51st Meeting of the Commission on Safety Standards

20–22 April 2022, IAEA Vienna

(physical meeting, with remote participation available)

Report of the Meeting

Overview of main results of the meeting

A. The following draft safety standards were endorsed:

- DS509a: Safety Guide on Commissioning of Research Reactors;
- DS509b: Safety Guide on Maintenance, Periodic Testing and Inspection of Research Reactors;
- DS509c: Safety Guide on Core Management and Fuel Handling for Research Reactors;
- DS509d: Safety Guide on Operational Limits and Conditions and Operating Procedures for Research Reactors;
- DS509e: Safety Guide on The Operating Organization and the Recruitment, Training and Qualification of Personnel for Research Reactors;
- DS509f: Safety Guide on Radiation Protection and Radioactive Waste Management in the Design and Operation of Research Reactors;
- DS509g: Safety Guide on Ageing Management for Research Reactors;
- DS509h: Safety Guide on Instrumentation and Control Systems and Software Important to Safety for Research Reactors;
- DS511: Safety Guide on Use of a Graded Approach in the Application of the Safety Requirements for Research Reactors;
- DS517a: Safety Guide on Safety of Conversion Facilities and Uranium Enrichment Facilities;
- DS517b: Safety Guide on Safety of Uranium Fuel Fabrication Facilities;
- DS517c: Safety Guide on Safety of Uranium and Plutonium Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facilities;
- DS520: Safety Guide on Hazards Associated with Human Induced External Events in Site Evaluation for Nuclear Installations.

B. The following draft DPPs were approved:

- DPP DS532: Safety Requirements on Safety of Nuclear Power Plants: Commissioning and Operation (revision of SSR-2/2 (Rev. 1));
- DPP DS534: New Safety Guide on Protection Strategy for a Nuclear or Radiological Emergency.

C. Policy discussions:

- The mid-term report of the 7th term of the CSS was adopted.
- A first round table discussion was held on the situation in Ukraine, including on whether guidance should be developed to address nuclear safety challenges arising in cases of military conflict. It was agreed that further discussion should take place at the next CSS meeting.
- The medium term plan for the safety standards was discussed and updated and the concept paper for the preparation of the long term plan for the safety standards was discussed and supported by the CSS.

1. Opening session

1.1 Guidance on the conduct of the virtual meeting

The 51st Meeting of the Commission on Safety Standards took place as an 'in-person' meeting at IAEA Headquarters; however, due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, provision was also made for remote attendance. The meeting took place over three half-day sessions held from 20th to 22nd of April 2022.

Mr D. Delattre welcomed the CSS participants logging on to the virtual meeting, and explained how the meeting would be conducted online.

1.2 Opening of the meeting

Mr S. Mallick, Director of the Office of Nuclear Safety and Security Coordination, provided opening remarks on behalf of Ms L. Evrard, DDG-NS. He welcomed everyone attending, either in person or virtually, and indicated his pleasure at seeing a significant number of CSS participants present at the Agency's headquarters.

Mr Mallick noted several particular issues for discussion at the meeting, including an update on small modular reactors and an opportunity to discuss a concept paper for the preparation of a long term structure and plan for the IAEA safety standards. Regarding the unprecedented situation in Ukraine, he noted that the Agency has expressed grave concerns about the safety and security of nuclear facilities in the country. At the request of CSS members, an item had been included in the agenda so as to have a first roundtable discussion on the safety implications of the situation in Ukraine.

He noted that 13 draft Safety Guides, in several batches of related guides, were submitted for endorsement, along with two draft Document Preparation Profiles (DPPs). There was a large batch of nine draft Safety Guides for research reactors and a batch of three draft Safety Guides for nuclear fuel cycle facilities, for consideration and endorsement. Mr Mallick also reported that the Secretariat had worked hard to find tangible solutions to solve the issue of delays in publications. He reported that eight Safety Guides had been published since the last CSS meeting in November 2021, and three more would be issued soon.

Mr Mallick shared with CSS members a new initiative established by the Director General, called the Nuclear Harmonization and Standardization Initiative (NHSI). This platform is aimed at bringing together policy makers, regulators, designers, vendors and operators to develop common regulatory and industrial approaches to innovative reactors such as small modular reactors (SMRs). The core objective of this initiative is to strengthen the international collaboration, for both regulatory and industrial approaches to ensure the safe and secure deployment of SMRs and advanced reactor technologies globally.

Finally, he expressed sincere appreciation to CSS members for their dedicated and diligent efforts as well as for the advice and guidance provided to the Agency for the safety standards. He concluded by wishing all participants a successful meeting.

1.3 Introductory remarks from the CSS Chair

Ms R. Velshi thanked Mr Mallick for his introductory remarks and noted that, once again, the CSS was meeting during difficult times. In addition to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the war in Ukraine had threatened the safety and security of civil nuclear installations. Because of this, a dedicated agenda item had been added to the meeting to consider developing guidance for operators of nuclear power plants in the event of an armed conflict. She emphasized that this would be a technical discussion, and that political statements should not be made.

Ms Velshi summarized the agenda for the meeting, which would be held over three sessions. She noted that there was a lot to cover, including the approval of 13 draft Safety Guides and two DPPs. Ms Velshi also noted the need to adopt the CSS mid-term report, and to discuss the medium term plan and the concept paper on the long term structure and plan for the safety standards. Ms Velshi noted that there

would be updates on SMR activities and the work of the Inter-Agency Committee on Radiation Safety, as well as information from UNSCEAR and OECD/NEA.

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

1.4 Introduction of new Commission's members

Ms Velshi noted that there were no new members of the CSS since the previous meeting.

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

1.5 Adoption of the agenda

Mr A. González noted that the total time allotted for the meeting was too short and requested that the next CSS meeting be organized as a full meeting, running over several days. For the current CSS meeting, he requested that time be found to discuss two additional important matters, namely the question of whether the safety standards can be used for reactors using novel technologies, such as SMRs or fusion reactors, and the question of tritium monitoring for the Advanced Liquid Processing System (ALPS) treated water released from the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant. Ms Velshi noted that the first matter would be addressed under item 7 of the agenda, and proposed that the second matter could be instead taken up at a special agenda item at the next CSS meeting.

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

1.6 Confirmation of the adoption of the final report of the 50th CSS meeting

Ms Velshi asked whether there were any further comments from the CSS on the report of the previous meeting.

Mr González stated that the CSS reports were always very well prepared. He requested two small changes to the version of the report that had been posted on the CSS website: namely that it be specified that the consistent approach between EPReSC and RASSC described is on radiation protection policy; and that it be clarified that the question of denial of shipment is not an issue of public acceptance.

