

R2D2P December 2012 Participant Feedback

1. Serbia – IAEA should consider establishing a “school” for drafting a DP, and repeat it every 5 years. It could be a one week class for drafting, targeted at the operator and a second week targeted at the regulator, focused on conducting DP review. Also, a workshop discussing industrial hazards would be helpful as well. (Vietnam agrees)
2. Philippines – R2D2P is almost done, one more meeting. In the final meeting, each country should present their DP, summarize what was learned to show what was got out of the R2D2P.
3. Brazil – for Brazil, R2D2 is a good start to finish decommissioning studies for NPPs. Ideas about decommissioning should be put into the Joint Convention (JC), people in the JC don’t think about it, but we could push for legislation for a minimal decommissioning framework.
4. Indonesia – we have 3 RR’s. National workshops on cost estimation, waste management and environmental assessment would be helpful. We need an IAEA expert assistance for these workshops. We submitted a TC program concept for IAEA approval for 2014-15 for expert assistance.
5. Romania – R2D2P provided good information for comparison with Romanian RTR. We have a good approach for NPP’s but not yet for RTRs. They were not always under good control. We are very pleased with the work plan example and RWP comparison. We would like a workshop on MARSSIM and MARSAME training. Perhaps it could be done first regionally or interregional, and then progress to National courses. So the first workshop would be general for R2D2P participants and the national workshops would involve a larger group, to include operators, survey designers etc. We would also like a more detailed presentation on the US Decommissioning Regulatory Framework—something at least ½ day long.
6. Egypt – Government structure in Egypt has changed so that the nuclear regulatory body reports to the prime minister. Decommissioning regulations need to be written, to include establishing decommissioning funding at time of construction. Workshop was very helpful—Egypt now often follows US regulations for radiation facilities.
7. Romania – Post Decommissioning studies are not all the same, so even with the same processes, the cost to decommission will vary. The USA seem not to use as much inspection as other countries, but other countries do not have the contractor expertise. We would need much more inspection for decommissioning, perhaps once per week. The US leverages infrastructure (disposal capacity) and contractor experience, which doesn’t work everywhere.
8. Argentina – R2D2P management is difficult; we have covered most decommissioning subjects and seen a lot of different things. Now we have some knowledge, and the best way to proceed would be by test cases. We need “how to do” not “how to follow”. Perhaps a test case could be developed in advance of the next meeting, and all of the procedures be provided in advance. Also, perhaps in future workshops, we should split the regulator and operator into different workshops. While a test case wasn’t practical before, perhaps it is now.
9. Vietnam - Workshop was very valuable in that it provided practical experience. In the future we need to develop DP’s, learn about safety analysis for decommissioning activities. Vietnam desires to build new RR’s and NPP’s in the future, so we want to learn about building decommissioning planning in at the design stage.

10. Serbia – Everything in Serbia has changed since the 2006 start of R2D2P. No one has been to more than 2 or three of the workshops. Perhaps it should be redone in two parts, to keep it shorter: one part preparation that goes for 2-4 years, and another phase for implementation that goes for 2-4 years.
11. Romania – Each country should send representatives from the regulator and the operator, and not just one or the other. We also should send specialists for specific training aspects, such as financial or radiation protection, so we can take back home more than just general information. We should recognize RR decommissioning is a multi-disciplinary activity.
12. Egypt – It is difficult to write a license for decommissioning. It is a challenge to use the right wording to avoid unintended meanings. It would be helpful to have a specialist in writing present and explain how to be clear when writing licenses.
13. Romania – We use operator license and change parts, adding in relevant documents into license, as well as limits and conditions. There are many things in a license, including the safety analysis and procedures. The standard review plan is helpful for writing the license, so you don't have to improvise on a case by case basis.
14. Argentina – Each member state finds it hard to combine the needs of the regulator and operator. A test case must be followed to help work through the different roles. The test case is indispensable to run a good project.
15. Brazil – A test case would be good. The operator is concerned what the Brazilian regulator will require for D&D. This workshop showed what is feasible and doable within a regulatory framework, and showed good transparency of the process.
16. Serbia - It was good to see cooperation between the regulator, operator and contractors. This is important for Serbia, so we can learn how to control and manage projects, especially those with contractors.