

**Unclassified**

**NEA/RWM/RF/A(2011)1**

Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Économiques  
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

**08-Mar-2011**

**English - Or. English**

**NUCLEAR ENERGY AGENCY  
RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

**RWMC Regulators' Forum (RWMC-RF)**

**DRAFT PROPOSED AGENDA OF THE 14TH SESSION OF THE RWMC-RF**

**22 March 2011  
NEA Premises, Issy les Moulineaux**

Please send any queries regarding this document to [claudio.pescatore@oecd.org](mailto:claudio.pescatore@oecd.org)

**JT03297737**

Document complet disponible sur OLIS dans son format d'origine  
Complete document available on OLIS in its original format



**NEA/RWM/RF/A(2011)1  
Unclassified**

**English - Or. English**

**RWMC REGULATORS' FORUM (RWMC RF)**

**PROVISIONAL AGENDA**

**FOR THE 14<sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF THE RWMC RF**

**ISSY-LES-MOULINEAUX, 22 MARCH 2011**

The 14<sup>th</sup> session of the **Radioactive Waste Management Committee Regulators' Forum (RWMC RF)** will take place on **22 March 2011**. It will be chaired by **Georg Arens**, the Chairperson of the RF. The venue is:

**OECD Nuclear Energy Agency**

**Le Seine Saint-Germain**

**12, Boulevard des Îles**

**92130 Issy les Moulineaux, France**

Building "B" - 7<sup>th</sup> Floor - Meeting Room "B"

**You will obtain identification for this meeting if you ask your Delegation to register you (separate registration to the RWMC meeting will be necessary, if applicable to you).**

Delegates are reminded that access to the meeting is granted subsequent to registration through the Delegate's member country delegation to the OECD.

The NEA web site has information on how to get to the address above as well as on accommodations in this area [<http://www.nea.fr/html/general/welcome.html>].

Delegates participating are advised further that the security arrangements in force at OECD include the obligation to present an identity document bearing a photograph. This document will be requested at the time of issuing Delegates' cards for the meeting on first entry to the OECD. It should also be presented subsequently with the card every time OECD premises are entered.

The nature of each agenda item is indicated as follows:

**I** : For information

**D** : For decision

**C** : Comments are elicited

Working Language: English

*When sending presentations and papers to the Secretariat, please indicate the agenda item number in the top right-hand corner. Please provide both Word/Powerpoint files **as well as** PDF files (for presentations, please put two slides per page to facilitate document distribution).*

WIFI is available in the meeting room. The network is "WIFI-G", the user ID is "WIFI" and the password is "oecdnea" (both are case-sensitive).

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
<b>9:30</b>	<b>1.</b>	<b>OPENING OF THE MEETING</b> <i>Chair, Secretariat</i>	
	<b>2.</b> <b>D</b>	<b>ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA</b> <i>Chair, Secretariat</i>	NEA/RWM/RF/A(2011)1
	<b>3.</b> <b>D</b>	<b>APPROVAL OF THE SUMMARY RECORD OF PREVIOUS MEETING</b> <i>Chair, Secretariat</i>	NEA/RWM/RF/M(2010)1
<b>RECENT DEVELOPMENTS WITHIN RWMC</b>			
	<b>4.</b> <b>I/C</b>	<b>INITIATIVES WITHIN RWMC THAT MAY REQUIRE SPECIFIC RF ATTENTION</b> <i>Claudio Pescatore</i>  Brief review/reminder of the RWMC initiatives on reversibility and retrievability, memory preservation, the ICGR 2011 conference. Emerging issues in the working parties. Some of these will also be covered later in the present agenda.	Oral report
	<b>5.</b> <b>I/C</b>	<b>OVERVIEW OF LAST YEAR'S AGREEMENTS AND ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE RF</b> <i>Claudio Pescatore</i>  At its March 2010 meeting, the RF members approved forward actions in the wake of the Tokyo workshop. Specific actions were presented and discussed, i.e., in the area of R&D needs of regulators and optimization, engaging the radiation protection profession in a dialogue on disposal safety criteria, taking up the issue of "the meaning of closure", and dealing with the very long time scales from a regulatory point of view. Emerging issues of specific interest to the members of the RF were pointed out, including: (a) the regulatory position related to reversibility and retrievability during the operational phase of the repository, (b) a suggestion from the FSC on the need for a definition of fundamental concepts like risk and safety.	Room Document (Table of Main Items and Decisions)
<b>10:15</b>	<b>PROGRAMME OF WORK</b>		
	<b>6.</b>	<b>THE R&amp;D NEEDS OF REGULATORY ORGANIZATIONS IN THE FIELD OF WASTE MANAGEMENT AND APPROACHES TO FULFILL THOSE NEEDS</b> <i>Claudio Pescatore</i>	

