

NATIONAL DOSE ASSESSMENT WORKING GROUP

PAPER 4-01: SUMMARY OF AGREEMENTS AND ACTIONS FROM 3RD MEETING

3rd Meeting held on 10th June 2003, Ashdown House London.

1. Present

Chair	John Cooper	NRPB
Regulators/agencies	Rob Allott	EA
	John Titley	EA
	Stuart Conney	FSA
	David Webb Wood	FSA
	Zitouni Ould-Dada	FSA
	Andrew Macpherson	DEFRA
	Cathy Griffiths	RWMAC
Industry	Patrick Stephen	NII
	George Hunter	SEPA
	Tim Parker	BNFL
	Laurence Austin	BNFL Magnox
	Michael Gaunt	Rolls-Royce
Specialists/NGOs	Paul Marks	Amersham plc
	Steve Jones	Westlakes Scientific Consulting
	Pete Roche	Greenpeace
	Barrie Lambert	Consultant
Secretariat	Mike Thorne	Mike Thorne and Associates
	Philip Day	University of Manchester
	Jane Simmonds	NRPB
	Ciara Walsh	NRPB

Apologies:

Ian Hall, Scottish Executive
 Nancy Lawton, DTI
 John Hunt, CEFAS
 Ken Ledgerwood, Dept Environment (NI)
 John Asquith, Local authorities representative
 Will Munro, FSA Scotland
 Havard Prosser, National Assembly for Wales

2. Actions from the second meeting and matters arising (Paper 3-01)

All actions had been completed, and matters arising from Actions 2.3 to 2.6 were considered in Paper 3-08 (NDAWG Review).

Following the discussion at the NDAWG second meeting on the use of ICRP fetal dose coefficients John Cooper thanked members for their comments and noted the comments had been considered when preparing draft NRPB advice which was published as a consultative document. The consultation period is now over and it is hoped that the advice will be published by the end of 2003.

3. Report back from sub group on retrospective assessments (Paper 3-02).

Rob Allott chairs this subgroup and he reported back from the second meeting of this subgroup. A record note from this meeting had been distributed prior to the meeting (paper 3-02). Issues which arose from Rob's summary of the meeting:

There is a need for an additional subgroup to consider the composition of critical groups as there are a number of issues about this topic which have been raised in both current NDAWG subgroups. There are detailed methodologies in use to define the critical groups and at times expert judgement is applied. It would be useful if a subgroup could consider these methodologies and give recommendations on their use. This is a topic that is also an issue for the subgroup on probabilistic modelling, and therefore the discussion was postponed until after paper 3-03.

Methods of disseminating recommendations from NDWG were discussed. A form of words is required on any recommendation and the secretariat suggested the following: "The views expressed here are those of the members of NDAWG and do not necessarily reflect the views of the organisations from which the members are drawn".

Peter Roche suggested the following, which was agreed by members: 'The views presented in this paper are those of the authors in consultation with members of NDAWG. They represent the views of the majority of members of NDAWG but do not necessarily reflect the views of the organisations from which the members are drawn'.

The steering group was asked to consider ways to publish NDAWG recommendations (**Action 3.1**)

When the RIFE methodology for calculating total dose is complete, NDAWG members will be given an opportunity to comment, perhaps at the April 2004 NDAWG meeting.

4. Report back from sub group on probabilistic modelling and related issues (Paper 3-03).

Zitouni Ould-Dada chairs this subgroup and he reported back from the second meeting of this subgroup. A record note from this meeting had been distributed prior to the meeting (paper 3-03).

5. Discussion on possible and probable dose (Paper 3-04).

Zitouni Ould-Dada presented a summary of this paper, outlining the method used by the Food Standards Agency and summarising the comments received from the subgroup on the method. Issues which arose from Zitouni's summary of the paper:

Many members were confused about the method and felt it needed significantly more clarification.

The implicit assumptions about sources of locally produced foods need to be described.

There was confusion about what group of individuals are the critical group, and whether the possible or the probable could be compared to the critical group dose reported by EA for example. Homogeneity within the critical groups was queried.

