



INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

Second Meeting of the International Project

“Use of Safety Assessment Results in Planning and Implementation of Decommissioning of Facilities Using Radioactive Material (FaSa)”

MEETING REPORT

**WORKING GROUP ON IMPLEMENTATION OF
SAFETY ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

07 – 11 December 2009

**Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety
D-53175 Bonn, Robert-Schuman-Platz 3, Germany**

Mark Pennington (UK)
Chairman, Implementation of Safety Assessment Results
Working Group

December 2009

CONTENTS

- 1. Meeting of the Implementation Working Group**
 - 1.1. Content and structure of the draft Chapter 4 of the FaSa report**
 - 1.2. Improvement of the chapter 4 on decommissioning conduct**
 - 1.3. Interfaces with WG on conduct and review**
 - 1.4. Work implementation**

- 2. Distribution**

Appendix A - List of Meeting Participants.

Appendix B - Meeting Agenda.

Appendix C - Meeting Participants Expectations of the Working Group.

Appendix D – Proposed Table of contents for Chapter 6.

1. Meeting of the Decommissioning Conduct Working Group

1.1. Objectives of the meeting

The Implementation was held from 7th to 11th September 2009 in Bonn (Germany).

The purpose of this working group meeting was to:

- Review the outcome of chapter 6 of the FaSa Draft Report.
- Identify contributors to develop the draft chapter 6.
- Define a table of contents
- Propose a work plan for further development.

The meeting was chaired by M. Pennington (UK).

A list of the participants of this meeting is enclosed in Appendix A.

The agenda of the meeting is enclosed in Appendix B.

The meeting participants expectations are detailed in Appendix C.

1.2. Improvement of the chapter 6 on implementation

The proposed structure of the Chapter 6 is as follow:

1. Agree Inputs from Conduct Working group.
2. Illustrate information flow – utilising the WG flowchart.
3. Discuss safe operating envelope.
4. Managerial considerations.
5. Engineering considerations.
6. Environmental assessment and considerations.
7. Conventional Safety assessment and considerations.
8. Member state examples.
9. Identify key principles & good practice.
10. Recommendations.
11. Interfaces.
12. Interactions with the Review Working Group.

The examples of phased approach have been reviewed. Information will be provided by participants in accordance with the flow diagram introduce at the beginning of the chapter 6.

Further works:

Contributions to be presented:

- UK (Dounreay) – Audrey Halle.

- France – Joel Bouffier.
- Bulgaria – Elka Anastasova.
- Italy – Alvio Bassanelli.
- Germany (Mining) – Erik Srub and Stefan Thierfeldt.
- Korea – Kwan-Seong Jeong.
- Japan – Yukihiro Iguchi.
- Armenia – Karine Ghazaryan.

1.3. Interfaces with WG on planning

Interface with WG on conduct

Recommendations concerning the update of the key deliverables identified by the WG on conduct have to be checked.

1.4. Work implementation

The following work implementation process has been agreed:

- **Send the minutes of the meeting and the detailed table of content of the chapter - to all the participants of the WG on implementation and the WG leaders before the mid of Jan 2010, (*Action WG leader*).**
- **Section 1 of the draft chapter to be drafted – to the WG leader before mid February 2010, (*Action Patrice Francois*).**
- **Discuss chapter structure with the Review WG by the end of February 2010, (*Action WG leader*).**
- **Contribution by participants of the WG on decommissioning implementation to the WG leader before end of March 2010, (*Action all WG participants of the Implementation WG*).**
- **Issue a new draft of chapter 6, including section 1 and WG participants contributions before end of April 2010, (*Action WG leader*).**
- **Organise two joint WG meeting with the Fuel Fabrication facility test case during early/mid June and early October 2010, (*Action WG leader*).**

2. Distribution

J. Kaulard, Chairman, FaSa Project

A. Bassanelli, NPP Test Case Working Group Chair

K. Lauridsen, Research Reactor Test Case Working Group Chair

A. Halle, Fuel Fabrication Test Case Working Group Chair

A. Cadden, Mining and Milling Test Case Working Group Chair

P. Manson, Decommissioning Planning Working Group Chair

P. François, Decommissioning Conduct Working Group Chair

A. Hart and O. Lareynie, Termination Working Group Chair

N. Orlando, Review Working Group Chair

V. Ljubenov, IAEA

All Implementation WG meeting participants.

Appendix A – List of Meeting Participants.

M. Pennington	UK
P. François	France
A. Halle	UK
S. Thierfeldt	Germany
F. Van Gemert	Netherland
J. Bouffier	France
E. Anastasova	Bulgaria
S. Miller	Canada
E. Strub	Germany
Y. Iguchi	Japan
K.S. Jeong	Korea
K. Ghazaryan	Armenia
A. Dietzold	UK
A. Cadden	UK
P. Auffray	France
Ivana Davidova	Czech Republic
A. Bassanelli	Italy
Y.D. Zhou	China
V. Ljubenov	IAEA

Appendix B – Meeting Agenda.



