

53rd Meeting of the Commission on Safety Standards
23–26 May 2023, IAEA, Vienna
Report of the Meeting

Overview of main results of the meeting

A. The following draft safety standards were endorsed:

- *DS508: Safety Guide on Assessment of the Safety Approach for Design Extension Conditions and Application of the Concept of Practical Elimination in the Design of Nuclear Power Plants;*
- *DS512: Safety Guide on Borehole Disposal Facilities for Disused Sealed Radioactive Sources;*
- *DS522: Safety Guide on Evaluation of Seismic Safety for Nuclear Installations.*

B. The following draft DPPs were approved:

- *DPP DS541 for a Safety Guide on Assessment of Meteorological and Hydrological Hazards in Site Evaluation for Nuclear Installations (revision of SSG-18);*
- *DPP DS542 for a Safety Guide on Release of Sites from Regulatory Control on Termination of Activities in Planned Exposure Situations (revision of WS-G-5.1);*
- *DPP DS543 for a Safety Requirements publication on Regulations for the Safe Transport of Radioactive Material, 20xx Edition – SSR-6 (Rev. 2);*
- *DPP DS544 for a new Safety Guide on Radiation Protection and Safety in Existing Exposure Situations;*
- *DPP DS545 for a Safety Guide on Radiation Safety of Gamma, X Ray and Electron Beam Irradiation Facilities, revision of SSG-8;*
- *DPP DS546 for a new Safety Guide on Ageing Management and Maintenance of Radioactive Material Transport Packages.*

C. Policy discussions

- *The conduct of an analysis on the challenges in the application of the safety standards and security guidance in an armed conflict situation and the preparation of a TECDOC on maintaining nuclear safety and security during an armed conflict was supported by the CSS.*
- *The CSS appreciated the development of the medium term plan for the safety standards and discussed the concept paper for the preparation of the long term plan for the safety standards. A working group of CSS members will be established to prepare CSS contributions for the future development of the long term plan.*
- *The revision of SPESS B and SPESS F was welcomed by the CSS¹. As appropriate this might be further considered in the future in a spirit of continuous improvement.*
- *The CSS welcomed the progress report presented on achievements on the working plan established to implement the recommendations of the Commission for its 7th term. This will be complemented to draft the end of term report including proposed recommendations for the 8th term.*

¹ The updated documents were then put into force after the CSS meeting on Friday, 26 May

1. Opening session

1.1 Opening of the meeting: Deputy Director General for Nuclear Safety and Security

Ms L. Evrard welcomed the members of the Commission on Safety Standards (CSS) to the meeting.

Ms Evrard noted that the CSS would be asked at the meeting to approve the draft medium term plan, which was an important document, and for which she thanked the Safety Standards Committees for their input. The meeting would also involve continued discussion of the concept paper for the preparation of a long term plan for the IAEA safety standards. Ms Evrard noted that the previous long term plan had been established in 2008 and was intended to run for 20 years: the same would apply to the next long term plan. Its preparation would involve agreeing first on its structure, then on its content, with input from the Committees, and finally on a list of prioritized actions.

Ms Evrard drew attention to the great progress made to address the delays in publication of the safety standards: 17 Safety Guides had been issued in 2022, the highest number ever achieved. She recognized the efforts made by the Office of Safety and Security Coordination (NSOC) and the Division of Conference and Document Services (MTCDD) to help make this possible. Ms Evrard also noted that, in terms of online access to IAEA publications, the Safety Standards Series and Nuclear Security Series remained in the top five publications and the top ten landing pages.

Ms Evrard noted that there would be a further discussion at the CSS meeting on ensuring safety during an armed conflict. She reported that:

- The IAEA had been assessing the situation in Ukraine with regard to nuclear safety and security, referring to the IAEA Safety Standards Series and the Nuclear Security Series. As part of this, the IAEA had conducted nine fact-finding missions in 2022, and had deployed continued support and assistance missions of IAEA safety and security experts at every Ukrainian nuclear power plant (NPP) since the beginning of 2023.
- With regard to the application of the IAEA safety standards, all the expert missions in Ukraine had highlighted specific issues and challenges resulting from the unprecedented situation. These included interruption and loss of off-site power; challenging working conditions for the operating personnel; issues related to the supply chain; degraded preparedness to respond to a potential nuclear or radiological emergency; and degraded conditions for deciding on and implementing protective actions.
- Member States, commissions and committees such as the CSS, and advisory bodies to the Director General such as the International Nuclear Safety Advisory Group (INSAG) and the Advisory Group on Nuclear Security (AdSec) had expressed their expectations that the Agency should look into the issue of maintaining nuclear safety and security during armed conflicts and should assess the practical application and potential challenges in the application of IAEA safety standards and nuclear security guidance during armed conflicts. Consequently, the Secretariat was developing a publication aimed at analysing the issues and challenges faced at nuclear facilities in the practical application of the IAEA safety standards and nuclear security guidance during armed conflicts, using the knowledge and experience collected in Ukraine since February 2022. The proposed publication was intended to be used as informational material for government authorities, regulatory bodies, other competent authorities, and operating organizations of nuclear facilities.

Ms Evrard said that the CSS would be presented with updated versions of SPESS B on the process for establishing safety standards and nuclear security guidance, and SPESS F, the template for a document preparation profile (DPP), which had been revised based on the proposals made by members of the Safety Standards Committees. In addition:

- Mr A. González from Argentina would provide a presentation on the follow-up to the publication of the Safety Report on Attribution of Radiation Health Effects and Inference of Radiation Risks: Discussion on national regulatory implications;
- The work done by the IAEA under the Advanced Liquid Processing System (ALPS) project to review the safety of the discharge of treated water from the Fukushima Daiichi NPP would also be presented;

- Since the subsequent meeting would be the last of the CSS in its seventh term, there would be a report on the progress made on the CSS Working Plan for its seventh term and work would begin on preparing the end of term report.

Finally, Ms Evrard expressed sincere appreciation to the CSS members for their dedicated and diligent efforts as well as for the advice and guidance they provided to the Agency regarding the safety standards. She noted that the safety standards were key publications for the Agency and formed the cornerstone for achieving globally high levels of nuclear safety and nuclear security. She wished all participants a productive and successful meeting.

1.2 Introductory remarks from the CSS Chair

Ms R. Velshi warmly welcomed everyone to the 53rd meeting of the CSS.

Ms Velshi drew particular attention to the upcoming discussions on the final report of the CSS seventh term, which would include setting the priorities for the eighth term. The CSS had accomplished a tremendous amount during its seventh term and it was important to ensure that progress continued in a number of key areas, including publication times, ensuring safety during situations such as pandemics and armed conflict, and consideration of new technologies.

She noted the effective coordination with and among the chairs of the Review Committees and thanked them for their leadership.

Ms Velshi thanked the CSS members for their participation and looked forward to a successful meeting.

1.3 Introduction of new CSS members

Ms Velshi welcomed the new members of the CSS: Mr Dinesh Kumar Shukla from India; Mr A. Bölme from Türkiye and Mr S.A. Morris from the United States of America. She also welcomed Mr P. Lardiez Holgado, the new Chair of the Nuclear Security Guidance Committee (NSGC), Ms S. Gandhi, the new Scientific Secretary for the Nuclear Safety Standards Committee (NUSSC), and Mr F. Mansoor, the recently appointed Chair of AdSec.

A complete list of participants to this CSS meeting is provided in Annex I.

The new members and the AdSec Chair all briefly introduced themselves to the CSS.

1.4 Adoption of the agenda

The agenda for the meeting was approved, and is reproduced in Annex II.

1.5 Confirmation of the adoption of the final report of the 52nd CSS meeting

The adoption of the report of the 52nd CSS meeting was confirmed.

