3 March 2010

Commission on Safety Standards

Twenty-sixth Meeting

14-16 October 2009

IAEA Headquarters, Vienna

Draft report of the Meeting

1. Opening Session

1.1 Opening of the Meeting

Mr Taniguchi opened the 26th meeting of the Commission on Safety Standards. He noted that, through the important work of the CSS, IAEA Safety Standards are increasingly regarded worldwide as the basic reference for improving global nuclear safety. The CSS continues to lead effectively the further improvement in establishing and revising safety standards and in providing for their use and feedback. He took the opportunity to express his appreciation and thanked the CSS members for their active participation and contributions in strengthening the global nuclear safety and security regime.

He then provided further context for the work to be accomplished by the CSS during this meeting. In particular, some perspectives on some areas where IAEA safety standards are particularly relevant, and some highlights regarding the nuclear safety and security programmes from last month's IAEA General Conference.

First, Mr Taniguchi noted some highlights of the 53rd General Conference.

The General Conference approved the Agency's Programme and Budget for 2010 and 2011. The major programme on nuclear safety and security had increased significantly by 21.5% for 2010 compared with the 2.8% for the whole Agency. This clearly demonstrated the importance assigned by the Member States to nuclear safety and security. The bulk of this increase was earmarked for nuclear security and emergency preparedness and response, particularly for so called "regularization", which allows EBP activities in core management areas to be converted to more predictable and assured and neutral regular budget activities.

Resolution GC(53)/RES/10 commended the Commission on Safety Standards, the Safety Standards Committees, and the Secretariat for the establishment and implementation of the Roadmap for the long term structure for safety standards. The General Conference looked forward to the integration of all thematic areas in a coherent and harmonized set of publications complemented by a series of facility and activity specific safety requirements. For the first time both the omnibus resolution for nuclear, radiation and waste safety was combined with the transport safety resolution, showing the integration of all safety issues in a harmonized manner.

In GC(53)/RES/11 on nuclear security, including Measures to protect against nuclear and radiological terrorism, the General Conference recalled UN General Assembly Resolution 60/78, which states that progress is urgently needed in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation in order to help to maintain international peace and security and to contribute to global efforts against terrorism. This acknowledged the need to make further progress towards achieving nuclear disarmament.

Second, Mr Taniguchi spoke about new and expanding nuclear power programmes.

In September 2009, the IAEA released its revised estimates on the future of nuclear power development. In October 2009, nearly 80 Member States are considering or have expressed interest in developing nuclear power programmes. Many countries have also embarked on ambitious plans for expanding their current programmes. The IAEA's latest update of its annual projections for the future of nuclear power, and its low and high projections for 2030, were now higher than they were in 2008. The low projection foresees an installed global nuclear power capacity of about 510 gigawatts-electric in 2030, a 40% increase over the 370 gigawatts-electric currently installed today. The high projection foresees 810 gigawatts-electric, which more than doubles the current capacity. It is expected that

approximately 5 to 20 new countries will be operating nuclear power plants by the year 2030. While prospective new nuclear programmes receive much attention, the expansion of existing programmes is far more significant in terms of the total size of the development. Much of the expansion will depend principally on those 30 countries that already have nuclear power. In terms of installed capacity, this translates roughly into the construction of 140 to 440 additional 1000 MW equivalent units within 20 years, which is indeed a significant challenge to the world nuclear community.

This expansion of nuclear power can only be realized with the establishment of sustainable safety and security infrastructures. Mr Taniguchi considered that IAEA safety standards can be effectively used by Member States in enabling the safe and secure introduction and expansion of nuclear power. The revision to GS-R-1 on *Legal and Governmental Infrastructure for Nuclear, Radiation, Radioactive Waste and Transport Safety* and draft safety guide DS424 on *Establishing a Safety Infrastructure for a National Nuclear Power Programme* were two good examples of this purpose. The aim should be to make these safety standards available for use by Member States in a timely manner. At this meeting, the CSS would receive a briefing on the development status of DS424, including plans for a pilot test of the draft.

Next, Mr Taniguchi covered long term management of radioactive sources.

The long term management for disused radioactive sources continues to be a challenge for the international nuclear community, and for many countries there is a strong need to improve the registering and monitoring of dangerous radioactive sources from cradle to grave for safety and security worldwide. In particular, disused sources, after losing their practical value tend to be left unattended. This is a significant problem that must be urgently addressed. On a broad level, the revision to GS-R-1, as well as the current revision of the BSS, both afford good opportunities for the international nuclear community to address this challenge.

Mr Taniguchi also drew attention to capacity building.

Cornerstones of sustainable infrastructure are adequate managerial and technological capacity and competence, along with the needed education and training to build them. The availability of qualified personnel as a building block for organizational, institutional and national capacity is vital to the development of an adequate and sustainable nuclear safety and security infrastructure. For this reason, the IAEA makes it a top priority to help develop the skills, knowledge and expertise of individuals across many disciplines, such as scientists, legislators, regulators, administrators, radiation and nuclear technology experts, and emergency response personnel. The IAEA is committed to continue help strengthen human, managerial and technological capabilities, thus further enabling the development of sustainable institutional and national capacities. The IAEA's Safety Standards and Security Guidelines are important inputs for this activity.

All these three issues had been discussed during the General Conference in Senior Regulators Meeting and INSAG Meeting and would be further discussed in December 2009 at the forthcoming conference in Capetown, South Africa.

He reported that an extraordinary meeting and an organizational meeting for the preparation of the 5th Safety Convention Review Meeting had been held, in which facilitation and encouragement of accession for new parties were important issues.

Next, Mr Taniguchi considered the CSS mid-term progress report.

He was pleased at main achievements reported in the draft mid-term progress report for the fourth CSS term. He considered that the second half of the fourth term would also be very productive in continuously improving the Agency's safety standards activities. The organization of joint AdSec and CSS sessions was an important initiative in this regard. He looked forward to the results of first meeting of the joint AdSec and CSS task force to work on its first task of improving the development process for safety standards and security series publications for better synergies and integration between them.

In conclusion, he hoped that his remarks provided further context and considerations for the work during the meeting. The international nuclear community continues to face many issues and challenges, including new and expanding nuclear power programmes, long term management of radioactive sources and capacity building. The CSS plays a vitally important role in the IAEA's efforts to establish high-quality standards of safety and to provide for their use and application.

1.2 Introductions, Adoption of the Agenda, Adoption of the 26th CSS meeting report

Mr Lacoste, Chairman of the Commission, welcomed participants. He introduced new members to the Commission, Mr. Nakamura from Japan and Ms Cousin from ICRP. He also indicated that apologies had been received from Mr Liu Hua from China (Mr Jun Yu represented China at the meeting), Mr Sharma from India, Mr Yun from Korea, Mr Maksimovas from Lithuania (Mr Paulikas represented Lithuania at the CSS), Mr Adamchik from Russia, Mr Clapisson from South Africa (Mr Pather represented South Africa at the meeting), Mr Weightman from the UK (Mr Cresswell represented the UK at the meeting), Mr Faross from the EU (Mr Janssens represented the EU at the CSS), Ms Cousins from the ICRP (Mr Gonzalez represented the ICRP at the meeting), Mr Meserve from INSAG (Mr Laaksonen represented INSAG at the meeting). A list of participants is provided in Annex I.