International Atomic Energy Agency

Second Meeting of the International Project

“Use of Safety Assessment Results in Planning and Implementation of Decommissioning of Facilities Using Radioactive Material (FaSa)”

07 – 11 December 2009

Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety
D-53175 Bonn, Robert-Schuman-Platz 3, Germany

Working Group on Implementation of Safety Assessment Results

TENTATIVE AGENDA

(dated 28th November 2009)

Wednesday 9th December 2009

9.00-10.30	1. Implementation of Safety Assessment Results WG Session No. 1 – Introduction	
	1.1 Introductions.	M. Pennington (UK)
	1.2 Approval of agenda.	M. Pennington (UK)
	1.3 Expectations of WG participants.	All
	1.4 Short presentation on the WG, including:	M. Pennington (UK)
	• Terms of Reference.	
	• Scope.	
	• Objectives.	
10:30-11:00	<i>Coffee break</i>	

11:00-12:45	2. Implementation of Safety Assessment Results WG Session No. 2 – Feedback and review	
	2.1 Short presentation on the findings from the Decommissioning Conduct Working Group.	P. François (France)
	2.2 Experience feedback on Safety Assessment Implementation Results from member states.	M. Pennington (UK)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English experience feedback (Sellafield Ltd). • WG participants experience feedback. 	All
	2.3 Review of the Report as it is now, of what IAEA is expecting as the outcome of this meeting: work on the report, but mainly discuss whether this Report contains the key elements.	M. Pennington (UK) All
12.45-13:45	<i>Lunch break</i>	
13.45-15.15	3. Implementation of Safety Assessment Results WG Session No. 3 - Work on Report	
	3.1 Identification of the key areas that need to be improved, including:	M. Pennington (UK) All
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main missing elements. • Examples to be added to transform the report from a “working paper” to a “safety report” – for further consideration in the next revision of this working paper in 2010. 	
15:15-15:45	<i>Coffee break</i>	
15:45-17:15	4. Implementation of Safety Assessment Results WG Session No. 4 - Work on Report	
	4.1 Further development of the document, including examples to be added.	All
	4.2 Draft a detailed work plan for the working group, including meeting dates, actions and their respective owners.	M. Pennington (UK)

Appendix C - Meeting Participants Expectations of the Working Group.



International Atomic Energy Agency

Second Meeting of the International Project

“Use of Safety Assessment Results in Planning and Implementation of Decommissioning of Facilities Using Radioactive Material (FaSa)”

07 – 11 December 2009

Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety
D-53175 Bonn, Robert-Schuman-Platz 3, Germany

Working Group on Implementation of Safety assessment results

PARTICIPANTS EXPECTATIONS

This WG will take the detailed safety assessment from the Decommissioning Conduct WG, highlight the limits and conditions and demonstrate the information flow through to the working documentation.

- Collect Member states experience:
 - Mining/Milling examples required.
 - Common agreement in accordance to the IAEA guidance.
 - Highlight “good practice.”
 - Define a series of “principals.”
 - Provide recommendations.

- Working Documentation:
 - Lessons Learned – feedback to the safety assessment.
 - Abnormal arrangements.
 - Method Statements/Operator Instructions.
 - How do you ensure compliance to working documentation.

- Include the following within the chapter:
 - Safe Working envelope.
 - Management systems.
 - Training requirements.
 - Decommissioning techniques.
 - Management systems.

- Contractors/Specialists.
 - Human Factors/Performance.
- Environmental limits and conditions.
 - Decommissioning techniques – decontamination.
- Conventional Safety.
- SSC Management.
 - Aging Management.
 - Obsolescence.

Appendix D – Proposed Table of contents for Chapter 6.

13. Agree Inputs from Conduct Working group.
14. Illustrate information flow – utilising the WG flowchart.
 - Working Documentation:
 - i. Lessons Learned – feedback to the safety assessment.
 - ii. Abnormal/Emergency arrangements.
 - iii. Method Statements/Operator Instructions.
 - iv. How do you ensure compliance to working documentation.
 - Review the implementation of Safety Assessment results down to the “workpackage” level, including “work permits.”
15. Discuss safe operating envelope.
 - Progressive implementation of Safety Assessment results.
 - Control of Phase and workpackages.
16. Managerial considerations.
 - Training requirements.
 - i. Decommissioning techniques.
 - ii. Management systems.
 - iii. Contractors/Specialists.
 - iv. Human Factors/Performance.
17. Engineering considerations.
 - SSC Management.
 - i. Application.
 - ii. Aging Management.
 - iii. Obsolescence.
 - iv. Temporary SSC;s
 - v. Maintenance and Operational (parameter and trending)
18. Environmental assessment and considerations.
19. Conventional Safety assessment and considerations.
20. Member state examples.
 - UK (Dounreay) – Audrey Halle.
 - France – Joel Bouffier.
 - Bulgaria – Elka Anastasova.
 - Italy – Alvio Bassanelli.
 - Germany (Mining) – Erik Srub and Stefan Thierfeldt.
 - Korea – Kwan-Seong Jeong.
 - Japan – Yukihiro Iguchi.
 - Armenia – Karine Ghazaryan.

21. Identify key principles & good practice.

- IAEA – existing guidance.
- Test cases.

22. Recommendations.

- Member States experiences.
- Test cases.

23. Interfaces.

- Infrastructure.
- On both single and multi facility sites.

24. Interactions with the Review Working Group.

- Review the implementation of Safety Assessment results down to the “workpackage” level, including “work permits.”