With these two changes, the adoption of the report of the 50th CSS meeting was confirmed **[Annex IV, Action 51.1].**

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

Mr Delattre presented the status of the roadmap for the long term structure of the safety standards, including those recently endorsed by the CSS. He informed the Commission that one General Safety Guide and seven Specific Safety Guides had been published since the previous CSS meeting in November 2021. Three other Safety Guides had completed the CSS silent approval procedure and were in the final stages of the publication process. In addition, two Safety Guides would shortly be submitted for CSS silent approval, and eight Safety Guides were in the process of being edited.

In summary, Mr Delattre reported that, as a result of the action plan to clear the publishing backlog described at the previous CSS meeting:

- Eight safety guides had been published since the previous CSS meeting, and three more were to be published soon.
- There is no longer a queue of CSS endorsed publications waiting for editing.

Mr Delattre presented information on timescales for publication, which had improved significantly due to the measures described at the previous CSS meeting. The total number of published safety standards was 130, consistent with the long term structure.

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.

The presentations are available in the CSS web page in the folder for documents provided for information: The Commission Members Area (iaea.org).

Mr P. Webster thanked the Secretariat for the timely publication of DS503 (SSG-77), which he had requested be prioritized, and hoped that additional resources would continue to be devoted to the editing of safety standards. Regarding the response to Action 50.02 (see Annex III), Mr Webster recalled the statement of Mr Delattre at the Chairs' meeting the previous day: namely the two documents that describe respectively the processes and associated responsibilities for the planning, development, review, revision, approval and establishment of the IAEA Safety Standards Series and of the IAEA Nuclear Security Series refer respectively to the Article III.A.6 of the IAEA's Statute for the safety standards and to the Article II of the IAEA's Statute for the nuclear security guidance.

Ms N. Cromnier and Mr González also thanked the Secretariat for eliminating the queue for publication, but Mr González requested that attention be paid to the translation of standards, particularly those standards relating to legally binding obligations on States, such as in the areas of transport of radioactive material and occupational radiation protection. Mr Delattre noted that all Safety Requirements publications are translated into all official languages as a matter of course; for the Safety Guides, the Secretariat aims to prioritize those publications that are most useful for the most users. For example, SSG-26 (Rev. 1), the Advisory Material for the IAEA Regulations for the Safe Transport of Radioactive Material, would soon be issued in English and funding was being sought for its translation; GSG-7, the Safety Guide on Occupational Radiation Protection, was available in Russian and translations into Chinese, French and Spanish were under way.

1.8 Adoption of the CSS mid-term report

Mr Delattre noted that the mid-term report had been posted on the CSS website. Comments had been received from Israel and these had been incorporated and a new version posted for approval.

Mr G. Nageswara Rao requested that particular attention be paid to Recommendation 6 for the 7th CSS term, namely to continue developing supporting informational publications, and suggested that the Safety Standards Committees could also promote the continued development of such publications. Mr Delattre noted that Recommendation 6 had been translated into Action 4.5 of the CSS Working Plan, and that several recent examples of such publications were listed in the relevant part of Annex II of the mid-term report, in which progress on the Working Plan is reported.

Mr Webster requested that it be clarified under Action 4.1 in Annex II (i.e. the action relating to clearing of the backlog of drafts in the editing queue) that approval of standards is by the Publications Committee and endorsement by the CSS. He also requested that the final sentence reporting progress on that action be strengthened to indicate that further process improvements would continue.

Mr González considered that the description under item 3.8 on UNSCEAR-ICRP-IAEA cooperation was unclear and as such misrepresented the situation somewhat, as ICRP and UNSCEAR do not in fact co-sponsor safety standards. Mr Delattre agreed that there was one part of the sentence missing and this would be corrected. Mr González also requested that the mid-term report also include reference to the draft Safety Report on the implications of the UNSCEAR 2012 report.

With the changes proposed by Mr Webster and Mr González, the CSS mid-term report was adopted **[Annex IV, Action 51.2].**

2. First roundtable discussion on the safety implications of the situation in Ukraine

Ms Velshi introduced the discussion and referred to a thought provoking article entitled 'What We Learned from Russia's Assaults on Nuclear Plants'[1], written with contribution from Mr Richard Meserve, the Chair of INSAG, in which it is stated: "Nuclear operators and regulators should develop plans to minimize the risk to a nuclear facility during a military crisis and train staff on how to execute those plans. The IAEA should consider preparing guidance on how to confront safety, security, and safeguards challenges at nuclear facilities in these situations. The guidance might include recommendations, for example, on when to shut down reactors, what additional supplies (food, water, fuel, lodging, etc.) might be needed, when additional redundant systems for power are needed, and when and if to distribute potassium iodide." She proposed that these ideas be discussed and also followed up at subsequent meetings of the CSS.

Mr T. Elsner expressed his dismay at what was happening in Ukraine. He strongly supported the idea of developing some sort of guidelines for the protection of nuclear installations in conflict-type situations, but noted that it could be difficult to do so. Nevertheless, Germany stood ready to provide expertise in this regard.

Mr González thanked the Chair for including the topic on the agenda of this meeting, and noted that – in his many decades of work in the area of nuclear and radiation safety – there had never been a situation like the current one in Ukraine, nor could he recall discussion at international meetings of how to ensure safety and security of nuclear installations in conflict-type situations. He recalled that there had been air and missile strikes on nuclear facilities in Iraq and in Iran in the 1980s, where the strength of the containment had been demonstrated. He noted, however, that there were issues other than the nuclear power plants of Ukraine that were also of grave concern, such as radioactive sources – he recalled how the misuse of a radioactive source in Goiânia, Brazil, in 1986 had contaminated an entire city and led to the death of four people and the injury of many others – and depleted uranium – he recalled a study performed by the IAEA on the impact of depleted uranium munitions in Kuwait after the Gulf War. He proposed that a small working group be convened to discuss all the relevant issues.

Ms K. Alm-Lytz noted that military conflict had never been included in the design basis for nuclear installations, nor in the design basis threat. She considered that military conflict situations should be dealt with at the State level. Nevertheless, preparedness for such situations could be important, to ensure the resilience of nuclear installations. She did not consider that the safety standards should be modified, but that that there could be room for guidance of some nature. Ms Cromnier agreed with Ms Alm-Lytz on these points, and also noted that decisions should not be made too quickly, nor the purpose of the safety standards be changed.

Mr S. Alten emphasized that preparedness for war is not the responsibility of the operator of a nuclear installation, nor of the regulatory body. He proposed that the issue could be discussed at the next Review Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention on Nuclear Safety, to be held in March 2023. In this regard, Mr González noted that this would still be a matter to be addressed in the framework of the safety standards: he recalled the important link between the Convention on Nuclear Safety and the safety standards that is expressed in Principle 3 of the Vienna Declaration.

