



19 September 2006

Mr. Y.A. Sokolov
Deputy Director General
Department of Nuclear Energy
International Atomic Energy Agency
P.O. Box 100
Wagramer Strasse 5
A-1400
Vienna, Austria

Subject Title: Report of the Sixth Meeting of the International Radioactive Waste
Technical Committee (WATEC)

Dear Mr. Sokolov,

Attached is the WATEC report, in its finalized form, for the 2006 meeting. I have gathered all of the comments of the members on the draft and have reconciled them in the final version.

I must, once more, congratulate you on the work of your staff in making out meeting a success. I am now beginning to see a real impact, by our committee, on the programs in your section and hope that you to see value in our contribution.

As always, I was very pleased to be involved. If you need any additional help or clarification do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bob Holmes".

Bob Holmes
Chairman of WATEC

cc: J.M. Potier

International Radioactive Waste Technical Committee
Report 2006

The International Radioactive Waste Technical Committee (WATEC) was held from the 3rd to the 7th of April. This timing was driven by the wish to influence the planning for 2008 onwards, and to ensure that there was an opportunity to interact with the Waste Safety Standards Committee (WASSC). It has long been the aim of both the Waste Technology Section (WTS) and WATEC to strengthen the links between WTS and the Waste Safety Section (WSS), an aim, shared by WSS.

The participants of WATEC are as shown in the Appendix I. The agenda was discussed in some detail as it represented a departure from the traditional Member State (MSs) presentations to a structured approach, where MSs replied to a pro forma asking for specific data. The data sets were then summarized by a grading of the size of programme. This left more time to discuss selected projects and areas. The Agenda, see Appendix II, was accepted by WATEC

The MSs' reports were summarized as three separate presentations. Whilst the concept of summary was sound and facilitated discussion the split was not and WATEC recommended that in the future a single consolidated presentation be prepared.

Contributions of issues and trends submitted by Committee members in advance to WTS in a prescribed format were reviewed. Three presentations were made covering MSs with major, advanced nuclear programs, small- to medium-size nuclear programs, and with radioactive waste from nuclear applications. These presentations replaced presentations by individual MSs, allowing more time for topical sessions throughout the week. Interestingly, similar issues and trends were noted among the three presentations. The sense of the Committee was that this format was an improvement and good first attempt, but improvements to the questionnaire could result in more consistency in reporting and focus on areas where MSs may benefit by WTS assistance. There were significant inconsistencies in how MSs reported.

Summary of issues and trends reported:

- Nuclear Power Plant (NPP) capacity expansion is evident in some MSs, even in the member state reporting waste only from nuclear applications;
- Significant planning and reviewing of national strategies and policies is occurring in MSs;
- Some MSs have national inventories and tracking systems;
- Disposal of High Level Waste (HLW) and Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) remains far off; interim storage is being used in near term;
- Many MSs have operating Low and Intermediate Level (LILW) disposal facilities;
- Some MSs recognize Very Low Level Waste (VLLW) class of Radioactive Waste (RW); most MSs show interest in VLLW;
- Many MSs reported clearance issues and implementation of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Safety Guide on clearance; this area received the highest attention;
- Adequate decommissioning and remedial action technology exists; many MSs have experience and are decommissioning nuclear facilities, in some cases taxing disposal capacity;
- Wide interest exists in information on remedial action on sites and facilities;
- Some MSs are considering infrastructure for Naturally Occurring Radioactive Material (NORM)/Technologically Enhanced Naturally Occurring Radioactive Material (TENORM);
- MSs showed significant interest in recovery and disposal of disused sealed sources; and
- Many MSs reported services available, e.g., mixed waste, remediation, decommissioning, and waste processing.

Discussion and prioritization of significant opportunities for WTS support were postponed until after topical discussions were held during the meeting. As expected, many MSs identified specific assistance items that apply to their national situations.