The validity of the statistical approach was queried as the individuals in the habit surveys were targeted due to their high rate consumption of locally produced foods and therefore are not a randomly chosen sample from the local population.

One suggestion was to develop scenarios based on the habit data available rather than using them directly to estimate doses.

The members agreed that a subgroup on habit data should be formed, Mike Thorne agreed to chair the group and the FSA agreed to provide the secretariat. The NDAWG secretariat and the steering group to prepare draft terms of reference for this subgroup (**Action 3.2**).

6. Direct radiation doses from sites (Paper 3-05)

Patrick Steven presented a summary of a draft paper from the NII that summarised the approach taken by the NII in assessing the direct radiation doses from sites and presented sample results. Issues which arose from Patrick's summary of the paper:

There was concern from some members over the magnitude of the doses at some sites. There was concern that if total dose was considered,

individuals may exceed the dose limit. It was noted that total doses will be published in RIFE (once the methodology has been approved) and this should resolve this issue.

Members are supportive of publishing contour maps of direct shine doses around sites as recommended at CEDA, although the problem of being able to identify the dose to particular individuals still remains.

It was suggested that collective doses were relevant here as individual doses from direct radiation at a site might be relatively high but collective doses would be relatively low.

7. FSA project on presentation of doses to the public (Paper 3-06)

Ciara Walsh presented a summary of progress to date on this project, reporting back from focus group trials that have been carried out at a single site. Issues which arose from this paper:

It would be interesting to carry out a similar study at a hospital particularly in putting the doses and risks into perspective

Members agreed that comparison against other sources of risk from the same site is important

It was not clear whether the views of the Local Liaison Committee at that site were representative of views at other sites and among members of the public.

Members asked for an update to this project when results from the second site were available.

8. Work on unusual pathways (Paper 3-07)

John Titley presented a summary of this paper, which are the findings of R&D commissioned by the EA. Issues which arose from this paper:

Members enquired whether the feral pigeons problem would have been identified by the methodology suggested in the report- Mike Throne (who was involved in the R&D) reported that it should be identified through the elicitation process at the source, and also queries about unusual behaviour at the receptor points would have highlighted a potential problem.

There was a suggestion that a list of unusual pathways that have actually occurred be compiled. There was support for this although it was not clear who should manage this list. The steering group will consider this. **(Action 3.3)**.

It was noted that the possibility of unusual pathways should be kept under review when carrying out a dose assessment for a site- but the more conventional pathways should also be reviewed regularly.

9. Report back from members

9.1 *RWMAC*

Cathy Griffiths reported on the potential changes to RWMAC. Within the next few months CoRWM, will be set up with the specific remit of "to oversee a review of options for managing solid radioactive waste in the UK and to recommend the option, or continuation of options, that can provide a long-term solution". Ministers have proposed to terminate RWMAC and the RWMAC secretariat will transfer to CoRWM.

Members expressed concern at this possibility- RWMAC is a very credible as an independent advisory body with a significantly broader remit than CoRWM. Cathy suggested that NDAWG write a letter to DEFRA requesting that RWMAC should not be disbanded.

However, after much discussion it was agreed that writing such a letter would be beyond the remit of the group but members were asked to bring this issue to their own organisations.

9.2 *CERRIE*

Andrew Macpherson, Philip Day and Pete Roche reported back on CERRIE. The preliminary report is being prepared and a conference is being held in late July to discuss this report. It is expected that a final report will be published by the end of 2003. The numbers wishing to attend the conference exceed the places available and therefore it may not be possible for interested individuals to attend the conference. The NDAWG secretariat will circulate a copy of the CERRIE preliminary report when it is available (**Action 3.4**).

9.3 *Greenpeace*

This was the first NDAWG meeting at which Greenpeace was represented. Pete Roche drew the members attention to the NGO response to the CEDA document.

9.4 *ADMLC*

Paul Marks reported back from a recent ADMLC meeting and outlined the recent reports published by ADMLC. The projects to be funded by the ADMLC next year

are likely to include dispersion from fires and a project to collate previous ADMLC reports. For information the ADMLC web site address is www.admlc.org.uk.