Mr M. Grzechnik pointed out the existence of the EPR Series publication on Preparedness and Response for a Nuclear or Radiological Emergency Combined with Other Incidents or Emergencies. The importance of this publication is that it allows considerations be given on the impact of an incident or emergency that is consident with the nuclear or radiological emergency on the emergency arrangements in place, so that adequate planning takes place to prevent that such impacts hinder the effectiveness of a response and that the response actions continue do more good then harm and provide the best protection under the circumstances.

---

[1] The article is available at https://www.defenseone.com/ideas/2022/03/what-we-learned-russias-assaults-nuclear-plants/363487/

Mr J. Lee noted the timeliness of this discussion. In the Republic of Korea, for example, intentional aircraft crash is included within the accident management plan for response, but conflict involving ground forces is not included. Such matters should be considered so as to provide useful guidance to operators.

Mr D. Roberts welcomed the opportunity for discussion, and also noted the importance of the work the IAEA is doing at the diplomatic level in this regard. Although nuclear power plants are robust, he acknowledged that conflict-type situations are not considered in the design. Indeed other matters such as personnel, fuel supply and the supply chain were perhaps even more important. He proposed that the seven indispensable pillars for ensuring nuclear safety and security in Ukraine, referred to by the IAEA Director General, could be embedded in the safety standards.

Mr A. Altinyollar drew the attention of the Commission to the draft Safety Guide DS520, presented for endorsement at this meeting under agenda item 4.13. In this Safety Guide it was clarified that malicious acts are not addressed, rather only accidental events. He also noted the recently issued Safety Guide SSG-68 on Design of Nuclear Installations Against External Events Excluding Earthquakes, which is applicable for external events of all types providing the load can be characterized. Another relevant normative publication is IAEA Nuclear Security Series No. 4 on Engineering Safety Aspects of the Protection of Nuclear Power Plants against Sabotage.

Ms Evrard thanked the members of the Commission for their interventions. She noted that some lessons from this situation in Ukraine had already been learned. For example, the key principles for safety are evidently still valid. Robustness and resilience, both from a technical and from a human perspective, are essential, irrespective of the nature of the hazard. Regarding the seven indispensable pillars, Ms Evrard noted that these are directly derived from the safety standards, therefore already fully embedded in them. Furthermore, she informed the Commission about ongoing discussions within the IAEA on the provision of assistance to Ukraine. Ms Evrard emphasized that, as the role of the CSS relates to the safety standards, the Commission might consider whether conflict-type conditions should be included in the design basis for nuclear installations and, if so, whether the existing safety requirements need to be extended or additional guidance provided. She also stressed that nuclear safety in Ukraine cannot be extricated from the bigger picture of the conflict as a whole.

Ms Velshi concluded the discussion by noting that it seemed that it would be helpful to develop guidance, but that further discussions were needed. She requested the Secretariat to include this point on the agenda for the next CSS meeting **[Annex IV, Action 51.3].**

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

3.1 Emergency Preparedness and Response Standards Committee (EPReSC)

Mr Grzechnik, EPReSC Chair, reported on the 13th meeting of EPReSC, at which it had reviewed 17 draft standards under development, three DPPs for safety standards and one DPP for nuclear security guidance. Regarding the proposed joint publication on management of the interfaces between safety and nuclear security, DS533/NST067, EPReSC had approved the DPP, noting the need for further work pending resolution within the NSGC of comments on the DPP. The proposals of the working group to discuss the roadmap for the development of safety standards and other publications on EPR had been accepted, and EPReSC had already reviewed the EPR standards for their applicability to new generation reactors including SMRs. The next EPReSC session in June 2022 would include a joint session with RASSC, while the EPReSC meeting to be held in November 2022 would include a joint session with NUSSC.

Mr Grzechnik's presentation is available on the CSS web site in the folder for documents provided for information: The Commission Members Area (iaea.org).

3.2 Nuclear Security Guidance Committee (NSGC)

Ms S. Case Lackner, NSGC Scientific Secretary, reported on the 20th meeting of NSGC. One draft Nuclear Security Series publication had been approved for submission to Member States for comment, while another draft had not been approved but was subsequently revised and then sent to NSGC for approval via a 30-day silence procedure in April 2022. Regarding the proposed joint publication on management of the interfaces between safety and nuclear security, DS533/NST067, NSGC had agreed to 'take note' of the DPP, rather than to 'approve' it: NSGC had recommended that the Secretariat arrange a consultancy meeting to discuss the aim, scope and place of this proposed publication in the system of IAEA publications. All submitted interface documents led by other Review Committees had been approved. It had also been reported to the NSGC that an Open-ended Meeting of Legal and Technical Experts on a Potential Revision of the Objective and Essential Elements of a State's Nuclear Security Regime (NSS No. 20) had been held in January 2022, and this had concluded that a further Technical Meeting should be convened to discuss a list of potential changes in NSS No. 20 and develop a recommendation for DDG-NS regarding the potential revision of NSS No. 20. A comprehensive review of the IAEA Nuclear Security Series was under way, and it was expected that discussion on this would take place at the 21st meeting of NSGC in June 2022.

Ms Case Lackner's presentation is available on the CSS web site in the folder for documents provided for information: The Commission Members Area (iaea.org).

Mr A. Cortés followed up by noting that it was hoped to have a solution regarding the issue of revision of NSS No. 20 by the end of the next NSGC meeting. He also indicated that there would be a discussion at the next NSGC meeting on whether and how security aspects of conflict situations could be addressed in the nuclear security guidance.

3.3 Additional information from other Committees

Regarding RASSC activities, Ms R. Bly, RASSC Chair, provided an update. She noted that work is under way to develop overarching guidance on existing exposure situations and to update the superseded Safety Guide on Safe Handling of Radioisotopes, issued in 1958 as IAEA Safety Series No. 1. She described the work plan to update Safety Guides that had been issued prior to GSR Part 3, and also described the work that was being done to address exposure due to radionuclides in food other than during a nuclear or radiological emergency, which would lead to a new Safety Report and a new TECDOC. Progress had been made since the last CSS meeting on addressing the applicability of GSR Part 3 to novel advanced reactors which is now included in the associated Safety Report (see Item 7), and a set of questions had been developed to provoke discussions on the long term plan for the safety standards.

Ms Bly's presentation is available on the CSS web site in the folder for documents provided for information: The Commission Members Area (iaea.org).

Mr González emphasized that the work on food safety should converge on a common policy on consumer goods, developed in coordination with other international organizations and in line with the relevant provisions of numerous IAEA General Conference resolutions. Ms O. Guzmán López Ocón noted that the project on food safety would lead for the first time to reference levels for radionuclides in food for application in non-emergency situations and that it has been developed in coordination with other international organizations and in line with the relevant provisions of numerous IAEA General Conference resolutions.