However, the following assistance items deserve note because they were identified by more than one member state:

- Complete revised guidance on classification of waste per DS-390;
- Develop definition, guidance and share information on how MSs are managing VLLW;
- Develop guidance on NORM and TENORM;
- Continue to support activities related to disposal safety assessment;
- Develop clear guidance on clearance of waste;
- Share information on how MSs are managing disused sealed sources;
- Share information on what MSs are doing with national inventories and tracking systems;
- Find ways to support MSs' implementation of the Joint Convention, including making the Net Enabled Waste Management Database (NEWMDB) available as a reporting tool for Radioactive Waste Management (RWM);
- Study the longevity of stored waste forms and impacts of lengthened storage time;
- Share information and lessons learned on remediation strategies and technologies, including commercial services offered by other MSs;
- Share Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&D) experience and support strategy and methodology development in MSs;
- Provide assistance with management of spent graphite;
- Provide assistance/training on Quality Assurance (QA) of waste packages; and
- Share information on borehole disposal.

It was observed that the issues raised were short-term needs, and long-term issues dealing with RWM from new reactors (Innovative Nuclear Reactors and Fuel Cycles (INPRO) or Generation IV (GEN-IV)) were not raised. RWM issues dealing with Nuclear Power Plants (NPPs) life extensions and refurbishment were also not raised.

There was a presentation on various Nuclear Fuel Cycles and comparative studies on techno-economic aspects. WATEC members felt these fuel cycles should also be

analyzed for waste arisings and their subsequent management. This exercise needs to be carried out in close coordination with the Waste Technology Section.

The Committee discussed the management of decommissioning waste and other special waste types. The discussion started with a presentation on the management and disposal strategies and plans for decommissioning materials. Special attention was paid to VLLW, for which 4 new disposal cells will be established at El Cabril. This discussion was followed by a series of presentations from WTS personnel on the topics of:

- Pre-disposal management of decommissioning wastes;
- Dispositioning of large quantities of decommissioning materials; and
- Disposal of decommissioning wastes.

Key points arising from these presentations and ensuing discussions focused on the following:

1. Current IAEA clearance and exemption standards are problematic to the disposition of large quantities of decommissioning wastes. To address this issue, some countries, supported by the regulator, are adopting novel approaches to “work-around” the standard. In other jurisdictions, the IAEA standard is being interpreted literally, placing an increased burden on operators within that Member State. In effect, then, the international standard is not a standard at all. Since the standard is generally recognized as excessively conservative, WATEC will raise this issue with WASCC and request that WASCC revisit the standard. If no changes to the standard are recommended by WASCC, WASCC should provide a quantitative, technical justification for the standard.
2. In the event that the standard is not revised, WATEC recommends also that the IAEA promote the concept of waste optimization in its guidance documentation (e.g. RS-G01.7) by including reference to alternative types of clearance criteria, such as semi-conditional and conditional criteria, and other practical suggestions.

The European Commission (EC) programme on Euratom projects in RWM was first presented and a brief overview of Euratom Safeguards (DG TREN) activity on policy development was then given. WATEC noted that there was potential for overlap, as both IAEA and the EC have similar priorities, for countries with large nuclear programmes. WATEC appreciated that the EC tended to promote massive Research and Development (R&D) programmes, whilst the IAEA relied on input from MSs and there were issues of membership and ownership that precluded totally uninhibited interactions, nonetheless it was felt by WATEC that many of the EC studies were paper exercises and thus very close to IAEA activities. There is obviously a co-operation at the working level through the exchange of information, but no formal involvement in the planning stages. It was felt by WATEC that the IAEA is relegated to the role of observer in EC meetings and programmes, when their role could be more interactive and add value to both organizations' programs. The IAEA is therefore urged to attempt to seek greater cross representation at meetings. The number of projects to implement such a policy is however limited (e.g. strategy or governance-related projects, for the essential).

The follow up from the 2005 WATEC meeting was presented by the Scientific Secretary. As already noted, the date of the meeting had been changed to allow the Committee to influence the 2008 planning cycle. A joint WATEC-WASSC meeting had also been arranged to facilitate closer working between the two Sections (see below). The Agenda has also been modified in line with requests from WATEC. In this section, the issue of the NEWMDB was raised along with the Waste Management Research Abstracts (WMRA). WATEC supports the NEWMDB although it was noted that some nations, including the United Kingdom, were not contributors. WATEC members agreed to follow this up with their MSs, but did note the burden placed on states by multiple requests for information in different formats by various bodies. WTS will attempt to resolve this issue on behalf of MSs (see below). Since the WMRA was no longer in frequent use and internet usage was evolving, WATEC recommended that WMRA should be dropped.

