

NATIONAL DOSE ASSESSMENT WORKING GROUP

SUMMARY OF AGREEMENTS AND ACTIONS FROM 8TH MEETING

8th Meeting held on 15th November 2005, Aviation House London.

1. Present

Chair	John Cooper	HPA
Members	Rob Allott	EA
	Laurence Austin	British Energy
	Stuart Conney	FSA
	Andrew Corns	GE Healthcare
	Andrew Craze	NDA
	Darren Cutts	FSA
	Paul Dale	SEPA
	Michael Gaunt	Rolls-Royce
	Ian Hall	Scottish Executive
	John Hunt	CEFAS
	Steve Jones	Westlakes Scientific Consulting
	Ray Kowe	HPA
	Barrie Lambert	Consultant
	Tim Parker	BNFL
	Hema Patel	Magnox Electric Ltd
	Ian Robertson	SEPA
	Jane Simmonds	HPA
	Patrick Stephen	NII
	Mike Thorne	Mike Thorne and Associates Ltd
	John Titley	EA
	David Webbe-Wood	FSA
	Chris Wilson	DEFRA
Speakers	Nick Hesketh	HPA

Apologies:

Lucy Bailey	Nirex
Philip Day	University of Manchester
Robert Larmour	Dept Environment (NI)
Ken Ledgerwood	Dept Environment (NI)
Simon Morgan	Nirex
Will Munro	FSA Scotland
Havard Prosser	National Assembly for Wales
Pete Roche	Consultant representing Greenpeace

The Chairman announced the following changes to membership:

Andrew Corns (GE Healthcare) is standing in for Dr David Tattam

Andrew Craze is representing the NDA

Hema Patel (Magnox Electric Ltd) is standing in for Laurence Austin

Ian Robertson (SEPA) is standing in for George Hunter

The Chairman welcomed new members and informed the group that he was seeking representation from small users and that the Small Users Liaison Group had been approached to nominate a representative.

The Chairman informed members that the main aim of today's meeting was to summarise where the group has got to, and to discuss whether we have achieved our objectives and what we will do in the future. NDAWG is planning to hold an open meeting in Autumn 2006 to review its work.

The protection of biota should have been considered at this meeting, as it was agreed last year to do this annually. However, the steering group felt that there was not time to deal with this topic adequately given the other agenda items and so this has been deferred to the next meeting. This will also give more time for current EA and EC work to develop.

2. Actions from the seventh meeting and matters arising (Paper 8-01)

Action 7.1 NDAWG members to comment on the two ICRP foundation papers 'The optimisation of radiological protection' and 'Assessing dose of the representative individual for the purpose of radiation protection of the public' by the end of May. Completed.

Action 7.2 Secretariat to collate comments on the two ICRP foundation papers and circulate to members for approval by email. Completed.

Action 7.3 Secretariat to collate any comments on the three other ICRP foundation papers and circulate to members for approval by email. Completed.

Action 7.4 Secretariat to compile a list of issues for small users of radioactivity. Completed and attached to paper 8-01 for discussion.

Action 7.5 Secretary of the modelling group to invite a Nirex representative onto the modelling subgroup. Completed.

Action 7.6 NDAWG members will send written comments on the habits subgroup position paper to Mike Thorne, copied to the Secretariat, by mid June. The habits subgroup will prepare a final version of the position paper for the Autumn NDAWG meeting. Completed paper revised and to be discussed later (Paper 8-08).

Action 7.7 The Secretariat to email NGO's to say that their presence was missed at the 7th meeting and that members hoped that they would be able to attend further main NDAWG and subgroup meetings. Completed.

Action 7.8 Simon Morgan to forward details of LGA special interest group to Secretariat as a contact for a nominee for a Local Authority representative on NDAWG. Completed – e-mail received, contact made but as yet no one has been nominated.

Localised doses

At the last meeting HPA presented localised pie charts for Cumbria and Cornwall and it was felt that before pressing ahead with other counties HPA should consult the public on what form of presentation they preferred and to make sure that what was presented was clear and complete. A project is planned, but little progress has been made, as it has taken time to raise the money to hold public focus groups. Work is now planned for next year and HPA will report back at the next meeting. In the meantime, the Steering Group has asked HPA to go ahead and produce the pie charts for each county and this is in hand.