1.6 Status of the IAEA safety standards and actions from previous meetings

Mr S. Mallick introduced the agenda item, reporting that the statistics from the previous year were evidence of the excellent progress that had been made in getting safety standards published. NSOC had worked diligently with MTCD, holding regular coordination meetings to avoid any backlog building up again. The average time from CSS endorsement to publication had been reduced significantly and was sustainable at its current rate.

Mr D. Delattre informed the CSS that 11 Safety Guides had been published since the previous meeting, meaning that 17 Safety Guides had been published in 2022 — the highest total ever achieved and almost double the normal number. This reflected the huge effort that had been put into resolving the previous issues. Nine more Safety Guides had completed the CSS silent approval procedure and were expected to be published in 2023. He reported that the total number of published safety standards was now 131. The average time taken from CSS endorsement to publication was now 10 months. Keeping that time below 12 months in the future was considered fully sustainable.

Up-to-date information on the status of all safety standards and the Nuclear Security Series (published and in draft) is available at: <https://www-ns.iaea.org/committees/files/CSS/205/status.pdf>.

Mr Delattre described the progress with outstanding actions from previous CSS meetings: see Annex III.

Mr Delattre's presentation is available in the CSS web page in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](https://www.iaea.org/News-Centres/Press/2023/02/23-css-meeting-2023).

Mr González noted that the translation of the safety standards was still an outstanding issue. Mr Mallick responded that good progress had been made in translating the safety standards into Chinese, French, Russian and Spanish. There had been more challenges with translation into Arabic, but solutions were being sought.

Ms Velshi asked how long it took on average to publish a safety standard from the approval of the DPP. Mr P. Shaw noted that the expected time was three to six years; it was not unusual for delays to occur at different stages in the process, but there was normally a good reason for them. Mr Delattre presented a graph demonstrating a trend in the reduction of publication times for the last 26 safety standards issued.

2. Ensuring safety during an armed conflict

Mr Mallick introduced the agenda item. He noted that, following discussions at the meetings of the CSS, AdSec and INSAG, the Department of Nuclear Safety and Security (NS) had created a working group with focal points from all NS divisions to assess the challenges for the application of the Safety Standards Series and the Nuclear Security Series publications in an armed conflict situation. Mr Delattre presented the objective and scope of the review, the conclusions of Phase 1 of the review, which covered NPPs in Ukraine, and explained that Phase 2 of the analysis will cover all nuclear and radiation facilities and activities within a State, provided that relevant information is available. He presented the DPP that had been approved by the Coordination Committee for the development of a TECDOC to document the lessons learned from the challenges in the implementation of safety standards and security guidance in Ukraine, as well as the efforts undertaken to prevent a nuclear accident.

Ms Evrard added that the TECDOC would collect and document the experience accumulated over the last year, and would highlight the challenges faced in the implementation of the requirements established in the safety standards. She added that as the situation was still evolving, the TECDOC could be updated in the future.

Mr Shukla noted that the situation in Ukraine was an unanticipated one, and that the event sequences that could lead to an accident could therefore not be practically eliminated. He added that the safety standards would be very difficult to implement during the evolving phase of a war, depending also on the country and the exact situation.

Ms N. Cromnier asked how it could be ensured that the IAEA was operating within its mandate. She noted that, in war conditions, a State cannot openly share its threat and risk analysis as it would normally for nuclear safety purposes. Mr Delattre replied that providing support to Ukraine upon request is within the mandate of the IAEA and this was being done through the establishment of on-site presence at nuclear facilities in Ukraine. Ms Evrard added that the situation in Ukraine was being assessed in relation to the seven pillars which had been derived from the IAEA safety standards and nuclear security guidance.

Mr J. Lee remarked that the results of the review would depend on the assumptions of the initial conditions for armed conflict. He asked whether a direct military attack on a nuclear installation had been considered in the review. Mr Delattre explained that during an armed conflict there are many challenges in operating an NPP, in performing regulatory activities and in making arrangements for emergency preparedness and response. He emphasized that the review was not looking into the design of nuclear facilities and that military attacks were out of the scope of the design.

Mr Bölme asked whether it might be too early to develop a TECDOC with data from Ukraine as the situation was not yet resolved. Mr Delattre explained that as the situation continues, the IAEA could update the TECDOC. He added that there was a challenge in collecting authoritative information on the situation.

Mr González commented that in the 60 years since the development of the first safety standards, war conditions had not been previously discussed and asked whether this might be an opportunity to explore the topic further. Mr González also referred to a report that had been recently submitted to the Board of Governors by the Russian Federation on the use of depleted uranium in military activities. He asked whether the CSS would be planning to address the issue of protection against depleted uranium and he recalled issues with the use of depleted uranium during the war in Yugoslavia. Ms Evrard noted that there were many challenges in addressing unexpected situations which could arise as a result of a variety of different initiators (e.g. war, pandemics). With regard to the depleted uranium, she agreed that this was something that the IAEA could investigate further in the future.

Mr J. Heinonen supported the decision of the IAEA to develop a TECDOC on armed conflict. However, he noted that a cautious approach should be followed and that care should be taken to not overlook any potential long term implications of such situations. He also noted that information on radioactive sources in Ukraine was very important, as they could create a potential problem in Europe in the future.

Mr Shukla cautioned that it would be premature to draw conclusions on the applicability of the safety standards at this stage and asked whether a war-like situation was within the scope of the safety standards. Mr Delattre explained that the seven pillars for ensuring safety and security were being applied in Ukraine. Ms Evrard also noted that the IAEA was still learning from the situation in Ukraine and was not yet in the position to provide definitive answers to all such questions.

Mr Morris expressed his full support for the development of the proposed TECDOC by the IAEA and noted the importance of recording all the challenges in the implementation of the safety standards in Ukraine.

Ms Velshi thanked the Secretariat for the information and suggested continuing the discussions at the next CSS meeting, as the situation in Ukraine was dynamic and constantly evolving. [Annex IV, Action 53.1].

3. Reports from the Safety Standards Committees and the Nuclear Security Guidance Committee

3.1 Waste Safety Standards Committee (WASSC)

Mr P. Dicks, WASSC Chair, reported on the 54th meeting of WASSC, as well as on the joint RASSC/WASSC session. During that meeting, WASSC had approved two draft standards and six DPPs for submission to the CSS, as well as three draft standards for Member State comments. Mr Dicks noted the coordinated work of the Review Committees and highlighted the importance of the meeting of the Chairs. There had also been discussions on the prioritization of WASSC-led standards in the medium term plan, the concept paper on the long term plan and the update of the SPESS B process.

Mr Dicks' presentation is available on the CSS website in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](https://www.iaea.org/commission-members-area).

3.2 Transport Safety Standards Committee (TRANSSC)

Mr D. Pstrak, TRANSSC Chair, reported on the 45th meeting of TRANSSC. During that meeting, TRANSSC had approved two DPPs for which it was the lead committee and one DPP led by RASSC. He presented the results of the 2021 review cycle for SSR-6 (Rev. 1) and the agreed milestone plan for the revision of SSR-6 (Rev. 1). He also summarized the results of the consultancy meeting and the follow up survey on e-schedules for Member States, and the report of the Working Group on transportable nuclear power plants (TNPPs).

Mr Pstrak's presentation is available on the CSS website in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](https://www.iaea.org/commission-members-area).

Mr González noted the importance of differentiating between TNPPs, the transport of nuclear material and reactors for propulsion. He recalled earlier discussions on the issue of the denial of shipment and appealed for consideration of the issue in the future. Mr Pstrak noted that there would be a dedicated presentation on this topic during the next TRANSSC meeting.

Mr R. Jammal questioned if the transport regulations would be flexible enough to adjust to emerging technologies, such as small and medium sized or modular reactors (SMRs) that need to be transported, and if the international community could accept exceptional provisions for new technologies.

