52nd Meeting of the Commission on Safety Standards

18–20 October 2022, IAEA, Vienna

Draft Report of the Meeting

Overview of main results of the meeting

A. The following draft safety standards were endorsed:

- DS470: Safety Guide on Radiation Safety of Radiation Sources used in Research and Education;
- DS499: Safety Guide on Application of the Concept of Exemption;
- DS500: Safety Guide on Application of the Concept of Clearance;
- DS521: Safety Guide on Radiation Protection Programmes for the Transport of Radioactive Material;
- DS523: Safety Guide on Development and Application of Level 1 Probabilistic Safety Assessment for Nuclear Power Plants.

B. The following draft DPPs were approved:

- DPP DS535: Safety Guide on Periodic Safety Review for Nuclear Power Plants (revision of SSG-25);
- DPP DS537: New Safety Guide on Safety Demonstration of Innovative Technology in Power Reactor Designs;
- DPP DS538: New Safety Guide on Long Term Post-Remediation Management of Areas Affected by Past Activities or Events;
- DPP DS539: Safety Guide on Licensing Process for Nuclear Installations (revision of SSG-12);
- DPP DS540: Safety Guide on Radiation Safety for Industrial Radiography (revision of SSG-11).

C. Policy discussions

- A second roundtable discussion was held on the safety implications of the situation in Ukraine, including a presentation from INSAG on its related activities and an update provided by the Secretariat on the development of a study on the considerations of the applicability of the safety standards and security guidance in an armed conflict situation.
- The feedback from the Review Committees on both the medium term plan for the safety standards and the concept paper for the preparation of the long term plan for the safety standards was discussed and supported by the CSS. The draft medium term plan should be further considered at the coming meetings of the Review Committees for further input, optimization and prioritization with a view to finalizing it for the next CSS meeting.
- The review/revision of SPESS B and SPESS F was discussed.

1. Opening session

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

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

Ms Evrard noted that the meeting would involve continued discussion of the draft medium term plan and of the concept paper for the preparation of a long term plan for the IAEA safety standards. The Safety Standards Committees would be asked to address the optimization and prioritization of the proposal with a view to maintaining a consistent set of safety standards and avoiding their proliferation.

Ms Evrard drew attention to the Secretariat's diligent ongoing work to find tangible solutions to the issue of delays in publications. She reported that eleven Safety Guides had been published since the last CSS meeting in April 2022, and two more would be issued soon. She noted that five draft Safety Guides were submitted to the CSS for endorsement at the current meeting, along with five draft Document Preparation Profiles (DPPs), including a DPP for a new Safety Guide on Safety Demonstration of Innovative Technology in Reactor Designs.

She noted that, at the request of CSS members, there would be a further roundtable discussion on the safety implications of the situation in Ukraine, with input from the International Nuclear Safety Group (INSAG) and information on the preparation of a gap analysis.

The Secretariat would provide the CSS with information on the review/revision of SPESS B and SPESS F on the basis of proposals made by members of the Review Committees. Following a CSS request at its last meeting, the Secretariat would also present an overview of the work under way on denial of shipment. Another important topic to be covered was the IAEA Director General's Nuclear Harmonization and Standardization Initiative (NHSI) and the activities of the Small Modular Reactor (SMR) Regulators' Forum.

Ms Evrard informed CSS members that the feedback from the implementation of the Advanced Liquid Processing System (ALPS) project would be provided at the next meeting, due to the unavailability of the presenters.

She drew attention to the issuing of the IAEA Nuclear Safety and Security Glossary, 2022 (Interim) Edition, which was an important achievement. This publication defines and explains technical terms used in IAEA safety standards and IAEA nuclear security guidance and other safety and security related IAEA publications, and provides information on their usage.

Finally, Ms Evrard expressed sincere appreciation to CSS members for their dedicated and diligent efforts as well as for the advice and guidance they provided to the Agency regarding the safety standards. The safety standards are key publications for the Agency, but more importantly they form a cornerstone of the global nuclear safety regime, to meet high levels of safety in protecting people and the environment from harmful effects of ionizing radiation. She concluded by wishing all participants a productive meeting.

1.2 Introductory remarks from the CSS Chair

Ms R. Velshi thanked Ms Evrard for her introductory remarks and commented that it was a pleasure to see so many CSS members present at the meeting in person.

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 a second roundtable discussion on the safety implications of the situation in Ukraine, and the approval of five draft Safety Guides and five DPPs. Ms Velshi reported that there would be updates on the medium term plan and the concept paper on the long term plan for the safety standards, the review and update of SPESS B and SPESS F, NHSI and the work being done on the denial of shipment, as well as information from the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP), the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR) and the Nuclear Energy Agency of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD/NEA).

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

1.3 Introduction of new CSS members

Ms Velshi welcomed the new members of the CSS: Mr J. Heinonen from Finland, Mr J.-L. Lachaume from France, Mr M. Zniber from Morocco and Ms R. Sardella from Switzerland. She also welcomed Mr S. Burns, the recently appointed Chair of INSAG, who would be participating in the meeting as an observer.

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

1.4 Adoption of the agenda

Mr A. González expressed his surprise that — following the issue of the Safety Report on Implications of the 2012 UNSCEAR report for the IAEA safety standards: Considerations on attribution of radiation health effects and inference of radiation risk on the IAEA's preprint repository[1] — there was no agenda item on the regulation of low radiation doses. Mr D. Delattre agreed that it was an important report that might assist in the implementation of safety standards in this area. A copy of the report could be emailed to Mr González so that he might promote it further, and the regulation of low radiation doses would be included as a topic on the agenda of the next CSS meeting. **[Annex IV, Action 52.1]**.

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

1.5 Confirmation of the adoption of the final report of the 51st CSS meeting

The adoption of the report of the 51st CSS meeting was confirmed.

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

Mr S. Mallick introduced the agenda item, reporting that there had been good progress on the action plan with MTCD aimed at clearing the backlog of awaiting publications and at finding a sustainable solution, as acknowledged in the nuclear and radiation safety resolution at the last IAEA General Conference (GC(66)/RES/6). He would continue to monitor the progress of the action plan to ensure that safety standards were published in a timely manner.

Mr Delattre noted that, as part of the action plan, he received a monthly report on the status of publications from the Director of MTCD and held a monthly meeting with the Section Head of Publishing. Monitoring tools were used to assess progress, prioritize publications, reduce the backlog and create a sustainable situation, taking into account the resources available both in MTCD and in the Safety Standards and Security Guidance Development Section (SSDS).

Mr Delattre informed the Commission that eleven Safety Guides had been published since the previous CSS meeting in April 2022 and two more had completed the CSS silent approval procedure and were in the final stages of the publication process. From November 2021 to November 2022, nineteen Safety Guides had been published, as compared to seven the year before. The only safety standards currently in the publishing queue were those endorsed at the last CSS meeting in April 2022, plus one endorsed at CSS 50. Any drafts endorsed at the current meeting would be added to that list. He reported that the total number of published safety standards was now 131.

