

Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management  
and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management

Fourth Review Meeting of the Contracting Parties  
**14 to 23 May 2012, Vienna, Austria**

**FINAL SUMMARY REPORT**

Mr Chang Sun Kang, President  
Ms Olena Mykolaichuk, Vice-President  
Mr Mark Bassett, Acting Vice-President  
Vienna, 23 May 2012

## **Introduction**

1. Recognizing the importance of the safe management of spent nuclear fuel and radioactive waste, the international community agreed upon the necessity of adopting a convention with the objective of achieving and maintaining a high level of safety worldwide in spent fuel and radioactive waste management: this was the origin of the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management (the “Joint Convention”), which was adopted on 5 September 1997 and entered into force on 18 June 2001.
2. The objectives of the Joint Convention are:
  - (i) To achieve and maintain a high level of safety worldwide in spent fuel and radioactive waste management, through the enhancement of national measures and international cooperation, including, where appropriate, safety-related cooperation;
  - (ii) To ensure that during all stages of spent fuel and radioactive waste management there are effective defences against potential hazards so that individuals, society, and the environment are protected from the harmful effects of ionizing radiation now and in the future, in such a way that the needs and aspirations of the present generation are met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs and aspirations; and
  - (iii) To prevent accidents with radiological consequences and to mitigate their consequences should they occur during any stage of spent fuel or radioactive waste management.
3. To achieve these objectives, the Joint Convention adopted a review process. The Joint Convention requires each Contracting Party to:
  - (i) Submit in advance to all other Contracting Parties a National Report describing how it implements the obligations of the Joint Convention;
  - (ii) Seek clarification on the National Reports of other Contracting Parties through a system of written questions and answers;
  - (iii) Present and discuss its National Report during a Review Meeting comprising Country Group sessions and Plenary Sessions; and
  - (iv) Be prepared to challenge and comment on the presentations made as part of a robust peer review process.

The Joint Convention specifies that the interval between Review Meetings should not exceed three years. Documents annexed to the Joint Convention provide guidance on the form and structure of the National Reports and on the way to conduct Review Meetings.

4. The Fourth Review Meeting of the Contracting Parties pursuant to Article 30 of the Joint Convention was held at the Headquarters of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which is the depositary and Secretariat for the Joint Convention, from 14 to 23 May 2012. The President of the Review Meeting was Mr Chang Sun Kang, Chairman and Chief Regulatory Officer of the Nuclear Safety and Security Commission, Republic of Korea. The Vice-President was Ms Olena Mykolaichuk, Chairperson of the State Nuclear Regulatory Inspectorate of Ukraine. Mr Andy Hall, Deputy Chief Inspector of Nuclear Installations, United Kingdom, who had been elected second Vice-President of the review process at the Organizational Meeting held in May 2011, was unable to carry out this role during the Review Meeting. The Contracting Parties agreed that Mr Mark Bassett, Deputy Chief Inspector of Nuclear Installations, United Kingdom, would act as Vice-President for the duration of the Meeting.
5. The General Committee of the Review Meeting comprised the President, the Vice-President and Acting Vice-President, and the six Country Group Chairpersons, namely Mr Dejan Trifunovic, Croatia; Mr Larry Camper, United States of America; Mr Jean-Jacques Dumont, France; Mr Kazumasa Hioki, Japan; Mr Peter Lietava, Czech Republic; and Mr Werner Mester, Germany.
6. Fifty-four Contracting Parties participated in the Review Meeting, namely: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Euratom, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Korea (Republic of), Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Arab Emirates and United States of America. Among these, eight Contracting Parties participated for the first time: Cyprus, Georgia, Ghana, Indonesia, Montenegro, Portugal, Republic of Moldova and United Arab Emirates. Georgia, Kazakhstan, the Republic of Moldova and Senegal did not provide a technical presentation of their respective National Reports.
7. Nine Contracting Parties did not participate in the Review Meeting, namely Chile, Gabon, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritania, Saudi Arabia, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tajikistan, Uruguay and Uzbekistan. Furthermore, Chile, Gabon, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritania, Saudi Arabia and Uzbekistan had not submitted a National Report.
8. There were no late ratifiers as defined in Rule 2 of the Rules of Procedure and Financial Rules (INFCIRC/602/Rev.3).
9. The Nuclear Energy Agency of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) was present as observer, as agreed at the Organizational Meeting.