WTS had acknowledged the problem wastes of sodium and graphite in its work in response to requests from WATEC.

It was noted that there were intentions in the Agency's WSS to revise the classification of radioactive waste, and in particular to introduce a new category of very low level waste. This is very much a WSS initiative with WTS being excluded. WATEC saw great potential for confusion and urge the agency to ensure WTS involvement.

The rising importance of NORM and TENORM was noted at the Tokyo conference, emphasizing the need for WTS to begin to engage in this problem.

The first major topical session was on Knowledge Management (KM) and was initiated by the delegate from Japan with a presentation on the specific needs of KM in geological disposal of waste. This presentation set the scene for presentations from both WTS and Nuclear Knowledge Management (NKM) Section on KM, by admirably illustrating the differences between Knowledge and Data Management.

The WTS presentation was very much about data management, which is generally short term and thus more time and resource consuming than KM. WATEC did acknowledge the WTS contribution to practical KM with their involvement in the Network of Centers of Excellence of Underground Labs. WATEC also acknowledged the capability building that WTS does *via* the Technical Committees (TCs), the meetings, training and other activities like spent source conditioning, *etc.*

The presentation from Nuclear Knowledge Management Section (NKMS) showed clearly the difference between data management and the practically useful and focused knowledge that must be saved for future activities, such as D&D, retrieval of waste that has been stored for prolonged periods *etc.*

The detailed assessment of the topical meeting was as follows:

Such documents as IAEA Safety Fundamentals No.111-F Principle 5, IAEA Safety Requirements WS-R-1, Recommendation of Tokyo Conference (2005), the Joint Convention Article 17, WATEC Chairman's Report (2004, 2005) pointed out information archives to ensure inter-generational information transfer of repositories. Especially, Tokyo Conference recommended IAEA to be the Archive backup of national institutions.

WATEC confirms that intergenerational information preservation, (at least a few hundred years still in the case of shallow land repositories) as well as intra-generational KM, will be required, recognizing the particular needs on repository development. A post closure safety case, on repository programme, prepared by implementers will be expected as typical information and knowledge packages.

It will, however, be necessary to continue to discuss the detailed methods of KM.

WATEC see this as a vitally important area for WTS as they represent the best source of input data and have the ability to assist NKMS in defining future needs. In addition, it is operatives in the MSs whose natural affinity is to WTS who will ultimately need these data.

The WATEC supports the setup of a Task Force to establish IAEA intergenerational archive framework to preserve knowledge and information on repositories.

The WATEC also recommends instead of information pooling & sharing (WMRA), to establish a knowledge pooling and sharing system to collect and compile information, e.g., strategies, methodologies, technologies and to transform information into knowledge.

WATEC also welcomed the proposed WTS initiative to harmonize data requests from the various agencies, however WATEC recognized the difficulties and potential cost associated with the WTS achieving proposal and suggested a costed and resource loaded proposal be prepared for review.

To move this activity forward, WATEC endorsed the upcoming Conference on KM and the proposed workshop to set the project in motion. Strong WTS involvement is recommended at both.

The next topical session was on decommissioning. There was a concern expressed by WATEC about the challenge presented by the volume of VLLW and LLW produced by decommissioning. This session was prefaced by a presentation by Spain.

WTS then presented their work on 'Dispositioning Large Volumes of Decommissioning Waste'. One particular concern of WATEC had been the ability of MSs to implement the standard that the Agency had developed for Clearance, with the concern focusing on the ability of the technology, extant, to measure the defined isotopic levels. Work by the Section indicated that it was possible to measure the levels concerned, although WATEC doubted that the measurement would be economical. Furthermore, the Section reported that cost could be reduced by extensive use of statistical sampling methodologies, but where MSs were involved in Clearance of material they were not using the standard but were either ignoring it or working around it. Furthermore in MSs where cognizance was being paid to the Standard it was an impediment to Clearance rather than an aid. WATEC strongly held the view that this was not a practically useful standard and might have been improved by early involvement of WTS.