The USA had submitted comments on the provisional agenda and these had been discussed with the Secretariat. Mr Lacoste proposed that the status of the letter sent by him to the Director General in June 2009 would be addressed under item 1.3 of the agenda and that the request for further information on the process for establishment and implementation of the European Union Directive be addressed under item 5.6.

Mr Lacoste further proposed that a comprehensive report on how operational experience information is collected by the IAEA and fed back into the standards development process would be presented at the 27th CSS meeting [Annex III, Action 26.5]. Nevertheless a presentation on the feedback from the Incident Reporting System and the OSART mission will be addressed with a new agenda item 5.7.

The agenda with the proposed changes was approved. The approved agenda is provided in Annex II.

Mr Lacoste informed the Commission that the draft report of the 25th CSS meeting had been made available and that no comments had been received. The report of the 25th CSS meeting was approved [Annex III, Action 26.1].

1.3 Administrative arrangements for the meeting, Status of the endorsed Standards and Response to Actions from the 24th Meeting

Mr Delattre briefly informed the Commission of administrative arrangements for the meeting. He noted that all material had been made available two months in advance of the meeting for effective review by the Commission.

Mr Delattre presented the status of the endorsed Safety Standards. He informed the Commission that 8 Safety Standards had been published so far in 2009:

The first two General Safety Requirements publications:

- Safety Assessment for Facilities and Activities (DS348) GSR Part 4
- Predisposal Management of Radioactive Waste (DS353) GSR Part 5

One Specific Safety Requirements publication:

- Regulations for the Safe Transport of Radioactive Material, 2009 Edition (DS345) TS-R-1

Five Safety Guides :

- Ageing Management for Nuclear Power Plants (DS382) NS-G-2.12
- Compliance Assurance for the Safe Transport of Radioactive Material (DS327) TS-G-1.5
- Evaluation of Seismic Safety for Existing Nuclear Installations (DS383) NS-G-2.13
- Severe Accident Management Programmes for Nuclear Power Plants (DS385) NS-G-2.15
- The Management System for Nuclear Installations (DS349) GS-G-3.5

He also noted that the Safety Framework for Nuclear Power Source Applications in Outer Space, A/AC.105/934, had been published.

He provided details on 12 further Safety Standards, endorsed by the Commission, that were being published:

- Safety of Nuclear Fuel Cycle Facilities: Uranium Fuel Fabrication Facilities (DS317)
- Safety of Nuclear Fuel Cycle Facilities: Uranium and Plutonium Mixed Oxide Fuel

Fabrication Facilities (DS318)

- Borehole Facilities for the Disposal of Radioactive Waste (DS335)
- Safety of Conversion and Enrichment facilities (DS344)
- Schedules of Provisions of the IAEA Regulations for the Safe Transport of Radioactive Material (DS387)
- Classification of Radioactive Waste (DS390)
- Development and Application of Level 2 Probabilistic Safety Assessment for Nuclear Power Plants (DS393)
- Development and Application of Level 1 Probabilistic Safety Assessment for Nuclear Reactors (DS394)
- Deterministic Safety Analysis for Nuclear Power Plants (DS395)

Mr Delattre informed the Commission of the status of actions arising from the 25th CSS meeting (see Annex IV).

Mr Delattre also reminded the Commission of the current composition of the joint CSS-AdSec taskforce: Messrs Hashmi and Lacoste as co-chairs of the taskforce; Messrs Adnan, Solit and Torres Vidal from AdSec; Messrs Laaksonen, Vinhas and Virgilio from the CSS; representatives of management of the Secretariat; and the scientific secretaries of the CSS and of AdSec.

On the topic of the Nuclear Energy Series, Mr Gonzalez considered that users in the Member States could be confused between the Safety Standards Series publications and the Nuclear Energy Series publications. Mr Taniguchi emphasized the need for step by step improvement in coordination between the two departments.

Copies of two documents that addressed this concern, namely the letter sent by Mr Lacoste to the Director General of the IAEA in June 2009 (see Annex IV, Action 25.10) and a joint Nuclear Safety/Nuclear Energy interoffice memorandum on publications, were circulated for information in support of the discussion. The Commission requested the Secretariat to provide to the 27th CSS meeting a report on the measures put in place to implement the joint NS/NE interoffice memorandum [Annex III, Action 26.3].

Mr Lacoste expressed his, the Commission's and the Safety Standards Committees' readiness to review NE Series draft publications, as necessary. Furthermore, he and the Chairs of the Committees would make themselves available to review such drafts between meetings of the Committees, if necessary. Mr. Virgilio expressed his concern that it may not be either sufficient or appropriate for the regulator to review a document that was created for the purpose of promoting nuclear power. The Commission requested representative from the Department of Nuclear Energy to provide a presentation to the 27th CSS meeting on the process NE intends to use to involve Member States in the review of Nuclear Energy Series draft publications [Annex III, Action 26.2].

Mr Gonzalez considered that the interoffice policy paper ought to have mentioned that safety standards are mentioned in the various safety Conventions, which confers on safety standards a special status. He drew attention to the similar numbering system adopted by the NE Series, which, he considered, increased the danger of confusion. Mr Virgilio considered that difficulties perhaps lay more deeply, at the level of the programmatic activities of the two departments.

2. Presentations and Discussion of Reports of Safety Standards Committees

2.1 Nuclear Safety Standards Committee

Mr Vaughan, Chairman of NUSSC, reported on the 27th NUSSC meeting. He informed the Commission that NUSSC had approved five draft Safety Standards (DS388, DS412, DS415, DS416, and DS422) for submission to the CSS and four draft Safety Standards (DS396, DS405, DS414 and DS424) for submission to Member States for comment, and had reviewed the progress of several other draft Safety Standards (DS351, DS379 and DS413). NUSSC had also approved three DPPs for submission to the CSS (DS429, DS430 and DS431). Mr Vaughan also reported on a new agenda item on feedback on regulatory arrangements and developments (Mr Vaughan's full presentation is available on the CSS website).

In the discussion that followed the NUSSC presentation, Mr Jammal and Mr Virgilio both referred to the need to remain focused on the CSS priorities drawn up in 2007. Mr Virgilio also considered that more discussion was necessary on the interfaces between Nuclear Safety and Nuclear Energy and between safety and security with regard to the proposed Safety Guides on Design of Electrical Power Systems for NPPs (DS430) and Design of I&C Systems for NPPs (DS431).

2.2 Radiation Safety Standards Committee

Mr Magnusson, Chairman of RASSC, reported on the 26th RASSC meeting, which had been held jointly with WASSC and TRANSSC. He summarized the discussions of the revision of the BSS, and informed the Commission that RASSC had approved seven draft Safety Standards (DS44, DS354, DS388, DS408, DS409, DS415 and DS416) for submission to the CSS, four draft Safety Standards (DS410, DS411, DS414 and DS424) for submission to Member States for comment and two DPPs (DS429 and DS432) (Mr Magnusson's full presentation is available on the CSS website).

2.3 Waste Safety Standards Committee

Mr Pather, Chairman of WASSC, reported on the 27th WASSC meeting, which had been held jointly with RASSC and TRANSSC. He informed the Commission that WASSC had approved seven draft Safety Standards (DS44, DS354, DS371, DS388, DS415, DS416 and DS422) for submission to the CSS, four draft Safety Standards (DS410, DS411, DS414 and DS424) for submission to Member States for comment and two DPPs (DS429 and DS432) (Mr Pather's full presentation is available on the CSS website).