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

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

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

Ms N. Cromnier asked why the presentation had contained no update on the Safety Report on Applicability of the IAEA Safety Standards to Non-Water-Cooled Reactors and Small Modular

[1] See https://inis.iaea.org/collection/NCLCollectionStore/_Public/53/079/53079840.pdf?r=1

Reactors, which had recently been issued on the IAEA's preprint server[2]. Mr Delattre explained that his presentation was only on the status of safety standards, so did not include safety reports.

Mr González noted that the update covered only the status of safety standards in English and not their translation into other languages. Noting the limited resources available in MTCD and SSDS, he suggested that Safety Guides could be distributed as INFCIRC documents, thus expediting their translation into all official languages.

2. Second roundtable discussion on the safety implications of the situation in Ukraine: Progress on the development of a gap analysis on maintaining safety and nuclear security during armed conflict

Mr Mallick introduced the discussion. He noted that there is a high interest from Member States in the topic of maintaining nuclear safety and security during an armed conflict and that there are expectations for the IAEA to investigate whether there is a potential need for additional guidance. After internal discussions within the Department of Nuclear Safety and Security (NS) and consultation with the Office of Legal Affairs (OLA), NS had created a working group with focal points from all NS divisions to assess the challenges for the application of the IAEA Safety Standards Series and Nuclear Security Series publications in an armed conflict situation.

Mr Burns presented information from the discussions that had been held on the situation in Ukraine at the INSAG meeting in March 2022 and at the INSAG forum during GC66. The INSAG members, in a letter sent to the Director General in August 2022, had expressed their concerns on maintaining safety in Ukraine, and had raised the issue of resilience for the operator and the regulator. INSAG members had expressed their support for the IAEA's efforts in establishing a nuclear safety and security protection zone around Zaporizhzhya nuclear power plant (ZNPP), as well as for the presence of IAEA staff at ZNPP. The INSAG members had decided to further develop advice on the safety of nuclear facilities in armed conflict situations, either as a stand-alone publication or as a part of broader work on the resilience of organizations and facilities looking at lessons learned from the Fukushima Daiichi accident, the pandemic and the current situation in Ukraine.

Ms Evrard provided an update on the activities undertaken by the IAEA in Ukraine and referred to the continuous presence of IAEA staff in Ukraine with the objective of conducting direct observations, maintaining a direct communication channel with the IAEA and providing assistance to Ukraine to prevent a potential accident. Ms Evrard also noted the activities for the establishment of a safety and security protection zone around ZNPP and the ongoing discussions with the Russian Federation and Ukraine.

Mr Delattre reported on progress on the development of the review of the IAEA Safety Standards Series and Nuclear Security Series publications in an armed conflict situation. He noted that the review will cover all nuclear and radiation facilities and activities as well as regulatory bodies involved in maintaining nuclear safety and security within a State. The review will identify those publications addressing issues that might arise during an armed conflict and potential challenges of their application, and will propose changes to the guidance provided, if necessary.

Ms Velshi thanked Mr Burns and the Secretariat for the information and emphasized the need to review the safety standards from the perspective of resilience.

Mr R. Jammal thanked Mr Burns for the information and commended the IAEA on looking at the safety standards in a systematic manner. He added that it might also be of interest to look at international conventions, such as the Geneva Convention, from a legal perspective and examine whether improvements can be proposed. He noted the importance of human factors and of the actions taken by the regulator and the operator to maintain safety in ZNPP. He added that any safety improvements in the design of nuclear power plants (NPPs) for withstanding military attacks should be handled with extreme care taking into consideration potential additional costs for building and sustaining NPPs.

Mr González remarked on the importance of the existing legal framework for ensuring safety and security in an armed conflict and commended the work done by the INSAG Chair. He recalled that

[2] See https://inis.iaea.org/collection/NCLCollectionStore/_Public/53/077/53077569.pdf?r=1

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 NPPs of Ukraine that were also of grave concern, such as radioactive sources and depleted uranium. Mr González added that the IAEA had provided support in the past on applications for non-peaceful uses of nuclear energy and noted that the IAEA Statute aims at preventing war. Ms Evrard explained that the Agency's activities in Ukraine cover all facilities and activities (e.g. radioactive sources, ZNPP, Chornobyl NPP) and referred to the reports on Ukraine by the Director General.

Mr T. Elsner strongly supported the commitment of the Director General to establish a safety and security protection zone and the work of the Agency in reviewing the safety standards. He expressed his concern regarding the safety of all nuclear installations in Ukraine and noted that there are gaps and limitations in the existing legal conventions, indeed particularly in the Geneva Convention, and regulations for nuclear safety in conflict-type situations.

Mr J. Dies Llovera described how Spain had in place arrangements for alternative emergency operations backup facilities and support agreements with the Nuclear Safety Council and other organizations to strengthen radiological emergency response capabilities. He continued that Spain is aiming at improving emergency management through the establishment of new Emergency Management Alternative Centres at every site and proposed to offer to the CSS a paper on these arrangements. He proposed that similar arrangements be made in Ukraine, for example, by maintaining diesel generators in neighbouring countries.

Mr Heinonen expressed his support for the Agency's review of the safety standards and noted the importance of following a holistic approach for the review to cover all nuclear and radioactive facilities and activities. He also suggested that different scenarios should be investigated to cover war conditions, pandemics and lessons identified from the Fukushima Daiichi accident. He noted the importance of contingency plans for nuclear facilities and added that in the long term and to reduce safety risks, States should consider disposal of waste instead of interim storage as an end-solution.

Mr Lachaume expressed his appreciation for IAEA's efforts in establishing a safety and security zone at ZNPP. He noted that in considering developing guidance for NPPs for war conditions, care should be taken to avoid creating the misapprehension that NPPs can withstand military attacks.

Mr D. Roberts noted that the United States of America strongly supports the IAEA's efforts to establish a safety and security protection zone at ZNPP and enquired how this could be enforced in practice. Ms Evrard explained that discussions on this topic are ongoing through diplomatic channels and that the radius of the zone is also under discussion on a technical basis.

Ms Cromnier suggested waiting until after the conflict is over to utilize the experience and lessons learned in the development of guidance for maintaining nuclear safety in conflict situations.

Ms Sardella added her support for the work of the IAEA in the establishment of the safety and security protection zone and noted that even if such a zone is established, the existing problems relating to human factors will still need to be addressed. She agreed with Mr Lachaume that NPPs cannot be designed to withstand military attacks.

Mr J. Lee expressed his support to the IAEA's support for Ukraine and enquired after the equipment sent to Ukraine. Ms Evrard replied that following requests for equipment from Ukraine, the IAEA had been trying to cover the needs to the extent possible through the Response and Assistance Network (RANET); three sets of equipment had already been delivered to Ukraine. She noted that NS is the lead department for coordination for assistance to Ukraine and explained that delivery of equipment is very challenging.

