukushima-Daiichi accident and other past incidents or accidents, as received from WASSC members.

2. To provide information to the WASSC Coordinator on the lessons learnt from the Tepco Fukushima-Daiichi accident or other past incidents or accidents on:
   - Results of stress tests on spent fuel and radioactive waste management facilities;
   - Management of large amounts of waste;
   - Decommissioning following severe accidents; and
   - Other relevant issues for SGs, such as confidence building.

3. To report to WASSC34 through the Secretariat on the results obtained on point 2 (above).

4. To make the information collated in dedicated web folders available to committee members.

5. To arrange a WASSC WG meeting after WASSC34 and before WASSC35 to analyse the feedback received and suggest priorities for the revision of the waste SGs.

**Action:** WASSC members to provide to WASSC Coordinator information on the lessons learnt from the Tepco Fukushima-Daiichi accident or other past incidents or accidents on results of stress tests on spent fuel and radioactive waste management facilities; management of large amounts of waste; decommissioning following severe accidents; and other relevant issues for SGs, such as confidence building.

### W.8 REVIEW OF DOCUMENT PREPARATION PROFILES (DPPS)

#### W.8.1 DS468 DPP for SG on Remediation process for areas with residual radioactive material

Mr G. Proehl, WES-NSRW, presented the Document Preparation Profile for the revision of the Safety Guide on Remediation Process for areas affected by past activities and accidents, WS-G-3.1(2007). Mr Proehl and Mr J. Rowat are the Technical Officers for the revision of this Safety Guide, and the review committees are WASSC and RASSC, with WASSC being the leading committee.

Mr Proehl gave a detailed presentation, available on the WASSC website, on the objectives of the document, the justification of the revision of the Safety Guide and an overview of the comments received. The main objective of the Safety Guide is to provide guidance on implementing the requirements for the remediation of areas contaminated by past activities and accidents. The relevant Safety Requirement document is the revised Basic Safety Standards (GSR Part 3).

In relation to the justification for the revision of the Safety Guide, the following were highlighted:
• The document on Remediation Process for areas affected by past activities and accidents, WS-G-3.1(2007) were based on the Safety Requirements in the document Remediation of areas contaminated by past activities and accidents, WS-R-3 (2003), now superseded by the GSR Part 3;

• Applicable Safety requirements, GSR Part 1, GSR Part 4 and GSR Part 5 were also revised after the publication of the previous Safety Guide;

• More guidance on policies and strategies for remediation needs to be incorporated;

• The guidance on involvement of interested parties needs to be expanded;

• The experience gained after Tepco’s Fukushima Accident needs to be incorporated.

The main topics to be considered in the revision are:

• Consistency with the new BSS for control of public and occupational exposure in existing exposure situations;

• Providing guidance on the derivation of radiological criteria (reference levels for exposures and for derived activity concentration in environmental media);

• Communicating exposure or risks to the public in existing exposure situations;

• Involvement of stakeholders and to assimilate the findings of ICRP 111, if applicable;

• Dose assessment for exposure scenarios before and after remedial action, and dose assessment for workers who carry out proposed remedial actions;

• Integration of the optimization process in decision making in the remediation process;

• Elaborating the necessity to develop realistic approaches for dose assessment;

• Licensing processes for resulting waste management after remediation;

• A risk based approach to be applied to management of remediation actions in existing exposure situations;

• Addressing protection of the environment;

• Addressing the regulation and management of mixed residues;

• The connection to decommissioning and radioactive waste management;

• Including the relevant lessons learned from the Fukushima Accident;

• Guidance on issues related to the generation of large amounts of waste with relatively low amounts of radionuclides;

• Exploring the possibilities and limitations of clearance of waste generated during the remediation;

• Providing guidance on the prioritization of remedial options; and

• Providing guidance on decision-aiding techniques.
There were comments received from members of the SSC’s from Germany (16), Japan (22), Ukraine (3) and USA (13). From these, 27 were of editorial nature or related to clarifications for improving the text, and were all accepted without reservation. The remaining comments focused on specific issues, which should be addressed while developing the Safety Guide. These include:

- Ensuring consistency with existing documents, BSS, Safety Guides, ICRP documents, other existing documents (i.e. NUREG/CR-7029) and SG’s under development;
- Implications of the remediation to the generation of radioactive waste;
- The inclusion of more introductory material;
- Exploring the re-use and clearance of wastes generated during the remediation;
- Specification of terms to be added: remediation, decontamination and clean-up;
- Expanding discussions on decommissioning and on-site remediation, and on criteria for optimization during remediation and the application of the graded approach; and
- Addressing on- and off site monitoring before and during remediation.

The following should be added to the intended table of contents: Source term and site characterization, monitoring and modelling. It was noted that experiences gained in Chernobyl and in the remediation in Japan should be also added.