## **General Observations**

10. Throughout the Fourth Review Meeting, while it was observed that high quality presentations were given by many Contracting Parties, it was nevertheless also observed that there was room to encourage more active participation in the review process for the future.

11. Since the Third Review Meeting, various Contracting Parties have made good progress and had significant accomplishments in implementing their national programmes. The following items were specifically addressed in National Reports and oral presentations during the Fourth Review Meeting:

- Development of a comprehensive regulatory framework;
- The effective independence of the regulatory body;
- Implementation of the strategies with visible milestones;
- Funding to secure waste management;
- Education and recruitment of competent staff and employees; and
- Geological repositories for high level waste.

12. Many Contracting Parties addressed in their oral presentations the topic of lessons learned from the accident at TEPCO's Fukushima Nuclear Power Stations (hereinafter referred to as 'the Fukushima accident'), as requested by President Kang in advance of the Review Meeting.

13. Despite a large diversity at the national level, most Contracting Parties reported good progress in maintaining and improving and in implementing their legal and regulatory frameworks.

14. Although good progress was reported by several Contracting Parties, it is recognized that the long term management of spent fuel and high level radioactive waste remains a challenging and difficult topic with considerable areas for improvement. All Contracting Parties agreed that such improvement is a continuous process.

15. The public is often greatly concerned with nuclear issues, e.g. in the case of the Fukushima accident. Good and prompt communication with the public and the need to ensure they are well informed were found to be crucial and essential elements of the management of spent fuel and radioactive waste.

16. The Fourth Review Meeting reaffirmed the importance of taking spent fuel management and radioactive waste management into account from the very beginning of any nuclear activities, such as in expanding nuclear power programmes.

17. Many Contracting Parties reported on progress in the areas of remediation of sites and the management of legacy waste.

18. At the Fourth Review Meeting, the Contracting Parties present showed good practices in many areas including the following:

- Public engagement;
- Management of sealed sources; and
- Sharing of information with neighbouring countries.

19. For countries embarking on nuclear power programmes, a systematic approach to planning for radioactive waste and spent fuel management was considered to be an essential practice, from the very beginning, with some Contracting Parties demonstrating an exemplary approach to this.

20. Although significant progress has been made since the last Review Meeting, challenges remain, including the following:

- Ensuring the robustness of the review process;
- Spent fuel storage capacity; and
- Delivery of disposal options.

### **Policy and technical highlights from the Fourth Review Meeting**

The main issues on which progress was noted are as follows.

#### *Comprehensive legal and regulatory framework*

21. Although many Contracting Parties have a well-established legal and regulatory framework, they have begun to review it, both to be consistent with recent new developments and also in order to determine any need for improvements in the light of lessons learned from the Fukushima accident. There is a need for continual efforts to ensure that the legal and regulatory framework is appropriate.

#### *Effective independence of the regulatory body*

22. Many Contracting Parties reported on measures taken to ensure the independence of the regulatory body.

#### *Implementation of strategies*

23. The need for long term radioactive waste and spent fuel management strategies was reaffirmed and many Contracting Parties have already established such strategies, which in

many cases include provision for regular review. Existing strategies were able to be used as models for Contracting Parties that are meeting the challenge of establishing new long term strategies.

24. Contracting Parties that are European Union member states are obliged to comply with the recently adopted Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom establishing a Community framework for the responsible and safe management of spent fuel and radioactive waste, which has close reference to articles of the Joint Convention.

25. Several Contracting Parties have a strategy for radioactive waste and spent fuel management in place and are pursuing this actively. A few Contracting Parties are already so far advanced as to be able to file an application for licensing of a geological disposal facility.

#### Funding to ensure waste management

26. The need for a well-established and secure funding system to ensure the safe management of spent fuel and radioactive waste, including decommissioning of facilities and the long term storage and disposal of waste, was reaffirmed.

27. The role of waste generators as financial contributors to such a funding system was recognized. The role of the State in the case of state-owned operations such as research facilities and of legacy waste was also recognized.

28. Regular updates of cost calculations and regular re-assessments of contributions to the funding system were reported as being good practices. Underfunding needs to be corrected and should be avoided.