The discussion that followed centered on a request from INLEX for technical advice from the Safety Standards Committees on a proposal from Germany to exclude small training and research reactors and nuclear installations being decommissioned from the application of the 1987 Vienna Convention on Civil Liability and of the Convention on Supplementary Compensation. Mr Louvat clarified that INLEX had requested the IAEA to verify if references to the safety standards in the proposal were correct.

In response to Mr Gonzalez's query, Mr Pather clarified that the phrase 'generic criteria' had been dropped from the title of DS432.

2.4 Transport Safety Standards Committee

Mr Brach, Chairman of TRANSSC, reported on the 18th TRANSSC meeting, which had been held jointly with RASSC and WASSC. He informed the Commission that, TRANSSC had approved five draft Safety Standards for submission to the CSS (DS44, DS408, DS409, DS415 and DS416), three draft Safety Standards for submission to Member States (DS411, DS414, DS424) and one DPP (DS429). Mr Brach also summarized TRANSSC's discussions on what would be a reasonable frequency for the review and revision of TS-R-1 (Mr Brach's full presentation is available on the CSS website).

In the discussion that followed, Mr Gonzalez expressed his agreement with TRANSSC that revision of TS-R-1 should continue to take place only as necessary; on the issue of format, he considered that flexibility would be necessary. He drew attention to the terms 'exemption' and 'exception' and the need to clarify the difference, if any, particularly for translation.

Transportable Nuclear Power Plants

Mr Khoroshev of the Department of Nuclear Energy then provided a presentation on an INPRO study on Legal and Institutional Issues for Transportable Nuclear Power Plants (TNPPs). Mr Khoroshev's full presentation is available on the CSS website. He reported that representatives of 30 Member States participate in the INPRO project. The study presented was the first stage of a comprehensive study of capacity building work to be done.

In the discussion that followed Mr Khoroshev's presentation, various members of the Commission expressed their serious concerns with how the study would address areas such as occupational radiation protection, effluent discharges and waste management, risk assessment and emergency preparedness.

Mr Jamet informed the Commission of a forthcoming DPP on Safety of Small/Medium, Transportable and Floating Nuclear Power Plants (DS435), which would be reviewed by NUSSC the following week.

The following day, the Commission returned to their discussion of the topic of TNPPs and the issue of the Nuclear Energy Series. Mr Cresswell considered that regulatory infrastructure should not be addressed as part of the work of the Department of Nuclear Energy. Mr Virgilio and Mr Gonzalez agreed that the roles and responsibilities of NE and NS required clarification. Furthermore, the structure adopted by the NE Series publications could lead to confusion.

Mr Lacoste proposed to the Commission that he would send a letter to the IAEA's Director General setting out the Commission's views on the NE Series and on the interface between the programmes of the Department of Nuclear Energy and the Department of Nuclear Safety and Security [Annex III, Action 26.4].

Mr Lacoste further requested the Safety Standards Committees to put together a list of preliminary safety issues relevant to DS435 (Safety Guide on Small/Medium, Transportable and Floating Nuclear Power Plants) for the 28th CSS meeting [Annex III, Action 26.7]. Mr Vaughan considered that perhaps the proposed Safety Guide could be better issued as a TECDOC. Mr Pather and Mr Lacoste considered that the justification for such power plants was insufficient.

3. Approval of draft publications and DPPs

3.1 Disposal of Radioactive Waste (DS354)

(Item 3.1 of the agenda was discussed by the Commission after item 3.2.)

Mr Metcalf presented the draft Safety Requirements for approval for publication and indicated the Secretariat's proposal to address comments by Japan and USA.

In the discussion that followed, Mr Virgilio considered that the same wording as agreed for paragraph 1.5 of DS415 (see item 3.2) may be used in DS354 to explain the status of the associated conditions.

Mr Metcalf informed the Commission that a forthcoming Safety Guide on The Safety Case and Safety Assessment for Radioactive Waste Disposal (DS355) would provide detail on long term optimization. Mr Vinhas requested the Secretariat to avoid in the future including so much text in the publication before the first requirements are introduced. Mr.Nakamura suggested the importance of referring to the origin of quantitative criteria on human intrusion.

The Commission approved the draft for submission to the Board of Governors.

3.2 Governmental, Legal and Regulatory Framework for Safety (DS415)

(Item 3.2 of the agenda was discussed by the Commission prior to item 3.1.)

Mr Caruso presented the draft Safety Requirements for approval for publication and indicated the Secretariat's proposal to address comments by USA and UK.

Mr Virgilio then made a presentation on USA's concerns relating to DS415, in which he emphasized the need to clarify the status of 'type 1' and 'type 2' requirements. He also noted that, for some requirements, their status as requirements was not clear owing to the use of ambiguous language. Mr Virgilio explained that the USA's concerns had become evident only recently owing to the fast evolution of the draft over the past year.

Mr Laaksonen commented favorably on Mr Virgilio's suggestions and proposed that the Chairs of the Safety Standards Committees review the draft and come back to the Commission with their comments, so that the Safety Requirements could be endorsed at this meeting.

Mr Gonzalez explained that, in contrast to technical aspects of safety addressed in other safety standards, the revision of GS-R-1 aims to establish requirements on governments. He indicated that Argentina's Government does not recognize a statutory responsibility of the Agency to impose requirements on governments. He considered that such requirements are necessarily less precise requirements, owing to the need to generalize the various approaches used in different countries and achieve consensus. He indicated that this would not be easy to clarify the text but agreed that this should be done quickly considering the Agency's need for the standard.

Ms Mykolaichuk considered that nuclear security issues should be included in the next revision of this safety standard, and that the development of a 'parallel' document on legal and governmental framework for security must be avoided.

Mr Virgilio endorsed Mr Laaksonen's suggestion that the four Chairs of the Safety Standards Committees could be tasked with reviewing the US changes, so that the CSS could endorse the draft. Mr Magnusson and Mr Vaughan, however, were unsure whether the Chairs could agree to such changes in substance or in format without returning DS415 to the Committees. Mr Larsson would agree to such a proposal if any changes were to be purely editorial; without having seen the proposed US changes, however, he was unclear whether they were indeed editorial.

Mr Lacoste considered that DS415 had to be endorsed by the CSS at this session and that no change in substance could be made at the CSS.

Mr Metcalf explained the thinking behind the development of WS-R-4, the Safety Requirements on Geological Disposal of Radioactive Waste, the first Safety Requirements publication to be developed in this 'new' format, namely the desire to have a more focused document.

Mr Virgilio therefore suggested that the draft could be approved as it is, provided that paragraph 1.5 be modified to address the main concern of clearly identifying the safety requirements.

Mr Lacoste requested Messrs Caruso, Delattre, Virgilio and Laaksonen to collaborate to redraft paragraph 1.5, for consideration by the Chairs of the Safety Standards Committees and then by the Commission.

(Discussions concluded for that evening and then resumed the following day.)

Mr Caruso presented a proposal for a change to paragraph 1.5, which indicated that concomitant requirements beneath the numbered requirements in bold text would be set out using a different presentation from that used for explanatory, descriptive text; the decision as to the precise style of presentation would be left to the Secretariat.