Ms Velshi asked how the discussions during the CSS meeting could be used in the work done by the IAEA. Mr Delattre responded that all input will be taken into consideration. He continued that there is a need to provide guidelines and technical advice on how to act in such situations with regard to the several issues that arise such as the operation of NPPs, the management of the supply chain, staff rotation and resilience. Mr Mallick added that, as a first step, the IAEA review will focus on specific publications and will cover NPPs in war conditions.

Mr C.-M. Larsson suggested that maybe the IAEA review should also look at the Safety Fundamentals. He noted that apart from reviewing the safety standards, this might be an opportunity to also look at international conventions or bilateral agreements.

Ms Velshi concluded that further discussions were needed and proposed to continue with a third roundtable discussion at the next CSS meeting. She asked Mr Burns whether he would be able to provide an update on INSAG activities during the next CSS meeting. Mr Burns responded that the INSAG meeting is scheduled to take place after the next CSS meeting, but he would be happy to share the preliminary findings of INSAG. Ms Velshi requested the Secretariat to include this point on the agenda for the next CSS meeting **[Annex IV, Action 52.2]**.

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

3.1 Waste Safety Standards Committee (WASSC)

Mr P. Dicks, WASSC Chair, reported on the 53rd meeting of WASSC. During that meeting, WASSC had approved two draft standards for submission to the CSS and five DPPs. It had also cleared one DPP for the Nuclear Security Series.

He reported that WASSC had requested that the original scope of WS-G-5.1 be retained when developing a DPP for its revision. WASSC had received updates on the SMR Regulators' Forum and on SMR related activities, as well as on draft Safety Guide DS512. Presentations had been given on radioactive waste classification schemes in the EU and on the use of NSS-OUI to collect feedback on the safety standards. A topical session had been held on approaches for decommissioning strategies in various Member States. WASSC had discussed the medium term plan and the concept paper for the long term plan for the safety standards and the revision of SPESS B. WASSC had held a joint meeting with TRANSSC, at which the exemption of naturally occurring radioactive material (NORM), A_1/A_2 values, and the project on the derivation of specific clearance levels in materials suitable for recycling, reuse or disposal in landfills had been discussed.

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

In response to a question from Mr Jammal, Ms N. Aghajanyan clarified that the revision of GSR Part 6 was not included by WASSC in the work plan for this term, nor for the medium term. She noted that the topical sessions were selected on the basis of requests by members, and were intended to allow for brainstorming on topics of interest and to reveal similarities and differences in the way Member States applied the safety standards.

Mr Dies Llovera suggested that WASSC might discuss ageing management for spent fuel storage containers as a topic for future meetings. Ms Aghajanyan agreed that this had been discussed in various forums and that one of the overarching issues identified by Contracting Parties at the Seventh Review Meeting of the Joint Convention was the ageing management of packages and facilities for radioactive waste and spent fuel, considering extended storage periods.

3.2 Transport Safety Standards Committee (TRANSSC)

Mr D. Pstrak, TRANSSC Chair, reported on the 44th meeting of TRANSSC. During that meeting, TRANSSC had approved four draft standards for submission to the CSS and three DPPs. It had also cleared one DPP for the Nuclear Security Series.

He reported that TRANSSC had discussed the review cycle for SSR-6 (Rev. 1); a decision on whether to begin the revision process will be taken at the next TRANSSC meeting. TRANSSC had approved the updated terms of reference of its Technical Expert Groups (TTEGs) and their recommendations to develop two Safety Guides and to include a reference to the latest ISO standards when revising SSR-6 (Rev. 1). TRANSSC had received a report on the latest meeting of the Inter-Agency Group on Transport (IAG), an update from the IAEA Secretariat regarding the SMR Regulators' Forum and SMR related activities, and an update from the working group on transportable nuclear power plants (TNPPs). TRANSSC had agreed to proceed with the Secretariat's proposal on the development of e-Schedules, in relation to which a consultancy meeting had later been held. Mr Pstrak also reported on the discussions at the joint session with WASSC (see agenda item 3.1).

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

Mr González commented on TRANSSC's review cycle for the Transport Regulations and the review cycle for the United Nations Model Regulations, and the challenges presented by reviewing and revising the regulations so frequently.

Mr Larsson enquired whether an analysis had been done to define the scope of TNPPs for both TRANSSC and NUSSC. Mr Pstrak responded that an analysis on this topic had not been completed, but the view of TRANSSC was that TNPPs were fully covered by the existing Transport Regulations. Mr Pstrak and Mr P. Webster confirmed that future joint meetings between TRANSSC and NUSSC were being planned.

Mr Dies Llovera voiced support for further cooperation between TRANSSC and NUSSC regarding TNPPs. He also requested that TRANSSC consider ageing management of transport packages within its work scope. Ms S. Fayyaz noted a DPP was under development for new guidance on ageing management of transport packages.

Mr Jammal asked whether there had been any discussions on denial of shipment within TRANSSC. Mr Pstrak clarified that the topic of denial of shipment will be presented under agenda item number 10.

3.3 Radiation Safety Standards Committee (RASSC)

Ms R. Bly, RASSC Chair, reported on the 52nd meeting of RASSC. During that meeting, RASSC had approved four draft standards for submission to the CSS and four DPPs. It had also cleared one DPP for the Nuclear Security Series.

She reported that RASSC had discussed the medium term plan and the concept paper for the long term plan for the safety standards, and had agreed to establish an e-working group on RASSC inputs for the long term plan. The CSS welcomed this initiative and suggested it to be considered also by the other Safety Standards Committees. RASSC had also discussed the potential revision of SPESS B. Updates had been provided on RASSC-led safety standards, including on the development of DPPs for comprehensive guidance on existing exposure situations, five Safety Guides that predated GSR Part 3 and a new Safety Guide covering the categorization of unsealed sources and the classification of laboratories to address a gap that had been created when Safety Series No. 1 was superseded. Presentations had been given on recently held technical meetings, the Inter-Agency Committee on Radiation Safety (IACRS), the applicability of safety standards to SMRs and non-water-cooled reactors, the applicability of GSR Part 3, GSG-7 and GSG-8 to novel reactor designs, a public survey on radon awareness, the analysis of Integrated Regulatory Review Service (IRRS) reports, a pilot advisory mission on radiation protection and safety in medical exposure, and the UNSCEAR 2020/2021 report on medical exposure to ionizing radiation. RASSC had held a topical session with the ICRP on whether the current radiation protection system is fit for purpose. RASSC had also held a joint meeting with EPReSC, at which they had discussed existing exposure situations, as well as interfaces between their activities and the different values used for emergency and non-emergency situations.

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

Mr Jammal enquired as to the purpose of the updates to Safety Series No. 1 on regulating unsealed sources and pointed out some sensitivities related to the medical application of such sources. Ms Bly responded that categorization is necessary in order to apply a graded approach in regulation and oversight of unsealed sources. She clarified that the sensitivities in relation to patients are known and will be taken into consideration.

Mr Larsson commented that further work is needed on the demarcation between exemption and clearance and that the demarcation will need to serve as the basis for all the other Review Committees. He also expressed support for the review and revision of Safety Series No. 1.