Research on phosphorus uptake by fish

At the last meeting NDAWG recommended that research was needed on this as it is an important issue for small users, particularly given the HPA advice on protection of the fetus. The chairman asked the FSA and EA what action they may take on this. The EA has started to review the discharge permits and the pollution inventory to find out where there are significant discharges of phosphorus and which rivers may be affected. FSA will consider including work on the uptake of phosphorus into fish into their research programme. There is also the need for monitoring of fish and EA could identify suitable rivers and obtain fish samples for FSA to arrange measurements. The Chairman told the group that this matter will be reviewed at the 9th meeting to see if it has progressed.

Comparison of doses for discharge to sewers

NDAWG recommended that a comparison should be made between the different methodologies for estimating doses from discharges to sewers (particularly the EA and FSA methodologies). It was agreed that this was something that could be considered by the modelling sub-group and that it should be included in their work programme.

Issues for small users

A short list of major points was drafted following the last meeting and follows the minutes in Paper 8-01; there is also a table noting what NDAWG might do to help. Members were reasonably happy with the list and felt it reflected the discussions at the meeting. The EA asked for an additional issue to be included, which was discharge from hospital roof vents. This situation is different from a stack discharge and relates particularly to the permitting of discharges from cyclotrons. The EA are also going to publish an initial assessment methodology,

which will contain a lot of useful information for small users. The FSA has funded a compilation of data for sewage works in England, Wales and Scotland. This work is in a database and could be made available for dissemination. It was agreed that it would be a good idea to have a small users section on the NDAWG website with links to relevant information.

Action 8.1 The Secretariat to liaise with the Steering Group over including a small users section on the NDAWG website.

3. Comparison of EA/FSA and industry assessments for Winfrith (Paper 8-02)

As input into the review of how well NDAWG is doing, Nick Hesketh (HPA) presented a paper summarising a comparison of three different dose assessments carried out for the authorisation process. There was a detailed discussion amongst members about the comparison and whether the situation had improved.

The Chairman concluded that members thought there had been some progress but not enough. There was an agreed need for transparency in dose assessments but clearer principles on what is meant by 'transparency' needed to be developed. There could be greater agreement between authorisation assessments if the major factual items were agreed beforehand, e.g. the characteristics of the core critical group, discharge heights, location of source etc. It was agreed that a protocol on how to carry out authorisation dose assessments would be useful and that NDAWG could produce such a paper to go on the web. This protocol should also include the transparency principle. A first draft of such a protocol will be produced by the secretariat for distribution to members for comment. It will be discussed at the next NDAWG meeting and will also be taken to the NDAWG open meeting.

Action 8.2 The NDAWG secretariat to produce a first draft of the assessment protocol to send to members for comment before it is brought back to the 9th NDAWG meeting.

Action 8.3 Steve Jones to draft a definition for the term 'transparency' for authorisation dose assessments.

4. Discussion to review progress on CEDA (Paper 8-03)

David Webbe-Wood outlined the FSA's view on how FSA and NDAWG had progressed on the various recommendations of CEDA. The various points were discussed and a number of points made for inclusion in the next version of the paper. There were several recommendations which had not yet been completely addressed, but which were the subject of work being carried out by the various subgroups. For example: the general issue of model validation will be covered by the modelling subgroup; the habit data subgroup will be considering habit data

for prospective assessments; the issue of presenting doses to the public will be a topic for the new communications subgroup. In addition, the proposed protocol for authorisation dose assessments will cover the commonality of approach. An amended version of Paper 8-03 will go forward to the open meeting to show progress of the NDAWG. It was agreed that RIFE provides evidence of successful collaboration between the relevant agencies and that this should be brought out in the paper. It was also agreed that the need for direct radiation doses at key locations should be discussed in the protocol paper. The FSA's probable and possible dose methodology has been discussed at previous NDAWG meetings and a number of comments were made. It is not clear what FSA has done to take these comments into account and so they were asked to report back at the next meeting.