Mr Pather and Mr Laaksonen noted that a variety of formulations is used for the concomitant requirements, and considered that these formulations should be made consistent throughout; Mr Magnusson agreed that the proposed change to paragraph 1.5 was one of many ways of distinguishing between requirements and explanatory text, but he felt reluctant to deal with the issue in such a hurried manner.

Mr Lacoste considered that this would be acceptable, and proposed that the Commission endorse DS415, while remaining aware that it is not a perfect document, with paragraph 1.5 modified to explain how concomitant requirements would be distinguished from explanatory text. He further proposed that DS415 be reviewed after 2 years, and account be taken of progress in the interface between safety and security and feedback from IRRS missions [Annex III, Action 26.6].

Mr Larsson considered that the proposed changed to paragraph 1.5 would make no difference to how DS415 was understood.

Mr Jammal felt that DS415 could be evaluated and modified even sooner than 3 years, if necessary.

The Commission endorsed the draft for submission to the Board of Governors, with the modification, as discussed, to differentiate clearly between concomitant requirements and explanatory text.

3.3 Chemistry Programme for Water Cooled Nuclear Power Plants (DS388)

Mr Renev presented the draft Safety Guide for approval for publication. No comments had been received from CSS members.

The discussion that followed surrounded the use of the terms "minimization" of exposure (typically used in the nuclear safety community); and "optimization" of exposure (typically used in the radiation protection community). Mr Magnusson and Mr Vaughan agreed that the terms have similar meanings.

The Commission endorsed the draft for publication.

3.4 Radiation Safety in Industrial Radiography (DS408)

Mr Wheatley presented the draft Safety Guide for approval for publication. No comments had been received from CSS members.

In the discussion that followed Mr Gonzalez and Mr Virgilio expressed their satisfaction at the inclusion of recommendations on security in Section 8.

The Commission endorsed the draft for publication.

3.5 Radiation Safety of Gamma, Electron and X Ray Irradiation Facilities (DS409)

Mr Reber presented the draft Safety Guide for approval for publication. No comments had been received from CSS members.

The Commission endorsed the draft for publication.

3.6 Ageing Management for Research Reactors (DS412)

Mr Shokr presented the draft Safety Guide for approval for publication. No comments had been received from CSS members.

Mr Gonzalez requested the Secretariat to carry out a further editorial check to verify the correct use of the term “SSCs” (systems, structures and components) in the draft.

The Commission endorsed the draft for publication.

3.7 Licensing Process for Nuclear Installations (DS416)

Mr Calpena presented the draft Safety Guide for approval for publication.

The discussion that followed centered on a comment received from Japan as to the use of the terms “authorization” or “licence”. Mr Nakamura believed that the usage should be consistent with that in DS415. Considering that the scope of DS416 focus on Nuclear Installations, compared to a wider scope for DS415, the Commission agreed that the term “licence” should remain as it is, but requested the Secretariat to take particular care for the translation of the standard.

The Commission endorsed the draft for publication.

3.8 Seismic Hazards in Site Evaluation for Nuclear Installations (DS422)

Mr Godoy presented the draft Safety Guide for approval for publication. No comments had been received from CSS members.

In the discussion that followed, the difficulty in reaching consensus on the topic was acknowledged because of varying experiences with seismicity.

The Commission endorsed the draft for publication.

3.9 DPP for a new Safety Guide on External Expert Support on Safety Issues (DS429)

Mr Philip presented the DPP for approval and indicated the Secretariat’s proposal to address, during the drafting, the request from Japan to revisit the title.

In the discussion that followed, Mr Vaughan, who had been involved in the drafting of the DPP, informed the Commission that NUSSC had discussed whether the scope should be restricted to regulatory bodies only, but had eventually approved the DPP with the current, broader, scope. Mr Gonzalez queried the need for the word “external” in the title, as, he felt, the focus ought to be on the expertise needed. He also queried the extensive listing of legal documents as interfaces, as the Safety Guide should present recommendations on the technical support necessary. Mr. Delattre clarified that the internal support is addressed by another safety guide and this is why this draft DS429 would deal only with the external support. Mr Philip also informed the Commission that the Safety Guide would include a recommendation that technical support organizations ensure functional independence in respect of support provided to both regulatory bodies and operating organizations.

The Commission approved the DPP, with account to be taken of the remarks made by the Commission.

3.10 DPP for a revision of NS-G-1.8, Safety Guide on Design of Electrical Power Systems for NPPs (DS431)

Mr Johnson presented the DPP for approval. No comments had been received from CSS members.

In the discussion that followed, Mr Virgilio highlighted the importance of the two topics of interactions with the electricity grid and cyber-security, and Mr Lacoste requested that these be

included in the DPP.

The Commission also discussed whether the Safety Guide should be restricted to nuclear power plants, or should cover all nuclear installations. Mr Johnson reminded the Commission of different approaches to the topic in different installations as well as differences in supporting documents. He moreover considered that a combined approach was less user-friendly and would result in a less useful Safety Guide. Several members of the Commission noted the importance of retaining coherence and consistency among Safety Guides, but the Commission agreed that the Secretariat should proceed to develop a Safety Guide for nuclear power plants only, as proposed. Mr Vaughan suggested that, when several Safety Guides on the topic of electrical power systems for various types of installations have been established, certain common recommendations could be developed.

The Commission approved the DPP, amended to include the two topics: interactions with the electricity grid; and cyber-security.

3.11 DPP for a revision of NS-G-1.1 and NS-G-1.3, Safety Guide on Design of I&C Systems for NPPs (DS431)

Mr Johnson presented the DPP for approval. No comments had been received from CSS members.

Mr Vaughan noted that the Safety Guide would contain recommendations on both hardware and software. Mr. Virgilio questioned and Mr. Johnson confirmed that cyber security issues would be addressed in this publication.

The Commission approved the DPP.

3.12 DPP for a new Safety Guide on Volcanic Hazards in Site Evaluation for Nuclear Installations (DS405)

Mr Godoy presented the DPP for approval. No comments had been received from CSS members.

Mr Godoy explained that the Safety Guide would be a revision and an update of Provisional Safety Standards Series No. 1, Volcanoes and Associated Topics in Relation to Nuclear Power Plant Siting, published in 1997. In 2005, NUSSC had agreed that the new Safety Guide should be developed; the DPP at hand was being presented to the CSS to formalize the approval process.

Although WASSC had not yet approved the DPP, Mr Pather agreed to its approval by the CSS, provided that WASSC comments, if any, be included. Mr Gonzalez noted the unusual process the draft publication had followed, but emphasized that no procedures had been violated.

The Commission approved the DPP, under the condition that comments from WASSC be included.

4. Progress reports on safety standards and other safety related publications

4.1 Information on the status of the implementation of the roadmap on the long term structure for safety standards

Mr Mrabit presented information on the status of the implementation of the roadmap. This progress report constitutes the main part of the mid-term report to be reviewed under agenda item 5.5. This includes the definition of the long term structure for the safety standards, the wider involvement of co-sponsors in the revision of the BSS and the establishment of a joint AdSec-CSS task force. Mr Mrabit also mentioned the reinforced cooperation among all actors, including through the reinforcement of the role of the five Chairpersons, through the meeting of the four Committees Chairs and the meeting of the five Chairs as well as through the modification from the internal steering committee to the new Coordination Committee. Mr Mrabit's full presentation is available on the CSS website.