Mr Grzechnik requested that meetings be held as hybrid meetings, allowing virtual participation, rather than only as in-person meetings, so as to allow broader participation; participants in other time zones would be able to adapt to the timing in Vienna.

Regarding TRANSSC activities, Mr D. Pstrak, TRANSSC Chair, reported that a Note Verbale had been issued to Member States requesting proposals for changes to the Transport Regulations. Over 200 proposals had been received, and these would now be assessed to determine whether a revision cycle

for the Transport Regulations should be initiated. Some of the proposals related to topics under discussion by TRANSSC technical expert groups (TTEGs). The next meeting of TRANSSC in June 2022 would include a joint session with WASSC. He noted that TRANSSC was still discussing the topic of transportable nuclear power plants (TNPPs): his view was that TNPPs must be subject to the Transport Regulations; otherwise, how could safe transport be demonstrated? Mr González commented the need to clarify the difference between reactors used for propulsion and those being transported without being in operation.

Mr González requested that the next meeting of the CSS include a discussion on denial of shipment, which had been presented as an issue of concern in General Conference resolutions for many years. Ms S. Fayyaz reported that work on the topic of denial of shipment is ongoing with Technical Meetings and Working Groups being convened. Ms Velshi requested that the Secretariat present at the next CSS meeting on the work being done in the area of denial of shipment. As discussed under item 1.5, the next meeting will also include a presentation on the feedback from the implementation of the ALPS project. **[Annex IV, Action 51.4]**

Regarding NUSSC activities, Mr Webster, NUSSC Chair, reported that he, along with the other Committee Chairs, had participated in a special meeting of the Chairs focused on SMRs, which took place on 15 February 2022. The topics presented at that Chairs' meeting would also be presented under agenda item 7 of this CSS meeting. The next NUSSC meeting in June 2022 would include a joint session with NSGC.

Regarding WASSC activities, Mr P. Dicks, WASSC Chair, reported that the next WASSC meeting in June 2022 would include a joint session with TRANSSC.

Ms Velshi complimented all the Chairs on their collaborative work, especially through joint sessions of Committee meetings.

3.4 Summary of the meetings of the Chairs and of the CSS Strategic Planning Working Group held on 15 February and on 19 April before the CSS meeting

Mr Delattre reported that the meeting of the Chairs on 15 February 2022 had been focussed around a presentation by the Secretariat on the Agency's review of the applicability of the IAEA safety standards to novel advanced reactors and the draft work plan on approaches to address any implications for future work on the safety standards and informational publications, which would also be discussed under agenda item 7.

He also reported on the meeting of the Chairs on 19 April 2022, which had included the following topics:

- An exchange on optimization of the SPESS B process. Discussions had taken place on how the process could be made more efficient, for example by modifying how the deadline for submission of a DPP or a draft to a Review Committee was set, by being more flexible in meeting that deadline, or by using virtual meetings or formal consultation by email in addition to face-to-face meetings.

- A presentation by the Secretariat on the SMR Regulators' Forum activities, which had described the link between the work of the SMR Regulators' Forum and the other ongoing IAEA work on SMRs (see agenda item 7).

- First overall feedback from the Review Committees Chairs on the proposed concept paper for the preparation of the long term structure and plan for the safety standards (see agenda item 8).

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 web site. 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 51.5].**

4.01. Draft Safety Guide DS509a on Commissioning of Research Reactors

4.02. Draft Safety Guide DS509b on Maintenance, Periodic Testing and Inspection of Research Reactors

4.03. Draft Safety Guide DS509c on Core Management and Fuel Handling for Research Reactors

4.04. Draft Safety Guide DS509d on Operational Limits and Conditions and Operating Procedures for Research Reactors

4.05. Draft Safety Guide DS509e on The Operating Organization and the Recruitment, Training and Qualification of Personnel for Research Reactors

4.06. Draft Safety Guide DS509f on Radiation Protection and Radioactive Waste Management in the Design and Operation of Research Reactors

4.07. Draft Safety Guide DS509g on Ageing Management for Research Reactors

4.08. Draft Safety Guide DS509h on Instrumentation and Control Systems and Software Important to Safety for Research Reactors

Mr D. Sears presented the background and scope of the eight interrelated draft Safety Guides, and the steps taken in their development. CSS comments had been received from Germany and the Republic of Korea and had been resolved. Mr Sears particularly thanked Mr P. Shaw, Standards Specialist, for his work on harmonizing the recommendations of the eight Safety Guides thereby greatly improving their quality and usefulness for Member States.

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

Mr González welcomed the revised Safety Guides and recommended that a reference be included in the foreword to the publications linking them to the Code of Conduct on the Safety of Research Reactors, to which many Member States had made a political commitment. Mr J. Scott also thanked the Secretariat for its work on revising these Safety Guides.

Mr Webster confirmed that NUSSC strongly supported the drafts. He also reported that NUSSC had now reviewed and approved three 'batch revisions' of Safety Guides, namely DS497 (see the report of the 49th CSS meeting), DS509 and DS517 (see agenda items 4.10 to 4.12), and at its next meeting in June 2022 it would consider lessons that had been learned from this mode of revision.

The Commission endorsed the eight drafts for publication, subject to subsequent silent approval of the final edited versions.

4.09. Draft Safety Guide DS511 on Use of a Graded Approach in the Application of the Safety Requirements for Research Reactors

Ms F. Naseer presented the background of the draft Safety Guide, and described the steps taken for its development and its scope. CSS comments had been received from Germany and the Republic of Korea and had been resolved.

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

Mr Webster confirmed that NUSSC strongly supported the draft.

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

4.10. Draft Safety Guide DS517a on Safety of Conversion Facilities and Uranium Enrichment Facilities

4.11. Draft Safety Guide DS517b on Safety of Uranium Fuel Fabrication Facilities

4.12. Draft Safety Guide DS517c on Safety of Uranium and Plutonium Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facilities

Mr J. Rovny presented the three draft Safety Guides and described their background, the steps in their development and their scope. CSS comments had been received from France and all had been resolved.

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

Mr Webster confirmed that NUSSC strongly supported the drafts.

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

4.13. Draft Safety Guide DS520 on Hazards Associated with Human Induced External Events in Site Evaluation for Nuclear Installations

Mr Altinyollar presented the draft Safety Guide and described the objective of the Safety Guide, the purpose of assessing external hazards and how the draft Safety Guide links to other Safety Guides on siting and design of nuclear installations. He also described its background, overview and the steps taken in its development. CSS comments had been received from Germany and had been resolved.

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

Mr González noted that external events such as those recently highlighted in the situation in Ukraine had not been under consideration when the DPP for this Safety Guide had initially been approved, and requested that it be stated clearly in the draft that such events were excluded from the scope. He requested that the position and the applicability of safety standards for conflict-type situations be urgently clarified.