9.5 ICRP Committee 4

John Cooper reported back from a recent meeting of committee 4 held under the auspices of the NEA in Lanzarote. There were presentations on various topics to be addressed in the new recommendations.

- The proposal to move to a series of constraints was rejected at the meeting and limits are to be reintroduced to the new recommendations.
- The new recommendations will basically be a consolidation of ICRP 60 with some subsequent advice- it will be bringing this advice together.
- Age weighted dose coefficients will be introduced.
- Protection of biota will be included

There will be a consultation stage that will begin after the IRPA meeting in March 2004.

Members noted that using age-weighted dose coefficients would present problems with habit data.

9.6 IUR

Mike Thorne reported that the IUR Working Group on Radioactive Waste Management held their first meeting in February 2003 and that they are working in close collaboration with the international BIOPROTA project.

10. NDAWG Review

10.1 NDAWG Terms of Reference

An additional term of reference was agreed:

"To facilitate the development of *coherent transparent methods* for the assessment of radiation dose to the public from all pathways which arise as a result of the operations at nuclear and non-nuclear sites."

It was decided not to add a term of reference to consider biota, although members will keep a watching brief on this area and the secretariat will add a presentation on this topic to the work plan. **(Action 3.5)**

10.2 NDAWG Website

The website statistics up to 31st May 2003 show 226 visitors and 6859 hits.

'Hits' do not represent unique visitors as an individual viewing several pages on the site will register several hits.

10.3 Work Programme

The work programme suggested by the Steering committee in paper 3-08 was agreed.

11. Review against objectives

At the 1st NDAWG meeting it was decided that there should be a review of the group's progress at every meeting. The terms of reference were used to monitor performance.

To facilitate the exchange of data and views between all parties on assessment methodologies. This is being achieved through the NDAWG meetings and the work of the subgroups.

To facilitate the development of coherent transparent methods for the assessment of radiation dose to the public from all pathways which arise as a result of the operations at nuclear and non-nuclear sites. This is being achieved through the NDAWG meetings and the work of the subgroups e.g. discussions on FSA possible and probable dose.

To advance the understanding between groups who are likely to have differing objectives and views on dose assessment methods. This is being achieved through the NDAWG meetings and the work of the subgroups. It was felt by some members that this implies a commitment to publish. Reports will be published when more work has been completed.

To meet on a regular basis (every 6 months) to discuss matters of mutual concern, and developments arising out of research, case histories (eg, recent consultations) or changes in government policy. This is being achieved through the NDAWG meetings and the work of the subgroups. It was agreed by the members that NDAWG should not be on the consultees list for discharge authorisations etc. due to conflicts of interests.

To identify and co-ordinate research which will progress dose assessment methods. This is being achieved through the NDAWG meetings and the work of the subgroups. The secretariat made a proposal for a method to identify on-going research through the use of an on-line database maintained from the NDAWG website. This was agreed by the members and will be implemented on the website **(Action 3.6)**

To initiate debate beyond the group on key issues, as necessary (for example via the Society for Radiological Protection). This has begun through the work of the probabilistic modelling subgroup.

To keep abreast of international developments on dose assessment methodologies, and to provide feedback to the appropriate UK authorities for input into EU bodies. This is being achieved through the NDAWG meetings and the work of the subgroups e.g. the discussion on the NRPB draft fetal dose document.

12. Date of next meeting

The next meeting will take place on 17th November 2003 at FSA, Aviation House, London.

13. Summary of Actions

Action 3.1 The steering group to consider ways to publish NDAWG recommendations

Action 3.2 The secretariat and the steering group to prepare draft terms of reference for the habit subgroup

Action 3.3 The steering group to consider who should compile a list of unusual pathways

Action 3.4 The NDAWG secretariat to circulate a copy of the CERRIE preliminary report when it is available

Action 3.5 The secretariat to add a presentation on biota to the work plan.

Action 3.6 The secretariat to develop an on-line database of research maintained from the NDAWG website

NDAWG Secretariat 20 June 2003