There was a suggestion to keep the original title of WS-G-3.1 for the revised document.

During the meeting the following areas were discussed:

- Criteria for optimization, highlighting the need for balancing all factors to be considered in the optimization process;
- The need for the addition of the scope of the document to the DPP
- The need to incorporate experts designated by the SSC’s into the development of the document
- The need to ensure the incorporation of the recent lessons learnt. In this regard, the need to disseminate the information on the International Experts Meeting on Decommissioning and Remediation to be held in Vienna, at the end of January 2013, to ensure the relevant expertise is captured there.

In a later session, the document was open again for discussion regarding the interfaces of Safety with Security. WASSC members suggested the following:

- The document should contain high level information to allow the document to be shared;
- The situations of remediation depend on the material on the site being remediated. These situations may need security measures on the base of the appearance of unexpected material.
The WASSC members agreed that the DPP, with the comments incorporated should be sent to the CSS for approval.

**Action:** The Secretariat to amend the DPP for DS468 and submit it to the CSS for approval.

### W.9 PROGRESS REPORTS ON DOCUMENTS UNDER DEVELOPMENT


Mr K. Moeller, WES-NSRW, briefly informed WASSC members on the status of development of the draft Safety Guide on Monitoring and Surveillance of Radioactive Waste Disposal Facilities. The focus of the presentation was a brief history of the development of the document, its current content, number and type of comments received from Member States and examples of the issues identified while incorporating Member States comments to the draft document.

The next steps of development include the finalization of the current draft and its presentation to WASSC at its 34th meeting (November 2012) for its approval to be forwarded to CSS for endorsement.


Mr G. Proehl (WES-NSRW) presented a status report on the draft Safety Guide “Radiological Environmental Impact Analysis for Facilities and Activities” (DS427). WASSC is the lead committee for its review, with inputs from RASSC and NUSSC. The presentation highlighted the interfaces with other IAEA’s Safety documents, outlined the main topics covered by the document and provided a detailed outline of each section of the document.

The topics discussed after the presentation covered the following:

- The document was held up during the period after the TEPCO Fukushima Daiichi NPP accident, but now it is close to completion;
- The intention is to integrate all the knowledge for planned exposure situations, including normal and potential releases;
- Lessons learnt from the TEPCO Fukushima Daiichi NPP accident should be incorporated to the document on remediation activities and not in this one;
- This document will support licensing and issues to be considered prospectively for protection of public and the environment;
- According to the revised BSS, the radiation impact to environment should be considered in the licensing process in accordance with national requirements;
- This Guide will provide advice on how to assess impact on flora and fauna following ICRP recommendations, for those Member States which require this option. This advice includes a methodology to compare doses calculated to flora and fauna to ‘dose consideration reference levels’ (DCRLs);
The approach developed in this Guide to assess impact to the environment is consistent with the ERICA Project (from EC), taking into account that the underlying thinking of the ICRP and ERICA Projects are the same. The Guide is focused on similar reference plants and animals to those in ERICA Tool. However, the IAEA guidance integrates further the protection of humans and the environment. The DCRLs are consistent with the generic screening value set in ERICA.

Techniques for the assessment of the exposure to humans are presented in the document IAEA-SRS-19. In the current revision of SRS-19, flora and fauna will be also included.


Mr V. Berkovskyy presented a progress report on the Draft Safety Guide on the Regulatory Control of Radioactive Discharges to the Environment (DS442). WASSC members were informed that DS442 is at the advanced stage of development, but the final harmonization between inter-related draft Safety Guides (DS427, DS432 and DS442) may require the additional efforts and time. The WASSC members had an opportunity to ask questions for clarification on the title and on the relation of this document with the other documents under development (DS427 ad DS432). The progress report also provided an overview of the revision of the DS442 supporting document on Generic Models for use in Assessing the Impact of Discharges of Radioactive Substances to the Environment (Safety Report Series No. 19). WASSC members were informed that the first part of the revised safety report includes a substantially extended set of environmental screening coefficients for prospective assessments of the public exposure and it is on the final stage of the development. The quality assurance of the new set of calculations is intended to be finished during the first quarter of 2013.


Mr I. Gusev (RSM-NSRW) introduced the draft Safety Guide on “Radiation Safety and Regulatory Control for Consumer Products”. Mr Gusev’s presentation covered the following topics:

- Definition of consumer products, indicating the major products being sold currently;
- The resources available for the development of the document and its timetable;
- The issues regarding the production and supply of irradiated gemstones;
- Feedback from RASSC received specifically on the use of irradiated gemstones; and
- The changes to the structure of the document suggested by experts.

WASSC members received the following information and questions from the Technical Officer:

- Highly radioactive gemstone waste may be stored at the research reactor site, disposal of which can be complicated by security issues with potentially valuable gemstone material, and property rights of the owner of the material.
- Recycling of consumer products can result in an accumulation of radioactive waste: its disposal can be problematic because of the chemical risk rather than the radiological risk.
What approach should be recommended for such combined waste generated by disassembling of consumer products?