Mr Pstrak gave an example of built-in flexibilities in the testing of type B packages and noted that there can be specific provisions made for exclusive use packages.

Mr Bölme asked about the nature of the changes proposed for future revision of SSR-6 (Rev. 1). Mr Pstrak replied that the proposed changes are not declaring existing regulations as unsafe or introducing new concepts, but are more about continuous improvement.

Ms R. Sardella remarked that the resources needed for conducting the revision are extensive and could lead to challenges for some Member States. Mr Pstrak concurred, but highlighted the importance of matching the pace of development of regulations with the rapid changes on the technology side.

Mr Shukla asked whether the proposed changes to SSR-6 (Rev. 1) were based on experience or were primarily in anticipation of developments and new trends and technologies. Mr Pstrak responded that it was a combination of both.

Mr González highlighted the importance of assigning adequate resources to the work dedicated to the transport of nuclear material. He also reminded the CSS of the mandate given by the United Nations to the IAEA to address the transport of radioactive material.

3.3 Radiation Safety Standards Committee (RASSC)

Ms R. Bly, RASSC Chair, reported on the 53rd meeting of RASSC, as well as on the joint RASSC/WASSC session and the topical session on radiation safety in non-food commodities. During that meeting, RASSC had approved one draft safety standard for submission for Member State comments and five DPPs. She highlighted the discussions on RASSC's priorities for the medium term and on the update of the SPESS B process. She reported on the work done by RASSC's e-working group to provide consolidated input to the long term plan for the IAEA safety standards. Ms Bly presented the pamphlets recently produced for the promotion of newly published Safety Guides SSG-57 and SSG-58, as requested by the CSS. She informed the Commission that RASSC's next topical session will be dedicated to Radiation Induced Second Primary Cancer Following Radiotherapy.

Ms Bly's presentation is available on the CSS website in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](https://www.iaea.org/commission-members-area).

Mr Shukla complimented RASSC on its work to collect relevant input and information on non-food commodities.

Mr González commented that occupational exposure (taking into account the International Labour Organization Convention concerning the Protection of Workers against Ionising Radiations) and secondary cancers after radiation therapy (taking into account the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR) study on that topic currently being finalized) needed to be considered for inclusion in the long term plan for the IAEA safety standards.

Mr González also highlighted the challenges of translating certain radiation safety concepts into other languages. Ms Bly responded that precision in language and translatability is part of the communication theme that is a priority.

3.4 Nuclear Security Guidance Committee (NSGC)

Mr P. Lardiez Holgado, NSGC Chair, reported on the 22nd meeting of the NSGC. One DPP had been approved for a draft Nuclear Security Series publication. All submitted interface documents led by the other Review Committees had been cleared, comprising one draft safety standard for submission to the CSS, one draft safety standard for submission for Member State review, and two DPPs. He also presented the next steps in the comprehensive NSS roadmap review.

Mr Lardiez Holgado's presentation is available on the CSS website in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](https://www.iaea.org/commission-members-area).

3.5 Nuclear Safety Standards Committee (NUSSC)

Mr P. Webster, NUSSC Chair, reported on the 54th meeting of NUSSC and the joint NUSSC/EPRReSC session, as well as on an extraordinary virtual meeting conducted in February 2023. During these meetings, NUSSC had approved four draft standards for submission to the CSS. He also presented the conclusions of discussions on the medium term plan for the safety standards, which will be viewed by NUSSC as a living document. He emphasized the importance of assigning adequate resources for the development of safety standards throughout the process.

Mr Webster's presentation is available on the CSS website in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](https://www.iaea.org/commission-members-area).

Mr González highlighted the need to coordinate with the Nuclear Energy Agency of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD/NEA) on aspects related to regulatory aspects for innovative design reactors. He also highlighted the future difficulty of translating the title of DS508 'Assessment of the Safety Approach for Design Extension Conditions and Application of the Concept of Practical Elimination in Design of Nuclear Power Plants' into other languages.

Mr Webster commented that with emerging innovative reactor design more revolutionary changes might be needed to SPESS B.

Mr Dies noted that when a broadly applied safety standard, in many cases transposed into national regulation, is revised, Member States have to adapt and understand how to put those changes into practice. That would be the case for SSG-25 (DS535), where periodic safety review takes long time to develop and only substantial and justified safety improvements in the SSG could support its prioritization.

3.6 Emergency Preparedness and Response Standards Committee (EPRReSC)

Mr M. Grzechnik, EPRReSC Chair, reported on the 15th meeting of EPRReSC, as well as the joint NUSSC/EPRReSC session, at which it had approved three draft standards and three DPPs for submission to the CSS and cleared one DPP for the Nuclear Security Series. He highlighted the results of the discussions on the medium term plan and the concept paper for the long term plan, and presented the timeline for emergency preparedness and response (EPR) related safety guides. He emphasized the importance of the review of GSR Part 7.

Mr Grzechnik's presentation is available on the CSS website in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](https://www.iaea.org/commission-members-area).

Mr Jammal asked if EPRReSC is coordinating with NSGC on potential security threats that could lead to an emergency situation during operation of SMRs. Mr Grzechnik confirmed that no such coordination had yet taken place.

Mr González emphasized the challenge of discussing protection strategies and policies in a way that is detached from overall radiation protection or that recognizes differences in approaches during planned or emergency situations. Mr Grzechnik said that this could be a suitable topic for the next joint RASSC/EPRReSC session.

Mr Heinonen expressed concern about the lack of resources in the Secretariat, which might delay the process of developing safety standards on EPR. Mr Torres Vidal, Director of the Incident and Emergency Centre, noted that efforts were being made to assign adequate human resources to developing standards.

Mr Shukla highlighted that Safety Requirements are not related to any particular technology, whereas Safety Guides are subject to technology driven considerations. That should be taken into account when developing EPR guidance related to SMRs. Mr Grzechnik agreed and noted that this will be very carefully considered in the review of the emergency classification system for facilities and activities.

3.7 Summary of the meeting of the Chairs held on 17 October before the CSS meeting

Mr Delattre reported on the results of the meeting of the Chairs of the Review Committees, drawing attention to the discussions on the updating of SPESS B to improve efficiency, effectiveness and efficacy, and highlighting the major updates. He noted that the initiative had been presented to the Review Committees and to the CSS, and that comments had been received from Member States and

had been considered in the final revision. He further reported on the Chairs' discussion on the medium term plan, including the upcoming planned revisions for each Review Committee. He also presented the scope and the workload of the Committees and the CSS in the form of a Gantt chart. He reported on the topics that had been proposed for dedicated discussions among the Chairs during their next meeting: TNPPs and the potential impact of the IAEA Nuclear Harmonization and Standardization Initiative (NHSI) on the safety standards. He concluded by noting the excellent coordination among the various Review Committees.

4. Approval of draft publications and DPPs

NOTE: The drafts submitted to the Commission at this meeting will be subsequently posted as a final edited version on the CSS website. CSS members will be notified and given a period of two weeks to provide comments. At the end of this period, if there are no objections, the draft will be considered to be endorsed (i.e. by 'silent approval') [Annex IV, Action 53.2].

4.1 Draft Safety Guide DS508 on Assessment of the Safety Approach for Design Extension Conditions and Application of the Concept of Practical Elimination in the Design of Nuclear Power Plants

Mr J. Luis Hernandez presented the background and scope of the draft Safety Guide. CSS comments had been received from India and had been resolved.

The presentation is available in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](https://www.iaea.org/members-area).

In response to a comment from Mr González, Mr Luis Hernandez confirmed that the draft Safety Guide is being developed taking into special consideration the translation of important terms, such as 'practical elimination'.

The Commission endorsed the draft for publication, subject to subsequent silent approval of the final edited version.