From this session, two main points emerged. The first was that despite excellent working relations between the Scientific Secretaries, there was no formal way for comments of WTS to find their way into the planning and execution of Safety Standards documents. WASSC work to a more formal and product (document) driven format. So WATEC suggest that WTS or WATEC members be required to comment on plans and papers and

that these comments be subject to a formal comment resolution process. The second point was that WATEC doubted that a prescriptive standard was useful at these low levels and that the Agency might consider withdrawing the Standard and replacing it with guidelines that reflect the current practices of viewing clearance on a case by case basis.

Other observations were that the work undertaken by WTS indicated that the need to develop technology was of low priority. The key issues are currently implementation of decommissioning against other challenges like funding, storage or disposal capacity *etc.* Given that cost is clearly an issue and there are opportunities to save significant sums of money, as evidenced by the demonstration of the assessment tool (which gives a dollar value to release and recategorization strategies that are intuitively obvious for planning purposes), WATEC did question if there were not still opportunities for technology development. The maturity of the activity was further illustrated by the various successful TCs. At this stage the most useful WTS function was to gather lessons learned. Many of the VLLW and LLW concerns had been addressed by the move to Brown Field philosophies for end-points with the resultant in-situ disposal activities.

The next Topical session was that of LLW. This was initiated with a presentation of the Improvement of Safety Assessment Methodologies (ISAM) and Application of Safety Assessment Methodologies (ASAM) studies. The thrust of these studies is to have a transparent methodology for reassessment of historic disposal sites. This activity is coordinated with WTS who are working on remediation technologies. WATEC is aware of the requirements of the Joint Convention with respect to records *etc* and is aware of the common practice of periodically revisiting assessments. WATEC is concerned however that the balance of the programme is giving the impression that disposal of LLW is a contentious issue, which sends a poor public relations message. In fact, LLW disposal is a well understood, mature and successful activity, and WATEC felt that perhaps WTS should focus on advice to MSs on ways of sustaining historical practice rather than remediation. WATEC accepts that there are several remediation projects underway, but these are driven by specific observations and unplanned events, rather than reassessment.

For the upcoming activities, WATEC did agree to solicit experts from these states to participate in the various events and provide expertise for review activities.

The next topical session related to spent sealed sources. The session was started with a presentation on security. This area, whilst not one that is visible to any great degree to WATEC, has some importance in waste management, particularly sealed sources, that might be a threat in the hands of malicious individuals. The basic philosophy was informative and WATEC was pleased to hear that the security section was fully engaged in the sealed source project. One concern was that a procedure was being prepared on the security of waste. This will undoubtedly have an impact on the design and operation on some if not all waste storage facilities. To date, WTS had not been consulted in the preparation of this document. WATEC urges the Agency to ensure that WTS are engaged in all activities to do with waste at an early stage and should rely on WTS to judge its potential for contribution rather than to assume no interest.

It goes without saying that WATEC was fully supportive of the work to bring the sealed sources under control and ultimately dispose of them. This is seen as a project of supreme importance and one that demands to be given the fullest support of the Agency. WATEC members asked the Chairman to convey these sentiments to SAGNE. The Committee was disappointed that despite its efforts, the support of Standing Advisory Group on Nuclear Energy (SAGNE) and the not inconsiderable efforts of the Deputy Directory General (DDG), this project was still not rated as a Priority 1 project. Although no detriment of funding was reported by the team, WATEC feels that this project is worthy of recognition as are its staff. WATEC noted that a key member of this team had only recently had his continued funding secured.

WATEC requested that the Agency assist the project in a variety of ways, including:

- Adopting a sealed source standard appropriate to disposition rather than prolonged industrial use to assist handling sources for repatriation,
- Pressure on MSs to accept return of historic sources.

- Enlist the aid of the World Maritime Organization to facilitate movement of sources.
- Train additional teams to retrieve conditioned sources.