4.2 Information on ICRP activities

Mr Gonzalez provided a presentation on the history, structure and recent activities of the ICRP. He highlighted the recent and forthcoming ICRP publications and detailed in a comprehensive review the changes in the recommendation ICRP 103. Mr Gonzalez's full presentation is available on the CSS website.

4.3 Information on the status of the revision of the BSS (DS379)

Ms Amaral presented a progress report on the revision of the Basic Safety Standards. Ms Amaral's full presentation is available on the CSS website.

Mr Magnusson reminded the Commission that the draft would be sent to Member States for 120 days' comment subject to its approval by the Committees. Mr Janssens referred the EU's participation in the BSS secretariat, and indicated that the EURATOM BSS, which was expected to be endorsed by experts in November 2009, had some conceptual differences but presented essentially the same requirements. Mr Yoshimura also indicated the NEA's involvement as a cosponsor.

4.4 Information on AdSec activities

Mr Hashmi presented information on AdSec activities. He noted that the establishment of the Joint CSS-AdSec taskforce had been welcomed by AdSec members. He further considered that the draft Safety Guide on National Strategy for Regaining Control over Orphan Sources and Improving Control over Vulnerable Sources, DS410, presently with Member States for comment, could be reviewed by both AdSec and CSS.

Mr Hashmi also informed the Commission that the IAEA's Director General had approved the establishment of a committee to review draft security publications, as part of the process to strengthen their development.

In the discussion that followed, Mr Gonzalez noted that a parallel series of publications was not a solution; rather security requirements and recommendations should be incorporated into safety standards. Mr Lacoste clarified that there was no intent to incorporate one series into another and that the long-term aim was clearly the feasibility of a series that would adequately cover both nuclear safety and nuclear security.

4.5 Information on INSAG activities

Mr Laaksonen presented information on INSAG activities, including recent and forthcoming publications. Mr Laaksonen's full presentation is available on the CSS website.

In the discussion that followed, Mr Lacoste asked whether INSAG could address the issue of regulatory framework for transportable nuclear power plants. Mr Jamet agreed that this issue could be provided to INSAG for consideration.

4.6 Progress report on the development of the Safety Guide DS424 and agreement for pilot use of the draft

Mr Caruso presented a progress report on the development of DS424. Mr Caruso's full presentation is available on the CSS website.

Mr Caruso also informed the Commission of the first application of DS424, in Vietnam. He also clarified that DS424 covered national policy and technical details relating to waste, spent fuel and decommissioning. The Commission agreed that the Secretariat should proceed to the use of DS424 in a pilot manner.

4.7 Other information on recent activities from the Secretariat

a) Mr Jamet provided a short presentation on recent activities in NSNI. Mr Jamet's presentation is available on the CSS website.

b) Ms Amaral provided a short presentation on recent activities in NSRW. Ms Amaral's presentation is available on the CSS website.

In the discussion that followed, Ms Amaral informed the Commission about NSRW activities in the area of medical applications (training, development of Safety Reports and a forthcoming joint project with WHO on justification of practices). In the area of non-medical uses of X-rays, NSRW was providing assistance through the IAEA's Technical Cooperation programme; and a manual of good practices in radiation protection was being developed to assist newcomers in uranium mining.

Following a suggestion from Mr Gonzalez, Mr Lacoste requested the Secretariat to provide information to the CSS on the results of the recent international conferences on Control and Management of Inadvertent Radioactive Material in Scrap Metal, held in February 2009 in Tarragona, Spain, and on Remediation of Lands Contaminated by Radioactive Material Residues, held in May 2009 in Astana, Kazakhstan, and actions arising from these conferences [Annex III, Action 26.9].

Mr Virgilio urged caution in taking a position on limits for reducing medical radiation exposure as the medical community believes they have saved a great deal of lives that outweigh the negative effects of

radiation exposure.

c) Mr Stern provided a short presentation on recent activities in the IEC. Mr Stern's presentation is available on the CSS website.

In the discussion that followed, Mr Gonzalez drew attention to the fact that the list of RANET countries did not reflect the actual situation, and that a list was necessary of those countries that would actually respond to an emergency. Mr Stern clarified that the aim of RANET was to smooth the path by which countries could respond.

d) Mr Mrabit provided a short presentation on recent activities in NS-SSCS. In particular he highlighted, in addition to the implementation of the roadmap already addressed under agenda item 4.1, the development of the SPESS document and its application manual, the new brochure on the IAEA safety standards for the General Conference and the establishment of a IT tool to identify terms used in the safety standards that should be added into the Safety Glossary and to ensure consistent use of the glossary terms. Mr Mrabit also summarized the main results of the Senior Regulators' meeting held during the General Conference. Mr Mrabit's presentation is available on the CSS website.

5. Policy discussion

5.1 Report on the activities of the joint AdSec CSS Task Force

Mr Lacoste reminded the Commission of the establishment of the joint CSS-AdSec taskforce, which would hold its first meeting immediately following the CSS meeting. The Terms of Reference had been drafted and would be discussed at the meeting. The dedicated taskforce website is http://www-ns.iaea.org/committees/css-adsec/.

5.2 Status on the discussion with the Safety Standards Committees on stakeholder involvement

Mr Delattre introduced the topic and informed the Commission of the status of the paper on stakeholder involvement in the process for preparation, review and approval of safety standards. Following the approval of the paper at the Safety Standards Committees, the paper would be submitted to the Commission in March 2010 for its approval, and would then be included in the SPESS document. The paper addresses the various types of stakeholders (the Member States, the United Nations and its specialized agencies, other inter-governmental organizations and non-governmental organizations) and provides criteria for their involvement at each stage in the process.

5.3 Final review of the draft 2 of the document on Strategies and Processes for the Establishment of IAEA Safety Standards (SPESS)

Mr Mrabit introduced the final review of draft 2 of the document on Strategies and Processes for the Establishment of IAEA Safety Standards (SPESS). Mr Mrabit's full presentation is available on the CSS website.

In the discussion that followed, Mr Virgilio proposed that all requirements in Safety Requirements publications, whether bold, numbered, 'type 1' overarching requirements or concomitant 'type 2' requirements, be written using "shall" statements.

Mr Brach, Mr Vaughan, Mr Magnusson, Mr Pather and Mr Gonzalez, in turn, agreed with Mr Virgilio's proposal:

- Mr Brach considered the use of "shall" for all requirements would be more user friendly, both for the Committees and the Commission in their review, and for users of the safety standards;
- Mr Vaughan and Mr Pather were concerned that the current situation left open a possibility that 'type 2' requirements might be considered less important, and thus might be ignored;
- Mr Magnusson considered that the use of "shall" for all requirements was one of several methods that could be used to achieve a clear distinction between what are requirements and what is explanatory text, and that achieving this clear distinction was most important;
- Mr Gonzalez felt that "shall" is the only auxiliary verb appropriate for requirements, and noted that the translation of other formulations would leave open some ambiguity.