4.2 Draft Safety Guide DS512 on Borehole Disposal Facilities for Disused Sealed Radioactive Sources

Mr G. Bruno presented the background and scope of the draft Safety Guide. One CSS comment had been received from India and had been resolved.

The presentation is available in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](https://www.iaea.org/members-area).

The Commission endorsed the draft for publication, subject to subsequent silent approval of the final edited version.

4.3 Draft Safety Guide DS522 on Evaluation of Seismic Safety for Nuclear Installations

Mr M. Mahmood presented the background and scope of the draft Safety Guide. CSS comments had been received from the Republic of Korea and Germany and all had been resolved.

The presentation is available in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](https://www.iaea.org/members-area).

Mr Delattre commented that this draft was an example of how recent updates in the SPESS process allow for greater flexibility in the drafting timeline for draft safety standards; the draft had been approved at an extraordinary meeting of NUSSC in February 2023, thus taking months off the process.

The Commission endorsed the draft for publication, subject to subsequent silent approval of the final edited version.

4.4 Draft DPP DS541 for a Safety Guide on Assessment of Meteorological and Hydrological Hazards in Site Evaluation for Nuclear Installations, revision of SSG-18

Mr Mahmood introduced the draft DPP, describing the background and justification for the publication, as well as the objectives, scope and proposed structure. CSS comments had been received from India and Israel and all of these comments had been resolved.

The presentation is available in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](https://www.iaea.org/members/area).

Mr P. Contri outlined the history of the DPP, explaining that it had first been prepared in 2011, before the Fukushima accident, but that three new chapters had been included since then.

In response to a question posed by Mr González, Mr Contri confirmed that the publication will be technology neutral and will be applicable for all facilities, using a graded approach. Mr Mahmood noted that the IAEA Nuclear Safety and Security Glossary definition of a nuclear installation includes all facilities, not just nuclear power plants: a clarification that could be included in the ‘Scope’ section of the publication.

The Commission approved the DPP.

4.5 Draft DPP DS542 for a Safety Guide on Release of Sites from Regulatory Control on Termination of Activities in Planned Exposure Situation, revision of WS-G-5.1,

Mr V. Ljubenov introduced the draft DPP, describing the background and justification for the publication, as well as the objectives, scope and proposed structure. CSS comments had been received from India, Israel and the Republic of Korea and all of these comments had been resolved.

The presentation is available in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](https://www.iaea.org/members/area).

The Commission approved the DPP.

4.6 Draft DPP DS543 for a Safety Requirements on Regulations for the Safe Transport of Radioactive Material, 20xx Edition – SSR-6 (Rev. 2)

Mr E. Reber introduced the draft DPP, describing the background and justification for the publication, as well as the objectives, scope and proposed structure. CSS comments had been received from India and had been resolved.

The presentation is available in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](https://www.iaea.org/members/area).

Mr Grzechnik offered to provide lessons learned following the investigation into a recent incident involving the transport of a radioactive source in Australia.

Mr González noted the importance of having the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and the International Maritime Organization (IMO) as cosponsors of the publication, to help tackle the problem of denial of shipment. Mr Pstrak said that the issue of postponement and denial of shipment would be raised at the next TRANSSC meeting.

The Commission approved the DPP.

4.7 Draft DPP DS544 for a new Safety Guide on Radiation Protection and Safety in Existing Exposure Situations

Ms O. Guzmán López-Ocón introduced the draft DPP, describing the background and justification for the publication, as well as the objectives, scope and proposed structure. CSS comments had been received from Israel and Japan and all of these comments had been resolved.

The presentation is available in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](https://www.iaea.org/members/area).

In response to a question by Mr González, Ms Guzmán López-Ocón confirmed that as part of the strategic approach to develop the new safety guide, a series of four regional workshops have been organized in 2022-2023 to gather input from Member States that were not well represented in the

Review Committees, as regards the major challenges and gaps they face, and that clarification of terminology would be an important consideration in the preparation of the draft Safety Guide.

The Commission approved the DPP.

4.8 Draft DPP DS545 for a Safety Guide on Radiation Safety of Gamma, X Ray and Electron Beam Irradiation Facilities, revision of SSG-8

Mr H. Pappinisseri Puthanveedu introduced the draft DPP, describing the background and justification for the publication, as well as the objectives, scope and proposed structure. CSS comments had been received from India and Israel and all of these comments had been resolved.

The presentation is available in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](https://www.iaea.org/members-area).

Mr Jammal requested that special attention be paid to the issue of female workers in the development of the draft. Mr Pappinisseri Puthanveedu confirmed that the draft would be consistent with the standards relevant to female workers during and after pregnancy, namely the requirements of GSR Part 3 and the recommendations of GSG-7.

The Commission approved the DPP.

4.9 Draft DPP DS546 for a new Safety Guide on Ageing Management and Maintenance of Radioactive Material Transport Packages

Mr Reber introduced the draft DPP, describing the background and justification for the publication, as well as the objectives, scope and proposed structure. CSS comments had been received from India and had been resolved.

The presentation is available in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](https://www.iaea.org/members-area).

The Commission approved the DPP.

5. Draft nuclear security guidance for information

None submitted.

6. Gantt Chart on the safety standards under development

Mr Delattre presented the new Gantt chart that had been prepared, showing the expected timelines for all the drafts currently under development, along with graphs visualizing the workload of each Safety Standards Committee and the CSS over the coming months and years. The graphs demonstrated that their workload was decreasing towards 2026 and they would therefore have the capability to begin reviewing more safety standards under the medium term plan.

The presentation is available in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](https://www.iaea.org/members-area).

7. Feedback from the Safety Standards Committees on the medium term plan for the IAEA safety standards

Mr Delattre made a presentation on the medium term plan, which covered safety standards that would be issued after 2026/2027 and which followed the vision and strategies set out in SPESS A. He presented the plan for each individual Safety Standards Committee and noted that NUSSC wished to continue with a living plan. As a result of the Chairs' meeting, a footnote had been added to the medium term plan stating that cross-cutting work on SMRs, TNPPs and pandemic-type circumstances would also be implemented in the medium term.

The presentation is available in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](https://www.iaea.org/members-area).

Mr Grzechnik noted that the plan for EPRESC should be updated to read “Planning for and revision of GSR Part 7...” as agreed at the Chairs’ meeting.

Ms Bly emphasized that any revision of GSR Part 7 should be implemented in parallel with the revision of GSR Part 3.

Mr Dicks noted that the coordination displayed among the Committees had been very helpful for resource planning purposes.

In response to a comment by Ms Sardella, Mr Delattre explained that the revision of SSR-5 was set as a priority as it was the oldest specific safety requirement not yet to have been revised.

Ms Cromnier noted that several Review Committees had mentioned issues with resources and suggested that it might be useful to reconsider working methods, with a view to using resources more efficiently. She also suggested that a discussion among CSS members on the purpose of the safety standards might be useful to help set priorities.

Mr González noted the importance of ensuring resources for both updating the current set of safety standards and incorporating new challenges such as SMRs. Ms Velshi replied that the two were not mutually exclusive and that many Review Committees were already working to address new challenges.

Mr A. Ferapontov said that the medium term plan needed to remain flexible to allow for necessary changes at any time, for example relating to TNPPs.

Mr Jammal expressed the opinion that the current medium term plan was adequate, but that it must remain agile to provide for changing priorities. The safety standards were used as a basis for many review missions and conventions and it was therefore important that they remain relevant.

Mr Delattre noted that challenges relating to SMRs, TNPPS and innovative technology were already being considered in the medium term plan and in work being undertaken in parallel, such as the preparation of safety reports.

Ms Velshi asked CSS members to consider whether the medium term plan had any gaping holes.