Ms O. Guzmán López-Ocón confirmed that many of the considerations would be addressed in the potential revision of Safety Series No. 1. Feedback from a Member State survey and information contained in existing TECDOCs would be considered. She also noted that the revision of Safety Series No. 1 would follow the standard consensus building process following SPESS B.

3.4 Nuclear Security Guidance Committee (NSGC)

Ms S. Case Lackner, NSGC Scientific Secretary, explained that as the position of NSGC Chair had recently been vacated, she would be reporting on the 21st meeting of the NSGC. Five DPPs had been approved and two draft Nuclear Security Series publications had been approved for submission to Member States for comment. All submitted interface documents led by the other Review Committees had been cleared, comprising three draft safety standards and six DPPs.

With regard to the comprehensive review of the Nuclear Security Series, following internal consultations, the Secretariat had presented an initial discussion paper to the NSGC at its 21st meeting. The discussion paper and the related road map had since been revised, on the basis of comments received from the NSGC. The NSGC had also received a briefing on the meeting of legal and technical experts on the need for revision of the Nuclear Security Fundamentals (NSS No. 20), which had concluded that the Secretariat should continue its review of NSS No. 20 — with a focus on improving its usability without impacting its stability — and should consult all Member States on specific changes. Arguments on whether to revise NSS No. 20 would be further analysed at a technical meeting to be held later this year.

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

Mr Larsson expressed support for a top-down review method of the IAEA Nuclear Security Series (NSS) publications — beginning with the Nuclear Security Fundamentals. He also noted that, in view of the current global situation, it was important to evaluate whether certain recommendations should be made through safety standards or nuclear security guidance publications or should actually be subject to further consideration in international legal instruments, such as conventions or agreements between States.

Mr Dies Llovera commented that tracking the geolocation of an object is now a common practice in many areas. He proposed that the NSGC consider recommending the GPS tracking of every radiation source for better security.

Mr Heinonen noted that in Member States, the implementation of enforcement differs between safety and security. Mr Delattre responded that the first joint publication DS533/NST067 on safety and security interfaces was currently in preparation. He noted that the topic of enforcement could potentially be addressed in future joint publications. Mr Webster confirmed that this proposal had been made during a joint NUSSC-NSGC meeting but had not yet been discussed in the NSGC.

In response to a comment by Mr González on the statutory role of the Agency in relation to nuclear security, Mr Mallick noted that the question is not whether the scope addressed by nuclear security series is part of the statutory mandate of the Agency, which is certainly the case, but rather under what article of the Statute it should be addressed. Mr Delattre reported that clarification had been sought from the Agency's Office of Legal Affairs, which had confirmed that the safety standards were issued under Article III.A.6 of the Agency's Statute, but that nuclear security guidance is not considered to be issued under this same article.

Mr R. F. Gutterres noted a lack of harmonization in the terminology used in safety standards and NSS publications. Mr Delattre indicated that the recently published IAEA Nuclear Safety and Security Glossary, which combines the agreed terminology in standards and nuclear security guidance, was intended to help resolve this issue, as it explained the meanings of the same terms in different contexts.

Ms Velshi acknowledged that the interface between safety and security is still challenging and the CSS would continue to hold discussions on the topic.

3.5 Nuclear Safety Standards Committee (NUSSC)

Mr Webster, NUSSC Chair, reported on the 53rd meeting of NUSSC. During that meeting, NUSSC had approved two draft standards for submission to the CSS and three DPPs. The DPP for DS536 had not been approved and will be resubmitted to the 54th NUSSC meeting. NUSSC had also cleared one DPP for the Nuclear Security Series.

He reported that NUSSC had discussed the medium term plan for the safety standards, the concept paper for the long term plan for the safety standards, the potential revision of SPESS B, activities related

to SMRs, including a number of informational publications under development, and a proposal for a new Safety Guide on the development and implementation of a regulatory experience feedback programme for regulatory bodies. One particular topic of discussion had been DS508, with a view to getting the draft standard approved at the 54th meeting of NUSSC. NUSSC had also held a joint session with the NSGC, at which they had discussed the structure of the Nuclear Security Series, Safety Standards Series and other publications, NHSI, the Technical Report Series 1000 safety–security interface publications, the International Conference on Topical Issues in Nuclear Installation Safety: Strengthening Safety of Evolutionary and Innovative Reactor Designs and the SMR Regulators' Forum.

Mr Webster and the Commission also thanked Mr M. Svab for his service as the NUSSC coordinator and wished him all the best for the future.

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

Mr G. Nageswara Rao expressed his appreciation to NUSSC for prioritizing design extension considerations and the initiatives to reach consensus on the term 'practical elimination'. He noted that the main challenges for consensus are in the area of meeting requirements on emergency preparedness and response. Ms Velshi further emphasized the urgency in approving DS508 and expressed the hope that NUSSC would be successful in reaching consensus at its next meeting.

3.6 Emergency Preparedness and Response Standards Committee (EPReSC)

Mr M. Grzechnik, EPReSC Chair, reported on the 14th meeting of EPReSC, at which it had approved two draft standards for submission to the CSS and five DPPs, and had cleared two DPPs for the Nuclear Security Series.

He reported that the meeting participants had discussed a range of topics, including the medium term plan and the concept paper for the long term plan for the safety standards, the potential revision of SPESS B, the road map on EPR-related safety standards, developments within the Emergency Preparedness and Response Information Management System (EPRIMS), Emergency Preparedness Review (EPREV) and EPR publications, activities supporting the implementation of GSR Part 7, the review of the applicability of safety standards to new technologies, the pool of EPR experts, and the coordination of assistance in nuclear safety and security in Ukraine. In addition, the composition and mode of work of the working groups on the road map for EPR-related safety standards had been finalized. He also reported on the discussions at EPReSC's joint session with RASSC (see agenda item 3.3).

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

Mr Jammal asked if any advice or recommendations had been given to members of the public or discussed by the Committee regarding emergency preparedness in case of a military conflict. Mr Grzechnik noted that this had not been addressed by EPReSC.

Ms Velshi thanked all of the Review Committees for their presentations and expressed appreciation for their work and for the enhanced collaboration among the Committees.

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

Mr Delattre reported on the results of the meeting of the Chairs of the Review Committees, noting that several agenda items of the current meeting had been discussed among the Chairs. He highlighted that approaches to the finalization of the living medium term plan had been extensively discussed. The revision of SPESS B and the resulting impact on SPESS F for DPPs had also received considerable attention and the Chairs' discussions would be presented under agenda item 8 of the current meeting. The Chairs had been briefed on the work in progress on the safety–security interface, including the joint INSAG-AdSec report and Technical Report Series 1000 publications. A potential amendment of the copyright notice for safety standards had been discussed, and it had been agreed that the Secretariat would conduct consultations on this matter with OLA and MTCD **[Annex IV, Action 52.3]**.