	I/C	Regulatory organizations responded to a questionnaire in this area in 2009. The results of the questionnaire as well as lessons to be retained were documented in the document NEA/RWM/RF(2010)1, co-authored by Hans Wanner and Klaus Fischer-Appelt . Additional comments were received afterwards, until June 2010. The March 2010 report was updated by the Secretariat in view of its release as “general distribution document”. The report number is NEA/RWM/RF(2010)4. In case additional information is provided by RF members, a revised version of the document will be produced.	NEA/RWM/RF(2010)4 (R&D report)
	7.  D	<b>THE EVOLVING ROLE OF THE REGULATOR</b> <i>Carmen Ruiz Lopez</i>  In 2003, the FSC and the RF together released a brochure on “The Regulator's Evolving Role and Image in Radioactive Waste Management”. The Core Group suggested that the RF reviews it to check if an update is needed. What are the views of the RF members? Is there a need to reissue the booklet?  Carmen Ruiz Lopez, will report on a first review by herself, Klaus Fischer-Appelt and Janet Kotra.	Oral report
	8.  D	<b>REGULATOR’S ROLE IN CONFIDENCE BUILDING</b> <i>Felix Altorfer</i>  Regulators have a special role in confidence building for safety as well as for the credibility of the decision making process. The Core Group suggested that we seek whether a short brochure or statement could be drafted on the confidence building roles of the regulator.  Felix Altorfer will present initial ideas that he developed with Walter Blommaert (seed document).  To be noted that the seed document for the ICGR-2011 conference refers to the important role of the regulator.	Infodoc #1 (Document on Confidence Role of the Regulator)
10:45	9.	<b>JOINT RF-IGSC WORKSHOP ON PRE-LICENSING</b> <b>a. Presentation followed by discussion</b> <i>Philippe Raimbault, Claudio Pescatore</i>  Following the Tokyo workshop and the publication of the document (NEA-6836) on optimization, the RF decided to organize a workshop on practical considerations for optimisation and licensing. Concurrently, at its last annual meeting, the IGSC identified the need to organize a workshop on operational safety where optimization issues such that of balancing operational safety and long term safety would be considered based on case studies. Based on this convergence of approaches the Secretariat was tasked by the IGSC and, later, by the RF Core group with trying to merge the two workshops into a single one that would	NEA/RWM(2011)4/PROV (Draft Programme for Discussion)

		<p>take place at the end of January 2012 in Paris, Berlin or Cordoba. It is proposed to title the workshop: “Preparing for the construction license of a deep geological repository - Challenges and good practices”. It would cover both the topic of operational safety and practical considerations for optimization and draw lessons in the context of preparing for the upcoming applications for construction licenses of deep repositories. A discussion document with a preliminary programme is presented for discussion.</p> <p><b>D</b></p> <p><b>b. Decision on next steps. In particular, identification of RF members to participate in the programme committee.</b></p> <p><i>Georg Arens</i></p>	
11:30	10.	<p><b>ISSUES RELATED TO RETRIEVABILITY</b></p> <p><i>Claudio Pescatore</i></p> <p>A number of RF members participated to the Reims conference which raised issues in the regulatory area.</p> <p><b>a. Presentation of a set of regulatory questions coming out of the Reims Conference</b></p> <p><i>Carmen Ruiz Lopez, Klaus Fischer-Appelt, Felix Altorfer</i></p> <p><b>D</b></p> <p><b>b. Discussion on possible follow-up actions to be presented at RWMC meeting</b></p>	Infodoc#2
12:00		<b>LUNCH</b>	
13:45	11.	<p><b>DIALOGUE WITH THE RADIATION PROTECTION PROFESSION</b></p> <p><i>Georg Arens</i></p> <p>The dialogue with the radiation protection profession started with a topical session at RWMC-43. The RF presented its position on a number of issues that were the subject of a questionnaire to all RF members. The validity of the questions raised was confirmed at RWMC-43. The debate added a question on the meaning of “control”. Since then, the ICRP has started a task group to revise ICRP-81. The dialogue with ICRP will continue at the next meeting of the RWMC. Once the ICRP will release its new recommendations there will be more opportunities to comment.</p> <p><b>a. Presentation of the main lines of the ICRP Task Group results</b></p> <p><i>Wolfgang Weiss</i></p> <p><b>b. Discussion</b></p> <p><b>D</b></p> <p><b>c. Decision in principle on the way forward based on the</b></p>	RWMC Infodoc#4