WASSC recommended to the Technical Officer that any activity involving irradiated substances, and consequently with concentrations of radioactive material higher than the clearance levels, has to be subject to regulatory control and carried out in regulated facilities, and the resulting waste has to be treated as any other stream of radioactive waste. This way of processing includes the regulation of other risks, in addition to the regulations regarding the radioactive content of the material. In addition, WASSC noted the need to differentiate the activities where bulk amounts of material are treated as opposed to the ones dealing with small amounts or items of products.

W.10 GENERAL SESSION

W.10.1 Activities in WES in relation to the Nuclear Safety Action Plan

Mr M. Vesterlind (WES-SH, NSRW) reported on the activities within the Waste and Environmental Safety Section in relation to the Nuclear Safety Action Plan (NSAP). These activities are targeted at:

- Review of Safety Standards
- International legal framework (Joint Convention)
- Protection of people and the environment

This contribution to the NSAP entailed modification on the plans for on-going activities and, the new activities are subject to the availability of funds (either funded by regular budget or extra budgetary).

Mr Vesterlind reported on nine specific activities in the following areas:

- Assessment of environmental releases
- Decommissioning and remediation
- Waste management

WASSC members sought clarification on the following topics:

- The relation between the existing activities and the ones added after the agreement of the NSAP and its funding. Mr Vesterlind noted that amongst the on-going activities, some are also relevant to the aftermath of an accident; therefore such activities were modified to be aligned to the NSAP needs. Regarding the funding of the new activities agreed under the NSAP, it was noted they need to be funded through EBFs, as the regular budget is for the normal programme aimed at activities of the interest of all Member States.

- Waste Management in the aftermath of an accident: This is a new task, aimed to generate a generic Safety Case to implement a quick licensing process. The work on this task is already in progress.
Joint Convention and the evaluation of review process: it is constrained because of the availability of funds. This is the reason for using opportunities like today (to discuss JC matters) as there are no specific funds for this activity.

Collection and analyses of feedback from missions on the effectiveness of the Safety Standards: Feedback collection is an ongoing activity, and nowadays the time staff is committed with existing activities of the programme and there is no possibility to go into much detail.

W.10.2 The Role of Optimization in Remediation and Rehabilitation – Report of discussions at RASSC

Mr T. Colgan summarized the discussions held at the last RASSC meeting (RASSC 32) on the topical session “The Role of Optimization in Remediation and Rehabilitation”. This RASSC session lasted two and a half days and consisted of presentations from three high level officers from Member States (France, Belarus and Japan), presentations by eight international organizations (IAEA, FAO, ILO, UNSCEAR, WHO, EC, ICRP and NEA/OECD) on their current and future work related to the Fukushima Accident.

Mr Colgan recounted the key topics that were discussed in these sessions:

- Transition from emergency situation to existing situation;
- Living in contaminated territories;
- Justification and optimization;
- Implementation of protective actions;
- Self-help protective action and stakeholder involvement;
- Applying radiation protection principles;
- Foodstuffs produced on the territories; and
- Involvement and regulating the activities of volunteers.

Mr Colgan also discussed in detail, the implications of the discussion of the current Safety Requirement documents: GS-R-2 and GSR-Part 3. Mr Colgan noted that GS-R-2 is now under revision, and that there appears to be no serious gaps in requirements and that the transition to an existing exposure situation is an important issue. Regarding GSR-Part 3, he noted that the current situation does not indicate the necessity of a review. In relation to the Safety Guides related to BSS, Mr Colgan noted the implications regarding the following topics: Transition to an existing exposure situation; Emergency Workers; Volunteers; Dose Assessment; Communicating with the public; Dose limits and reference levels and Control of foodstuff.

One of the main conclusions of RASSC regarding this situation was that radiation protection should help the people in such situations and not hinder their lives.

WASSC committee members thanked the contribution of RASSC to the work of WASSC as recommended by the WG of WASSC at its meeting in October 2011 (included into the WASSC 32 report).
WASSC members made the following suggestions and observations:

- **Communication with the public:** The Regulatory Body (RB) should establish a Communication programme with the public. It should be differentiated from the consultation with the public while making a regulatory decision on licensing of activities. The recommended communication programme should cover the communication of their activities and for the broad understanding of nuclear activities. This last activity is very important to be set by a RB as soon as possible, and always before any accident. The objective of this activity should be to establish a strong relationship between the RB and the public. This is mainly because after an accident, in many cases, the government is no longer trusted, and therefore, the information provided by the press often takes the role of the information to be provided by the RB. In the case of an accident, it is very important to have reliable information given to the people. And this role should be performed by the RB. If the relationship between the RB and the public is well established in advance, the RB will be trusted if an accident should occur. With this relationship in place, the RB can help the people, if an accident occurs, to make their own choices.