In addition, some of the spin-offs from this activity are bearing fruit elsewhere, for example, the source database, which is part of the International Catalogue of Sealed Radioactive Sources and Devices, is now in wide use with security, scrap metal and customs officials. This work is currently extra programme funded and could be cut at any moment. A similar situation exists with the source management software platform. The Agency is invited to regularize this funding.

The borehole project is progressing but there are some ill informed views that the disposal methodology and the use in small or developing states is somehow a second rate solution. Both WTS and WSS do not subscribe to this view and must counter it, but in the interim, potential deployment in the United States, where the licensing system is seen as a model process is being explored. Again WATEC fully support moving forward with this disposal method as the sealed source problem will only be closed when sources are repatriated or disposed of in appropriate repositories.

A joint session was held with WASSC. WATEC is delighted that these meetings are now held regularly and are a measure of how the relationship has improved between WTS and WSS. This is in no small measure due to the diligent efforts of the Scientific Secretaries.

This relationship has advanced to the extent that in addition to giving a view of the major issues and trends we felt confident enough to raise over concerns about the Clearance and Exemption issues, see above, the balance in LLW disposal site remediation, and concerns about reclassification of waste. Whilst WSS were unable to offer any immediate response they were at least sympathetic.

In looking at the WSS forward programme there were a number of activities that stretched the bounds of safety, e.g. management systems, but there were some specific

ones that will impact WTS, e.g. Safety Assessment Driving Waste Management Options. When pressed it was evident that links, though good, were informal. We put a proposition to WASSC to consider a formal Comment Resolution process to assist WTS to feel its' contribution is at least being considered.

WASSC challenged WTS to carry out some technical assessments, including a study of liquid effluent treatment, against new Safety Standards.

In the next session, the Nuclear Energy (NE) Publications structure was unveiled. WATEC was enthusiastic about this and fully supported the initiative. If applied universally, this process will not only improve the effectiveness of the document preparation but would also potentially shorten the time of production. WTS were urged to continue their cooperation with the Section Head and Secretariat – Nuclear Power Engineering Section (NPES).

It was also suggested that WTS might consider a similar structured approach to the decision making process to identify new documents.

WTS then presented their programme for 2008-2009. Some of the work had been initiated by WATEC in earlier meetings or reflected current concerns. Most of the work was discussed in the topical sessions so WATEC had no problem in broadly endorsing the programme. The links between activities and the aims were not always transparent and the options for achieving the objectives were not always clear. It was suggested that WTS might explore the road map approach used by the United States Department of Energy to try to give some clarity to a programme that might otherwise seem to a casual observer a little eclectic.

WATEC felt that the new approach was a success, particularly the consolidated country reports, the topical sessions, and the WASSC joint meeting. The presentation of the WTS programme was better than normal, although there is still some room for improvement. The Scientific Secretary and the Chairman were urged to build on this excellent

innovation. The main consequence of the improvement was the high quality discussion with WTS staff.

Appendix I

INTERNATIONAL RADIOACTIVE WASTE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE (WATEC)6th Meeting, 3-7 April 2006

VIC, IAEA Conference Room C07 VI

FINAL LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**BELGIUM**

Mr. Jean-Paul Boyazis
ONDRAF/NIRAS
Avenue des Arts 14
1210 Brussels
Belgium
Tel: +32 (2) 212 1052
Fax: +32 (2) 218 5165
E-mail: jp.boyazis@nirond.be

BRAZIL

Mr. Ayrton José Caubit da Silva
CNEN
Rua General Severiano No. 90
Botafogo, 22290-901
Rio de Janeiro
Brazil
Tel: +55 21 22756595 or 25462211
Fax: +55 21 25462316
E-mail: ayrton@cnen.gov.br

CANADA

Mr. W.C.F. Kupferschmidt
AECL Chalk River Laboratories
Chalk River, Ontario
Canada KOJ 1JO
Tel: 1 (613) 584 3311 Ext. 38894
Fax: 1 (613) 584 4434
E-mail: kupferschmidtw@aecl.ca