Action 8.4: FSA to report back on their response to NDAWG's comments on their dose assessment methodology.

5. Report back from Subgroup on uncertainty and variability in dose assessments and draft paper for discussion (Papers 8-04 and 8-05)

David Webbe-Wood presented Paper 8-04 which was a review of how the subgroup has met its terms of reference and minutes of its last meeting. Paper 8-05 is the draft second report of the group 'Reviewing non nuclear licensed site radiation dose assessments taking into account uncertainty'. The subgroup has dealt with all its terms of reference except the presentation of probabilistic results to members of the public which is an issue for the communications subgroup. Paper 8-05 included advice to consult an 'expert' at the end of an iterative approach and this led to discussion of how such expertise could be certified. One possibility would be some form of professional certification, say through the Society of Radiological Protection (SRP). The paper was agreed for publication, but members were asked to e-mail any further comments to David within the next 2 weeks. A final version of the paper would then be put onto the NDAWG website. This paper is also relevant to the planned small users section of the NDAWG website.

Action 8.5 The secretariat will draft a letter to the Society for Radiological Protection to ask if it will act as a body to accredit people as having competence for external consultancy on uncertainty in radiological assessments.

Action 8.6 Members to email minor editorial changes to Paper 8-05 to David Webbe-Wood and for him to prepare a final version of the paper to go onto the website.

NDAWG members agreed that the uncertainty and variability in dose assessments subgroup would now be wound up and the Chairman thanked subgroup members for their valuable contributions.

6. Report back from Subgroup on modelling and draft paper for discussion (Papers 8-06 and 8-07)

Rob Allott outlined the work of the subgroup to-date. He described paper 8-07 which is an overview of radiological assessment models identifying key gaps and uncertainties. He described the methodology for ranking pathways and uncertainties for continuous and short-term releases for different media and identified areas for more work.

Some members were concerned that doses based on measurements should be a criterion rather than predicted doses, as priority should not be given to situations where doses had been found to be significantly over estimated. It was then agreed that priority should be given to areas where there was a danger of under-prediction of doses.

It was noted that a number of the areas of uncertainty that had been identified in the paper related to habits and so they needed to be considered by the habits data sub-group.

Action 8.7 members to provide Rob Allot with comments on the modelling paper by the end of November and the paper will be reviewed at the 9th NDAWG meeting.

The subgroup is to next consider modelling doses due to discharge to sewers and so Mike Thorne is to join the subgroup. The question of whether a separate subgroup should be set up to consider short-term releases is to be deferred to the 9th NDAWG meeting.

7. Report back from Subgroup on habits data and critical groups and draft paper for discussion (Paper 8-08)

Mike Thorne presented this item. There has not been a meeting of the group since the last NDAWG meeting and this is a revised report taking account of members' comments on the previous version presented last time. The subgroup is next proposing to look at national habit survey data which will form the basis of another paper. The subgroup will meet before the 9th NDAWG meeting to discuss the issues previously identified together with the relevant items raised in the modelling subgroup paper and habits for prospective assessments.

The Chairman recommended that the paper can be published on the website.

8. Report back from members

8.1 ICRP

The Chairman informed members that a new main commission had been appointed for the ICRP with Chairman Lars Eric Holm and vice Chairman Roger

Cox. The main commission and 5 committees had met in September in Geneva to discuss the comments received on the draft ICRP 2005 recommendations and support documents. A revised draft of the ICRP 2005 recommendations which addresses the comments will be reissued for a further round of consultation. The foundation documents are being redrafted by the various committees. The main commission is also preparing a further two documents for consultation.

Roger Clarke has been elected an emeritus member of the commission.