- **Risk communication:** It is widely recognized that risk communication does not work, as the risk terminology is not understood by the general public. Individuals tend to use more subjective criteria in reaching decisions, such as the perceived health risks, the desire to protect their children and the value of continuing to live in the same community.

WASSC members then chose to discuss the importance of communication and consultation with the public, and confidence building for the approval by the society of the waste disposal.

**W.10.3 Feedback on the stress-test conducted for the CLAB facility**

Mr Hedberg (WASSC member from Sweden) informed about the stress-test conducted for the Central Interim Storage for Spent Fuel (CLAB). Although the formal stress tests involved only nuclear power reactors, it was decided at the national level that stress tests should be performed also for CLAB. The reports from the licensee, the Swedish Nuclear Fuel and Waste Management Co (SKB), are currently under review by the Swedish Radiation Safety Authority and the preliminary conclusions are yet to be confirmed.

This facility is constructed underground and has a total of eight pools dedicated to Spent Fuel Storage, and has completed 66 % of its capacity. The topics covered by the presentation were the following:

- Overview and specific features of the facility. It was noted that it is not possible to shut-down this facility as it needs to continue being operated, and this is the reason of counting with several back-up systems;

- Results of the analysis for: loss of cooling function, earthquake, severe accidents, loss of off-site power and station black-out; flooding; extreme weather;

- Identification of areas of improvements resulting from the analysis indicated above; and

- Preliminary conclusions

WASSC members sought clarification on the following topics:

- Scenario for the spent fuel elevator being stuck and the cooling of the cask;
- State of the accesses after an earthquake;
- Potential radiological accident; consequences of a potential abandonment;
- Presence of multiple facilities at the same site;
- Generation of gases and its release.

Mr Hedberg’s personal conclusions from the stress tests conducted on the CLAB facility were:

- CLAB is, in a general sense, a robust facility with appropriate safety margins as regards the scenarios addressed in the stressed tests;
- Due to the character of the facility, any incident or accident is likely to develop slowly, thereby allowing for timely and structured intervention;
- The stress test exercise has identified additional possibilities to improve the robustness of the facility.

WASSC members agreed with Mr Hedberg on the importance to implement the improvements resulting from the stress test carried out for the CLAB.

W.10.4 Feedback from WATEC and WTS

Ms I. Mele (WTS-NEFW) presented the last meeting report of WATEC (the International Waste Technical Committee) held in March 2012. Ms Mele informed that WATEC had recently changed membership. Its members are appointed by the DDG of Nuclear Energy. The number of members is approximately 20, with several observers from international organizations.

Ms Mele explained the working methods of WATEC and reported the main results from the meeting on issues and trends in RWM from different type of Member States (with large nuclear programmes, with small-to-medium size programmes and for programmes with only nuclear applications). The meeting also had topical sessions on the following:

- Waste Management aspects in the aftermath of severe nuclear/radiological accident
- Managing long-term liabilities related to RWM
- Management of disused sealed radioactive sources

WASSC members sought clarification on the following topics:

- Openness of WATEC to public;
- Effectiveness of networks;
- Membership of DISPONET – it is not only for operators as it is also relevant for Regulators (important). Ms Mele encouraged participation of regulators and operators.
- Relevance of the IAEA- SS’s for discussion at meeting: SS are always behind any discussion. WATEC members are using SS’s but they do not discuss them at the meetings.
It was noted by WASSC members that for collection of information it is good to work together as WASSC has equivalent tasks agreed.

**W.10.5 Feedback on a CSM on Human action and intrusion in disposal facilities**

Ms.Y. Kumano (WES-NSRW) introduced the topic of human action and intrusion in disposal facilities. Ms. Kumano’s presentation focused on the definition of the problem, on the development of an initial position paper and delineated the topical areas for the work of a possible WG to be set after holding a Technical Meeting to discuss human intrusion and actions, to be held in Vienna on 24-28 September 2012.

Ms. Kumano highlighted that the outcomes expected from this Technical Meeting would be used as input for developing an IAEA safety document on methodologies for the development of inadvertent human action and human intrusion scenarios and implementing them to Safety Cases.

WASSC members’ discussions after this presentation touched on the following:

- Scope of the work of the possible WG for better use of the resources: WASSC recommended covering all types of disposal, including near-surface disposal (and uranium mining waste disposal) and geological disposal, and to ensure that it covers an appropriate period of performance compliance for control and oversight during institutional control and afterwards;

- The need for a methodology to derive scenarios of human intrusion and actions. This topic arising from IRRS missions where it was pointed out that the definition of scenarios was not clear. Several caveats were raised by WASSC members, particularly related to priorities (near-surface disposal or geological disposal), an appropriate period of surveillance of performance, and other phenomena to be also considered in the process of disturbing the surface, like glaciation, societal assumptions for long term.