CHINA, People's Rep. of

Mr. Sun Qinghong
China Institute for Radiation Protection
P.O. Box 120, Taiyuan, Shanxi 030006
People's Republic of China
Tel: +86 351 220 3186
Fax: +86 351 7020407
Email: sunqhcirp@tom.com

CZECH REPUBLIC

Mr. Vojtech Priman
Fuel Cycle Department
CEZ plc, Duhova 2/1444
140 53 Praha 4, Czech Republic
Phone +420 271 132 290
Fax +420 271132043
E-mail: primav1.hsp@mail.cez.cz

FRANCE

Mr. Gérald Ouzounian
ANDRA
Parc de la Croix Blanche
1-7 rue Jean Monnet
92298 Châtenay-Malabry, Cedex, France
Tel: +33 1 46 11 8435
Fax: +33 1 49 11 8268
E-mail: gerald.ouzounian@andra.fr

INDIA

Mr. P.D. Ozarde
Nuclear Recycle Group, Waste Management Facilities
BARC
Mumbai 400 085, India
Tel : 91-22-25595503
Fax : 91-22-25505151/-25519613
E-mail: pdozarde@apsara.barc.ernet.in

INDONESIA

Mr. Asmedi Suropto
Radioactive Waste Technology Center
National Nuclear Energy Agency (BATAN)
PTLR-BATAN
Kawasan Puspiptek
Tangerang 15310, Indonesia
Tel: +62 21 7587 4262
Fax: +62 21 756 0927
E-mails: tas971@centrin.net.id; or asmedi_s@batan.go.id

JAPAN

Mr. Takao Tsuboya
Radioactive Waste Management Funding and Research
Center (RWMC)
No. 15 Mori Bldg., 2-8-10, Toranomon
Minato-ku, Tokyo 105-0001
Japan
Tel: +81.3.3504.1081
Fax: +81 3 3504 1297
Email: tsuboya@rwmc.or.jp

LITHUANIA

Mr. Stasys Motiejūnas
Radioactive Waste Management Agency (RATA)
Algirdo St. 31,
2006 Vilnius
Lithuania
Tel: +370 5 2104070
Fax: +370 5 2133141
Mob: +370 686 17297
E-mail: stasys_motiejunas@rata.lt

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Mr. Leonid Sukhanov
A.A. Bochvar All-Russia Research Institute of Inorganic
Materials (VNIINM)
PO Box 369
123060 Moscow
Tel: 007 095 196 64 51
Fax: 007 095 196 41 68
Email lpsoukh@bochvar.ru or nazar@bochvar.ru

SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. Ezekiel Maphisa
Solid Waste Management Services (Necsa)
P.O. Box 582
Pretoria 0001, South Africa
Tel: +27 12 305 3937
Fax: +27 12 305 3950
E-mail: shima@necsa.co.za

SPAIN

Mr. José Luis González Gómez
Department of International Relations
ENRESA
Emilio Vargas No. 7
E-28043 Madrid
Spain
Tel: +3491 5668257
Fax: +3491 5668165
E-mail: jgog@enresa.es

SWEDEN

Mr. Magnus Westerlind
Office of Nuclear Waste
Swedish Nuclear Power Inspectorate (SKI)
Klarabergsviadukten 90
106 58 Stockholm, Sweden
Tel: +46 (8) 698-8684
Fax: +46 (8) 661-9086
Email: magnus.westerlind@ski.se

UNITED KINGDOM

Chairman

Mr. Robert GG Holmes
BNG America
1920 East 17 Street, Suite 200
Idaho Falls, ID 83404
USA
Tel: 001 208 535 3808
Fax: 001 208 535 3801
E-mail: rholmes@bngamerica.com

USA

Mr. Douglas Tonkay
Office of Commercial Disposition Options, EM-12
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave.
Washington, D.C. 20585, USA
Tel: +1 301 903 7212
Fax: +1 301 903 1431
E-mail: douglas.tonkay@em.doe.gov

EC

Mr. Michel Raynal
European Commission
DG Research
CDMA 21/1/61
rue du Champ de Mars 21
B-1050 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: +32 2 296 61 78/296 04 63
Fax: +32 2 295 49 91
E-mail: michel.raynal@cec.eu.int