Mr Rao emphasized the importance of this Safety Guide in facing public challenges to siting of nuclear installations.

Mr Altinyollar confirmed that the scope of the Safety Guide did indeed explicitly exclude malicious acts. Mr Delattre and Mr P. Contri both noted that this Safety Guide was on the topic of site evaluation, rather than design; and that perhaps a future revision of the Safety Guide SSG-68 (on Design of Nuclear Installations Against External Events Excluding Earthquakes) would be better placed to provide recommendations on the protection of nuclear installations in conflict-type situations.

Mr Webster confirmed that NUSSC strongly supported the draft, and congratulated Mr Altinyollar on having developed it within the timeline agreed in the DPP.

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

4.14. Draft DPP DS532 for Safety Requirements on Safety of Nuclear Power Plants: Commissioning and Operation, revision of SSR-2/2 (Rev. 1)

Mr S. Morgan introduced the draft DPP, describing the background and justification for the publication, as well as the objectives, scope and proposed structure. No CSS comments had been received.

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

Mr Webster confirmed that NUSSC supported the development of this publication.

Ms A.-C. Rigail requested clarification of the types of requirements for SMRs that were expected to be included in this revised Safety Requirements publication. Mr Morgan replied that this would be one of the topics to be fully defined in the Consultancy Meetings, and that the inclusion of such requirements would depend on the time frames for development of other ongoing work on SMRs at the Agency.

The Commission approved the DPP.

4.15. Draft DPP DS534 for a new Safety Guide on Protection Strategy for a Nuclear or Radiological Emergency

Ms K. Kouts introduced the draft DPP, describing the background and justification for the publication, as well as the objectives and scope. CSS comments had been received from Israel and had been resolved.

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

Ms Cromnier strongly supported the Safety Guide. Mr Rao also noted the importance of the topic for public perception of safety, and expected that the Safety Guide on this sensitive topic would contribute to public confidence.

Mr González requested that particular care be given to the use of language, particularly in such phrases as 'justification and optimization of strategy', where the use of nouns as modifiers to other nouns could lead to ambiguities and be difficult to translate. Ms Kouts commented that the language used in DPP is consistent with the GSR Part 7 and IAEA Safety Glossary.

Mr Delattre informed the Commission that the Safety Guide would be strongly based on the existing EPR Series publication EPR-Protection Strategy. This manual had been inserted in the Nuclear Safety and Security Online User Interface (NSS-OUI), which would facilitate the collection of feedback and the development of the new Safety Guide.

Mr Grzechnik strongly supported this development of this publication.

The Commission approved the DPP.

5. DPP for information

5.01. DPP DS533/NST067 for a joint publication on Management of the Interfaces Between Safety and Nuclear Security

Mr K. Horvath introduced the draft DPP, describing the approach to be taken to drafting and review, the background and justification for the publication, as well as the objectives, scope and structure. He explained that this publication would be issued as two identical publications under two separate covers: as a Safety Guide in the IAEA Safety Standards Series and as an Implementing Guide in the IAEA Nuclear Security Series.

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

Mr Delattre explained that the DPP had been approved by all the Safety Standards Committees at the end of 2021. A Consultancy Meeting had been held in March 2022 to further develop the DPP, focussing on the proposed table of contents. The DPP would be submitted to NSGC for approval in June 2022, and it was anticipated that it would be approved. For this reason, the DPP was being provided to the Commission now for advance information and would then be submitted formally to the Comission for approval in July. In this manner, it was hoped to save time and avoid awaiting the CSS meeting in October 2022.

Mr T. Elsner, Ms R. Sardella, Mr González and Ms Velshi all strongly supported the development of this joint publication. Ms Sardella hoped that issues such as links between safety culture and security culture could be clarified through development of the publication. Mr González also considered that the issue of the relationship between safety and security had been made unnecessarily complicated in the past and that the development of this joint publication was evidence that security is a necessary element of safety.

6. Update on the draft Medium Term Plan

Mr Delattre presented the status of the medium term plan. He had posted an update to the plan on the CSS website at the end of March 2022. The plan had been kept 'alive' for the Committees to continue to review it. In particular, the Committees were requested at their next meetings to have a final look at the list of drafts for review and the list of new topics for future consideration. He expected there might be some updates from EPReSC based on their discussion of their roadmap. He had updated the annexes to the plan, and, based on the discussion under agenda item 4, he intended to add a bullet on consideration of the safety implications of situations involving armed conflicts such as in Ukraine.

Ms Alm-Lytz and Ms Cromnier were concerned that the review of the medium term plan could lead to a very large number of publications being revised or new drafts being developed. They considered it was important to have established the strategic objectives and conducted the environmental scanning so that the work could be properly prioritized. Mr Delattre noted that there were criteria for the optimization of the number of Safety Guides included in SPESS; the concept paper for the long term plan (see agenda item 8) also set criteria for the prioritization of Safety Guides.

Mr Delattre also explained that priorities from the medium term plan regarding SMRs would align with the work being done on harmonizing regulatory approaches SMRs through the NHSI in that safety standards, being consensus publications, de facto contribute to harmonization.

Mr Rao emphasized the importance of monitoring and tracking progress on the items on the medium term plan.

Mr González requested that consideration be given in the medium term plan to feedback from the ALPS project. In particular, he noted that there had never been any study that showed any health effects from exposure to tritium. He also lamented that, when safety standards are revised, frequently important guidance or recommendations are lost. He referred to the concept of committed dose, which had been well described in IAEA Safety Series No. 77 on Principles for Limiting Releases of Radioactive Effluents into the Environment, but which is no longer well reflected in the current body of safety standards.

Mr Roberts suggested that the medium term plan be kept as a living, operational document. Mr Delattre indicated that he would update the medium term plan and its appendix in accordance with the comments made, and ensure it was placed on the agenda of the forthcoming meetings of the Safety Standards Committees **[Annex IV, Action 51.6].**

7. Update on SMR related activities

Ms P. Calle Vives provided a comprehensive presentation on the status and conclusions of the Safety Report on applicability of the safety standards. She also described the key findings of the review of applicability of the safety standards to non-water cooled reactors and SMRs and described recommendations of the IAEA SMR working group for a work plan on how to consider SMRs and non-water cooled reactors in the safety standards, as well as recommendations on other publications and other activities, namely to provide advice on practical application of standards and to develop a repository of knowledge.

Mr J. Luis Hernandez provided an update on the development of a TECDOC on Approach and Methodology for the Development of Regulatory Safety Requirements for the Design of Advanced Nuclear Power Plants: Case Study on Small Modular Reactors. He described the background to the

TECDOC, the inherent safety features of SMRs, including examples, as well as the approach and methodology set out in the TECDOC. He also presented four examples of application of the proposed approach and the methodology for updating and adapting design safety requirements in SSR-2/1 (Rev.1) for different SMR technologies.

