

The International Framework for Nuclear Energy Cooperation (IFNEC)

Infrastructure Development Working Group

John Mathieson and Al Burkart, co-chairs

Phoenix, February 28th, 2012



Key Considerations for IDWG Activities

- Established to facilitate the development of the infrastructure needed for worldwide nuclear energy expansion in a safe, secure and peaceful manner.
- The IAEA document "Milestones in the Development of a National Infrastructure for Nuclear Power" established 19 infrastructure elements which we use as a basis for looking at the Group's activities.

Consensus messages

- > All members are experiencing infrastructure development challenges.
- Human Resource development is a central issue.
- Providing a forum for exchange of experience, lessons learned, and resource information is beneficial to members.



Infrastructure Development Working Group

- Focuses on seven key areas:
 - Human Resource Development
 - Radioactive Waste Management
 - Small Modular Reactors
 - Support for Participant Countries, including Assessments and Financing Approaches
 - Interaction with Specialist Organizations
 - Online Resource Library
 - Infrastructure Needs for an International Nuclear Fuel Services Framework



IDWG Meetings and Workshops: Defining Activities, Summarizing Results, Sharing Information

- IDWG meetings:
 - 2008, 2009, 2010 (2x/year)
 - April 2011 in Paris





October/November 2011 in Vienna





Peer-to-peer engagement Lessons-learned exchanges and workshops

- Interaction with industry, educational community and specialist organizations
- Fast-track
 activities to
 complement a
 strong base of
 IAEA and bilateral
 efforts



Exchange Programme

- Program Summary
 - Facilitates sharing of knowledge and lessons learned critical to infrastructure
 - Provides opportunities for recent graduates, professors, and secondary educator exchanges
- Exchanges to date include
 - UK nucleargraduates program with USDOE, IAEA and others
 - Other exchanges between Texas A&M & Bulgaria
 - Educational exchanges NPI with Italy & France;
 - Estonia with US-Russian worksop



Human Resource Development Modeling Tool

- Recent model development has focused on regulatory agency workforce and safeguards capabilities
 - Workforce for a nuclear regulatory body based on the US NRC is now included in the model
- Opportunities for specialized training such as safeguards are now represented in the model



Trial Review with the IAEA - Oct 2011

> Final review of tool documentation and training course materials

Pilot the Tool with Selected Member States

First IAEA Training Session - Jan 2012



Economic Study for SMRs

- Preliminary Findings of Independent Ongoing Study of Economics of SMRs
 - Construction learning can bring down overnight cost.
 - Predictable and streamlined regulatory and construction schedules that includes strong stakeholder involvement and support can reduce the cost of capital, which in turn can reduce levelized cost.
 - > Building multiple units at a site will bring down average cost per unit.
 - In some cases SMRs can be competitive with large plants
 - In some cases SMRs can be competitive with natural gas
 - Transferring significant capital costs from the site to the factory can be one of the principal factors to reduce contingency costs.
 - Standardized, certified designs can reduce duration risk, which is also a key factor reducing the cost of capital.
- "Economies of Small and Modular" can be Competitive with "Economies of Scale"
- Waste Management Issues are of Interest



IFNEC Resource Library

 An <u>integrated on-line source</u> of existing infrastructure development references, programs, tools, and pooled Participants' resources



- Education and training sources
 Assessment tools
 Conference and event information
 Best practice references
 Operational data
 Services information
 Vendor information
 Past meeting presentations
- Now the unified source for all non-public IFNEC data, including IDWG, RNFSWG, and Steering Group presentations
- Resource Library calendar is regularly updated to reflect ongoing civilian nuclear energyrelated events



Radioactive Waste Management

• Radioactive Waste Management Subgroup (chaired by the UK) reinforces the importance of radioactive waste management

• Working from a consolidated topic list

- Research and Development
- Funding and institutional arrangements
- Interactions with stakeholders
- Safe and secure storage and transport of used fuel and radioactive waste prior to disposition
- Opportunities and constraints for regional and/or shared disposal facilities
- > Opportunities for changing how human resources are developed
- > Will be addressing waste issues for Small Modular Reactors