OECD/NEA

Mr. Claudio Pescatore
Radiation Protection and Waste Management Division
Le Seine-St Germain Building
12, boulevard des Îles
92130 Issy-les-Moulineaux, France
Tel: 33 1 4524 1048
Fax: 33 1 45241145
E-mail: pescatore@nea.fr

IAEA

Jan-Marie Potier
Scientific Secretary
Room A2668
Ext. 22662

Appendix II

INTERNATIONAL RADIOACTIVE WASTE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE (WATEC)6th Meeting, 3-7 April 2006

VIC, IAEA Conference Room C07 VI

FINAL AGENDA**Monday, 3 April 2006****Morning Session**

09:30 – 10:30	1. Introductory session <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcoming / Opening address • Chairman remarks • Introduction of participants • Adoption of the Agenda • Administrative remarks 	H. Forsström, DIR-NEFW B. Holmes (UK) WATEC Chair J-M Potier, SH-WTS Scientific Secretary
---------------	---	---

10:30 – 11:00 Coffee break

11:00 – 11:20	2. Follow up of WATEC 2005 recommendations and update on WTS ongoing activities	J-M Potier
---------------	---	------------

11:20 – 12:30	3. Issues and trends in RWM in WATEC Member Countries : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSs with major, advanced nuclear programmes (<i>Belgium, Canada, China, France, Japan, Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, UK, USA</i>) MSs with small- to medium-size nuclear programmes (<i>Brazil, Czech Republic, India, Lithuania, South Africa</i>) MSs with RW from nuclear applications (<i>Indonesia</i>) 	D. Tonkay (USA) S. Motiejūnas (Lithuania) A. Suripto (Indonesia)
---------------	---	--

12:30 – 14:00 Lunch break

Afternoon Session

14:00 – 15:30	3. Issues and Trends in WATEC Member Countries (cont'd) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • European Commission activities in the field of Radioactive Waste Management • Update on NEA RWM-related activities • Discussion 	M. Raynal, EC C. Pescatore, NEA
---------------	---	--

15:30 – 16:00 Coffee break

16:00 – 17:30	3. Issues and Trends in WATEC Member Countries (cont'd) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion (cont'd) • Drafting WATEC report on Issues and Trends in WATEC Member Countries 	
---------------	---	--

19:15 - **Social event**

Tuesday, 4 April 2006
Morning Session

09:00 – 10:30	4. Topical session on Knowledge Management (KM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge Management Issue on Geological Disposal for Long-lived Radioactive Waste • Knowledge Management / Approach of the Agency and Activities of the INIS&NKM Section • KM Activities in the WTS 	<p>T. Tsuboya (Japan)</p> <p>R. Workman, SH-NKMS and P. Gowin, NKMS</p> <p>J-M. Potier</p>
10:30 – 11:00	Coffee break		
11:00 – 11:45	4. Topical session on Knowledge Management (cont'd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion and WATEC guidance to WTS for future activities 	
11:45 – 12:30	4. Topical session on Knowledge Management (con't)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafting WATEC recommendations to IAEA 	

12:30 – 14:00 Lunch break

Afternoon Session

14:00 – 15:30	5. Topical session on Management of Decommissioning Waste and other special waste types:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management and disposal of decommissioning materials in Spain • Pre-disposal management of decommissioning waste • Dispositioning of large amounts of decom materials at lower activity levels : Strategies and methodologies • Disposal of decommissioning waste 	<p>J.L. González, (Spain)</p> <p>J. Kelly, WTS</p> <p>M. Laraia, WTS</p> <p>L. Nachmilner, WTS</p>
15:30 – 16:00	Coffee break		
16:00 – 16:45	5. Topical session on Management of Decommissioning Waste and other special waste types (con't)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion : WATEC guidance to WTS for future activities 	
16:45 – 17:30	5. Topical session on Management of Decommissioning Waste and other special waste types (con't)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafting WATEC recommendations to IAEA 	