29. It was stressed that funding systems must be established in such a way as to ensure that the system remains robust even in a financial crisis. Contracting Parties are looking into their funding systems in order to check the need for enhancement.

#### Education and recruitment of competent staff

30. Human resources were identified as a subject that needs attention, in particular because of high retirement rates and the need to find competent and well qualified replacements. The provision of good career prospects, sustainable projects and interesting jobs, in combination with knowledge management and education and training programmes, have been addressed by various Contracting Parties in order to ensure that competent staff will be available when needed.

#### Disposal facilities

31. A great number of near surface disposal facilities are in operation and broad experience has been gained with such facilities in many Contracting Parties. On the other hand geological

repositories for spent fuel and high level waste remain a challenging issue for all Contracting Parties.

32. Although geological disposal of high level waste is commonly accepted as the proper way forward, the implementation of geological disposal is an extended process. In addition, in many Contracting Parties it is expected that such facilities will operate only at a later date, with the long term storage of spent fuel and high level waste being used as an interim solution. Sufficient storage capacity should be available in the event that programmes for the development of geological repositories are delayed.

33. Major progress in establishing disposal facilities was reported by several Contracting Parties, including success with the site selection process. Public engagement, including early and effective communication, was found to be a ‘success factor’ for such disposal projects.

34. Shared repositories would be preferred by Contracting Parties, such as those that have limited amounts of waste – often legacy waste, and those that have more substantial amounts of radioactive waste from research, medical and industrial activities.

35. Consideration was also given to the reversibility and retrievability of radioactive waste and spent fuel from a repository. It was highlighted that justification of retrieval should take into account safety considerations and not only be based on public acceptance.

36. It was also reported that the early availability of waste acceptance criteria for the disposal of radioactive waste is an important factor, in particular for the appropriate and safe processing and storage of radioactive waste prior to its ultimate disposal.

#### *Implications of the Fukushima accident on spent fuel management*

37. Many Contracting Parties reported that they have carried out an immediate initial analysis for their spent fuel and waste management facilities based on the scenarios that happened at Fukushima, and have analysed their severe accident management strategies, to identify any deficiencies and to find means to rectify any undesirable situation. In most cases, these initial analyses indicated that no risks had been identified that would warrant immediate action. More detailed assessments are planned or are being carried out to verify the validity of the initial results. Emergency preparedness and response plans for nuclear facilities may need to be updated.

38. Following the Fukushima accident, particular attention was paid to the issue of the safety of spent fuel stored in pools. The importance of further discussions on this issue and the possible dry storage of spent fuel were acknowledged by Contracting Parties.

Other issues relating to spent fuel

39. It had already been reported in past Review Meetings that used research reactor fuel had been shipped back to the respective country of origin. This good practice has continued since the last Review Meetings and will continue in the future.

40. The timely availability of spent fuel storage capacity in the absence of disposal facilities was also stressed, in particular in situations where the nuclear capacity is planned to increase.

41. Cooperation between Contracting Parties on fuel cycle activities was seen by some Contracting Parties as a measure to increase safety and efficiency in the management of spent fuel, in particular for countries with small nuclear programmes. The Contracting Parties recognized the importance of having discussions on comprehensive approaches to the back-end of the fuel cycle.

Sealed sources

42. The need to have strict control over sealed sources has been recognized by all Contracting Parties. Consequently many Contracting Parties have campaigns at a national level to collect orphan sources and bring them under control. As a complementary safety measure, strict registries, licensing systems or tracking systems of sources have been established which, as a good practice, are being properly maintained and updated.

43. Many Contracting Parties established a licensing policy of not accepting the import of a sealed source unless its return to the manufacturer or supplier is guaranteed. Where return to the supplier is not realized, the Contracting Party must ensure appropriate management solutions are established.

Decommissioning

44. Many Contracting Parties reported on their experience in the management of decommissioning projects.

45. The reporting showed also that there is a trend towards immediate dismantling as the preferred option. A very interesting approach was immediate dismantling with subsequent storage of large components for decay, with the aim of either releasing such components from regulatory control or easing their management at the end of the decay period.

46. Many Contracting Parties reported that they have included the preparation of decommissioning plans as a legal requirement in their national legal framework.