Both presentations as well as the draft TECDOC are available in the folder for documents provided for information: The Commission Members Area (iaea.org).

Mr González expressed his interpretation that there is a distinction between the words 'standard' and 'norm': a standard was a level of attainment, and based on fundamental ethical principles; whereas a norm was in fact a rule. The safety standards contained both standards and norms. He considered that the 'true' standards contained within the IAEA Safety Standards Series would apply to all technologies, even including fusion reactors; but the norms would not apply so widely.

Ms Alm-Lytz noted that the development of new IAEA standards on SMRs would take many years, and believed that Member States should not wait, rather should already begin to develop their own national regulations in parallel.

Ms A. Bradford reported that the NHSI would begin its work at a kick-off meeting in June 2022. She anticipated that complete harmonization would be challenging, but that smaller steps could be achieved to make the regulation of SMRs more efficient. Mr González added that NHSI includes also work with industrial counterparts in addition to the work on regulatory aspects.

Mr J. Dies Llovera commented that the fuel used in some kinds of SMR would be enriched up to 20%. It was important to address this, because the transport of fuel enriched at this level is challenging. He also noted the importance of considering accident tolerant fuel, including for conventional reactors; recently, the EU taxonomy classification (i.e. in support of activities that are needed to achieve climate neutrality) requires the use of accident tolerant fuel from 2025 if facilities are to receive EU funds for investment. Mr Luis Hernandez noted that in addition to SMRs and as mentioned in his presentation, the new materials used for nuclear fuel coating are a subject of a publication, currently in preparation, on the experience of using such advanced fuels in conventional water cooled reactors.

Mr Roberts considered that the vast amount of work proposed in the work plan would necessitate prioritization of resources, and questioned why it was not envisaged to address a review of SSR-6 (the Transport Regulations) in the near term. Ms Calle Vives confirmed that the details of the work plan outlined in her presentation were still subject to further discussion.

Mr Pstrak also noted that, in his view, regulations should not be revised to meet new designs; rather regulations should 'drive' the design. However, Mr González recalled how regulations had been developed historically: first the technology had been invented and only then the regulations established. The NHSI envisaged harmonization and standardization for both industry and regulation, and it was important that work proceed at least in parallel.

Mr Lee welcomed the work done so far, and considered that, for reasons of efficiency, as a first step, SMR specific safety standards should be developed. Only later should the results of the work be incorporated into existing safety standards. Ms Calle Vives considered that a different approach might be taken for different topics; for example, it might be more appropriate for Safety Requirements publications to remain technology-neutral, while Safety Guides could be more technology specific. Mr Luis Hernandez complemented this by noting that, even within Safety Guides, some parts are technology-neutral/technology inclusive (applicable to all reactor technologies) and would not need to be changed, while other specific parts, technology-specific, could be updated separately.

Ms Velshi concluded the discussion by noting the urgency of the need to address the topic of SMRs, and looked forward to hearing back from the Safety Standards Committees on their views of the work being done.

8. Discussion on the concept paper on the preparation of the long term plan for the IAEA safety standards

Mr Delattre introduced the concept paper, which had been posted in advance of the meeting. He noted that the concept paper was not a long term structure nor a plan in itself; rather it sets out what needed to be considered in building the long term structure and plan.

Mr Delattre explained that the paper was arranged as follows: a part setting out considerations on structural matters, including criteria for optimizing the set of Safety Guides and adding new Safety Guides, and a mechanism for collecting feedback via NSS-OUI as a centralized knowledge management system, and a part setting out considerations for the content of the standards for the long term. The concept paper also included specific questions to be asked that could solicit feedback for the development of a long term plan for the safety standards.

Mr Delattre indicated that substantial input on the concept paper had been received from Finland, setting out ideas around an environmental scan for development of a long term plan, and from France, setting out main trends as perceived by ASN. The next step would be for the Safety Standards Committees to discuss the concept paper, and for those discussions then to be included in the paper over a number of iterations, so as to cooperatively develop strategic objectives and a long term plan.

Ms Alm-Lytz proposed that the concept paper would also describe the way forward, how the environmental scan, strategic objectives and the long-term plan will be developed. She also proposed that databases other than NSS-OUI could be used in the environmental scan. Mr Delattre noted that NSS-OUI was intended to hold feedback from IAEA peer review and advisory missions, and it was very important that such feedback be retained in a centralized location.

Ms Cromnier proposed that three strategic objectives could established for the long term plan: (a) consolidation of the number of standards, to avoid proliferation of standards; (b) resilience, to ensure that standards anticipate future challenges and incidents rather than only responding to them; (c) future-proofing of the safety standards, so that they are fit for purpose for new technologies. Ms Velshi suggested that another strategic objective could encompass knowledge management.

Mr González agreed with the three proposed strategic objectives. He emphasized, however, that it was essential that any consensus reached in the past should not be lost, e.g. on concepts such as committed dose.

Mr Webster agreed strongly that further consolidation of standards was needed. He provided as an example the various Safety Guides on site evaluation, where the content could be combined and issued in a smaller number of publications. He recalled the roadmap for the safety standards that had been developed in 2008, together with the reference set of Safety Guides, established by the CSS in 2009. He suggested that a target number of safety standards, lower than the 'reasonable total number' of 130, could be established.

Ms Velshi concluded the discussion by encouraging CSS members to provide further input on the concept paper **[Annex IV, Action 51.7]**, and by requesting the Chairs to discuss the concept paper within their various Committees and feed the results back to Mr Delattre for integration and further development **[Annex IV, Action 51.8].**

9. Information from the Inter-Agency Committee on Radiation Safety (IACRS)

Ms Guzmán López Ocón gave a presentation on the history and membership of IACRS. She described the mandate, objectives, and working procedures and main achievements of IACRS towards international harmonization of radiation protection and safety, emphasizing the key role of the IACRS in the development of the International Basic Safety Standards (BSS) since its foundation. The eight members of the IACRS are cosponsors of the latest BSS published in 2014.

Ms Guzmán López Ocón's presentation is available on the CSS web page The Commission Members Area (iaea.org).

10. Information from ICRP, UNSCEAR and OECD/NEA

Mr Delattre reported that UNSCEAR and OECD/NEA had each provided a paper in advance of the meeting, on their recent activities and main developments, and their future work activities.

Both contributions from UNSCEAR and OECD/NEA are available on the CSS web page The Commission Members Area (iaea.org).

