

PANEL SESSION 28 - Worldwide Regulatory Oversight of Radioactive Legacy Sites

Co-Chairs: Malgorzata K. Sneve, *Norwegian Radiation Protection Authority*;
Ray Clark, *US EPA*

Reporter: Graham Smith, *GMS Abingdon, Ltd.*

Presentations were provided from Norway, Russia, USA, Kazakhstan and the IAEA.

Panelists Included:

- Russell Edge, *IAEA (Austria)*
- Mikhail Kiselev, *Federal Medical Biological Agency (Russia)*
- Alexander Kim, *Atomic Energy Commission (Kazakhstan)*
- Stuart Walker, *US EPA*
- Malgorzata Sneve, *Norwegian Radiation Protection Authority (Norway)*
- Natalya Klimova, *Federal Medical Biological Agency (Russia)*
- Natalya Shandala, *Federal Medical Biological Agency (Russia)*

Subjects included:

- Norwegian-Russia bilateral regulatory cooperation
- Regulation of the nuclear and uranium legacies in Russia
- EPA regulation of Superfund sites
- Multiplicity of legacy issues in Kazakhstan
- IAEA's International Working Forum on Regulatory Supervision of Legacy Sites

Requests for more information indicated interest in what is happening in other countries.

Key conclusions, technical messages, questions and uncertainties:

- Bilateral regulatory cooperation has already helped to improve regulatory supervision of legacy sites. There is still much to do, not only to complete the legacy management programs, but also to give confidence in new nuclear technology activities.
- Legacy sites present a wide range of radiation and other pollution and physically hazardous situations, and well as a wide range of regulatory challenges.
- There is still much to be done to improve and align regulatory standards and processes within individual countries to more effectively address these complex legacy issues.
- This includes alignment of protection objectives for radioactive and differently toxic wastes.
- Uncertainties in dose/cancer risk relationships are large at low doses and dose rates for radiation, but are even higher for some chemicals.
- Improvement of scientific information may, after the event, indicate that remediation action had been over-protective, or show the need to re-visit a site to carry out further remediation. This is simply an uncertainty that we have to learn to live with.
- Stakeholder engagement can be very helpful, but does not on its own reduce the complexity of the problem of how to make a good decision. Consultation should not be

WM2011 Conference Panel Report

used as a mechanism for delaying urgently required mitigative action, but, as indicated above, delay for further site investigation and scientific development.

- It may be possible to use international regulatory cooperation to break regulatory logjams and inertia.
- Not all countries need to have the same standards and processes, because of a range of technical, geographic and socio-economic factors, as well as special stakeholder issues. However, there is a lot of scope to learn from different national experience.
- IAEA provides a continuing common basis in terms of fundamentals, high level standards for protection objectives, as well as a wide range of guidance and technical documents.
- IAEA RSLs can provide an important mechanism for exchange of information, provision of support and development of specific projects, as well as to inform IAEA on improvements to its recommendations and guidance. Participation in RSLs was encouraged.

Many of these points align with comments made in the plenary presentations and in the Monday lunchtime talks, both from Russia and USA.

Other recommendations:

- WM Symposia is encouraged to continue to promote international regulatory cooperation as a conference topic.
- WM Symposium may also wish to consider how to widen participation of regulators from countries which are less technologically developed but which have significant nuclear and uranium legacy issues.

#####