Wednesday, 5 April 2006
Morning Session

- | | | |
|---------------|---|--|
| 09:00 – 10:30 | 6. Topical session on Management of Low-Level Radioactive Waste (LLRW) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reassessing the safety of existing disposal facilities for LLW : the ISAM / ASAM working group and activities • Implementing remedial actions to upgrade the safety of existing storage and disposal facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Upgrading storage facilities ▪ Upgrading disposal facilities | P. Metcalf, WSS

J. Kelly, WTS
L. Nachmilner, WTS |
|---------------|---|--|

10:30 – 11:00 Coffee break

- | | | |
|---------------|---|--|
| 11:00 – 11:45 | 6. Topical session on LLRW Management (contd.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion : WATEC guidance to WTS for future activities | |
|---------------|---|--|

- | | | |
|---------------|---|--|
| 11:45 – 12:30 | 6. Topical session on LLRW Management (contd.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafting WATEC recommendations to IAEA | |
|---------------|---|--|

12:30 – 14:00 Lunch break

Afternoon Session

- | | | |
|---------------|--|--|
| 14:00 – 15:30 | 7. Topical session on Management of Disused Sealed Radioactive Sources (DSRS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new IAEA Nuclear Security Plan 2006-2009 : activities relevant to the secure management of DSRS; • Overview of WTS on-going activities and future programme on DSRS | P. Colgan, NSNS

M. Al-Mughrabi, WTS |
|---------------|--|--|

15:30 – 16:00 Coffee break

- | | | |
|---------------|--|--|
| 16:00 – 16:45 | 7. Topical session on Management of DSRS (cont'd) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion : WATEC guidance to WTS for future activities | |
|---------------|--|--|

- | | | |
|---------------|--|--|
| 16:45 – 17:30 | 7. Topical session on Management of DSRS (cont'd) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafting WATEC recommendations to IAEA | |
|---------------|--|--|

Thursday, 6 April 2006**Morning Session (Joint Meeting with WATEC)****IAEA Conference Room C02 I**

09:00 – 10:30	8. WATEC / WASSC joint session <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WATEC's perspective on Current Issues and Trends in the RWM area. • Strategic Directions for the IAEA RWM Programme for 2008-2011. • Discussion 	R. Holmes, WATEC Chairman D. Louvat, SH-WSS
10:30 – 11:00	Coffee break	
11:00 – 11:45	9. Update on IAEA-NE activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle and Materials Section <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Presentation ○ Discussion 	T. Ganguly, SH-NFC&MS
11:45 - 12:30	9. Update on IAEA-NE activities (cont'd) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new Nuclear Energy Series Publications : Structure and the Process 	R. Clark, SH-NPES P. Vincze, NPES
12:30 – 14:00	Lunch break	

Afternoon Session

14:00 – 15:30	10. Session on Strategic Directions in RWM for P&B 2008-2009 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme L - P&B 2008-2009 - Strategic Directions in the RWM area • Strengthening WATEC / WTS Interaction : the "RAMP" Initiative • WTS Contribution to the IAEA TC Programme • Discussion : WATEC guidance on Strategic Directions for Programme L P&B 2008-2009 	J-M. Potier, SH-WTS J-M. Potier, SH-WTS J-M. Potier, SH-WTS
15:30 – 16:00	Coffee break	
16:00 – 16:45	10. Session on Strategic Directions in RWM for P&B 2008-2009 (cont'd) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion (cont'd) 	
16:45 – 17:30	10. Session on Strategic Directions in RWM for P&B 2008-2009 (cont'd) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafting WATEC recommendations to IAEA 	

Friday, 7 April 2006
Morning Session

09:00 – 12:00	11. Closing session	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discussion on WATEC's draft report• Recommendations for Topical Sessions for the WATEC 2007 meeting• Conclusions and summing-up• Closing	WATEC Chair+Members WATEC Chair+Members B. Holmes (UK) WATEC Chair H. Forsström, NEFW
14:00 – 14:30	WATEC Chairman's debriefing with DDG-NE	B. Holmes, Y. Sokolov, H. Forsström, J-M. Potier