Workshop on Emergency Preparedness and Response

- Ensuring Effective Emergency Preparedness and Response as an Aspect of Infrastructure Development
- International Framework for Preparedness and Response to Nuclear and Radiological Emergencies
- IAEA Guidance, Tools and Programmes in the Area of Emergency Preparedness and Response
- Case Study on Experience in Developing an Emergency Preparedness and Response Capability While Establishing a National Nuclear Power Program
- IAEA Guidance on Emergency Preparedness and Response: Considerations for States Embarking on a Nuclear Power Programme
- Making the Best Use of IAEA and Member State Assistance Programmes Assistance Programs



Industry Engagement

- AdSTM Inc
- Advance Uranium Asset Management
- Ansaldo
- Areva
- Argonne National Laboratory
- Atomstroyexport
- Babcock & Wilcox
- Barclay's Capital
- Cameco Corporation
- Curtiss-Wright Flow Control Company
- Deutsche Bank
- EDF
- Emirates Nuclear Energy Corporation
- Enel (Italy)
- Energopomiar (Poland)
- Eni (Italy)
- Fitch Ratings
- GE Hitachi Nuclear Energy
- International Nuclear Services
- Hyperion Power
- JAIF International Cooperation Center

- Korea Atomic Energy Research Institute
- Korea Hydro & Nuclear Power Company
- Kozloduy NPP Plc.
- Lightbridge Corporation
- Lithuanian Electricity Organization
- National Skills Academy for Nuclear (UK)
- Nuclear Assurance Corporation
- Nuclear Energy Institute
- NuScale Power
- Oak Ridge National Laboratory
- PNTL
- SKB
- Société Générale
- Sogin
- Towers Perrin
- Toshiba Corporation
- UK National Nuclear Laboratory
- Urenco
- U.S. Export-Import Bank
- U.S. Civilian Research and Development Foundation
- Ux Consulting Company
- Westinghouse
- WM Mining



Educational Community and International Organization Engagement

- Czech Technical University
- CIRTEN
- Igor Kurchatov Vocational School
- Kuwait University
- North Carolina State University
- Politechnico di Milano
- Sapienza University of Rome
- Texas A&M University
- University of California-Berkeley
- University of Manchester
- University of Sofia
- University of Tartu (Estonia)

- ARIUS
- EDRAM
- European Nuclear Education Network (ENEN)
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)
- World Association of Nuclear Operators (WANO)
- World Institute for Nuclear Security (WINS)
- World Nuclear Association (WNA)



Joint Workshop: Backend Management Summary Points

- General, relating to infrastructure support for CFS
 - Timeframes for radioactive waste management & decommissioning are longer than operational reactor life
 - Setting a full (reactor, sf /rwm, decommissioning) lifecycle strategy, complete with decisionmaking points, is key
 - > Ethical, socio-political aspects of storage & disposal (& transportation) important
 - Much joint work being done and useful to transfer experiences but no universal formula for successful progress e.g. on siting
 - > Technical aspects are generally well understood and issues are manageable
 - o Again much joint research being undertaken
- Specific to multinational approaches for storage / disposal
 - > These may appear attractive but
 - Similar issues to the above general points
 - Political/ public support lacking & difficult to tackle
 - a main barrier to progress?
 - But this should not prevent constructive discussion, particularly if no host country is identified at the beginning of the process



Joint Workshop: Backend Management Recommendations Going Forward

- The WGs should continue to work together & share experiences, technologies in storage, transportation and disposal in approach to infrastructure support for CTG
- Continue discussion on Regional Co-operation (recognising sensitivities) within the IFNEC context
 - > In line with Joint Convention / IAEA Principles etc.
 - > Recognising positive and negative impacts on infrastructure (including financing rwm, regulatory and legal frameworks)
 - > Recognising countries could consider dual track approach national / international
 - o but not one at the expense of the other, i.e. "wait and see" not acceptable
 - Could/ should/ would a country or a group of countries "volunteer"?
 - > Recognise "issues" such as liabilities, economics, financing etc
 - o IDWG to draft papers
 - Recognise aspirations of new countries and manage expectations in policy / strategy development for either single/ dual-track approach
 - o Assistance in establishing infrastructures, especially legal and regulatory framework
 - o Partnership building between regulators, and also partnerships between site operators or organizations

• Continue engaging with industry (i.e. the implementers/ service providers)

- Role of Industry in a public/private partnership needs further exploration
- > RNFSWG to redesign and re-circulate industry survey