WASSC members requested the position paper developed for this topic to be made available to committee members. In addition, the committee members requested that the Note Verbale calling for the Technical meeting on this subject be available to committee members.

*Action:* The Secretariat to distribute to WASSC members the Note Verbale calling for nominations to attend the Technical Meeting to Discuss Human Intrusion and Future Human Actions in relation to Disposal of Radioactive Waste, to be held in Vienna, Austria, from 24 to 28 September 2012 September and the initial position paper on “Human Action and Intrusion in Disposal Facilities” as soon as possible.

**W.10.6 Feedback on a CSM on a tool for peer review in Waste Management**

Mr. G. Bruno presented the status of development of a tool to be used for peer review in Waste Management. The presentation covered the following topics: the role of peer reviews, services offered to IAEA’s Member States, reviews performed in the recent years, the need to develop a structured service to offer to the Member States, current status of the tool and basis for development of the questionnaires.

WASSC members sought clarification on the following topics:

- Availability of the questionnaires: A new draft is being refined and can be made available for information. The target users are experts performing review missions, but of course, it is also useful for self-assessment;
- Relation of the tool developed with the existing questionnaire on Radioactive Waste Management for IRRS. The questionnaire on RWM for IRRS includes the predisposal part of the questionnaire, but the tool now developed would cover the whole RWM programme: predisposal and disposal.

W.11 FEEDBACK FOR WASSC MEMBERS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF IAEA SAFETY STANDARDS

Mr Trifunovic (WASSC representative of Croatia) reported on the latest developments in the WM area in Croatia. In particular, he stated that the Waste Management infrastructure in Croatia is under development, being the main generators the medical, industry and research fields. The level of maturity of the waste management programme is not complete. Now, they are thinking more about its sustainability. The main problems of the country in relation to the DSS management, particularly where it concerns, to provide to decision-makers an idea of the time when would be needed to implement the solutions for its disposal. The need for a structured process was identified, and it was found that this is not fully elaborated on in the waste Safety Standards.

Mr Camper (WASSC representative of USA) reported on the latest activities being performed in USA in relation to the IAEA’s Safety Standards. In particular, the regulations of the USA are undergoing a review to identify any gaps in relation to the international standards on a case-by-case basis, to achieve harmonization. There is a panel of stakeholders, set for the BSS revision, coordinated by the NRC and composed of several Federal agencies with responsibilities in the field of radiation protection or protection of public health and safety. Efforts are underway to improve stakeholder awareness and involvement in preparing US Government comments on IAEA Safety Standards under development or revision. The US Nuclear Regulatory Commission is interested in improving the harmonization of its regulations with the IAEA Safety Standards.

Mr Williams (WASSC representative from Australia and Chair of WASSC) emphasized the importance of participation of stakeholders and its relation to waste matters as was indicated earlier in this WASSC meeting. Australia has started with the involvement of stakeholders for federal waste safety standards in development; they are posted on the ARPANSA web site, together with the draft Agency standards, in order to collect wider feedback from interested parties. The objective is to develop confidence, through openness and transparency, while also highlighting the work done.

Mr Howard (WASSC representative from Canada) noted that an IRRS mission was received by Canada in 2009, and a follow-up mission, last year. During those missions the Regulatory Framework for radioactive waste management was reviewed. Seven years of work on the programme was required to develop the Regulatory Framework. In particular, one of its objective was to ensure that the Safety Standards of the Agency be incorporated into Canada’s regulations (or be made compatible). Canada is also posting the Safety Standard’s on the web site for comment. There is a problem in Canada, thus being, as a bilingual country, the information has to be in both the English and French language. In addition, guidance is being provided to operators on how to comply with regulations.

Mr Hedberg (WASSC representative from Sweden) reported that Sweden had hosted an IRRS mission in February 2012. One of the main conclusions was that a strategy should be developed to assure that Sweden’s regulatory framework (legislation, regulations and guides) is consistent with IAEA Safety Standards. The report is publicly available at the SSM web page.

Mr Abdel-Geleel (WASSC representative from Egypt) reported that Egypt is in the position to establish a Safety Requirement, compatible with IAEA-GSR-Part5. It covers the basic safety requirements applicable to all types of waste and facilities. It is foreseen to be a nation-wide application. It was developed as a general Safety Regulation and it is ready to be sent for approval.
Mr Cheong (WASSC representative from the Rep of Korea) informed on the implementation of IAEA Safety Standards: its use is in both direct and indirect way and as reflected in the Regulations. The use of IAEA’s Safety Standards was encouraged by IRRS Mission in 2011. Now, they are preparing the follow-up mission. It is a general practice to review the national regulations by reference to the IAEA SS’s. They will be used for next IRRS Mission and it is considered very valuable to safety. General practice in rule-making in Korea is to compare them with IAEA SS’s and with practices in other Member States on how they implement the IAEA SS’s. Mr Cheong suggested elaborating a technical document on how each Member State uses IAEA SS’s to optimize use of resources.