Other issues relating to radioactive waste management

47. Several Contracting Parties reported that the management of legacy waste, including its characterization and remediation, is an on-going and challenging task.



48. Most Contracting Parties have on-going research programmes in place to improve radioactive waste management techniques.

49. The minimization of radioactive waste through legal, administrative and technical means is the goal of many Contracting Parties.

#### International cooperation

50. All Contracting Parties see benefits in international cooperation through information exchange, experience and technology. In particular Contracting Parties with small nuclear programmes expressed the benefits of sharing knowledge and assistance.

51. Many Contracting Parties reported on their use of the IAEA safety standards and their experience with the Integrated Regulatory Review Service (IRRS) of the IAEA. Several Contracting Parties reported that they have made their IRRS reports and follow-up action plans public. Other Contracting Parties plan to request IRRS missions in the future.

#### **Outcomes of the Open-Ended Working Group**

52. Improvements for future review meetings, as well as other arrangements to ensure continuity between review meetings, were identified through the deliberations of the Open-Ended Working Group and were approved at the Plenary Session of the Review Meeting.

53. Effectively eleven topics were discussed by the Open-Ended Working Group, which was established at the opening Plenary session and was chaired by Mr Mark Bassett:

- (1) Training and educational opportunities;
- (2) Consideration of Comprehensive Fuel Services;
- (3) a Enhancing the effectiveness of the review process;  
b Specific proposal to improve time management;  
c Process for continued discussion and applying improvements;
- (4) Enhancing the continuity of knowledge of the Joint Convention process;
- (5) Shedding light on the safety and security interface;
- (6) Enhancing the continuity and on-going dialogue between review meetings;
- (7) Ways to improve the reporting of management of disused sealed sources;
- (8) Mechanism to ensure coherence between Joint Convention and Convention on Nuclear Safety; and
- (9) Changed role for the Coordinator during the Review Meeting.

54. The report of the Open-Ended Working Group is provided as an annex to this Summary Report.

### **Conclusions**

55. The participants in the Fourth Review Meeting noted the increase in number of Contracting Parties from 48 to 63, as compared to the Third Review Meeting. The Contracting Parties present recommend that efforts should be maintained to continue this trend in the future.

56. On the other hand, nine Contracting Parties did not participate in the Fourth Review Meeting, three further Contracting Parties did not attend Country Group sessions and six Contracting Parties had not submitted National Reports. All Contracting Parties are reminded of their obligation under the Joint Convention to participate fully in the review process.

57. Constructive exchanges and sharing of knowledge took place in an open and candid manner. However the Contracting Parties recognize the importance of continuous improvement and the need for the invigoration of the peer review process including an increase in the preparation and willingness of Contracting Parties to challenge and comment on the presentations of other Contracting Parties. The Contracting Parties also noted that a robust peer review process requires full and active engagement by Contracting Parties and Officers. Proper involvement and support by the Secretariat is also very important for ensuring efficient and productive Review Meetings, ensuring continuity between Review Meetings, and facilitating coherence between the review processes of the Joint Convention and of the Convention on Nuclear Safety.

58. International peer review missions and the implementation of their recommendations were regarded as an effective process to strengthen the regulatory infrastructure and safety.

59. The exchange of information on actions taken by Contracting Parties to review safety and identify needs for improvement as a consequence of the Fukushima accident was very valuable. Although no risks had been identified that would warrant immediate action, in most cases more detailed assessments are planned or are being carried out to verify the validity of the initial results. The Contracting Parties will continue to discuss the lessons learned from the Fukushima accident and to share best practices to this end.

60. All Contracting Parties are working towards raising the level of safety in radioactive waste and spent fuel management. During the Review Meeting, a number of challenges were identified for Contracting Parties with respect to their implementation of particular provisions.

61. The Contracting Parties agreed that National Reports to the next Review Meeting should include the following issues:

- Management of disused sealed sources;
- Safety implications of very long storage periods and delayed disposal of spent fuel and radioactive waste;
- International cooperation in finding solutions for the long term management and disposal of different types of radioactive waste and/or spent fuel; and
- Progress on lessons learned from the Fukushima accident, in particular regarding strategies for spent fuel management.