8.2 CONTAMINATED LAND CONSULTATION

Chris Wilson informed members that the consultation period on the contaminated land regulations for England has now been closed and some 40-50 responses had been received. Non-human receptors had been excluded from the scope on EA advice. People were supportive of the HPA recommendations on the dose criteria. Work is ongoing on the radiological assessment model RCLEA. There are some issues concerning the interaction between the radiological contaminated land regime and nuclear sites covered by the Paris convention. Parallel consultations on the draft Scottish and Welsh regulations are ongoing. Ian Hall informed members that there are differences between the English regime and the Scottish regime, but he feels that the net effect is the same.

8.3 NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING AGENCY

Andrew Craze informed members that the NDA had now been operating for 8 months and had recruited 90% of its complement (200 people). It had published a draft strategy which had received 280 comments and which will go to ministers for approval. It had interfaced with the UKAEA and BNG on the management of sites.

8.4 RASCC

Patrick Stephens said the NII were looking at implications of the NDA strategy for waste handling and on the effect of the timescale on doses to workers. The IAEA's RASCC had received a proposal from the IAEA secretariat on a revision of the Basic Safety Standards (BSS). The RASCC has rejected the IAEA's proposals and has developed an action plan for the review of the BSS with a view to subsequent revision by the end of 2006. There is also an IAEA paper on the release of sites on the termination of a practice, but it is uncertain how the paper is going to be taken forward, as there have been objections by USA members.

8.5 SEPA

Ian Robertson informed members that the document on doses and risks from Dounreay fuel fragments is now on the SEPA website.

8.6 INTERNATIONAL WORKING GROUP ON REVISED CODEX GUIDELINES

Stuart Conney informed members that the draft report of the international working group on revised codex guideline levels for radionuclides in foods for international trade has been revised. The title has been revised to clarify that the guidelines only come into force after future accidental or malevolent contamination and do not apply to routine releases. Separate levels for infants and other foods have been distinguished for all four categories of radionuclides.

9. NDAWG review (paper 8-09)

11.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE

The terms of reference had been addressed earlier in today's meeting.

The possible extension of the remit of NDAWG to consider solid waste management and contaminated land could be discussed at the 9th NDAWG meeting in April 2006.

11.2 FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME

The next meeting will look at effects on biota and short-term releases and also consider the protocol for assessing releases and the FSA update of their assessment methodology.

11.3 COMMUNICATIONS SUBGROUP

Members agreed that there was a need for such a subgroup as several issues had arisen from the work other subgroups. The terms of reference of the group were agreed.

Action 8.7 The Steering committee to organise membership of the communications subgroup to include David Collier, Barrie Lambert, Andrew Craze, and members of the FSA, EA and HPA.

11.4 RESEARCH LIST

Members were requested to keep sending in research information to go on the website.

11.5 WEBSITE

There were a total of 5123 visits between May 2005-Oct 2005, with 2558 files downloaded.

10. AOB

The Chairman raised the issue of BNFL no longer publishing a hard copy of the environmental reports for BNFL sites. Members expressed concern that useful data will no longer be available. Tim Parker explained why this change in publication had arisen and assured members that the same information as in the hard copy reports will be available both for Sellafield and the Magnox sites from the BNFL website

11. Date of next meeting

The next meeting will take place on Thursday 27th April 2006 at FSA, Aviation House, London.

12. Summary of Actions

Action 8.1 The Secretariat to liaise with the Steering Group over including a small users section on the NDAWG website.

Action 8.2 The NDAWG secretariat to produce a first draft of the assessment protocol and to send to members for comments before it is brought back to the 9th NDAWG meeting.

Action 8.3 Steve Jones to draft a definition for the term 'transparency' for authorisation dose assessments.

Action 8.4: FSA to report back on their response to NDAWG's comments on their dose assessment methodology.

Action 8.5 The secretariat will draft a letter to the Society for Radiological Protection to ask if it will act as a body to accredit people as having competence for external consultancy on uncertainty in radiological assessments.

Action 8.6 Members to email minor editorial changes on Paper 8-05 to David Webbe-Wood and for him to prepare a final version of the paper to go onto the website.

Action 8.7 The Steering committee to organise membership of the communications subgroup to include David Collier, Barrie Lambert, Andrew Craze, and members of the FSA, EA and HPA.

NDAWG Secretariat 21 November 2005