

NATIONAL DOSE ASSESSMENT WORKING GROUP

SUB-GROUP ON UNCERTAINTY AND VARIABILITY IN DOSE ASSESSMENTS

6th meeting held on 5 October 2005, Aviation House London.

Present

Chair	David Webbe-Wood	FSA
Regulators/agencies	David Brazier	EA
	Ray Kowe	HPA
	Jane Simmonds	HPA
Specialists/NGOs	Marcus Grzechnik	CEFAS
	Mike Thorne	Consultant

1. Minutes of previous meeting 23 February 2005

The minutes were agreed, all actions have been completed.

2. Matters arising

There were no matters arising.

3. Finalisation of the second report 'Reviewing Non Nuclear Licensed Site Radiation Dose Assessments Taking Into Account Uncertainty'

David Webbe-Wood has incorporated comments from members of the subgroup, and has received a summary of a recent assessment that used W63 for the Weston Park hospital complex, Sheffield from Cathy Griffiths which will form annex B. The purpose of today's meeting is to finalise the document. The main (non-formatting) changes to the text were listed as following:

Introduction

Paragraph 3, sentence 3 – change 'is given' to 'is given on'

Section 2

Paragraph 1 - the definition of uncertainty in paper 1 of the subgroup should be reiterated near the start of the paragraph.

Paragraph 1, last sentence – change ‘alternative’ to ‘less’

Section 2.1

Paragraph 1, sentence 5 – change ‘models used and in the’ to ‘models used including the’

Paragraph 1, last sentence – change ‘would not be unacceptable’ to ‘ would be acceptable’

Section 2.2

Paragraph 1, sentence 2 - change ‘carried out on the impact’ to ‘carried out on the effect’

Paragraph 3, sentence 2 – change ‘upper bound estimates’ to ‘upper bound calculations’

Paragraph 3, sentence 3 – change ‘will be above the LoD’ to ‘will be below or well below the LoD’ and move bracket to end of sentence.

Paragraph 3, sentence 4 – spelling of ‘estimate’

Last paragraph in square brackets - should be reworded to ‘Care must be taken when using empirical relationships based on monitoring data that environmental conditions have not changed since the monitoring was carried out’

Section 2.3

Paragraph 1, sentence 4 – change ‘For this reason,’ to ‘For this reason even’

Paragraph 1, sentence 4 – change ‘are included in’ to ‘are included in one presentation of’

Paragraph 2, sentence 1 – change ‘to a number of significant figure’ to ‘to a specified number of significant figures’

Paragraph 2, sentence 2 – change ‘an undue level of accuracy and care should be taken to ensure that it is made explicit that this is not the case’ to ‘false precision’

Section 2.7

Sentence 1 – change ‘There may be other’ to ‘There are various’

Section 3

Paragraph 1, sentences 1 and 2 – change ‘assessment^{1,6}, As illustrated by the flowchart in figure1’ to ‘assessment^{1,6} as illustrated by the flowchart in Figure1’

Paragraph 1, sentence 6 – change ‘the extent to which doses may have’ to ‘the extent to which doses have’

Section 3.2

Sentence 2 – change ‘specific radionuclides’ to ‘particular radionuclides’

Sentence 3 – change ‘estimated based on the operations at the plant’ to ‘estimate based on the operations at the facility’

Sentence 4 – change ‘discharge is of the radionuclide’ to ‘discharge comprises of the radionuclide’

Sentence 6 – change ‘Studies, for example for the river’ to ‘Studies of, for example of the River’

Section 3.3

Sentence 4 – change ‘literature on the model’ to ‘literature to determine the pedigree and intended application of the model.’ David Webbe-Woode to reword the remainder of the sentence beginning ‘being used...’

Sentence 6 – change ‘(such as molybdenum)’ to ‘(such as irridium)’

Sentence 10 – delete ‘e.g. transfer factors to fish based on water concentrations may not be adequate for representing direct transfers from bottom sediment for benthic species’

Section 3.4

Sentence 2 – change ‘Changing the location can’ to ‘Changing the location relative to the source can’

Section 3.5

Sentence 6 – change ‘sub-committee’ to ‘subgroup’

Section 3.6

Sentence 1 – change ‘consideration of any’ to ‘consideration in any’

Sentence 3 – change ‘sub-committee’ to ‘subgroup’

Section 3.7

Last sentence – change ‘or a one year old child’ to ‘or children of various ages’

Section 3.8

Last sentence – change ‘and so it may not’ ‘and so it is not’

Last paragraph

Sentence 1 – change ‘As part’ to ‘In summary, as part’

Penultimate sentence – change ‘carried out if the doses are felt to be particularly uncertain and it is considered’ to ‘carried out if the assessed doses are sufficiently high and uncertain that it is considered’

Last sentence – change ‘Annexes’ to ‘annexes’

Section 4

Paragraph 1, sentence 1 - change ‘outline’ to ‘outlined’

Bullet point 3 – change ‘qualified’ to ‘suitable’

Annex A

Paragraph 1, sentence 5 – change ‘river Thames estuary upstream’ to ‘River Thames estuary itself upstream’

Paragraph 1, sentence 6 – change ‘river Colne’ to ‘River Colne’

Bullet point 3, sentence 2 – change ‘discharges may decrease the estimated potential doses by factors of about 30’ to ‘discharges decreased the estimated potential doses by factors up to 30’

Bullet point 3, sentence 3 – change ‘better’ to ‘specific’

Bullet point 8, sentence 1 – change ‘quite cautious’ to ‘cautious’

Bullet point 8, sentence 2 – change ‘due to the uncertainty’ to ‘due to the partly cancelling effect due to the uncertainty’

Action 6.1 Jane to provide David Webbe-Wood with the correct list of authors for the PC-CREAM document.

Annex B

Throughout – use same referencing convention throughout document.

Paragraph 2 – remove first sentence and add second sentence to end of paragraph 1.

Paragraph 3 – remove

Paragraph 4, sentence 4 – change 'to uplift' to 'to increase'

Table 1 - remove

Paragraph 5 – remove

Paragraph 6 – remove, move third sentence to top of paragraph 7

Paragraph 7 – rewrite to describe total volumes only

Action 6.2 Ray to use annex B for note on small users for main NDAWG group

Final draft of the report is required by the end of October to issue to the main NDAWG group members.

Action 6.3 David Webbe-Wood to circulate revised report and annex B to subgroup members by Friday 14th October

Action 6.4 Members to comment on revised report by Friday 21st October and David to complete report by Friday 28th October.

4. Summary of achievements of the working group

David Webbe-Wood has drafted a table of progress of the subgroup against the terms of reference. Members agreed with the draft with a couple of additions.

TOR 4 – cite EA principles document

TOR 5 – add 'This could also consider stakeholders'

5. AOB

David Webbe-Wood thanked members for their contribution to the subgroup.

6. Summary of Actions

Action 6.1 Jane to provide David Webbe-Wood with the correct list of authors for the PC-CREAM document.

Action 6.2 Ray to use annex B for note on small users for main NDAWG group

Action 6.3 David Webbe-Wood to circulate revised report and annex B to subgroup members by Friday 14th October

Action 6.4 Members to comment on revised report by Friday 21st October and David to complete report by Friday 28th October.

Ray Kowe, 7 October 2005