**Annex**  
**Summary of the Meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG)**  
**of the 4th Review Meeting of the Joint Convention**  
**May 15-17, 2012**

**Introduction**

On May 15, 2012, Chairman Mark Bassett (UK), Acting Vice President opened the discussion and explained that the work of the OEWG would be challenging as there were effectively 11 proposals to discuss within three days. The Chair reminded the meeting of his statements in the Plenary that the proposals were being examined by not limiting the scope of the OEWG to the narrow interpretation of the ‘functioning’ of the Joint Convention process but in the spirit of the Joint Convention to share good practice.

The original proposals are available on the closed JCWeb.

The meeting met formally over three days followed by further consultations on the fourth and discussed the following:

- Proposal 1: Education and training opportunities for spent fuel and radioactive waste management available to all Contracting Parties to maintain qualified staff
- Proposal 2: Consideration of the Comprehensive Nuclear Fuel Services (accompanied by a presentation)
- Proposal 3 (a): A new tool to enhance the effectiveness of the peer review (replaced by an amended proposal during the meeting)
- Proposal 3 (b): A specific proposal to improve time management during the country group sessions
- Proposal 3 (c) and 6: Proposals for inter-sessional meetings(combined within the meeting)
- Proposal 4: Enhance the continuity of knowledge of the Convention process
- Proposal 5: Shedding light again on safety and security interface
- Proposal 7: Improving the reporting of safe management of disused sealed sources under the Joint Convention
- Proposal 8: Creation of a mechanism to ensure coherence and benchmark between the rules governing the review process of the Joint Convention and those of the Convention on Nuclear Safety
- Proposal 9: Changed role for the Coordinator during the Review Meeting

## **Conclusion**

The OEWG recommends that the Contracting Parties of the 4<sup>th</sup> Review Meeting adopt its recommendations as set out in the Appendix to this report.

The OEWG recommends that the Secretariat be requested to conduct an editorial review of the proposed changes to the Guidelines, to ensure internal consistency between all guidance documents. On the understanding that wording changes resulting from this editorial review would not be substantive, it further recommends that the final text be circulated for tacit approval.

## **Appendix to the Annex**

Proposal 1: Education and training opportunities for spent fuel and radioactive waste management available to all Contracting Parties to maintain qualified staff

### **Outcome**

The OEWG recognises the importance of education and training opportunities to ensure the human resources necessary to sustain spent fuel and radioactive waste management programs. The OEWG also noted the background information provided on education and training opportunities provided by the Secretariat, EU, and USA.

### **Recommendation**

The OEWG recommends that Contracting Parties take steps to promote education and training opportunities and to identify these opportunities by appropriate means such as inclusion in their national reports, and suggests that the Secretariat might consider a consolidated database of available opportunities.

Proposal 2: Consideration of the Comprehensive Nuclear Fuel Services

### **Outcome**

The US made a presentation of its Comprehensive Fuel Services arrangement.

The Contracting Parties recognise the importance of having discussions on comprehensive approaches to the back-end of the fuel cycle. However, the Contracting Parties also noted that this is a complex issue, and some Contracting Parties stated that they needed further time to consider this topic.

### **Recommendation**

The OEWG recommends that Contracting Parties could continue discussions on comprehensive approaches to the back-end of the fuel cycle, inter alia, at the first topical meeting proposed in Proposal 3c/6.

Proposal 3 (a): Enhancing the effectiveness of the peer review

### **Outcome**

The United States submitted a revised proposal, which is available on the JCWeb, to enhance the effective implementation of the Joint Convention as called for in the IAEA Action Plan.

Specifically, the United States proposal urges Contracting Parties to make a political commitment to follow certain principles in implementing the Joint Convention. These implementing principles address: (1) emphasizing steps to assure an effective, independent and transparent regulatory function; (2) recognizing the important contribution IAEA safety standards can make to achieving the objectives of the Joint Convention; (3) taking full advantage of international peer review missions; and (4) promoting greater transparency and openness by making certain information publically available.

While widespread support was expressed for the ideas reflected in the principles, some Contracting Parties expressed doubts as to whether the meetings held in the framework of the Joint Convention provided the appropriate forum for a declaration which was political in essence and which embodied concepts already being discussed in other fora having a more overarching and political perspective, such as the Ministerial Conference on Nuclear Safety and the meetings leading to the adoption of the Action Plan on Nuclear Safety. Some Contracting Parties also expressed the view that more time would be needed before an eventual decision on a political commitment as contained in the US proposal could be given consideration. Some Contracting Parties also expressed the need for further consideration of how the principles were articulated and how the principles would relate to the Joint Convention.

