

NATIONAL DOSE ASSESSMENT WORKING GROUP

PAPER 3-08: NDAWG REVIEW

1 TERMS OF REFERENCE

The current terms of reference are:

1. To facilitate the exchange of data and views between all parties on assessment methodologies.
2. To advance the understanding between groups who are likely to have differing objectives and views on dose assessment methods.
3. 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.
4. To identify, discuss and evaluate research which will progress dose assessment methods.
5. To initiate debate beyond the group on key issues, as necessary (for example via the Society for Radiological Protection).
6. To keep abreast of international developments on dose assessment methodologies, and to provide feedback to the appropriate UK authorities for input into EU bodies.

These were agreed at the 1st NDAWG meeting (April 2002) and revised at the 2nd NDAWG meeting (November 2002).

1.1 Proposed changes to the terms of reference

Barrie Lambert proposed a change to the first term of reference before the 2nd NDAWG meeting. His proposed term of reference is:

"To facilitate the development of a unified, transparent method 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 was discussed at the 2nd NDAWG meeting and it was agreed that the original term of reference was not strong enough, but was a valid term of reference. It was agreed that an additional term of reference be added, but many members objected to the term 'unified' in the proposed change.

Barrie Lambert was unable to attend this meeting, and therefore this will be discussed at the 3rd NDAWG meeting. The secretariat was asked to propose an alternative term of reference:

"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."

2 FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME

At the 2nd NDAWG meeting the steering group were asked to review the proposed work plan to ensure the work plan follows a logical structure.

The following work plan has been proposed:

Meeting 3 Possible and probable dose, direct radiation doses, presentation of doses to the public, unusual pathways

Meeting 4 Principles document, habit data, the use of measurements (model validation, prospective assessments predicted/observed ratios)

Meeting 5 Presenting data to the public, looking at wide range at issues including possibly a outside speaker.

Meeting 6 Review of progress on CEDA – are all issues being addressed? Small user issues, issues for the nuclear industry.

Remaining topics are as follows:

- Methodologies available for carrying out dose assessments – differences, similarities and possible harmonisation.
- Modelling developments and studies relating to the transfer of radionuclides in the marine environment.
- Methods and data required to assess doses from radionuclides disposed of in sewage, including the use of sewage sludge.
- Particular problems associated with assessing doses from short term releases
- Modelling the dispersion of radionuclides in the atmosphere, particularly experiences in using ADMS
- The need to consider the transfer of radionuclides to breast-fed infants – if ICRP report issued

- Compatibility of dose coefficients for ingestion and inhalation and related habit data
- The use and calculation of collective dose

Commentary: This proposed work plan is based on the results of last year's consultation with members on the priorities for future work. However, it was not possible to follow this directly, as some topics can not be discussed until studies elsewhere are completed or reports are published. For example, discussion on the ICRP report on breast fed infants has to await its publication. Also the steering group wanted similar or related topics to be dealt with at the same meeting. They also felt that there was a need for a review of the issues raised at CEDA and whether they had been addressed and that fitted with a discussion of particular issues for small users and the nuclear industry. The proposed work plan is therefore a compromise. The plan is flexible and can be changed if necessary. It will therefore be reviewed at each meeting of NDAWG.

3 COLLATING ONGOING RESEARCH

It was decided at the 2nd NDAWG meeting that to achieve progress on the 4th term of reference (*To identify, discuss and evaluate research which will progress dose assessment methods*), ongoing research should be collated. To this aim the secretariat propose an online database, similar to that managed by the UK Groundwater forum: <http://www.nerc-wallingford.ac.uk/gwf/gwfdbas2.htm>

This database would be hosted at www.ndawg.org and would be maintained by the secretariat. To encourage researchers/funding organisations to enter information on this database, the data entry requirements should not be onerous, although researchers/funding organisations would be encouraged to enter as much information as possible.

The following data fields would be required:

- Project name
- Name and e-mail address of individual who submitted the information

The following data fields would be optional:

- Principal Research Organisation(s)
- Contact Name and Address
- Dates: Start - End
- Objectives / Results
- Sponsor or Funding Organisation(s)

- Keywords
- Abstract / Description
- Publications
- Comments

The database could then be searched using a number of criteria:

- Current projects (by research organisation)
- Current projects (by funding organisation)
- Current projects (by topic or keyword)
- Finished projects

Before a decision is made whether to proceed with this proposal a number of issues need to be considered:

Will the database be of use to NDAWG members / wider community

Will data be added to the database by researchers/funding organisations

Is it necessary to restrict database entries to work topics being considered by NDAWG- as this database would be online, it may be useful in other areas of radiation protection.

Is it necessary to restrict database entries to projects being funded/carried out by UK organisations- as the database would be online, it may be useful to international organisations.

Are there any organisations willing to fund the development of this database

4 NDAWG MEMBERSHIP

Should additional NGO representation be sought? Current NDAWG membership/representation is as follows:

4.1 Chair

John Cooper NRPB

4.2 Regulators/agencies

Rob Allott, John Titley, EA

Stuart Conney, Zitouni Ould-Dada, David Webbe-Wood FSA

Patrick Stephen, NII

Andrew Macpherson, DEFRA

Nancy Lawton, DTI

Cathy Griffiths, RWMAC

George Hunter, SEPA

Ken Ledgerwood, Dept Environment (NI)

Havard Prosser, National Assembly for Wales

Will Munro, FSA Scotland

Ian Hall, Scottish Executive

4.3 Industry

Tim Parker, BNFL

Laurence Austin, BNFL Magnox

Michael Gaunt, Rolls-Royce

Paul Marks, Amersham plc

4.4 Specialists/NGOs

Steve Jones, Westlakes Scientific Consulting

Barrie Lambert, NGO

John Hunt, CEFAS

Mike Thorne, Consultant

Philip Day, Consultant

Jeff Stacey, Local Authorities representative

Pete Roche, Greenpeace

4.5 Secretariat

Jane Simmonds, NRPB

Ciara Walsh, NRPB

If a further NGO representative is considered advisable then it will be necessary to identify possible people so suggestions are welcomed from members.