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

Mr Delattre indicated that a draft list of actions resulting from the 51st CSS meeting would be provided for comment to the CSS members **[Annex IV, Action 51.9]** and that the draft report of the 51st CSS meeting would be posted on the CSS website for comment **[Annex IV, Action 51.10]**. Mr Delattre informed the Commission that all presentations made at the 51st CSS meeting would be posted on the CSS website **[Annex IV, Action 51.11]**.

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

- CSS 52: week of 17–21 October 2022
- CSS 53: week of 3–6 April 2023
- CSS 54: week of 27 November to 1 December 2023

The current intention was that these would be all-day physical meetings.

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

ANNEX I

PARTICIPATION AT THE 51st CSS MEETING (in-person and remotely)

The Commission

R. Velshi (Chair of CSS)

A. J. González, Argentina

G. Hirth, Australia (sent apologies – represented by J. Scott)

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

R. F. Gutterres, Brazil

J. Yu, China

M. R. M. Ezz El-Din, Egypt

K. Alm-Lytz, Finland

A.-C. Rigail, France

T. Elsner, Germany

G. Nageswara Rao, India

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

T. Yamada, Japan

J. Lee, Republic of Korea

F. Mansoor, Pakistan

A. Ferapontov, Russian Federation

M. Žiaková, Slovakia (sent apologies – represented by M. Turner)

C. O. Phillips, South Africa

J. Dies Llovera, Spain

N. Cromnier, Sweden

M. Kenzelmann, Switzerland (sent apologies – represented by R. Sardella)

S. Alten, Republic of Türkiey

S. Vinton, United Kingdom

D. Roberts, United States of America

Observers

L. Vinhas, AdSec (sent apologies – unable to attend)

M. Hübel, EC (sent apologies – represented by E. Micha)

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

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

N. Muroya, OECD-NEA (sent apologies – represented by V. Rouyer)

B. Batandjieva-Metcalf, UNSCEAR

Representatives and experts supporting CSS members and observers

M. Aparicio, C. Ditsche, Y.-K. Chung, C. Cole, H. Dong Woo, M. Granier, J. Kim, A. Loscertales, S. Mroz, N. Sandberg, R. Sharafutdinov, N. Subrtova, S. Wittick, L. Yan

Chairpersons of the Review Committees

EPReSC: M. Grzechnik

NSGC: A. Cortés

NUSSC: P. Webster

RASSC: R. Bly

TRANSSC: D. Pstrak

WASSC: P. Dicks

Coordinators of Review Committees and of the Commission on Safety Standards

S. Nestoroska Madjunarova, Incident and Emergency Centre (IEC), EPReSC

M. Svab, Regulatory Activities Section (NSNI), NUSSC

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

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

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

S. Case-Lackner, Programme Development & Int Cooperation Section, 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

E. Buglova, Director, Division of Nuclear Security (NSNS)

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

A. Bradford, Director, Division of Nuclear Installation Safety (NSNI)

G. Caruso, Director, Coordinator Fukushima DNPP ALPS Treated Water

C. Torres Vidal, Director, Incident and Emergency Centre

P. Contri, A. Clark, L. Guo, F. Jiang, H. Mansoux, M. Moracho Ramirez, A. Shokr

A. Altinyollar, K. Asfaw, G. Bruno, P. Calle-Vives, C. Fischer, S. Geupel, Z. Gulerce, K. Horvath, J. Joksic, T. Karseka-Yanev, K. Kouts, D. Liu, J. Luis Hernandez, S. Morgan, F. Naseer, M. Nikolaki, O. Holmberg, J. Rovny, P. Sales Barbosa, D. Sears, J. Silye, R. Wright, M. Yuzawa

ANNEX II

Agenda of the 51st Meeting of the COMMISSION ON SAFETY STANDARDS

1. Opening Session

1.1. For members joining the meeting via WebEx: Guidance from the Secretariat on the conduct of the meeting

1.2. Opening of the Meeting; *L. Evrard, DDG NS*

1.3. Introductory remarks from the CSS Chair; *R. Velshi*

1.4. Introduction of new CSS members: *none so far*

1.5. Adoption of the agenda; *CSS members*

1.6. Confirmation of the adoption of the final report of the 50th CSS meeting

1.7. Status of the IAEA Safety Standards and actions from previous meetings; *D. Delattre*

1.8. Adoption of the CSS mid-term report; *CSS members*

2. First Roundtable discussion on the safety implications of the situation in Ukraine

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

3.1. Emergency Preparedness and Response Standards Committee; *M. Grzechnik, Chairperson / S. Nestoroska Madjunarova, Scientific Secretary*

3.2. Nuclear Security Guidance Committee; *A. Cortés Carmona*, *Chairperson / S. Case Lackner, Scientific Secretary*

3.3. Additional information from other Committees (optional)

3.4. Summary of the meetings of the Chairs and of the CSS Strategic Planning Working Group held on 15 February and on 19 April before the CSS meeting

4. Approval of draft publications and DPPs

4.01. Draft Safety Guide DS509a on Commissioning of Research Reactors; *D. Sears and NUSSC Chair*

4.02. Draft Safety Guide DS509b on Maintenance, Periodic Testing and Inspection of Research Reactors; *D. Sears and NUSSC Chair*

4.03. Draft Safety Guide DS509c on Core Management and Fuel Handling for Research Reactors; *D. Sears and NUSSC Chair*

4.04. Draft Safety Guide DS509d on Operational Limits and Conditions and Operating Procedures for Research Reactors; *D. Sears and NUSSC Chair*

4.05. Draft Safety Guide DS509e on The Operating Organization and the Recruitment, Training and Qualification of Personnel for Research Reactors; *D. Sears and NUSSC Chair*

4.06. Draft Safety Guide DS509f on Radiation Protection and Radioactive Waste Management in the Design and Operation of Research Reactors; *D. Sears and NUSSC Chair*

4.07. Draft Safety Guide DS509g on Ageing Management for Research Reactors; *D. Sears and NUSSC Chair*

4.08. Draft Safety Guide DS509h on Instrumentation and Control Systems and Software Important to Safety for Research Reactors; *D. Sears and NUSSC Chair*

4.09. Draft Safety Guide DS511 on Use of a Graded Approach in the Application of the Safety Requirements for Research Reactors; *F. Naseer and NUSSC Chair*

4.10. Draft Safety Guide DS517a on Safety of Conversion Facilities and Uranium Enrichment Facilities; *J. Rovny and NUSSC Chair*

4.11. Draft Safety Guide DS517b on Safety of Uranium Fuel Fabrication Facilities; *J. Rovny and NUSSC Chair*

4.12. Draft Safety Guide DS517c on Safety of Uranium and Plutonium Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facilities; *J. Rovny and NUSSC Chair*

4.13. Draft Safety Guide DS520 on Hazards Associated with Human induced External Events in Site Evaluation for Nuclear Installations; *A. Altinyollar and NUSSC Chair*