In response to a question from Mr Jammal, Mr Webster expressed NUSSC’s opinion that the new Safety Guide on level 3 probabilistic safety assessment was long overdue, especially in the context of SMRs.

Mr Dies questioned whether the revision of SSG-25 should be considered a priority and whether PSA level 3 was to be considered in the revision. He stressed the relevance of the use of risk informed regulation making use of the metrics derived from PSA.

Mr Shukla noted that the medium term plan constituted a bridge between short and long term activities, so it was important to have a clear idea of those activities before deciding if the medium term plan was adequate. The Review Committees were in a better position than the CSS to decide on the priorities in each area.

Mr Delattre highlighted that the Review Committees were not asking the CSS to set the priorities, but to provide strategic direction. The medium term plan followed a bottom-up approach, whereas the long term plan would be based on a top-down approach.

Mr González noted that many States not represented on the CSS needed clear requirements and guidance that were not reflected in the medium term plan. Ms Velshi highlighted that many other States were represented on the Review Committees.

Ms Velshi summarized that the medium term plan represented a snapshot in time of the current situation regarding drafts already in the SPESS process or soon to enter it. The priorities in the plan had been identified by the Review Committees, which were in the best position to make such judgements. However, as reflected in the plan, it was a dynamic document that could still be changed to reflect emerging priorities.

8. Concept paper for the preparation of the long term plan for the IAEA safety standards

Mr Delattre presented a brief overview of why the CSS had been created — namely, to coordinate the work of all the Safety Standards Committees and help eliminate the silos that had developed for each

area of work within the broader topic of nuclear safety. He urged all CSS members to read SPESS A to get a more detailed overview of that history.

Mr Delattre then presented on the concept paper for the preparation of the long term plan, underlining that the concept paper itself was not the long term plan, but provided the basis for preparing the plan. In developing the plan in the future, CSS members would first need to decide whether the existing structure of the safety standards remained fit for purpose and consider ways in which the collection of safety standards could be optimized, then decide on the content of the plan, with input from the Committees. The planned activities would then need to be prioritized, resulting in the long term plan.

The presentation is available in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](https://www.iaea.org/members/area).

Mr González suggested that there might be justification for bringing back the ‘safety practices’ category of publication to provide examples in case States found themselves in similar situations to those already experienced by others. He noted that some safety standards — such as SSR-6 (Rev. 1) and GSR Part 3 — were used far more internationally than others, and that usage should be reflected in the priority assigned to their revision. He further noted that the collection of safety standards was prolific and should be condensed in order to make it more manageable.

Ms Cromnier said that she supported a top-down approach, beginning with a review of the Safety Fundamentals. She was of the opinion that, while the concept paper was useful on an operational level, it would be a good idea to begin with higher level, more strategic questions, such as the purpose of the safety standards and the strategic objectives of the entire system. The safety standards were currently too prescriptive, which might place restrictions on any review missions in which they were used, such as Integrated Regulatory Review Service (IRRS) and Integrated Review Service for Radioactive Waste and Spent Fuel Management, Decommissioning and Remediation (ARTEMIS) missions. It would be preferable to have performance-based standards that included targets to be achieved but were otherwise flexible, thus ensuring that innovation was not restricted during this era of technological shift.

Mr Heinonen said that the possibility of combining safety and security — and possibly even safeguards too — into one set of fundamentals should be included in discussions on the long term plan.

Mr Shukla said that, for any activity, it was essential to first set clear objectives as to why it was being implemented, then establish how to implement it, maintaining flexibility but always aligning with the initial objectives. In the case of the safety standards, the Safety Fundamentals constituted the anchor point with which everything else must align. In his opinion, the existing safety standards system was therefore adequately structured. It was also important to monitor and assess that system and provide feedback as to its effectiveness.

Mr Jammal noted that the existing structure of the safety standards was adequate, but the standards needed to keep up with practices as they changed. That was particularly important for Member States that adopted the standards into their national regulations. With regard to the suggestion to develop combined fundamentals for safety and security, Mr Jammal noted that it had been attempted in the past without success. While the interfaces between the two could be considered, the areas could not be combined.

Mr González said that it made no sense to have separate fundamentals for nuclear safety and security. Unfortunately, however, previous attempts to harmonize them had failed. Similar issues would be encountered if attempts were made to incorporate safeguards.

Mr Heinonen, supported by several members, proposed the establishment of a task force involving several members of the CSS to begin discussing the preparation of the long term plan.

Ms Sardella expressed the view that, although the existing structure of the safety standards collection was adequate, there were too many individual publications, which made the implementation of the safety standards challenging, especially for States with small regulatory bodies. Regarding the

fundamentals, the Agency was not providing a good service to its Member States by providing separate principles for nuclear safety and security.

Mr Ferapontov urged caution in making changes to the safety standards system, as it was used by many States, in particular embarking countries. The system also formed the basis for the Agency's review missions.

Mr Dies expressed the compatibility between an efficient and time expedite licensing regulatory process while increasing safety.

Mr Bölme noted that, as an embarking country, Türkiye drew heavily on the IAEA safety standards for its authorization system and would actually like them to be more prescriptive.

Ms Cromnier pointed out that more prescriptive standards led to far more resources needed in preparing and implementing Agency review missions.

Mr Shukla said that, as safety, security and safeguards all had the same objective of protecting people and the environment from the harmful effects of radiation, it was sufficient to have one fundamentals publication covering all three areas. The only exception would be for facilities built before the safety–security interface was considered. Regarding the prescriptiveness of the safety standards, States were free to adopt the Agency's standards where appropriate, but otherwise adapt them or create their own standards as needed. Likewise, States with small nuclear programmes could take into consideration some, but not all of the safety standards if the numbers were unmanageable. The Agency had to accommodate many Member States, all in different situations, so responsibility for resolving these issues should lie with the national regulators rather than the Agency.

Ms Velshi said that a working group comprising several members of the CSS would be established to support the CSS consideration on the preparation of the long term structure and plan for the IAEA safety standards. The working group would report on its work at the next CSS meeting in November [**Annex IV, Action 53.3**].

Ms Bly made a presentation on how RASSC had provided inputs for the long term strategy for the safety standards through an e-working group that developed a questionnaire to gather feedback from RASSC members. The questionnaire results were then used to prepare a document on RASSC inputs to the long term strategy. The document on [RASSC inputs for the Preparation of the Long-term strategy for the IAEA](#) was sent to the CSS Secretary and is available on the [RASSC-53 Webfolder](#).

The presentation is available in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](#).

Ms Velshi thanked RASSC for taking this initiative, which could serve as a model to the other Review Committees.

9. The revision of SPESS B and SPESS F

Ms M. Nikolaki presented the progress made on the revision of SPESS B and SPESS F. She referenced the historical base for the uniform approach adopted in SPESS and presented to the Board of Governors in 1995.

She reminded the CSS that SPESS is applicable for Nuclear Security Series publications as well. She highlighted that an evolutionary approach had been adopted to the revision of SPESS B. She summarized the main recommendations of the dedicated consultancy meeting conducted the previous year and explained how those recommendations had been reflected in the revision. She also presented in detail the modifications that had been made. She noted that the updated versions of SPESS B and SPESS F had been approved by the Coordination Committee and presented at the meeting of the Chairs, and would be made available on the Committees' website.

The presentation is available in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](#)

In response to a question by Mr Lee, Ms Nikolaki clarified that the Review Committees were free to decide, if a third meeting per year is necessary, on a case by case basis.

Ms Velshi, noting that the changes had been evolutionary rather than revolutionary, suggested that the CSS might wish to revisit the SPESS process again in its next term.

Mr Mallick clarified that the potential need for another SPESS revision would arise from the next long term plan.

Mr González suggested that the Board of Governors might need to be updated on the latest changes to the safety standards establishment system since the issue of GOV/INF/772.