**Action:** The Secretariat and the Chair of WASSC to draft a listing of available information on how the Member States apply the Safety Standards.

### W.12 REPORTS FROM INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

#### W.12.1 Recent EU activities on spent fuel and radioactive waste management

Ms C. Necheva (EC) and Ms V. Rangelova (EC) reported on the recent European Union activities regarding spent fuel and radioactive waste management, with emphasis on the implementation of the EU directive, on the Conference Euradwaste’13 (to be held in October 2013), and on the results of the stress tests performed in all EU members for NPP’s.

1. Facilitating the implementation of the **Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom** establishing a Community framework for the responsible and safe management of spent fuel and radioactive waste: The key activities are:
   - a transposition seminar, and a workshop on drafting and implementing national programmes organized by the EC;
   - guidance on format for preparing NR’s are expected by the end of this year, and discussions on peer review and self-assessment guidance are being carried out, under development by ENSREG. In respect to the peer reviews cooperation between the IAEA and EU is expected.

   *SF and RW Management systems* to be established at national level, and not only at the level of the operator. A paper is being developed to implement the directive on this topic (working document) by ENSREG.

2. **Euradwaste ’13**, to be held from 14 to 18 October 2013, in Lithuania, and will be in parallel to the FISA conference.

3. **EU stress tests in EU:** The methodology and specification of Stress tests and peer review were developed by WENRA and approved by ENSREG. Three main topics were identified to be addressed by stress tests: natural hazards, loss of safety systems and severe accident management. The process was as follows: the operators generated the report, the National Regulators revised it and generated the final National Report which was published and subject to peer review by all countries involved in the stress tests. There were two public events: before and after the Peer Review. The Peer Review was managed by the Peer Review Board. The Peer Review finished with a report, with the conclusion and recommendations at the EU level. This report was complemented by 17 country reports which summarized the highlights from the peer review for each individual country.

4. The exercise was conducted by 17 countries. The general conclusion addressed the need to:
a. Increase the protection against extreme hazards

b. Reinforce Periodic Safety Reviews, at least once in ten years, and as frequent as necessary

c. Improve containment capabilities

d. Urgent implementation of accident management measures

WASSC members sought clarification on several topics as follows:

- **Participants in the exercise and plans for the future:** All EU members with nuclear power plants functioning, and Lithuania, Ukraine and Switzerland. Follow-up actions were agreed by ENSREG in July 2012. An Action plan was agreed to follow the recommendations implementation. An action plan at national level is to be developed by the end of 2012. Next year a meeting will be held to monitor the status of the Action Plan in Member States.

- **Plans to expand stress test to other nuclear installations** in addition to nuclear power plants: stress tests on NI’s have been performed in many countries, however not in the scope of the EU stress test exercise. As concerns future, more importance is put on improved emergency preparedness, as need better coordination.

- **Management of the recommendations of the Oversight Board:** to be given to each Regulatory Body with the aim to discuss later how it is implemented. The recommendations are not targeted to legislation and regulations.

- **Availability of reports:** All national reports, as well as the peer review reports are available on the ENSREG the public web site.

- **Type of events to be considered:** Now, only extreme external events are considered in light of the Fukushima accident. However, loss of safety functions was considered irrespectively of the reason which can cause it.

### W.12.2 Recent ENISS Activities

Mr P. Nocture (observer of WASSC representing ENISS - European Nuclear Installations Safety Standards, an organization within the FORATOM) made an institutional presentation covering the following topics: their main activities, membership, objectives, organization, relations with other organizations, like WENRA, areas of interest of ENISS on the review of Safety Standards of the IAEA, contribution of ENISS to the development of Safety Standards on Waste and decommissioning Safety and activities after the TEPCO Fukushima Daiichi accident.

### W.13 SPESS AND STEP-BY-STEP MANUAL: FAMILIARIZATION

Mr Delattre presented the history and status of the IAEAs Safety Standards and provided WASSC members with updated information on the review and approval process.

WASSC members sought clarification on the updates foreseen for SPESS and its Step-by-Step application manual, as the current version dates from March 2011, and the view of the importance of having stable procedures was expressed. In this regard, it was noted that there is a need to update both documents with the interface of SSC’s with the NSGC (Nuclear Security Guidance Committee just
established) and the interface Group, the update on the role of the Chairs and the specific process for review and approval by addenda to several safety standards. These updates should be issued shortly as the work of the NSGC just is starting and the Interface Group is meeting in September.