The Chairs had further discussed the merits of virtual vs in-person Committee meetings, noting the difficulty of consensus building in the virtual format; they had agreed to encourage Committee members

to participate in person. Finally, there had been a discussion on the 'batch' revision of safety standards, and the pros and cons of such an approach had been highlighted.

4. Approval of draft publications and DPPs

NOTE: The drafts submitted to the Commission at this meeting will be subsequently posted as a final edited version on the CSS website. CSS members will be notified and given a period of two weeks to provide comments. At the end of this period, if there are no objections, the draft will be considered to be endorsed (i.e. by 'silent approval') **[Annex IV, Action 52.4].**

4.01 Draft Safety Guide DS470 on Radiation Safety of Radiation Sources used in Research and Education

Mr H. Pappinisseri Puthanveedu presented the background and scope of the draft Safety Guide. Comments had been received from India and all had been resolved.

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

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

4.02 Draft Safety Guide DS499 on Application of the Concept of Exemption

Mr Pappinisseri Puthanveedu presented the background of the draft, and described the steps taken for its development. Comments had been received from India and had all been resolved.

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

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

4.03 Draft Safety Guide DS500 on Application of the Concept of Clearance

Mr V. Ljubenov presented the background of the draft, and described the steps taken for its development. Comments had been received from the Republic of Korea and India, and all had been resolved.

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

Mr Larsson, referring to both DS499 and DS500, commented that Australia had felt that the process for developing the two drafts had been somewhat disjointed, and that much discussion had been on the definitions and descriptions of the fundamental concepts set out in the drafts. He thanked the Secretariat and the Review Committees for their work in achieving harmonized recommendations, and requested the Secretariat to ensure that the implementation of the two Safety Guides was also conducted in a harmonized manner.

Mr Delattre referred to a request from Mr González to re-insert a footnote into DS500 relating to the deliberate mixing or diluting of radioactive material with non-radioactive material. Mr Delattre reported that this particular issue had been discussed at the Committees and that there had been no consensus on it at that time. He proposed, and Ms Velshi agreed, that for this reason it would not be possible to insert the requested footnote at this time.

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

4.04 Draft Safety Guide DS521 on Radiation Protection Programmes for the Transport of Radioactive Material

Mr E. Reber presented the background of the draft, and described the steps taken for its development. Comments had been received from India and had all been resolved.

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

Ms Sardella commended the Secretariat for the work in developing this draft Safety Guide.

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

4.05 Draft Safety Guide DS523 on Development and Application of Level 1 Probabilistic Safety Assessment for Nuclear Power Plants

Mr S. Poghosyan presented the background of the draft, and described the steps taken for its development. Comments had been received from India and had all been resolved.

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

Mr Dies Llovera appreciated the additional guidance provided in DS523 covering probabilistic safety assessment (PSA) of the spent fuel pool. He urged the Secretariat to develop recommendations for PSA for waste storage facilities inside NPPs. Mr Poghosyan noted the increased interest in Member States for PSA for non-reactor facilities, and informed the CSS that a TECDOC on that topic was being planned.

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

4.06 Draft DPP DS535 for a Safety Guide on Periodic Safety Review for Nuclear Power Plants, revision of SSG-25

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

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

The Commission approved the DPP.

4.07 Draft DPP DS537 for a new Safety Guide on Safety Demonstration of Innovative Technology in Power Reactor Designs

Mr Poghosyan 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 Germany and Israel and had all been resolved.

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

Ms Cromnier requested that the development of this Safety Guide be prioritized over other drafts. Mr Poghosyan noted that time would certainly be needed to develop the text, although perhaps the process could be sped up after the text had been developed.

In response to questions from Mr Nageswara Rao and Mr Heinonen on which particular technologies would be addressed, Mr Poghosyan explained that the focus of the Safety Guide would be on the process, rather than on the technological aspects. He also noted that a Safety Report was being developed in parallel on safety analysis for different types of SMR, and that several TECDOCs were currently under development to address different technologies.

Mr Gutterres considered that international cooperation was a key point in solving the challenges associated with safety demonstration of innovative technologies.

Mr Larsson cautioned that accelerating the work on certain Safety Guides would necessarily slow down the work on others. He suggested that those countries that wished to prioritize certain publications might provide the necessary resources to do so. Ms Velshi requested the Secretariat to revisit the schedule for the Safety Guide to see whether its production could be accelerated.

The Commission approved the DPP.

4.08 Draft DPP DS538 for a new Safety Guide on Long Term Post-Remediation Management of Areas Affected by Past Activities or Events

Mr E. Carvalho 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).

In response to a question from Ms Sardella, Mr Carvalho noted that planning for post remediation should be done at the same time as planning for remediation. He also noted that the concept of 'citizen science', as set out in the DPP, referred to the involvement of the public.

The Commission approved the DPP.

4.09 Draft DPP DS539 for a Safety Guide on Licensing Process for Nuclear Installations, revision of SSG-12

Mr M. Santini introduced the draft DPP, describing the background and justification for the publication, as well as the objectives and scope. In particular, it was proposed that this revision of the publication would present guidance for licensing of SMRs in an appendix. 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).

Mr Jammal noted that a proposed publication date of 2026 was rather far into the future: by then, he expected, many SMRs would already be under construction. Mr Webster also commented that this draft Safety Guide ought to be developed in parallel with DS537 (see agenda item 4.07). Furthermore, Ms Cromnier noted that it would be more challenging to ensure harmonized international guidance later into the future, when different countries will have already different national approaches to licensing.

Mr Santini responded that there was a necessary trade-off between urgency and quality of the draft, and that for completeness it would be desirable to bring in discussions and outcomes from the ongoing work of NHSI and the SMR Regulators' Forum (see agenda item 9).

Mr S. Alten called for guidance of high quality to be developed, as it was particularly newcomer countries who would benefit most from clearer and better guidance.

Mr Delattre proposed that time could be saved by undertaking certain steps of the SPESS process by electronic means, e.g. consulting the CSS at Step 12 via commenting on the website. Ms Velshi supported this idea and suggested that – provided the Review Committees had approved the draft – the CSS approval could be expedited in such a manner, so as to achieve a publication date of 2025.

The Commission approved the DPP.

4.10 Draft DPP DS540 for a Safety Guide on Radiation Safety for Industrial Radiography, revision of SSG-11

Ms M. Cervera 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).

The discussion that followed addressed the merits of GPS tracking of sources, and whether it was better to insert such tracking devices on the housing of the source, or on the vehicle transporting the source, and the differing national requirements in this regard. Ms Cervera clarified that both fixed and mobile sources would be addressed in the Safety Guide.

The Commission approved the DPP.

5. Draft nuclear security guidance for information

5.01 Draft Implementing Guide NST069 on Nuclear Security Systems and Measures for Major Public Events, revision of NSS No. 18

Ms E. Paladi introduced the draft DPP, describing the background and justification for the publication, as well as the objectives, scope and structure. No comments had been received from the CSS.