Nevertheless, the OEWG noted any Contracting Party could consider the actions in the implementing principles when considering ways in which to enhance the effective implementation of the Joint Convention.

### **Recommendation**

The OEWG recommends that the United States proposal remains open and that Contracting Parties be prepared to discuss the proposal in greater detail at the next appropriate forum, for example one of the meetings as described in Proposal 3c/6.

Proposal 3(b): A specific proposal to improve time management during the country group sessions

### **Outcome**

There was general agreement that the increasing number of Contracting Parties, in combination with time and resource constraints, makes it imperative to develop mechanisms to manage time and resources more effectively in order to maintain and increase the usefulness of the peer review process.

### **Recommendation**

The OEWG recommends that Contracting Parties continue to consider the United States proposal and potentially other proposals to manage time and resources better. In this regard, the Contracting Parties are encouraged to discuss the United States proposal and other potential time and resource management mechanisms at the next appropriate forum, for example one of the meetings as described in Proposal 3c/6.

Proposal 3(c): A proposed process to continue discussions and apply improvements prior to the Fifth Review Meeting

and

Proposal 6: Enhance the continuity and ongoing dialogue between Review meetings

### **Outcome**

#### **Recommendation**

The OEWG recommends that

1. The Secretariat is requested to organize additional meetings of Contracting Parties, subject to the availability of resources, to continue consideration of proposals to improve implementation of the Joint Convention and to develop recommendations for consideration by the Contracting Parties. The first such meeting would be expected to take place in early 2013, and a second opportunity could be in conjunction with the next Organizational Meeting of the Joint Convention. Pursuant to Article 31, an Extraordinary Meeting could be convened in order to adopt any revisions to the arrangements under the Joint Convention to take effect prior to the 5th Review Meeting.
2. Topical meetings should be held between Review Meetings to address specific topics identified at this and each subsequent Review Meeting, with a view to development of topical reports for presentation at the Review Meeting following the topical meeting. Each such meeting and related activities could be organized jointly by the Secretariat, subject to the availability of resources, and a Contracting Party volunteering to host the meeting and should be structured in a manner that promotes continuity and on-going dialogue among the Contracting Parties. The topic for consideration at the first topical meeting could be a meeting to discuss various mechanisms for ensuring effective approaches to the back end of the fuel cycle.



Proposal 4: Enhance the continuity of knowledge of the Convention process

### **Outcome**

The status and functions of the national Contact Points are clarified by inclusion in the Guidelines to the Joint Convention. Each national contact shall be invited, if they wish, to participate with Officers of the Convention in the handover meeting between incoming and outgoing Officers after the Organizational Meeting, to enhance the continuity of expertise and knowledge in the Joint Convention review process.

### **Recommendation**

The OEWG recommends that the text of INFCIRC/603/Rev.4 be amended as indicated below in bold.

INFCIRC/603/Rev 4, Paragraph 13: (sentence added):

13. Following the Organizational Meeting, a workshop of incoming and outgoing officers shall be held to describe the Review Meeting process in detail, including key documents, and to share experience and lessons learned. **The National Contacts, as described in the Annex, shall be invited to participate, if they consider it appropriate, in this meeting.**

INFCIRC/603/Rev 4, Annex: (new paragraph added after II.6 Coordinator):

### **II.7 National Contacts**

**National Contacts will be nominated by each Contracting Party and will be expected:**

- (a) To have access to and regularly monitor the Joint Convention's secure and restricted database ("the Convention secure website"), together with the right to upload national documents, questions, and answers;**
- (b) To disseminate, nationally, information promulgated on the Convention secure website;**
- (c) To facilitate progress on issues related to the Convention in their own Member State;**
- (d) To act as contact for the Country Group Coordinator prior to each Review Meeting;**  
**and**
- (e) To consider participating in the one-day meeting of incoming and outgoing Officers of the Joint Convention.**

INFCIRC/603/Rev 4, Annex: (new paragraph added after III.6 Coordinator):

### **III.7 National Contacts**

**It is desirable that National Contacts possess the following qualities:**

- (a) Be available for contact and work between the Review Meetings;**
- (b) Have a knowledge of spent fuel and radioactive waste safety issues;**
- (c) Be familiar with electronic database management; and**
- (d) Have good English-language skill.**

Proposal 5: Shedding light again on safety and security interface

#### **Outcome**

The importance of the interface between security and safety in spent fuel management was recognised but it was decided that this specific proposal cannot be accepted as it fell outside the scope of the Joint Convention. Future considerations should be within other fora.