Mr Mallick said that the Secretariat would hold internal discussions on the involvement of the Board and report back to the CSS. **[Annex IV, Action 53.4].**

10. Follow-up to the publication of the Safety Report on Attribution of Radiation Health Effects and Inference of Radiation Risks: Discussion on national regulatory implications

Mr González presented on the implications of attribution of radiation health effects on regulatory decisions. He described the difference between deterministic and stochastic health effects; frequentist and subjective probability; and inference and attribution of effects, especially in the area of low doses. He also briefly outlined the legal implications of regulatory decisions and closed his presentation by noting that the safety standards do not differentiate between health effects that are factually attributable and risks that are subjectively inferred.

Ms Sardella congratulated Mr González on his presentation. She noted that it is not clear in which area of doses the threshold for the statistical significance of epidemiological studies is positioned (i.e. between low and very low doses or between low and moderate doses). Mr González agreed that there is no clear answer and that this still needs to be discussed at an international level. He continued that perhaps it is ethically correct to continue with the approach followed by the international community today but those involved should be fully aware of the limitations and the ethical arguments.

Mr Shukla also agreed that more clarity is needed on the topic with regard to what is considered to be a high dose. He brought up the example of areas where the natural background is high, however the public feels safe. He proposed that the linear no-threshold (LNT) model could start from those natural doses. He also noted that as there is no methodology available to discriminate the radiation induced health effects from all other health effects, the scientific community would not be able to answer this question. Mr González remarked that it would be problematic to use natural background levels as a starting point.

Mr Jammal noted that an important aspect of the discussion was the acceptance of scientific findings and recommendations by the general public. He emphasized the role of the regulators in educating the population. Mr González agreed that communication with the public is key. He mentioned secondary cancers as an example, where regulators cannot protect the patient (as there are benefits to the patient) but should be aware of the probability of occurrence of secondary cancer after radiotherapy treatment.

Ms Cromnier drew a parallel between radiation and chemical agents. She noted that scientific knowledge improves over time and regulators should find the balance between not being able to prove something and following the precautionary principle. Mr González agreed that there was a tendency to follow the precautionary principle, however its implementation in the case of accidents had proven to do more harm than good in the past.

The presentation is available in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](#).

11. Feedback from the implementation of the ALPS project

Ms A. Clark presented the activities undertaken for the implementation of the IAEA's review of safety related aspects of ALPS treated water discharge at the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power station (FDNPS). She briefly presented how the ALPS treated water is produced, the IAEA safety standards used for the review and the three main components of the review. She also presented the missions

conducted by the ALPS Task Force and the reports published as well as the planned future activities and milestones of the review.

Mr Bölme enquired whether the process for the discharge of ALPS treated water had already been approved by the Japanese regulatory authority. Ms Clark clarified that the decision to discharge ALPS treated water to the sea had already been taken by the Government of Japan and an explanation of this decision is provided in the Basic Policy published by the Government of Japan. She highlighted that the purpose of the IAEA's review, upon request of the Government of Japan, was to assess whether Japan's approach to the discharge of ALPS treated water is consistent with relevant international safety standards. Mr T. Yamada added that the discharge was planned to commence after the Nuclear Regulatory Authority (NRA) of Japan will have completed the relevant regulatory inspections. Mr Yamada clarified that the IAEA was reviewing the approval process implemented by the NRA. He also expressed his appreciation for the commitment of the Task Force and noted the efforts undertaken by Japan to address the concerns of the international community after the FDNPS accident.

Mr González added that the IAEA was conducting the review under Article 3.6 of its Statute and was providing for the implementation of its safety standards. He also praised the role that the IAEA laboratories were playing in the conduct of the review by providing independent sampling, and data analysis and corroboration.

Mr Jammal enquired after the lessons learned by the IAEA during the implementation of the review. Ms Clark noted that the influence of public perception was playing a key role in decision making and explained that Japan was following a focused approach in communicating with interested parties. Mr J.-L. Lachaume, who was also a member of the IAEA Task Force, added that Japan had displayed openness and transparency throughout the review and verified that the review was being conducted in a thorough manner.

Mr Lee noted that the discharges were planned to continue for 30 years and asked whether the IAEA would continue its monitoring activities and missions in the future. Ms Clark explained that additional work would continue in order to verify adherence to the safety standards after the discharge had commenced.

Mr Shukla noted that the involvement of the IAEA helped ensure transparency. He also emphasized that the prime responsibility for safety rests with the operating organization in accordance with Principle 1 of the IAEA Fundamental Safety Principles. Mr González also pointed to Principle 7 of the IAEA Fundamental Safety Principles on the protection of future generations and noted the importance of calculating the committed doses from the discharge.

Ms Velshi enquired whether there was any feedback from the review on the application of the safety standards used in the review. Ms Clark explained that the safety standards provided a sound basis for the review and enabled appropriate discussions during the conduct of the review.

The presentation is available in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](https://www.iaea.org/NewsAndMedia/PressAndPublicAffairs/CommissionMembersArea).

12. Preparation of the end of term report for the 7th CSS term

Mr Delattre presented a progress update for each action in the working plan for the 7th CSS term. The final step will be to finalize the end of term report before the start of the 8th CSS term.

Mr González commented that it would be useful to consider the report in terms of its functional aspects and its thematic areas. Thematic areas for consideration included the work of UNSCEAR on secondary cancers and the topic of SMRs.

Ms Velshi noted that the progress report on the working plan established to implement the recommendations of the Commission for its 7th term will be complemented to develop the end of term report, including proposed recommendations for the 8th term. **[Annex IV, Action 53.5]**.

13. Information from ICRP, UNSCEAR and OECD/NEA

Ms B. Batandjieva-Metcalf presented a summary of recent UNSCEAR activities that included a summary of the 69th session of UNSCEAR and the progress that has been made on ongoing scientific evaluations and a new UNSCEAR evaluation on the effects of ionizing radiation on the nervous system that was launched in April 2023. Other topics presented included the future work programme of work for the years 2025 to 2029 (to be finalized in 2024), the strategy used in UNSCEAR's Global Survey to collect data on public exposure to ionizing radiation, current collaboration efforts between UNSCEAR and the IAEA and other organizations, and outreach activities relating to the evaluation of occupational exposure to ionizing radiation.

In response to questions from Mr Jammal, Ms Batandjieva-Metcalf clarified that the purpose of the epidemiological studies of radiation and cancer did not include developing safety objectives that could be useful for the purposes of developing IAEA safety standards. She also clarified that the evaluation of risk of radiation exposure would include low to high exposure within the scope of the evaluations. She added that UNSCEAR was coordinating these efforts with ICRP.

The presentation is available in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](#).

Ms V. Rangelova presented a summary of recent OECD/NEA activities that included the topics discussed during April 2023 NEA Steering Committee meeting such as newly signed international partnerships, new OECD/NEA publications issued, and the recent Conference on Nuclear Financing organized by the International Framework for Nuclear Energy Cooperation (IFNEC). Other topics presented were the changes to the structure of the Working Groups of the Committee on Nuclear Regulatory Activities (CNRA) and recent events of possible interest to CSS addressing nuclear safety. She elaborated on the work done by the NEA Expert Group on SMR to define future safety research needed to support safe deployment of SMR and noted the publication of the NEA SMR Dashboard:

(https://www.oecd-nea.org/upload/docs/application/pdf/2023-02/7650_smr_dashboard.pdf).

Ms Rangelova concluded with updates from last meeting of the Committee on Radiological Protection and Public Health (CRPPH) and updates from several meetings on the topical areas of radioactive waste management and decommissioning, deep geological disposals and nuclear law.

The presentation is available in the folder for documents provided for information: [The Commission Members Area \(iaea.org\)](#).