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

Mr Gutterres expressed his concern that the guide might advocate duplication of or possibly even conflict between organizational structures dealing with response to a nuclear security event and response to a nuclear or radiological emergency. Ms Paladi confirmed that there was close cooperation with EPReSC so as to avoid this.

5.02 Draft Implementing Guide NST070 on Information Security for Nuclear Facility, revision of NSS No. 23-G

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

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

Mr Hewes, in response to questions on the nature of information security, noted that the guide would emphasize the need for awareness of information security, rather than on training on the topic.

Ms Sardella requested that close collaboration with NUSSC be ensured, as the interface with safety was important in this area. Mr Delattre confirmed that the draft was an interface document, which would be submitted to all Safety Standards Committees for clearance.

6. Update on the living medium term plan

Mr Delattre reported on the status of the medium term plan and noted that he had posted an update to the plan on the CSS website in September 2022. Following a request from the CSS (Report of CSS 51, Annex IV, Action 51.6), the Safety Standards Committees had looked at the list of drafts for review and the list of new topics for future consideration and the medium term plan had been updated accordingly to reflect the road maps of the Committees. Mr Delattre had also included in the medium term plan new proposals received by individual Member States (Germany, Pakistan, Spain, Sweden) that still need to be discussed with the Committees and need to be prioritized or moved to the long term plan or to another category of publication (e.g. Safety Report, Technical Report Series 1000, TECDOCs). He added that the aim is to finalize the medium term plan for the next CSS meeting. He continued that during the meeting of the Chairs, the Committee Chairs had agreed that each Committee will produce a single list of drafts and will also prioritize the drafts; then the CSS will help with the overall prioritization. He added that this requires detailed discussions and a lot of work from the Committees.

Ms Velshi proposed that a Gantt chart be developed that would help with the planning and the resources needed to realize the plan. **[Annex IV, Action 52.5]**.

Ms Cromnier noted that the medium term plan needs to reflect the three strategic objectives that had been discussed at the last CSS meeting to give a steer to the Committees so that they can conduct the prioritization. Mr Delattre noted that the medium term plan contains criteria for optimization of the set of Safety Guides, as reflected in annex IV of SPESS A and in the concept paper for the preparation of the long term plan for the IAEA safety standards. Ms Cromnier thanked Mr Delattre for providing detailed explanations on the plan.

Ms Velshi suggested restructuring the medium term plan to emphasize the strategic areas and then include the criteria for optimization. She asked the Committee Chairs how the Committees do the prioritization. Mr Webster explained that NUSSC is responsible for a large number of safety standards and that SMRs are an overriding priority. Mr Pstrak noted that TRANSSC sees the development of guidance on ageing management and maintenance for transport packages containing radioactive material as a high priority, and that TRANSSC is also showing a high interest in TNPPs. Mr Dicks noted that the Committees and the CSS need to be open to new topics. He added that a bottom-up

approach should be implemented at the same time as a top-down approach with strategic direction of the activities by the CSS and the Chairs.

Mr Gutterres noted that the plan should allow for flexibility, so that new issues that might arise can be included. Ms Velshi remarked that recent experience has shown that the plan needs to stay up to date and emphasized that the medium term plan is currently a living plan exactly to allow for the incorporation of new topical areas as needed.
Mr Dies Llovera noted that when conducting the prioritization, the CSS needs to take into consideration that different resources are being used (i.e. from different parts of the Secretariat). He added that developing guidance for SMRs should be a high priority, as many countries are currently in the process of developing new nuclear reactors. Mr Delattre agreed that different divisions are working in parallel to complete the plan, however the need for review and publication will also need to be considered. He noted that there is a need to look at the bigger picture and the limits in the system.

Ms Sardella supported the idea that resources need to remain focused on areas of high interest and noted that the role of the CSS is to provide direction to the Safety Standards Committees. She agreed that the Committees should first do the prioritization and a plan can then be made taking into consideration existing resources and the timescales and this plan can be reviewed at the next CSS meeting.

Ms Velshi summarized the path forward and acknowledged the work done by the Chairs to align the work of the Committees with priorities and expectations.

Mr Delattre indicated that he would update the medium term plan and its appendix in accordance with the comments made and the input to be provided by the Safety Standards Committees, and that he would ensure that the medium term plan is placed on the agenda of the next CSS meeting **[Annex IV, Action 52.6]**

7. Feedback from the Safety Standards Committees on the concept paper for the preparation of the long term plan for the IAEA safety standards

Mr Delattre described the content of the concept paper and noted that the overall approach for the preparation of the long term plan was supported by the Safety Standards Committees. Each Committee had been provided with a questionnaire to stimulate input from the Committee members and to conduct an environmental scan.

Mr Webster explained that NUSSC 53 had raised an action on collecting input from the members and the intention is to include this again in the agenda of the next NUSSC meeting. Ms Velshi enquired whether NUSSC was planning to follow the same approach as RASSC and form working groups to collect input for the long term plan. Mr Webster explained that such an approach would take time to produce the desired outcome and Mr Delattre explained that it is important to collect input and reminded the CSS that the long term plan will be put into action after 2026.

Ms Cromnier thanked Mr Delattre for his presentation and asked that strategic objectives form part of the long term plan. Ms Velshi supported the idea. Mr Delattre noted that SPESS A contains 11 strategic objectives for the development of safety standards that have been extracted and included in the plan as structural elements and agreed that these strategic objectives can also be added in the long term plan.

Mr Heinonen suggested including areas where additional guidance can be provided and brought examples from the topics addressed during the meeting (e.g. integration of safety and security, review of the safety fundamentals, optimization related to radiation protection). He continued that the CSS ought to be more involved in the development of the long term plan using the input provided by the Safety Standards Committees.

Ms Velshi proposed looking at the strategic objectives at the next CSS meeting to see how the long term plan can be aligned to these objectives. **[Annex IV, Action 52.7]**

Ms Velshi concluded the discussion by encouraging CSS members to provide further input on the concept paper **[Annex IV, Action 52.8]**, 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 52.9].**

8. Progress on the review/revision of SPESS B and SPESS F

Mr Mallick introduced the initiative of reviewing SPESS B manual on the step by step process for the application on Strategies and Processes for the Establishment of IAEA Safety Standards (SPESS A). He noted that the objective is to update SPESS B and improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the process.

Ms M. Nikolaki presented the review/revision process of SPESS B and SPESS F and reported on the results of the Consultancy Meeting that had been conducted for that purpose. She explained that the meeting participants, who were mostly current or former members of the Review Committees, had discussed all the proposals and suggestions that had been collected by the Secretariat and made the following observations and recommendations:

- The existing SPESS B process is fit for purpose and effective, and it produces high quality consensus publications;
- Deadlines should be adhered to, deviations should be exceptional, reminder emails are desirable when actions by Committee members are required;
- DPPs could be more explicit, the scope should be well defined (potentially by allocating a longer discussion time during Committee meetings), a gap analysis or feedback analysis should always be attached; SPESS F should be modified accordingly;
- More explanation in SPESS B is needed on how a decision for developing a DPP is made (a 'step 0' or preamble);
- An annex to SPESS B is needed, providing a short overview of the role of the Review Committees in the SPESS process and the different expectations for their role at step 7 and step 11;
- More clarification is needed that 'silent approval' is a means to confirm consensus on a text after sufficient discussion at a meeting and the resulting changes pending implementation, and is not a substitute for consensus building discussions;
- A third (virtual) meeting of Review Committees should be held each year to spread the workload and identify areas where consensus is not yet achieved. That might affect the timing of the CSS meetings planned throughout a year.