Mr Gonzalez reminded the Commission on his comments made on DS415 (agenda item 3.2). He

regretted that the resolution of the concerns about DS415 through a simple change of the paragraph 1.5 was not necessarily a perfect solution, and agreed to join the consensus but suggested that further revision of the standard in the future should address all the issues raised. In this regard, Mr Gonzalez indicated that he would provide the Secretariat with a note to be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.[1]

Further, Mr Gonzalez felt that in the long term the Glossary must become a 'real' glossary of terms, with a single definition for each. He also considered that Article 11 of the Statute should be mentioned in SPESS too, as it is less general but even more important than Article 3.

Mr Larsson and Mr Lacoste reflected on the difficulties that always accompany continuous progress, noting that changes would need to be made in DS354 and DS415, which had already been endorsed at this meeting, if they were to be brought into line with the general agreement among CSS members that "shall" should be used for all requirements.

Mr Virgilio further requested the Secretariat to specify in Section I of the SPESS document the different sources of feedback to improve the safety standards, including information from the IRS [Annex III, Action 26.8].

Mr Pather requested the Secretariat to mark obsolete or superseded publications as such on the IAEA publications website.

---

[1] Following the meeting, Mr Gonzalez provided the following points in writing to the Secretariat:

"(1) Mr. Gonzalez noted that substantial new observations to document Draft 4 of DS415 has been made by the US delegation. These observations were seen with sympathy by Argentina and considered of fundamental nature.

"(2) He further noted that these observations reflect an intrinsic problem of all of the IAEA documents aimed at imposing obligations and 'managerial' approaches on governments, which unfortunately have been termed 'standards'. These type of documents differ substantially from the quantitative technical 'standards of safety' proper that the IAEA has been establishing over the last 50 years as per Article 3 of its Statute. The IAEA 'standards of safety' are amenable to unambiguous requirements imposing clear duties on those having the ultimate responsibility for safety according to current legally binding agreements; for instance, the holder of the relevant licence for the safety of a nuclear installation rests, or the employer for the safety of occupationally exposed workers. Conversely, these documents, by their nature, cannot and should not include such type of duties to Governments. His Government has called the attention of the Secretariat on these intrinsic problems on a number of occasions.

"(3) Safety obligations on Governments (be they on specific actions by the administration or Parliament, or on managerial practices) may only be undertaken by Governments trough intergovernmental legally binding agreements, such as Conventions. The Government of Argentina undertook safety obligations by signing, and further ratifying by legislative instruments approved by the Parliament, all the relevant safety-related conventions. The IAEA Statute authorizes the Agency to establish standards of safety but not to establish obligations to Governments. These standards of safety may presume, as a preamble to their requirements, that Governments are fulfilling their safety obligations as a precondition for safety, but they may neither impose additional obligations nor reformulate or re-elaborate the obligations undertaken trough appropriate international instruments.

"(4) The US comments have evidenced the intrinsic problems that may appear in the use of documents such as DS-415, for instance pursuant to the IAEA duty and obligations on safety established in Article IX of its Statute. While the standards of safety can establish unambiguous safety requirements using the auxiliary verb 'shall' ('deber' in Spanish), documents including pseudo-obligations to Governments cannot and they must use uncharacteristic formulations for safety standards (such as 'typically', as correctly indicated by the US delegation in its comments).

"(5) Mr. Gonzalez further noted that an opportunity was missed to discuss this fundamental issue and rather it was decided by CSS to undertake few unedited modifications of DS-415, which were approved in a rush without further consultations, neither to Governments nor to the relevant Committees. While he did not wanted to block the apparent consensus on CSS to pursue with the document approval, he noted that the only apparent urgency on having this document approved seems to have arose from the Secretariat rather from a consensus claim from Member States."

5.4 Final review of the reference list of Safety Guides for the long term

Mr Delattre introduced the final review of the reference list of Safety Guides for the long term. Mr Delattre's full presentation is available on the CSS website.

The Commission requested the Secretariat to retain this item as a standing topic on the CSS agenda, and to maintain the reference list, update it as necessary and reissue it after each CSS meeting, with changes if new DPPs are approved [Annex III, Action 26.10].

5.5 Review of the draft mid-term report

Mr Delattre introduced the review of the draft mid-term report. He indicated that the draft was available on the CSS website.

Mr Virgilio suggested that the Commission should update its Terms of Reference, keeping in mind forthcoming activities relating to the interface between safety and security. Mr Magnusson considered that the Safety Standards Committees should also update their Terms of Reference at the same time; Mr Pather noted that the terms of office of the Committees expire at the end of 2010, so that such work would need to be carried out soon. Mr Lacoste requested the members of the Commission and the Committees to provide suggestions for updating their Terms of Reference [Annex III, Action 26.11].

Mr Gonzalez reflected on the history of how and why the CSS had been established, and Mr Lacoste requested Mr Gonzalez to provide such information to the members of the Commission.

5.6 Adoption of a European Directive of Nuclear Safety

Mr Lacoste provided information on the new European Directive on Nuclear Safety, a copy of which was distributed to CSS members. He drew attention to many elements of the Directive that were directly or indirectly linked to the safety Conventions, the Safety Fundamentals SF-1 and other IAEA safety standards. There is also an explicit reference made to the IAEA IRRS. Mr Lacoste considered that significant elements are the fact that there is a collective agreement among the members of the European Union, that the IAEA safety standards and the CSS activities have influenced the content of the Directive and that for this reason Mr Jamet had provided support to the EC for the drafting of the Directive. Mr Janssens informed the Commission that among the possible future steps another directive on waste management could be issued. Finally Mr Lacoste indicated that the WENRA reference levels are also derived from the IAEA safety standards.

6. Feedback from the Commission on the Use of IAEA Safety Standards and Regulatory Issues

6.1 Topical discussion on the Use of Safety Standards and National Practice on Involvement of Stakeholders

Ms Asfaw provided a summary of the contributions sent in advance by Belgium, Canada, Finland, Japan, Korea, Lithuania, Sweden, UK and USA. The contributions were posted on the CSS web page and will remain available for all members in an archive file on the web page (http://www-ns.iaea.org/committees/css/) in the folder "Presentations provided by the CSS members".

6.2 Regulatory Issues in the Member States

As for item 6.1, many presentations on related regulatory issues had been provided in advance. The material will also remain available for all members in an archive file on the web page (http://www-ns.iaea.org/committees/css/) in the folder "Presentations provided by the CSS members".

Mr Lachaume informed the Commission of a recent plutonium inventory incident at the Atelier de Technologie du Plutonium (ATPu) facility at Cadarache, France, which ASN had classified at Level 2 on the INES scale.

Mr Samain informed the Commission of a recent decision in Belgium to suspend the phasing out of nuclear power for 10 years until 2025.

Mr Larsson reported on a proposal in Sweden that would allow for new reactors to be built under certain conditions; the proposal would shortly be submitted for public comment and would probably be submitted to parliament for approval later in 2009.

7. Miscellaneous, Report of the Meeting, Date of the next Meetings

Mr Lacoste informed the Commission that a detailed list of actions resulting from the meeting would be issued within two weeks for comment [Annex III, Action 26.12].

He also informed the Commission that a draft report of the meeting would be prepared and sent for comment to the members and the draft mid-term report will be finalized taking into consideration the comments received under agenda item 5.5 and provided to the Director General. [Annex III, Action 26.13].