W.14 CONCLUSIONS OF THE SESSION

Mr Williams made his concluding remarks recognizing the importance of the work planned to complete the review of the Waste Safety Standards development process and the update of the Safety Guides according to the lessons learnt by the TFA. Mr Williams concluded by thanking WASSC members for their active participation in the meeting and wishing all WASSC members a safe trip back home.

W.15 CLOSURE OF WASSC SESSION

Mr M Vesterlind closed the meeting by thanking all participants for their inputs and active interventions and highlighted the important work ahead.

W.16 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24th TRANSSC</td>
<td>16-20 July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st CSS meeting</td>
<td>9-11 October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th TRANSSC</td>
<td>29 October - 2 November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34th NUSSC</td>
<td>19-23 November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33rd RASSC</td>
<td>26-30 November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34th WASSC</td>
<td>26-30 November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35th WASSC</td>
<td>1-5 July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36th WASSC</td>
<td>18-22 November 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NUSSC and WASSC Joint Session

Monday, 2 July 2012, at 2.00 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. NUSSC/WASSC JOINT SESSION – GENERAL ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Opening of Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J. Lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr P-S. Hahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chairmen’s Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr F. Feron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr G. Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adoption of agenda for the Joint Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUSSC &amp; WASSC Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Administrative arrangements for the meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms G. Siraky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr M. Svab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interaction with other Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1. Report from the previous meetings of the 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs (January &amp; March 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr F. Feron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr G. Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2. a) Report of the 31st CSS Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Progress Report on the Review of Safety Standards. CSS Chair’s letter to IAEA DG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr D. Delattre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Presentation on the Status of the Fukushima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daiichi NPP’s, including regulatory and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decommissioning/remediation matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr S. Maki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr K. Oue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Implementation of the IAEA Action Plan on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Safety (including information on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Experts Meeting, March 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr L. Bevington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Nuclear Security Committee (current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr I. Barraclough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on the Joint Convention Review Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9. and 2nd CNS Extraordinary Meeting preparation  
  
  For information  
  Ms G. Siraky  
  Mr M. Svab  

Tuesday, 3 July 2012, at 9:00 a.m.

2. NUSS/WASSC JOINT SESSION – REVIEW OF DRAFT SAFETY STANDARDS

2.1 DS407 SG on Criticality Safety for Facilities and Activities handling Fissile material  
  
  For approval for submission to CSS  
  Mr G. Jones  

2.2 DS446 SG on Commissioning for Nuclear Power Plants  
  
  For approval for submission to CSS  
  Mr Y. Martynenko  

2.3 DS450 SR on Safe decommissioning of facilities  
  
  For approval for submission to MSs  
  Ms M. Wong  

3. NUSSC/WASSC JOINT SESSION – REVIEW OF DOCUMENT PREPARATION PROFILES (DPPs)

3.1 DS460 DPP for a SG on Communication and Consultation with Interested Parties  
  
  For approval for submission to CSS  
  Mr J.-R. Jubin  

3.2 DS462 Document Outline (DPP) Revision through addenda of GSR Part1, NS-R-3, SSR-2/1, SSR-2/2 and GSR Part 4  
  
  For approval for submission to CSS  
  Mr D. Delattre  

4. NUSSC/WASSC JOINT SESSION – MISCELLANEOUS

4.1 Draft Code of Conduct on the Transboundary Movement of Radioactive Material Inadvertently Incorporated into Scrap Metal and Semi-Finished Products of the Metal Recycling Industries  
  
  For information  
  Mr E. Reber  

4.2 Progress report on the Revision of the Safety Glossary  
  
  For information  
  Mr D. Delves  

5 NUSSC/WASSC JOINT SESSION – CONCLUSIONS – CLOSURE

Mr F. Feron  
Mr G. Williams
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**4-5 July 2012, Vienna**

**Press Briefing Room (M Building)**

## FINAL AGENDA

### 9:00 – Wednesday, 4 July 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W.1.</th>
<th>OPENING OF WASSC MEETING</th>
<th>M. Vesterlind (SH-WES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W.2.</td>
<td>Chairman’s remarks</td>
<td>Mr G. Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.3.</td>
<td>Adoption of agenda for the WASSC Meeting</td>
<td>For approval Mr G. Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.4.</td>
<td>Report from 32nd meeting</td>
<td>For approval Ms G. Siraky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.5.</td>
<td>Status of actions arising from WASSC32</td>
<td>For information Ms G. Siraky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.6.</td>
<td>Administrative arrangements for the meeting</td>
<td>For information Ms G. Siraky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.7.</td>
<td>Waste Safety Standards status and future steps</td>
<td>For information Ms G. Siraky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.7.1</td>
<td>Discussion on strategies for review of Safety Guides in light of Fukushima accident</td>
<td>For discussion Mr G. Williams &amp; WASSC Members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### W.8. REVIEW OF DOCUMENT PREPARATION PROFILES (DPPS)

| W.8.1 | DS 468 | DPP for a SG on Remediation process for areas with residual radioactive material | For approval for submission to CSS Mr G. Proehl |