14. Any other business. Report of the meeting. Dates of the next meetings

Ms T. Karseka-Yanev presented information on the new website for the Review Committees and the CSS, demonstrated the main features on the prototype website, and explained that by the end of the year, the current website will be replaced for both the CSS and Review Committees. She confirmed that information available on the old website will be preserved and made accessible.

Ms Sardella asked if the work approach will be unified for all committees with this software change. Ms Karseka-Yanev confirmed that the new website will provide a unified approach to all Review Committees, however the Scientific Secretaries of the Review Committees and the CSS will be able to customize their committee area as needed, within given parameters.

Ms Velshi asked whether the NSGC is part of the initiative. Ms Karseka-Yanev replied that the NSGC will not initially have a dedicated area on this publicly available website, but such an area can easily be established if requested.

Mr Delattre noted that the CSS members would soon receive an email asking for volunteers to test and provide feedback on the new website.

Mr Grzechnik proposed making arrangements to allow participants to observe in-person standards meetings online, to allow for better coordination in Member States. Mr Delattre supported the proposal.

Ms Clark informed the CSS about the upcoming IAEA International Conference on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management, Decommissioning, Environmental Protection and Remediation:

Ensuring Safety and Enabling Sustainability to be held in November 2023 in Vienna. The Conference would address many of the points related to safety and efficiency that had been raised during the CSS meeting.

Ms Cromnier noted that this was her last meeting as a CSS member and thanked everyone for their active collaboration.

Mr Delattre summarized the draft list of actions resulting from the 53rd CSS meeting and indicated that it would be provided for comment to the CSS members [**Annex IV, Action 53.6**] and that the draft report of the 53rd CSS meeting would be posted on the CSS web page for comment [**Annex IV, Action 53.7**]. Mr Delattre informed the Commission that all presentations made at the 53rd CSS meeting would be posted on the CSS web page [**Annex IV, Action 53.8**].

Mr González requested that the topics of SMRs and the use of depleted uranium in armed conflict situations be included in the agenda of the next CSS meeting.

Mr Delattre informed the Commission of the following dates for the next CSS meetings:

- **CSS 54:** week of 27 November to 1 December 2023
- **CSS 55:** week of 27 to 31 May 2024
- **CSS 56:** week of 25 to 29 November 2024

Ms Velshi thanked all participants, and the meeting was adjourned.

ANNEX I

PARTICIPATION AT THE 53rd CSS MEETING

The Commission

R. Velshi, Canada (Chair of CSS)

A.J. González, Argentina

G. Hirth, Australia (sent apologies — represented by M. Grzechnik)

O. Lugovskaya, Belarus (sent apologies — unable to attend)

R.F. Gutterres, Brazil (sent apologies — unable to attend)

J. Yu, China (sent apologies — unable to attend)

M.R.M. Ezz El-Din, Egypt (sent apologies — unable to attend)

J. Heinonen, Finland

J-L Lachaume, France

T. Elsner, Germany

D. K. Shukla, India

F. Gov, Israel (sent apologies — unable to attend)

T. Yamada, Japan

J. Lee, Republic of Korea

M. Zniber, Morocco (sent apologies — unable to attend)

F. Mansoor, Pakistan

A. Ferapontov, Russian Federation

M. Žiaková, Slovakia

C.O. Phillips, South Africa (sent apologies — unable to attend)

J. Dies, Spain

N. Cromnier, Sweden

R. Sardella, Switzerland

A. Bölme, Türkiye

S. Vinton, United Kingdom (sent apologies — represented by P. Dicks)

S.A. Morris, United States of America

Observers

F. Mansoor, AdSec

M. Hübel, EC

C. Clement, ICRP (sent apologies — unable to attend)

S. Burns, INSAG (sent apologies — unable to attend)

N. Muroya, OECD/NEA (sent apologies — represented by V. Rangelova)

B. Batandjieva-Metcalf, UNSCEAR

Representatives and experts supporting CSS members and observers

M. Aparicio, M. Asfar Tous, C. Cole, T. Granier, S. Holiday, R. Jammal, J. Kim, S.H. Kim, S. Oreshnikov, F. Pelayo, D. Pyrkina, K. Saito, N. Sandberg, M. Turner

Chairs of the Review Committees

EPRéSC: M. Grzechnik

NSGC: P. Lardiez Holgado

NUSSC: P. Webster

RASSC: R. Bly

TRANSSC: D. Pstrak

WASSC: P. Dicks

Scientific Secretaries of Review Committees and of the Commission on Safety Standards

F. Stephani, Incident and Emergency Centre (IEC), EPRéSC

S. Gandhi, Regulatory Activities Section (NSNI), NUSSC

O. Guzmán López Ocón, Radiation Safety and Monitoring Section (NSRW), RASSC

E. Reber (representing S. Fayyaz), Regulatory Infrastructure and Transport Safety Section (NSRW), TRANSSC

N. Aghajanyan, Waste and Environmental Safety Section (NSRW), WASSC

S. Case Lackner, Programme Development and International Cooperation Section (NSNS), NSGC

D. Delattre, Safety Standards and Security Guidance Development Section (NSOC), Scientific Secretary of the CSS

IAEA Secretariat

L. Evrard, Deputy Director General, Department of Nuclear Safety and Security

S. Mallick, Director, Office of Safety and Security Coordination (NSOC)

E. Buglova, Director, Division of Nuclear Security

C. Torres Vidal, Director, Incident and Emergency Centre

H. Vandenhove, Director, Division of Radiation, Transport and Waste Safety

K. Alm-Lytz, A. Clark, P. Contri, A. Gomez Cobo, L. Guo, M. Pinak, J. Tierney, J. Yllera

K. Asfaw, J. Brown, G. Bruno, C. Fischer, O. German, J. Luis Hernandez, J. Joksic, T. Karseka-Yanev, K. Kouts, V. Ljubenov, M. Mahmood, M. Moracho Ramirez, S. Nestoroska Madjunarova, M. Nikolaki, H. Pappinisseri Puthanveedu, J. Rovny, M. Salmon, P. Shaw, A. Suzuki, G. Winkler, R. Wright.

ANNEX II

Agenda of the 53rd meeting of the COMMISSION ON SAFETY STANDARDS

1. Opening session

- 1.1. Opening of the Meeting; *L. Evrard, DDG NS*
- 1.2. Introductory remarks from the CSS Chair; *R. Velshi*
- 1.3. Introduction of new CSS members: India, Türkiye and USA as well as new NSGC Chair and new AdSec Chair
- 1.4. Adoption of the agenda; *CSS members*
- 1.5. Confirmation of the adoption of the final report of the 52nd CSS meeting.
Item 11: moved here to ensure availability of the presenter.
- 1.6. Status of the IAEA Safety Standards and actions from previous meetings; *S. Mallick and D. Delattre*

2. Ensuring safety during an armed conflict *S. Mallick*

- 2.1 Progress on the phase one and status on the phase two of the analysis on maintaining safety and nuclear security during armed conflict; *D. Delattre*

3. Reports from the Safety Standards Committees and the Nuclear Security Guidance Committee

- 3.1. Waste Safety Standards Committee: *P. Dicks, Chair; N. Aghajanyan, Scientific Secretary*
- 3.2. Transport Safety Standards Committee: *D. Pstrak, Chair; S. Fayyaz, Scientific Secretary*
- 3.3. Radiation Safety Standards Committee: *R. Bly, Chair; O. Guzmán López-Ocón, Scientific Secretary*
- 3.4. Nuclear Security Guidance Committee: *P. Lardiez Holgado, Chair; S. Case Lackner, Scientific Secretary*
- 3.5. Nuclear Safety Standards Committee: *P. Webster, Chair; M. Svab, Scientific Secretary*
- 3.6. Emergency Preparedness and Response Standards Committee: *M. Grzechnik, Chair; F. Stephani, Scientific Secretary*
- 3.7. Summary of the meetings of the Chairs held before the CSS meeting