The next meetings are planned to be held from **17 to 19 March 2010** and from **29 September to 1 October 2010.**

ANNEX I

PARTICIPATION AT THE 26TH CSS MEETING

The Commission

A.J. González, Argentina

P. Johnston, Australia

J.-P. Samain, Belgium

L.A. Vinhas, Brazil

R. Jammal, Canada

Liu Hua, China (sent apologies – unable to attend)

M. B. F. Barakat, Egypt

Y. Laaksonen, Finland

A-C. Lacoste, (Chairman) France

D. Majer, Germany

S. K. Sharma, India (sent apologies – unable to attend)

I. Levanon, Israel

K. Nakamura, Japan

C. H. Yun, Korea (sent apologies – unable to attend)

G. Maksimovas, Lithuania (sent apologies – unable to attend)

M. S. Rahman, Pakistan

S. Adamchik, Russian Federation (sent apologies – unable to attend)

G. Clapisson, South Africa (sent apologies – unable to attend)

A.D. Gurguí Ferrer, Spain

C.-M. Larsson, Sweden

O. Mykolaichuk, Ukraine

M. Weightman, United Kingdom (sent apologies – unable to attend)

M. Virgilio, United States of America

L. C. Dung, Vietnam

Observers

J. A. Hashmi, AdSec

P. Faross, EC (sent apologies – unable to attend)

C. Cousins, ICRP (sent apologies – unable to attend)

R. Meserve, INSAG (sent apologies – unable to attend)

U. Yoshimura, OECD NEA

Chairmen of Committees

G. Vaughan, NUSSC

S. Magnusson, RASSC

E. W. Brach, TRANSSC

T. Pather, WASSC

Representatives and associated experts

Mr Reiman, Ms Forest, Mr Lachaume, Mr Nomoto, Mr Ogiso, Ms Collet i Campo, Mr Williams, Mr Janssens, Mr Paulikas, Mr. Cresswell, Mr. Yu.

IAEA Staff Members

T. Taniguchi, Deputy Director General, Department of Nuclear Safety and Security

E. Amaral, Director, Division of Radiation, Transport and Waste Safety (NSRW)

A. Nilsson, Director, Office of Nuclear Security (NSNS)

P. Jamet, Director, Division of Nuclear Installation Safety (NSNI)

K. Mrabit, Head, Safety and Security Coordination Section (SSCS)

W. Stern, Head, Incident and Emergency Centre (IEC)

H. Abou Yehia, G. Caruso, R. Czarwinski, P. Colgan, M. El Shanawany, A. Godoy, M. Gregoric, R. Hoskins, M. Lipar, D. Louvat, K. Mrabit, C. Viktorsson, J, Wheatley

K. Asfaw, S. Calpena, G. Johnson, M. Khoroshev, P. Metcalf, G. Philip, E. Reber, A. Renev, A. Shokr, A. Starz

Safety Standards coordinators

G. Feige, Policy and Programme Support Section (NSNI), NUSSC

G. Siraky, Waste and Environmental Safety Section (NSRW), WASSC

J. Stewart, Regulatory Infrastructure and Transport Safety Section (NSRW), TRANSSC

T. Boal, Radiation Safety and Monitoring Services Section (NSRW), RASSC

D. Delattre, Scientific Secretary of the CSS, Safety and Security Coordination Section

ANNEX II

AGENDA

Twenty sixth Meeting of the

COMMISSION ON SAFETY STANDARDS

14 – 16 October 2009

VIC – Boardroom A M0237, 2nd floor in the M Building

1. Opening Session

   1.1 Opening of the Meeting (14:00); *T. Taniguchi; DDG*-NS

   1.2 Introductions, Adoption of the Agenda, Adoption of the 25th CSS meeting report; *A.-C. Lacoste*

   1.3 Administrative arrangements for the meeting, Status on the main topics for the 4th CSS term, Status of the endorsed Standards and Response to Actions from the 25th Meeting; D. Delattre

2. Presentations and Discussion of Reports of Safety Standards Committees

   2.1 Nuclear Safety Standards Committee

   G. Vaughan, Chairman/G. Feige, Scientific Secretary - NUSSC

   2.2 Radiation Safety Standards Committee

   S. Magnusson, Chairman/T.J. Boal, Scientific Secretary - RASSC

   2.3 Waste Safety Standards Committee

   T. Pather, Chairman/G. Siraky, Scientific Secretary – WASSC

   2.4 Transport Safety Standards Committee

   E.W. Brach, Chairman/J.Stewart, Scientific Secretary – TRANSSC

3. Approval of draft publications and DPPs

   3.1 Disposal of Radioactive Waste (DS354), *P. Metcalf*

   3.2 Governmental, Legal and Regulatory Framework for Safety (DS415), *G. Caruso*

   3.3 Chemistry Programme for Water Cooled Nuclear Power Plants (DS388), *A. Renev*

   3.4 Radiation Safety in Industrial Radiography (DS408), *J. Wheatley*

   3.5 Radiation Safety of Gamma, Electron and X Ray Irradiation Facilities (DS409), *E. Reber*

   3.6 Ageing Management for Research Reactors (DS412), *A. Shokr*

   3.7 Licensing Process for Nuclear Installations (DS416), *S. Calpena*

   3.8 Seismic Hazards in Site Evaluation for Nuclear Installations (DS422), *A. Godoy*

   3.9 DPP for a new Safety Guide on External Expert Support on Safety Issues (DS429), *G. Philip*

   3.10 DPP for a revision of NS-G-1.8, Safety Guide on Design of Electric Power Systems for NPPs (DS430), *G. Johnson*

   3.11 DPP for a revision of NS-G-1.1 and NS-G-1.3, Safety Guide on Design of I&C Systems for NPPs (DS431), *G. Johnson*

   3.12 DPP for a new Safety Guide on Volcanic Hazards in Site Evaluation for Nuclear Installations (DS405), *A. Godoy*

4. Progress reports on safety standards and other safety related publications

   4.1 Information on the status of the implementation of the roadmap on the long term structure for safety standards; *K: Mrabit*

4.2 Information on ICRP activities; *A. Gonzalez*

4.3 Information on the status of the revision of the BSS*; E. Amaral*

4.4 Information on AdSec activities; *J. Hashmi*

4.5 Information on INSAG activities, *J. Laaksonen*

4.6 Progress report on the development of the safety guide DS424 and agreement for pilot use of the draft; *G. Caruso*

4.7 Other information on recent activities from the Secretariat

5. Policy discussion

5.1 Report on the activities of the joint AdSec and CSS Task Force; *co chairs of the task force*

5.2 Status on the discussion with the Safety Standards Committees on stakeholder involvement; *D. Delattre*

5.3 Final review of the draft 2 of the document on Strategies and Processes for the Establishment of IAEA Safety Standards (SPESS); *K. Mrabit*

5.4 Final review of the reference list of safety guides for the long term; *D. Delattre*

5.5 Review of the draft mid-term report; *D. Delattre*

5.6 Adoption of a European Directive on Nuclear Safety, *A.-C. Lacoste*

5.7 Feedback from OSARTs, NSNI programmes, IRS Topical Studies and events to IAEA Safety Standards, *M. Lipar*

6. Feedback from the Commission on the application of safety standards and regulatory issues

6.1 Topical discussion on the Use of Safety Standards; *(K. Asfaw)*

6.2 Regulatory Issues in the Member States; *(CSS Members)*

7. Miscellaneous, Report of the Meeting, Dates of the next meetings

- 17-19 March 2010
- 20 September – 1 October 2010

ANNEX III

ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE 26th MEETING OF THE COMMISSION