Proposal 7: Consideration of the status of disused sealed sources under the Joint Convention and the way to improve the report on their safe management through the review mechanisms, in order to facilitate information and experience sharing as well as peer reviews of this topic.

#### **Outcome**

##### **Recommendation**

The OEWG recommends that the text of INFCIRC/604/Rev.1 be amended as indicated below in bold.

Section J. Disused Sealed Sources

32. This section covers the obligations under Article 28 (Disused Sealed Sources).

**33. This section should give a comprehensive description of the legislative and regulatory system governing the management of disused sealed sources, including the following issues:**

- status of disused sealed sources within the framework of its national legislation;**
- national strategy for the management of disused sealed sources, including the legal responsibilities, of manufacturers, suppliers, owners and users of sealed sources for their end-of-life management;**

– for Contracting Parties in which suppliers of sealed sources are or were located:

- the framework concerning the reentry of disused sealed sources into its territory for return to a manufacturer qualified to receive and possess the disused sealed sources and,
- the retrieval approach, if any, of sealed sources considered as having a national origin from a foreign state.

Proposal 8: Creation of a mechanism to ensure coherence between the rules governing the review process of the Joint Convention and those of the Convention on Nuclear Safety.

## **Outcome**

### **Recommendation**

The OEWG recommends that in order to ensure coherence between the review process of the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and of the Convention on Nuclear Safety, the Contracting Parties of the Joint Convention urge the leadership of the Joint Convention to invite the leadership of the 5th Review Meeting of the Convention on Nuclear Safety to a discussion (e.g. via video conference) on improvements to the effectiveness of each Convention and then to make a joint presentation at the 2012 IAEA General Conference on such improvements.

In the same spirit, the Contracting Parties of the Joint Convention invite the leadership of each convention to undertake informal discussions on a regular basis to ensure such coherence.

Proposal 9: Changed role for the Coordinator during the Review Meeting

## **Outcome**

### **Recommendation**

The OEWG recommends that the text of INFCIRC/602/Rev.3 and INFCIRC/603/Rev.4 be amended as indicated below in bold and strike-through.

Rules of Procedures and Financial Rules, INFCIRC/602/Rev.3:

B. PREPARATORY PROCESS FOR REVIEW MEETINGS

Rule 11 Organizational Meetings

1. ~~C. elect Country Group Co-ordinators for the forthcoming Review Meeting;~~
2. D. elect Country Group **Co-ordinators**, Rapporteurs, Chairpersons and Vice-Chairpersons for the forthcoming Review Meeting, and assign them to the Country Groups so that no **Co-ordinator**, Rapporteur, Chairperson or Vice-Chairperson is assigned to the Country Group of which his or her country is a member;

Guidelines on the Review Process, INFCIRC/603/Rev.4:

VIII. Guidance to Officers on how to Conduct a Country Group Session

~~46. The Coordinator's duties as an officer are completed at this point. Coordinators are therefore free to participate in their national delegations as desired.~~

IX. Distribution of National Reports and Subsequent Actions

53. The group Co-ordinator will analyse the questions and comments on national reports in his/her country group, and identify any trends in them in order to assist the Chairperson in the conduct of the discussion. This analysis should be distributed, confidentially, to the officers and Contracting Parties who are members of this country group in advance of the Review Meeting. ~~The Coordinators should participate in the 2-day meeting of officers immediately before the start of the Review Meeting (see para. 37), but are then free of officer responsibilities so that they can participate fully as members of their national delegations.~~

Guidelines on the Review Process, INFCIRC/603/Rev.4 — Annex:

II. Duties of Officers

II.6 Coordinator

- (a) ~~To sort all written questions, comments, and answers relating to national reports of his/her country group according to the Convention's articles;~~