### W.9. PROGRESS REPORTS ON DOCUMENTS UNDER DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W9.2</td>
<td>DS427</td>
<td>Draft Safety Guide on “Radiological Environmental Impact Analysis for Facilities and Activities”</td>
<td>For information Mr G. Proehl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W9.3</td>
<td>DS442</td>
<td>Draft Safety Guide “Regulatory Control of Radioactive Discharges to the Environment” and the revision of the Safety Report Series No 19</td>
<td>For information Mr V Berkovskyy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W9.4</td>
<td>DS458</td>
<td>Draft Safety Guide on &quot; Radiation Safety and Regulatory Control for Consumer Products&quot;</td>
<td>For information Mr I. Gusev</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### W.10. GENERAL SESSION

| W.10.1 | Activities in WES in relation to the Nuclear Safety Action Plan | For information M. Vesterlind |
W.10.2  The Role of Optimization in Remediation and Rehabilitation – report of discussions at RASSC
For information  Mr T. Colgan

W.10.3  Feedback on the stress-test conducted for the CLAB facility
For information  Mr B. Hedberg

W.10.4  Feedback from WATEC and WTS
For information  Ms I. Mele

W.10.5  Feedback on a CSM on Human action and intrusion in disposal facilities
Ms Y. Kumano

W.10.6  Feedback on a CSM on a tool for peer review in Waste Management
For information  Mr G. Bruno

9:00 – Thursday, 5 July 2012

W.11.  Feedback from WASSC members on implementation of IAEA Safety Standards
For information  WASSC Members

W.12.  Reports from International Organizations
W12.1  Recent EU activities on spent fuel and radioactive waste management
For information  Ms C. Necheva Ms V. Rangelova

W12.2  Recent ENISS activities
For information  P. Nocture

For information  Mr D. Delattre

W.14.  Conclusions of the session
For information  Mr G. Williams

W.15.  Closure of WASSC meeting
For information  Mr M. Vesterlind

W.16.  Dates of future meetings

24th TRANSSC  16-20 July 2012
31st CSS meeting  9-11 October 2012
24th TRANSSC  29 October - 2 November 2012
33rd RASSC  26-30 November 2012
34th WASSC  26-30 November 2012
34th NUSSC  19-23 November 2012
35th WASSC  1-5 July 2013
36th WASSC  18-22 November 2013
# ANNEX II: ACTIONS FOLLOWING 32\textsuperscript{ND} WASSC/31\textsuperscript{ST} RASSC MEETINGS

## JOINT WASSC/RASSC SESSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM AG</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| RW6.1   | DPP for DS421 to be sent to CSS for approval | Implemented  
DPP approved by CSS31 |
| RW6.2   | DPP for DS458 to be sent to CSS for approval, with incorporation of references to material transferred from DS401 | Implemented  
DPP approved by CSS31 |
| RW6.3   | DPP for DS459 to be sent to CSS for approval | Implemented  
DPP approved by CSS31 |
| RW7.1   | DS421 to be sent to MS for comment after CSS approved the DPP | Implemented  
DS submitted to MS for comments.  
Closing date for comments by MS: 13 August 2012 |
| RW7.2   | DS429 to be sent to CSS for endorsement | Implemented  
DS endorsed by CSS31 |
| RW7.3   | DS439 to be sent to MS for comments. | DS submitted to MS for comments.  
Closing date for comments by MS: 29 May 2012 |
| RW7.4   | DS401 to be redrafted in line with the decision taken at the meeting after the recommendation of the ad-hoc WG and sent to MS for comments | DS submitted to MS for comments.  
Closing date for comments by MS: 7 June 2012 |
| RW9.1   | WASSC members to provide comments on the list of Lessons Learnt on OAR’s, in the document named “2- First review of the Safety Standards by the Secretariat” at this site: [http://www-ns.iaea.org/committees/comments/default.asp?fd=1114](http://www-ns.iaea.org/committees/comments/default.asp?fd=1114)  
Orientation on the commenting can be found in the | Implemented  
Document submitted to CSS for comments |
same page in this file: “0- message to the Safety Standards Committees”


**WASSC SESSIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM AG</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W8.1</td>
<td>DS433 to be sent to MS for comments</td>
<td>DS submitted to MS for comments. Closing date for comments by MS: 3 August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W8.2</td>
<td>DS441 to be sent to MS for comments</td>
<td>DS submitted to MS for comments. Closing date for comments by MS: 30 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W8.3</td>
<td>Glossary matters related to SS development: to provide a proposal at WASSC33 for the revision of the Glossary, with the aim to have electronic format and allowing control of versions</td>
<td>Revised version of the Safety Glossary (2013 edition) in advanced state. Progress Report to be presented at WASSC33.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>