4.14. Draft DPP DS532 for Safety Requirements on Safety of Nuclear Power Plants: Commissioning and Operation, revision of SSR-2/2 (Rev. 1); *S. Morgan and NUSSC Chair*

4.15. Draft DPP DS534 for a new Safety Guide on Protection Strategy for a Nuclear or Radiological Emergency; *K. Kouts and EPReSC Chair*

5. DPP for information *(it is approved by all Safety Standards Committees but not yet by NSGC)*

5.01. DPP DS533/NST067 for a joint publication on Management of the interfaces between safety and nuclear security; *K. Horvath*

6. Update on the draft Medium Term Plan; *D. Delattre*

7. Update on SMR related activities; *P. Calle Vives – J. Luis Hernandez*

8. Discussion on the concept paper on the preparation of the long term plan for the IAEA safety standards*; D. Delattre, CSS members*

9. Information from the Inter-Agency Committee on Radiation Safety*; M. Pinak*

10. Information from ICRP, UNSCEAR and OECD/NEA

11. AoB, Report of the meeting; Date of the next meetings

ANNEX III

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

46th MEETING

46.02 The MTCD edited versions of the draft safety guides DS469, DS494, DS496 and DS506 to be posted for silent approval procedure by the CSS **[Action: Secretariat, CSS]. DS496 remains to be pbloshed after silence approval already completed. To be issued soon.**

46.06 The Secretariat is still seeking additional funding for the translation of the 2018 Edition of the Safety Glossary in Arabic, Chinese and Russian **[Action: Secretariat, CSS]. In good progress with new EBPs, except for Arabic.**

47th MEETING

47.04. The fully edited versions of the four endorsed draft Safety Guides — DS468, DS507, DS490 and DS498 — will be posted on the CSS webpage 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]. All done.**

48th MEETING

48.04. The fully edited versions of the five endorsed draft Safety Guides — DS477, DS493, DS510A, DS510B and DS514 — will be posted on the CSS webpage 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]. Remains DS510A and DS510B.**

49th MEETING

49.02. The Secretariat will continue investigating ways for addressing the publishing issues and regularly informing the CSS on the evolution of the situation **[Action: Secretariat, CSS Scientific Secretary]. In good progress (see agenda item 1.7).**

49.03. The fully edited versions of the eight endorsed draft Safety Guides — DS497A to DS497G, and DS516 — will be posted on the CSS webpage 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]**. **Expected Q2 2022.**

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 published as SSG-77. Remains DS515.**

50.02. The IAEA Office of Legal Affairs will be asked as to whether the existing OLA opinion papers on the nature of the safety standards and the nuclear security series publications need to be updated. **[Action: Secretariat] We have consulted OLA with regard to the current legal opinions on the nature of safety standards and the nuclear security series publications. OLA confirms that those opinions are still valid and that there is therefore no need for any further update. Kindly note that the legal opinions on the nature of safety standards and the nuclear security series publications are well reflected in the two documents that describe respectively the processes and**

associated responsibilities for the planning, development, review, revision, approval and establishment of the IAEA Safety Standards Series and of the IAEA Nuclear Security Series.

50.03. The CSS strategic plan will be renamed as the "Working Plan for the 7th term of the CSS": this plan has been formally adopted by the CSS. Time will be specifically allocated in the agenda of the 51st meeting of the CSS for discussions on important topical policy issues and the long term strategy for the safety standards. The need for these discussions will be added to the CSS Working Plan. **[Action: Secretariat, CSS members] Done. Specific folder created, linked to the concept paper for the long-term plan. Input received from Finland and France.**

50.04. A new folder on the CSS members' webpage will be created in which individual proposals for this environmental scanning can be posted. All members of the CSS are encouraged to use this space to post comments and suggestions on the future issues and challenges to be considered in the long term strategy for the safety standards as well as contribution papers on important topical policy issues referred to in Action 50.03. **[Action: Secretariat, CSS members] Same as above.**

50.05. Feedback from the COVID-19 pandemic will not be retained as a standing agenda item for future meetings. Instead, such feedback will be submitted to the Secretariat using NSS-OUI. The Secretariat will record in NSS-OUI the feedback that has been received up to now. The feedback collected via NSS-OUI will then be considered when individual safety standards are reviewed and revised in future. **[Action: Secretariat, CSS members, RCs members] Done. Feedback expected through NSS-OUI.**

50.06. A draft list of actions from the 50th CSS meeting (this list) will be provided to CSS members for comment **[Action: Secretariat, CSS Scientific Secretary]**. **Done, this list.**

50.07. The draft report of the 50th CSS meeting and the draft mid-term report will be posted on the CSS webpage for comment **[Action: Secretariat, CSS Scientific Secretary]**. **Done, Agenda items 1.6 and 1.8.**

50.08. The presentations made at the 50th CSS meeting will be posted on the CSS webpage **[Action: CSS Scientific Secretary]**. **Done.**

ANNEX IV

ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE 51st MEETING OF THE COMMISSION ON SAFETY STANDARDS

51.1. The report of the 50th CSS meeting to incorporate comments made during the meeting and be posted on the Review Committees web page. **[Action: CSS Scientific Secretary]**

51.2. The mid-term report for the 7th term of the CSS to incorporate comments made during the meeting and be posted on the Review Committees web page. **[Action: CSS Scientific Secretary]**

51.3. The first round of discussion on the safety implications of the situation in Ukraine to be reflected in the meeting report and further discussions to be planned at the next CSS meeting. **[Action: CSS Scientific Secretary]**

51.4. The Secretariat to present an overview of the work being done in the area of denial of shipment at the next CSS meeting. **[Action: Secretariat (NSRW and TRANSSC Scientific Secretary)]**. As mentioned during the discussion under agenda item 1.5, the Secretariat will also present feedback from the implementation of the ALPS project. **[Action: Secretariat]**

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]**

51.6. The draft living medium term plan to be updated and posted for further consideration by the Safety Standards Committees. **[Action: Secretariat, Safety Standards Committees members]**

51.7. The CSS members to provide further input on the concept paper with a view to preparing the long-term structure and plan. [**Action: CSS members]**

51.8. The Safety Standards Committees to exchange on the concept paper and provide input, particularly on the questionnaire. **[Action: Secretariat, Safety Standards Committees members]**

51.9. A draft list of actions from the 51st CSS meeting (this list) will be provided to CSS members for comment. **[Action: Secretariat, CSS Scientific Secretary]**

51.10. The draft report of the 51st CSS meeting will be posted on the CSS webpage for comment. **[Action: Secretariat, CSS Scientific Secretary]**

51.11. The presentations made at the 51st CSS meeting will be posted on the CSS webpage. **[Action: CSS Scientific Secretary]**