Based on the conclusions of the review process, a new version of the SPESS B and SPESS F will be issued **[Annex IV, Action 52.10]**.

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

Mr González highlighted the need for training on the SPESS process. He also noted the importance of maintaining availability of superseded safety standards for informational purposes as, historically, the earlier standards had been more detailed.

Mr Webster endorsed the proposals and highlighted the advantages of holding three Committee meetings per year.

Mr Dicks highlighted the importance of focusing on the outcomes. He noted that Review Committees have the capacity to also explore additional efficiencies within their areas of work, including more emphasis on discipline and proposed to make the third meeting optional for consideration of each Review Committee.

Ms Bly agreed that the option of the third meeting with a narrower scope could be explored.

Ms Cromnier welcomed the attempt to make the process more efficient.

Mr Gutterres noted that the meetings of Review Committees are usually conducted over 2–3 days. With the introduction of a third meeting, even virtual, the duration of the two other meetings might be further reduced. He highlighted the difficulty of justifying the need for in-person participation in such a short meeting for national governmental organizations, especially for countries that are located further away from Vienna.

9. Information on the activities for the Nuclear Harmonization and Standardization Initiative (NHSI) and on the activities of the SMR Regulators' Forum

Ms A. Bradford presented the initiative and its members and summarized the work done to date, including the development of a roadmap to accelerate the safe and secure deployment of advanced nuclear reactors, with a particular focus on SMRs and the holistic review of the applicability of safety standards to SMRs. She also presented the action plan from 2022 to 2024 for both the regulatory and industrial tracks and the three working groups created under the initiative. She noted that the regulatory track of the initiative would be working on publications that would help in the pre-licensing regulatory review of designs, and highlighted that the development of such international review criteria is an ambitious task.

She noted that the creation of a repository of knowledge on innovative designs, and the revision of Safety Guides on the design of NPPs were within the working scope of the initiative.

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

Mr Jammal commended the Secretariat on the clarity of the process and the intensive work done so far. He also noted that DS539 on the Licensing Process for Nuclear Installations had a preparation timeline beyond 2024 and wondered if the NHSI work was coordinated with the development of that draft. Ms Bradford confirmed that there would be coordination within the Secretariat.

Mr T. Granier asked for clarification on the governance of the initiative, the number of IAEA staff involved and whether the initiative had a steering committee. Ms Bradford noted that the initiative had no steering committee, but that the chairpersons of the two tracks and the Divisional Directors involved had an overview of the initiative, in which several IAEA staff were involved.

Mr González emphasized that, in line with its mandate, the IAEA needed to be very careful not to take any promotional role in the initiative. He noted that innovative reactor designs might need more detailed norms in addition to the safety standards.

Mr Lee recalled the IAEA's Advanced Reactors Information System (ARIS), which provides an overview of reactor designs. He noted that an international review would be helpful to regulatory bodies with less experience in the licensing of nuclear installations.

Ms Cromnier commended the initiative.

Mr Gutterres asked if the publications proposed by NHSI would be developed following the SPESS process and whether the CSS would be involved in their review. Ms Bradford clarified that only the proposed safety standards would follow the SPESS process, not the informational publications. However, she indicated her readiness to inform the CSS on the progress of those informational publications too.

Mr Nageswara Rao commended the Secretariat on the initiative and highlighted the importance of a discussion platform for reactor designers.

Mr González proposed to bring together regulators that are embarking on the licensing of reactors of similar types and designs. Ms Velshi noted that this proposal was in line with discussions happening at the International Conference on Topical Issues in Nuclear Installation Safety: Strengthening Safety of Evolutionary and Innovative Reactor Designs, which was taking place in parallel with the meeting of the CSS.

10. Overview of the work being done in the area of denial of shipment

Mr Reber presented the work done from 2003 to 2021 related to the denial of shipment, including the formation of a dedicated working group to analyse the issue in detail.

Mr Reber's presentation is available on the CSS web page The Commission Members Area (iaea.org).

Mr González commended the Secretariat for initiating work on this known problem.

Mr Jammal emphasized the importance of knowledge management, including a database of past decisions made, especially in the area of transport of radiopharmaceuticals.

11. Feedback from the implementation of the ALPS project

This agenda item was postponed to the next meeting due to the unavailability of possible presenters.

12. Information from ICRP, UNSCEAR and OECD/NEA

Mr Delattre noted that the representatives from ICRP, UNSCEAR and OECD/NEA were not available to speak at the meeting, but had provided documents that were available on the CSS web page The Commission Members Area (iaea.org).

The ICRP had provided a report that included information on its recent statement on the conflict in Ukraine and its interim advice for the public on protection in case of a nuclear detonation. It had also reported on the review and revision of the System of Radiological Protection, and on its recent publications.

UNSCEAR had provided a paper on its activities and updates, including a report of its 69th session, its 2025–2029 programme of work, the UNSCEAR data collection strategy, cooperation with the IAEA and other international organizations, and outreach activities.

The OECD/NEA had provided information on an upcoming workshop for its Nuclear Safety Research Joint Projects Week, that would include high-level panels and a series of technical sessions.

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 52nd CSS meeting would be provided for comment to the CSS members **[Annex IV, Action 52.11]** and that the draft report of the 52nd CSS meeting would be posted on the CSS web page for comment **[Annex IV, Action 52.12]**. Mr Delattre informed the Commission that all presentations made at the 52nd CSS meeting would be posted on the CSS web page **[Annex IV, Action 52.13]**.

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

- **CSS 53:** initially planned for 3–4 April 2023, but moved afterwards to 23-26 May 2023
- **CSS 54:** week of 27 November to 1 December 2023

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

ANNEX I

PARTICIPATION AT THE 52nd CSS MEETING (in person and remotely)

The Commission

R. Velshi (Chair of CSS)

A. J. González, Argentina

G. Hirth, Australia (sent apologies – represented by C. -M. Larsson)

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

R. F. Gutterres, Brazil

R. Jammal, Canada

J. Yu, China

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

J. Heinonen, Finland

J-L Lachaume, France

T. Elsner, Germany

G. Nageswara Rao, India

F. Gov, Israel

T. Yamada, Japan

J. Lee, Republic of Korea

M. Zniber, Morocco

F. Mansoor, Pakistan

A. Ferapontov, Russian Federation (sent apologies – represented by R. Sharafutdinov)

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

C. O. Phillips, South Africa

J. Dies Llovera, Spain

N. Cromnier, Sweden

R. Sardella, Switzerland

S. Alten, Türkiye

S. Vinton, United Kingdom

D. Roberts, United States of America

Observers

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

M. Hübel, EC

C. Clement, ICRP

S. Burns, INSAG

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

B. Batandjieva-Metcalf, UNSCEAR

Representatives and experts supporting CSS members and observers

M. Aparicio, S. Atack, Y.-K. Chung, C. Cole, C. Ditsche, R. El Gamoussi, L. Gerber, T. Granier, C Hanson, S. Holiday, J. Kim, A. Loscertales, O. Mikula, A. Müller-Germanà, S. Wittick