4. Approval of draft publications and DPPs

- 4.1. Draft Safety Guide DS508 on Assessment of the Safety Approach for Design Extension Conditions and Application of the Concept of Practical Elimination in the Design of Nuclear Power Plants, *J. Luis Hernandez*
- 4.2. Draft Safety Guide DS512 on Borehole Disposal Facilities for Disused Sealed Radioactive Sources, *D. Bennett*
- 4.3. Draft Safety Guide DS522 on Evaluation of Seismic Safety for Nuclear Installations, *M. Mahmood*
- 4.4. Draft DPP DS541 for a Safety Guide on Assessment of Meteorological and Hydrological Hazards in Site Evaluation for Nuclear Installations, revision of SSG-18, *K. Nagasawa*
- 4.5. Draft DPP DS542 for a Safety Guide on Release of Sites from Regulatory Control on Termination of Activities in Planned Exposure Situation, revision of WS-G-5.1, *V. Ljubenov*

- 4.6. Draft DPP DS543 for a Safety Requirements on Regulations for the Safe Transport of Radioactive Material, 20xx Edition – SSR-6 (Rev. 2), *E. Reber*
- 4.7. Draft DPP DS544 for a new Safety Guide on Radiation Protection and Safety in Existing Exposure Situations, *O. Guzmán López-Ocón*
- 4.8. Draft DPP DS545 for a Safety Guide on Radiation Safety of Gamma, X Ray and Electron Beam Irradiation Facilities, revision of SSG-8, *H. Pappinisseri Puthanveedu*
- 4.9. Draft DPP DS546 for a new Safety Guide on Ageing Management and Maintenance of Radioactive Material Transport Packages, *S. Fayyaz*

5. Draft nuclear security guidance for information

None submitted

6. Gantt Chart on the safety standards under development; *D. Delattre, M. Nikolaki*

7. Feedback from the Committees on the Medium-Term Plan; *Safety Standards Committees Chairpersons, CSS*

8. Concept paper for the preparation of the long-term plan for the IAEA safety standards; *Safety Standards Committees Chairpersons, CSS*

9. Revision of SPESS B and SPESS F; *S. Mallick and M. Nikolaki*

10. Follow-up to the publication of the Safety Report on Attribution of Radiation Health Effects and Inference of Radiation Risks: Discussion on national regulatory implications; *TBD NSRW*

11. Feedback from the implementation of the ALPS project; *G. Caruso*

12. Preparation of the end of term report for the 7th CSS term, *D. Delattre, CSS*

13. Information from ICRP, UNSCEAR and OECD/NEA

14. AoB, Report of the meeting; Date of the next meetings:

- **CSS 54:** week from 27 November to 1 December 2023
- **CSS 55:** week from 27 to 31 May 2024
- **CSS 56:** week from 25 to 29 November 2024

ANNEX III

STATUS OF OUTSTANDING ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS OF THE COMMISSION ON SAFETY STANDARDS

50th MEETING

50.01. The fully edited versions of the two endorsed draft Safety Guides — DS503 and DS515 — will be posted on the CSS webpage as soon as they are available. CSS members will be alerted by email for a two-week silence approval procedure with the objective of confirming the CSS endorsement of these drafts. **[Action: Secretariat, CSS members]. DS503 is already published. DS515 has been confirmed by CSS silent approval and is being edited for publication.**

51st MEETING

51.4. The Secretariat will present feedback from the implementation of the ALPS project. **[Action: Secretariat]. Agenda item 11 of this meeting.**

51.5. The fully edited versions of the thirteen endorsed draft Safety Guides — DS509a–h, DS511, DS517a–c and DS520 — to be posted on the CSS webpage as soon as they are available. CSS members to be alerted by email for a two-week silence approval procedure with the objective of confirming the CSS endorsement of these drafts. **[Action: Secretariat, CSS members]. DS511, DS517a-c, DS520 and DS509a–d are published. DS509e confirmed by CSS silent approval. DS509f–h to be submitted soon for silent approval.**

52nd MEETING

52.1. An item on the regulation of low radiation doses will be included on the agenda of the next CSS meeting. **[Action: CSS Scientific Secretary]. Agenda item 10 of this meeting.**

52.2. The second round of discussion on the safety implications of the situation in Ukraine will be reflected in the meeting report and further discussions will be planned at the next CSS meeting. **[Action: CSS Scientific Secretary]. Agenda item 2 of this meeting.**

52.3. The IAEA Office of Legal Affairs and MTCD will be consulted regarding the potential rewording of the copyright notice for NS publications. **[Action: Secretariat]. Progress expected soon.**

52.4. The fully edited versions of the five endorsed draft Safety Guides — DS470, DS499, DS500, DS521 and DS523 — will be posted on the CSS web page as soon as they are available. CSS members will be alerted by email for a two-week silence approval procedure with the objective of confirming the CSS endorsement of these drafts. **[Action: Secretariat, CSS members]. All currently being edited.**

52.8. CSS members will provide further input on the concept paper for the preparation of the long term plan for the IAEA safety standards. **[Action: CSS members]. Agenda item 8 of this meeting.**

52.9. The Safety Standards Committee Chairs will discuss the concept paper for the preparation of the long term plan for the IAEA safety standards within their various Committees and provide feedback on the results. **[Action: Safety Standards Committees]. Meeting in February and on 22 May before the CSS.**

52.10. New versions of SPESS B and SPESS F will be issued. **[Action: IAEA Secretariat]. Agenda item 9 of this meeting.**

52.11. A draft list of actions from the 52nd CSS meeting (this list) will be provided to CSS members for comment. **[Action: Secretariat, CSS Scientific Secretary]. Done: this list.**

52.12. The draft report of the 52nd CSS meeting will be posted on the CSS web page for comment. **[Action: Secretariat, CSS Scientific Secretary]. Done Agenda item 1.5 of this meeting.**

52.13. The presentations made at the 52nd CSS meeting will be posted on the CSS web page. [**Action: CSS Scientific Secretary**]. **Done.**

ANNEX IV

ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE 53rd MEETING OF THE COMMISSION ON SAFETY STANDARDS

- 53.1.** The discussion on ensuring safety during an armed conflict will be reflected in the meeting report and further discussions will be planned at the next CSS meeting, including a progress report on the preparation of a related TECDOC [**Action: CSS Scientific Secretary**].
- 53.2.** The fully edited versions of the three endorsed draft Safety Guides — DS508, DS512 and DS522 — will be posted on the CSS web page as soon as they are available. CSS members will be alerted by email for a two-week silent approval procedure with the objective of confirming the CSS endorsement of these drafts. [**Action: Secretariat, CSS members**].
- 53.3.** A working group comprising several members of the CSS will be established to prepare the CSS contribution for the future development of the long term plan for the IAEA safety standards [**Action: CSS Chair, CSS Scientific Secretary**].
- 53.4.** The Secretariat will report back to the CSS on internal discussions regarding the need to update the Board of Governors on changes to the safety standards establishment system since the issue of GOV/INF/772 [**Action: Secretariat**].
- 53.5** The progress report on the working plan established to implement the recommendations of the Commission for its 7th term will be complemented to develop the end of term report, including proposed recommendations for the 8th term [**Action: CSS Scientific Secretary**].
- 53.6.** A draft list of actions from the 53rd CSS meeting (this list) will be provided to CSS members for comment. [**Action: Secretariat, CSS Scientific Secretary**].
- 53.7.** The draft report of the 53rd CSS meeting will be posted on the CSS web page for comment. [**Action: Secretariat, CSS Scientific Secretary**].
- 53.8.** The presentations made at the 53rd CSS meeting will be posted on the CSS web page. [**Action: CSS Scientific Secretary**].