



BNFL

C & E Code of Practice

Workshop

David Owen

Chairman - C & E W G

Thursday 12th June 2003

Day Summary (1)

- Summarise overall objective of document
- Identify major points in each chapter
- Give you opportunity to try proposals
- Opportunities for general discussion
- Describe way forward

This Session

- History – why (and how) are we here
- What the overall objectives of the CoP are
- The overarching considerations

History (1)

- 1992 - HASPEM Radioactive Clearance Monitoring
- 2000 - Events @ Dungeness, Bradwell, Sheffield
- C & E recognition of lack of consistency
- SDF instructed C & EWG and HPOLM to address

History (2)

- November 2001 – Workshop to identify issues
 - Spring 2002 – C&EWG engaged consultant
 - End 2002 – Consultation draft issued
 - January 2003 – Presentation to Safety Directors Forum
 - March 2003 – End of consultation
 - May 2003 – Further discussion at SDF
 - May 2003 – Issue of interim version
 - June 2003 – Second workshop
-

Overall Considerations (1)

- Covers release without further consideration
 - “Controlled Clearances” not “Free Release”
 - CoP should meet all relevant legislation
 - Organisations may treat as RA material anyway
 - Not working level procedures – needs
implementation
-

Overall Considerations (2)

- Can't identify every situation (but feedback route)
- Current understanding of a robust approach
- NOT political – CoP is a 'how' document
- Consider next year to be a trial
- Further development, both near and long term

Intent

- Clarifies our understanding of legislation
- Where legislation not clear, identifies good practice
- Contains a standard management framework
- Agreed guidance on principles, processes & practices
- SDF intention to implement within organisations

Scope (1)

- Clearance of material excluded or exempt by legislation
- Does not cover transfer between controlled areas
- Contains a number of clear principles

Scope (2)

- HASPEM 1992 covered RSA & IRR
- New CoP also covers e.g transport at current time
- Further considers existing practices
- Pulls no punches !

General Notes

- Clearly refers to the hierarchy of waste
- Related to this – recognition of ‘clean’ concept
- Intended to be robust against future changes

Communications

- Two stage process for the next year
- Whilst users 'trial' the document
- C & E W G and others will seek further comment
- We accept it may not be perfect
- So - what does it say.....