Chairs of the Review Committees

EPReSC: M. Grzechnik

NSGC: *currently no Chair*

NUSSC: P. Webster

RASSC: R. Bly

TRANSSC: D. Pstrak

WASSC: P. Dicks

Coordinators of Review Committees and of the Commission on Safety Standards

F. Stephani, 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 and International 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

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

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

A. Clark, A. Gomez Cobo

M. Alves dos Santos Junior, K. Asfaw, G. Bruno, N. Capadona, E. Carvalho, M. Cervera, C. Fischer, M. Gajdos, O. German, S. Geupel, M. Hewes, T. Karseka-Yanev, V. Ljubenov, M. Moracho Ramirez, S. Nestoroska Madjunarova, M. Nikolaki, E. Paladi, H. Pappinisseri Puthanveedu, M. Pinak, S. Pohgosyan, E. Reber, J. Rovny, P. Sales Barbosa, M. Santini, R. Wright, M. Yuzawa

ANNEX II

Agenda of the 52nd meeting of the COMMISSION ON SAFETY STANDARDS

1. Opening Session

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

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

1.3. Introduction of new CSS members: France, Finland, Morocco and Switzerland

1.4. Adoption of the agenda; *CSS members*

1.5. Confirmation of the adoption of the final report of the 51st CSS meeting.

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

2. Second Roundtable discussion on the safety implications of the situation in Ukraine: Progress on the development of a gap analysis on maintaining safety and nuclear security during armed conflict *S. Mallick*

- Information on INSAG related activities; *S. Burns, INSAG Chair*
- Progress on the development of a gap analysis on maintaining safety and nuclear security during armed conflict; *D. Delattre*

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

3.1. Waste Safety Standards Committee; *P. Dicks, Chair / N. Aghajanyan, Scientific Secretary*

3.2. Transport Safety Standards Committee; *D. Pstrak, Chair / S. Fayyaz, Scientific Secretary*

3.3. Radiation Safety Standards Committee; R. Bly, *Chair / O. Guzmán López-Ocón, Scientific Secretary*

3.4. Nuclear Security Guidance Committee; *S. Case Lackner, Scientific Secretary*

3.5. Nuclear Safety Standards Committee; *P. Webster, Chair / M. Svab, Scientific Secretary*

3.6. Emergency Preparedness and Response Standards Committee; *M. Grzechnik, Chair / F. Stephani, A/Scientific Secretary*

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

4. Approval of draft publications and DPPs

4.01. Draft Safety Guide DS470 on Radiation Safety of Radiation Sources used in Research and Education, *H. Pappinisseri Puthanveedu*

4.02. Draft Safety Guide DS499 on Application of the Concept of Exemption, *H. Pappinisseri Puthanveedu*

4.03. Draft Safety Guide DS500 on Application of the Concept of Clearance, *V. Ljubenov*

4.04. Draft Safety Guide DS521 on Radiation Protection Programmes for the Transport of Radioactive Material, *E. Reber*

4.05. Draft Safety Guide DS523 on Development and Application of Level 1 Probabilistic Safety Assessment for Nuclear Power Plants, *S. Poghosyan*

4.06. Draft DPP DS535 for a Safety Guide on Periodic Safety Review for Nuclear Power Plants, revision of SSG-25, *M. Gajdos*

4.07. Draft DPP DS537 for a new Safety Guide on Safety Demonstration of Innovative Technology in

Power Reactor Designs, *S. Poghosyan*

4.08. Draft DPP DS538 for a new Safety Guide on Long Term Post-Remediation Management of Areas Affected by Past Activities or Events, *E. Carvalho*

4.09. Draft DPP DS539 for a Safety Guide on Licensing Process for Nuclear Installations, revision of SSG-12, *M. Santini*

4.10. Draft DPP DS540 for a Safety Guide on Radiation Safety for Industrial Radiography, revision of SSG-11, *M. Cervera*

5. Draft nuclear security guidance for information

5.01. Draft Implementing Guide NST069 on Nuclear Security Systems and Measures for Major Public Events, revision of NSS No. 18, *E. Paladi*

5.02. Draft Implementing Guide NST070 on Information Security for Nuclear Facility, revision of NSS No. 23-G, *M. Hewes*

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

7. Feedback from the Safety Standards Committees on the Concept paper for the preparation of the long-term plan for the IAEA safety standards*; D. Delattre*

8. Progress on the review/revision of SPESS B and SPESS F; *S. Mallick and K. Asfaw*

9. Information on the activities for the Nuclear Harmonization and Standardization Initiative (NHSI) and on the activities of the SMR Regulators' Forum; *A. Bradford*

10. Overview of the work being done in the area of denial of shipment; *S. Fayyaz*

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

Postponed to the next meeting due to unavailability of the possible presenters

12. Information from ICRP, UNSCEAR and OECD/NEA

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

- **CSS 53:** 3-4 April 2023
- **CSS 54:** week from 27 November to 1 December 2023

ANNEX III

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

49th MEETING

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]. Only DS497E and DS497G remain, CSS silent approval already confirmed, expected to be published soon.**

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. DS515 remains, already being edited.**

51st MEETING

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]. Done**

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]. Done**

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]. Done, agenda item 2 of this meeting.**

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]. Denial of shipment — agenda item 10 of this meeting; ALPS — next meeting.**

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

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]. Done — agenda item 6 of this meeting.**

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]. No input from CSS, but further input from the Committees — agenda item 7 of this meeting.**

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]. See above.**

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]. Done — this list.**

51.10. The draft report of the 51st CSS meeting will be posted on the CSS webpage for comment. **[Action: Secretariat, CSS Scientific Secretary]. Done — agenda item 1.5 of this meeting.**

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

ANNEX IV

ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE 52nd MEETING OF THE COMMISSION ON SAFETY STANDARDS

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

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

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

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

52.5. A Gantt chart will be developed laying out the timelines for publications currently in the SPESS process. **[Action: IAEA Secretariat]**

52.6. The draft living medium term plan will be finalized on the basis of input from its consideration by the Safety Standards Committees at their next meetings and it will be included on the agenda of the next CSS meeting. **[Action: Secretariat, Safety Standards Committees members]**

52.7. The strategic objectives of SPESS A will be considered at the next CSS meeting to see how the long term plan for the IAEA safety standards can be aligned to these objectives. **[Action: CSS members]**

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

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

52.10. New versions of SPESS B and SPESS F will be issued. **[Action: IAEA Secretariat]**

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

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

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