		<p><b>information available. In particular, preparation of the EGIR (CRPPH) type review group and/or independent group of the RF</b></p> <p><b>d. Preparation of list of comments to present at RWMC-44</b></p>	
14:45	<p><b>12.</b></p> <p><b>LONG TIME SCALES AND THE SAFETY CASE FOR DISPOSAL – TOWARDS AN RF POSITION STATEMENT</b> <i>Georg Arens</i></p> <p>The Core Group had proposed to start a discussion within the RF that would lead to a high level statement by the RF on the issue of dealing with very-long timeframes, when assessments of safety may become highly speculative while hazards may still exist. A discussion paper was distributed to colleagues and comments elicited for the March 2010 meeting of the RF. There was not complete agreement that an NEA document on this topic be published along the lines shown then. It was felt that the objectives of the paper need to be made clearer, and that arguments need to be developed that better support its conclusions. From the regulatory point of view, there was also a lack of agreement on whether cut-offs in time are appropriate. The RF Core Group was tasked to clarify the objectives of any proposed future action from the RF on this topic.</p> <p>Since then:</p> <p><b>I/C</b></p> <p>(a) The Secretariat provided a generic report to the IGSC on the RF activities. The IGSC are very interested in this specific topic.</p> <p>(b) From a national point of view, there was a discussion of this issue at a recent workshop of the SSM in Sweden. There were two presentations, by N. Chapman and C. Pescatore, and a short discussion. The workshop will be documented on the web. The SSM colleagues were of the view that international work/statement on this issue would be useful, in view also of questions that will be asked by stakeholders during the review of the “site study” by the SSM.</p> <p>(c) The issue was taken up by the Core Group at their meeting in December 2010, who tasked Mr. Altorfer as follows.</p> <p><b>a. Presentation of a few questions summarizing the different possible approaches in order to create the basis for a new document</b> <i>Felix Altorfer</i></p> <p><b>D</b></p> <p><b>b. Discussion on the proposal and decision on way forward</b></p>	<p><b>Infodoc#3</b></p>	
15:30		<b>BREAK</b>	

<p>15:45</p>	<p>13.</p>	<p><b>MEANING OF “SAFETY”, “RISK”, “RETRIEVABILITY”, “MONITORING”ETC.</b></p> <p><i>Georg Arens</i></p> <p>The FSC has stated to the RWMC that the meaning of these and other concepts are not technically fixed and meaning is context dependent and the result of dialogues within society. The RF research confirms that, indeed, there is no common, technical definition of these terms in the field of waste disposal. What can the RF do further?</p> <p>There was an initial discussion within the Core Group. It is proposed to have <b>a discussion within the RF</b> on the following basis:</p> <p>“The RF agrees that these terms are not universally definable and need to be defined in regulations. The definitions by the regulator are meant for the implementer, even if they are a social construct; they are fit-for-purpose and useful for arguing in a licensing procedure; the guidelines have nothing to do with the political sphere.”</p>	
<p>16:30</p>	<p>14.</p>	<p><b>LONG-TERM PRESERVATION OF RECORDS, KNOWLEDGE AND MEMORY</b></p> <p><i>Claudio Pescatore</i></p> <p>A homonymous project has been started within the RWMC. The CG was informed of its status. In particular, a meeting is called at NEA on 24-25 February 2011 in order to further define the Terms of Reference.</p> <p>In connection with the longer term, one important question arises: who will be in charge of doing what? If the regulator never intends to cease its oversight, what kind of data may it want to be kept and how and by whom? A strong regulatory presence in the new project would make the project more effective and relevant.</p>	<p>Oral report</p>
<p>17:00</p>	<p>15.</p>	<p><b>MEMBERSHIP IN THE CORE GROUP</b></p> <p><i>Georg Arens</i></p> <p>Hans Wanner has left the RF.</p> <p>Current members are Georg Arens (Chair), Walter Blommaert, Esko Ruokola, Carl-Magnus Larsson, Géraldine Dandrieux and Shawn Smith. Carmen Ruiz acts as the representative of the RWMC Bureau.</p> <p>The CG proposes that Mr. Altorfer become a member of the CG.</p>	

		<b>CLOSURE</b>	
<b>17:15</b>	<b>16.</b>	<p><b>CURRENT PRIORITIES IN REGULATION IN MEMBER COUNTRIES</b></p> <p><i>Chair</i></p> <p>Optional, 5-minute presentations from delegates who may wish to comment on emerging issues in the regulatory field to complement the information that is already available in the update provided to the RWMC-44. Please inform the Secretariat in advance, or at the beginning, of the meeting.</p> <p><b>I</b></p>	Oral Reports
	<b>17.</b>	<p><b>NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p><b>D</b> Proposed date: 20 March 2012</p>	
	<b>18.</b>	<b>OTHER</b>	
<b>17:45</b>	<b>19.</b>	<p><b>SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS AND DECISIONS</b></p> <p><i>Chair</i></p>	
<b>18:00</b>		<b>ADJOURN</b>	