

NATIONAL DOSE ASSESSMENT WORKING GROUP

PAPER 11-05: REPORT BACK FROM SUB-GROUP ON COMMUNICATIONS

4th Meeting held on 30th January 2007, Aviation House London.

1. Present

Chair	Barrie Lambert	Consultant
Regulators/agencies	Anne Nisbet	HPA
	Mike Poole	NDA
	David Webbe-Wood	FSA
Specialists/NGOs	David Collier	Faulkland Associates
Secretariat	Ray Kowe	HPA
Apologies	Andrew Craze	NDA
	Patrick Stephen	NII

2. Minutes of previous meeting

Members agreed on the minutes of the 3rd meeting.

3. Actions from the first meeting

Action 3.1 Anne and David Webbe-Wood to progress the joint workshop on risk communication. Completed. FSA cannot support the meeting, it may be possible for the HPA to organise the meeting.

Action 3.2 David Webbe-Wood to supply Barrie with the report "Presentation of Probabilistic Dose Estimates" by Greenstreet Berman Ltd, which was a pilot project for the FSA. Completed.

Action 3.3 Anne to find out what leaflets the HPA are producing and on what timescale. Completed. HPA have no intention in the near future of producing any at a glance leaflets. HPA resources are concentrated on producing web-based material.

Action 3.4 Patrick to produce a short note on licensing of nuclear sites. Completed.

Action 3.5 David Webbe-Wood to produce a short note on authorisations. Completed.

Action 3.6 Barrie to produce a short note on health impact. Completed.

Action 3.7 Anne to email people in HPA for information for Barrie on health impact. Completed.

Action 3.8 David Webbe-Wood and David Collier to produce a short note on probabilistic doses. Completed.

Action 3.9 Andrew and David Collier to provide a short summary of the relationship between the NDA and commercial organisations involved in the operation of its sites.

Action 3.10 Andrew to draw up separate diagram on the role of the NDA. Completed.

Action 3.11 Subgroup members to get their notes to Barrie by the week beginning the 9th October, who will collate them with an introduction by the 15th October. Completed.

4. Topics for discussion

Action 4.1 Anne and David Collier to meet with Jane to draw up proposal for the workshop, they will write a short note outlining a date, prospective attendees, speakers etc by Easter

Action 4.2 Ray to email Patrick to see if the NII communications person is best to represent the NII on the communications subgroup

4.1 Feedback from the NDAWG open meeting

The issue of communication was of great interest in the open meeting. The chairman (of the subgroup) said that the open meeting gave the subgroup the remit to proceed and a briefing leaflet would be a good first step in progressing the issue of communication.

Attendees though the presentation of data was a good idea but gave no indication of how to do it. The display of the main routes of exposure to the UK population as 'bricks' in a 'wall' was not well received.

Participants wanted to know more about risk.

One of the agreed outcomes of the open meeting was that NDAWG should consider further its role in relation to solid waste disposals. This is an issue which would increase the importance the communication of routine doses.

4.2 Briefing note for SSG's and LCLC's

One issue is perceived ownership of the leaflet, will it seem to be coming from an operator or regulator perspective. It may be better if it is produced by an independent agency, in particular the HPA.

Action 4.3 Barrie to write to John Cooper to ask Roger Cox if the HPA would produce the briefing leaflet from the communications subgroup which will have an NDAWG logo

Overall, subgroup members agreed that the leaflet addressed all the correct questions and was a good first draft document.

Several specific comments on the draft leaflet arising from the meeting were:

What is the role of the site owner/operator?

Need to define what a licensed nuclear site is.

Second sentence – specify that hazards are from radiation.

Second sentence - change 'only' to 'potential'.

Third sentence – change 'minimise' to 'manage'.

Action 4.4 David Webbe-Wood to look at requirement for a nuclear site licence

Action 4.5 Ray to ask Andrew to clarify the role of owner/operator for nuclear licensed sites

How are authorisations set?

Need to define 'public dose limit'.

Who does the monitoring?

Third sentence – change 'required by the conditions of their authorisation' to 'required by the EA as part of the licence for authorisation to discharge'.

Also add in that it is useful for the operators to have the capability of monitoring in the event of an emergency.

Action 4.6 Ray to ask Rob Allott to provide wording as to why operators are required to monitor the environment

How are radiation doses to members of the public assessed?

Barrie to reword paragraph to say that there is uncertainty in different aspects of the dose calculation (consumption rate) other than dose conversion factor.

Final sentence – change 'contaminates sites' to 'contaminated areas'.

How do risks compare – are they acceptable?

Need to explain processes of why dose gives rise to risk.

Change 'by about 10-100 times' to 'significantly'.

Add in comparison of risk from radiation compared to benzene.

Overall subgroup members agreed the text has the right balance about the comparison of risk.

How do I find out about health statistics in my area?

Included references to COMARE 11, and Cartwright

Action 4.7 Subgroup members to read through the leaflet and send specific comments directly to Barrie by the end February, who will produce first version by Easter

Action 4.8 Anne to select a suitable image for the leaflet from HPA archive

4.3 Vehicles for communication

Leaflet will produced as a first step, this could then be used for future PowerPoint presentations.

4.4 Use of dose/risk/total risk/risk comparisons

This topic was covered by one of the questions in the information leaflet.

4.5 Should we consider a briefing note on: collective dose, emergency procedures?

The issue of collective dose is one of the topics for a future main NDAWG meeting.

Emergency procedures – there are some old leaflets about procedures in event of incidents at nuclear power stations, a briefing note may be needed for the public rather than a Government briefing note.

Another issue that could be considered is a note on how an authorisation is set.

4 Date of next meeting

The next meeting will be held after the main NDAWG meeting in April.

5 Summary of Actions

Action 4.1 Anne and David Collier to meet with Jane to draw up proposal for the workshop, they will write a short note outlining a date, prospective attendees, speakers etc by Easter

Action 4.2 Ray to email Patrick to see if the NII communications person is best to represent the NII on the communications subgroup

Action 4.3 Barrie to write to John Cooper to ask Roger Cox if the HPA would produce the briefing leaflet from the communications subgroup which will have an NDAWG logo

Action 4.4 David Webbe-Wood to look at requirement for a nuclear site licence

Action 4.5 Ray to ask Andrew to clarify the role of owner/operator for nuclear licensed sites

Action 4.6 Ray to ask Rob Allott to provide wording as to why operators are required to monitor the environment

Action 4.7 Subgroup members to read through the leaflet and send specific comments directly to Barrie by the end February, who will produce first version by Easter

Action 4.8 Anne to select a suitable image for the leaflet from HPA archive