

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

# Research reactor test case working group

# **MEETING REPORT**

10 December 2009, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, Bonn, Germany

(7 January 2010)

## **CONTENTS**

1	Introduction	. 3
	Objectives of the meeting	
	Work Performed	
4	Outcomes	. 3
	Work plan	
	Next meeting	
7	Distribution	. 5

# Appendices

Appendix A List of participants in the meeting

Appendix B Agenda

#### 1 Introduction

This was the third meeting of the Research Reactor Test Case Working Group. It was held as part of the second main meeting of the FaSa project. There were 10 participants from 9 countries in the meeting, cf. the list of participants in Appendix A to the present meeting report.

### 2 Objectives of the meeting

The primary objective of this meeting was to discuss and edit the draft test case report that had been sent to the participants in November, and to establish if the structure and contents were in accordance with the "DeSa methodology" in order to serve as an illustration of the findings in FaSa.

#### 3 Work Performed

The structure of the report was discussed, and it was agreed to move the description of the facility forward to become a new chapter 2.

Chapters 1-3 of the report were gone through and necessary changes and amendments were identified and in some cases implemented.

The term "family of works" was discussed somewhat because it was unfamiliar (sic!) to the non-French participants. Joël Bouffier underlined that the term is **not** synonymous with "work phase", because the temporal performance of different families may overlap. Potential terms to replace "family of works" were proposed, such as "work package" or "group of works". "Work package" seems to be a good replacement and will be implemented if no counterarguments are forwarded within the next two months. Furthermore, some other terms that are particular for the French regulatory regime were proposed to be replaced with more neutral terms; for instance, the term "decree" was suggested to be replaced with "permit".

Editing of parts of chapter 3 and chapter 4 and 5 was agreed to be done as homework by a few participants, as detailed in the work plan below.

Possible ways to demonstrate the effects of the changed method of liner removal were discussed briefly, but the solution needs to be further considered, possibly by coordinating the approach with other test cases that have similar aspects.

Three possible ways to demonstrate the effects of a change of end state were discussed:

- Create a scenario as set out in the FaSa project description, i.e. changing from an end state with restrictions and with the building remaining to a "greenfield" end state.
- Doing the opposite: change from "greenfield" as the end state to "brownfield" with the building remaining. In this case the existing safety analysis could be used for the base case and a revised one would have to be carried out for the new end state.
- Extending or postponing the duration of the decommissioning, e.g. due to lack of funding, so that the conditions in the decommissioning permit cannot be fulfilled. A revised safety analysis would have to address, inter alia, safety issues during a period of safe enclosure.

#### 4 Outcomes

The outcomes of the meeting were:

- agreement on tasks to be performed on the short term, c.f. the work plan below
- a more consolidated draft test case report (after the implementation of the editing)

## 5 Work plan

Subject	Participants	Deadlines
Edit the draft test case report according to the comments given during the meeting	Kurt Lauridsen	31 December 2009
Draft text for chapter 2.8 Safety Assessment Approach	Frank van Gemert	31 January 2010
Insert text from French safety report in Ch. 3.6, Waste management	Kurt Lauridsen	31 December 2009
Review/edit new text in ch. 3.6 (which will be Ch. 2.6 in the new edited version)	Tetiana Kilochytska	31 January 2010
Find text for Ch. 3.7 (to become Ch. 2.7)	Joël Bouffier	31 January 2010
Check Ch. 4	Frank van Gemert	31 January 2010
Comment/edit Ch. 5.1	Bernd Rehs Tetiana Kilochytska Others are welcome	31 January 2010
Comment/edit Ch. 5.2	Elka Anastasova Kwan-Seong Jeong Others are welcome	31 January 2010
Edit the draft test case report according to comments received	Kurt Lauridsen	Spring 2010
Discuss possible ways to introduce a change of end state scenario with coordinating group	Kurt Lauridsen	Spring 2010
Decide how to document the changes in the (low level) safety analysis for the liner removal	All WG members	Next meeting
Decide on a change of end state scenario	All WG members	Next meeting
Derive conclusions from the WG concerning the applicability of the DeSa methodology	All WG members	At the end of the work

### 6 Next meeting

It was agreed to attempt to hold a meeting lasting a couple of days in the first half of 2010, possibly in conjunction with a meeting in one of the other working groups, in order to reduce travel costs and time consumption. Kurt Lauridsen will investigate the possibilities. It is not to be expected that all WG members will be able to participate, but at least five members indicated that they would be willing and able to attend such a meeting.

The next main meeting of the FaSa project will take place 29 November - 3 December 2010 in the IAEA headquarters in Vienna.

### 7 Distribution

Test case participants

J. Kaulard, Chairman, FaSa Project

#### WG leaders:

- P. Manson, Decommissioning Planning Working Group Chair
- P. François, Decommissioning Conduct Working Group Chair
- A. Hart, Decommissioning Termination Working Group Chair (2009)
- O. Lareynie, Decommissioning Termination Working Group Chair (2010)
- M. Pennington, Safety Assessments Implementation Working Group Chair
- N. Orlando, Review Working Group Chair

#### Test case leaders:

- A. Bassanelli, NPP Test Case Working Group Chair
- A Halle, Fuel Fabrication Test Case Working Group Chair
- K. Lauridsen, Research Reactor Test Case Working Group Chair
- A. Cadden, Mining and Milling Test Case Working Group Chair

#### IAEA:

- J. Rowat, IAEA
- V. Ljubenov, IAEA Scientific Secretary

FaSa website

## APPENDIX A

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

MEMBER STATE	NAME
Bulgaria	Mrs. Elka ANASTASOVA
China	Mr. Yidong ZHOU
Denmark	Mr. Kurt LAURIDSEN
France	Mr. Joël BOUFFIER
Germany	Mr. Bernd REHS
Korea	Mr. Kwan-Seong JEONG
Korea	Mr. Min-chul SONG
Netherlands	Mr. Frank van GEMERT
Romania	Mr. Alexandru RODNA
Ukraine	Mrs. Tetiana KILOCHYTSKA

# **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 the Research Reactor Test Case**

## **TENTATIVE AGENDA**

(Dated 2009-11-25)

### Thursday 10 December 2009

9.00-10.30	Introduction by the WG Leader	Kurt Lauridsen
	Summary of activities since the first annual FaSa meeting	Kurt Lauridsen/Joël Bouffier
	Progress in decommissioning of Siloé	Joël Bouffier
	Discussion of the conclusions from the WG meeting in June in Grenoble (cf. meeting report)	All
10:30-11:00	Coffee break	
11:00-12:45	Discussion of the structure of the draft test case report	All
	Discussion of the necessary level of detail	All
	Identification of a way to illustrate a change of end state	All
12.45-13:45	Lunch break	
13.45-15.15	Detailed commenting and editing of the draft report	All
	Discussion of approach to chapters 6 to 9	All
15:15-15:45	Coffee break	
15:45-17:15	Agreement on work plan and time schedule	All
	Identification of contributors to the further work on the test case and distribution of tasks	All
	Agreement on the presentation of the WG work and future plans to the plenary meeting	All
	Any other business	All