26.1. The final report of the 25th CSS meeting to be posted on the safety standards web site. **[Action: Secretariat].**

26.2. A representative from the Department of Nuclear Energy to provide a presentation to the 27th CSS meeting on the process NE intends to use to involve Member States in the review of Nuclear Energy Series draft publications. **[Action: Secretariat (NE)]**

26.3. A report to be provided to the 27th CSS meeting on the measures to implement the joint NE/NS interoffice memorandum, also clarifying the respective roles of the Safety Standards Series and the Nuclear Energy Series. **[Action: Secretariat (NS and NE)]**

26.4. The CSS Chair to meet with and send a letter to the IAEA Director General setting out the Commission's views on the NE Series and on the interface between the programmes of the Department of Nuclear Energy and the Department of Nuclear Safety and Security. **[Action: CSS Chair]**

26.5. A comprehensive report on IAEA feedback mechanisms for the safety standards to be provided to the 27th CSS meeting. **[Action: Secretariat]**

26.6. Revise Draft Standard DS415 (Safety Requirements on Governmental, Legal and Regulatory Framework for Safety) to improve the clarity around what are the requirements, submit it to the Board of Governor and issue as an IAEA Safety Standard. Conduct a review within 2 years to further improve the clarity, incorporate feedback from IRRS missions, and to reflect progress on the interface between safety and security. **[Action: Secretariat]**

26.7. Safety Standards Committees to put together a list of safety issues relevant to DS435 (Safety Guide on Small/Medium, Transportable and Floating Nuclear Power Plants) for the 28th CSS meeting. **[Action: Members of the SSCs]**

26.8. To specify in Section I of the SPESS document the different sources for feedback. SPESS document to be provided at the 27th CSS meeting, after consultation of the Safety Standards Committees. **[Action: Secretariat]**

26.9. The results of the recent international conferences on Control and Management of Inadvertent Radioactive Material in Scrap Metal, held in February 2009 in Tarragona, Spain, and on Remediation of Lands Contaminated by Radioactive Material Residues, held in May 2009 in Astana, Kazakhstan, and actions arising from these conferences to be provided for information to the CSS. **[Action: Secretariat]**

26.10. Update and provide the "Reference Set of Safety Guides for the Long Term" document at each CSS. As a standing CSS agenda item, present any changes to the set of safety guides and safety requirement documents. **[Action: Secretariat].**

26.11. Provide suggestions for updating the Terms of Reference for the Committees and the Commission with the goal of having approved Terms of Reference in place at the start of the new terms. **[Action: Members of the CSS and SSCs].**

26.12. A list of actions resulting from the 26th meeting to be provided for comment to the CSS members. **[Action: Secretariat].**

26.13. The draft report of the 26th CSS meeting to be posted for comment to the CSS web site and the draft mid-term report to be finalized and provided to the Director General **[Action: Secretariat].**

ANNEX IV

STATUS OF ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE 25th MEETING OF THE COMMISSION

25.1. The final report of the 24th CSS meeting with the agreed resolution of comments to be posted on the safety standards web site **[Action: Secretariat].** Done. Final report posted on 24 April 2009

25.2. A status report on progress on the main topics identified as priorities at the 23rd CSS meeting for the CSS fourth term to be provided, at the beginning of each CSS fourth term meeting **[Action: Secretariat]**. This will actually be part of the mid-term report (agenda item 5.5 of the 26th CSS meeting). Draft report posted on 14 August 2009.

25.3. The Transport Safety Standards Committee Chair to discuss with TRANSSC 1) what is a reasonable frequency for the revision/amendment of TS-R-1, 2) the need to update related safety guides concurrently with revisions of TS-R-1, and 3) how to implement the new format for safety requirements in TS-R-1, and to report to the 26th CSS meeting **[Action: TRANSSC Chair]** Done. Addressed under agenda item 2.4 of the 26th CSS meeting.

25.4. The presentation on the process for the finalization of the revision of the BSS to be updated so as to reflect the following five conclusions and to be provided to the CSS members **[Action: Secretariat]**: Addressed under agenda item 4.3 of the 26th CSS meeting.

- Priority should be given to the quality of the draft over the production time;

- Member States should be consulted only once, on a revised draft that implements the new format for Safety Requirements;

- All changes made to the current SS115 should be made available to the Safety Standards Committees members and the Member States in a file showing the changes made;

- Sufficient time should be given to the Safety Standards Committee members to review the draft prior to Member States consultation;

- The current and potential co-sponsors should continue to be involved in the process, including the implementation of the new format for the Safety Requirements.

25.5. The CSS Chair and the AdSec Chair to establish jointly a task force in order to consider the results of the joint CSS/AdSec session and to seek candidatures to participate in the joint task force. The joint task force to develop and circulate its Term of Reference **[Action: CSS Chair with AdSec Chair]**. Joint Task Force Established. Web site established. TOR submitted for comments and contribution papers uploaded. First meeting on 16 October 2009.

25.6. A paper on criteria, role and guidelines for the involvement of stakeholders in the Safety Standards Committee meetings to be prepared jointly with the Committee Chairs **[Action: Secretariat, including OLA and EXPO, in co-operation with the Committees Chairs].** Done. Paper developed in meetings with the Four Chairs, with involvement of OLA and EXPO. Draft being submitted currently to the Committees.

25.7. The CSS members to continue to share their national practices on stakeholder involvement **[Action: CSS members].** New contributions for this 26th CSS meeting. Contributions at the previous meeting left on the web site so as to compile all contributions. Still a number of contributions missing.

25.8. Technical editors in NS-SSCS to review drafts, in particular draft Safety Requirements, as soon as possible after resolution of Member States comments **[Action: Secretariat]**. Decision was too late for its implementation for the June meeting of the Committees (the draft were already posted). Being now implemented for the drafts submitted at the October-November meeting of the Committees.

25.9. The sequence of meetings of the Safety Standards Committees and the CSS to be established on the basis of the timeline optimization paper approved at the 25th CSS meeting **[Action: Secretariat]**. Will be implemented on a regular basis.

25.10. A letter to be sent to the IAEA Director General by the CSS Chair on the concern of the CSS that some publications from the Nuclear Energy Department addressing safety related aspects could

duplicate and address differently the recommendations of the IAEA safety standards, resulting in possible confusion in the Member States on the objectives of the different IAEA publications **[Action: CSS Chair]**. Done. Letter send on 24 June 2009 and posted on the CSS web site. NS-NE Series relationship policy paper established on 6 October 2009.

25.11 A list of actions resulting from the 25th meeting to be provide for comment to the CSS members **[Action: Secretariat].** Done. Draft submitted for comment on 29 April 2009. Final list as an annex to the draft report of the 25th meeting.

25.12. The draft report of the 25th CSS meeting to be posted for comment to the CSS web site **[Action: Secretariat].** Done. Draft report posted for comment on 14 August 2009.

25.13 A draft mid-term report to be prepared and posted for approval at the 26th CSS meeting **[Action: Secretariat].** Done. Draft mid term report posted on 14 August 2009.