



IRRS missions: French experience feedback and proposals for improvement

**Pierre-Franck Chevet
ASN Chairman**

**ENSREG Conference 2015
29-30 June 2015**

- **Experience feedback from the IRRS mission in France (17-28 November 2014).**
 - Preparatory phase.
 - Two-week mission.
- **Proposals for IRRS improvement.**

- **IRRS missions in France:**

- 2006: full scope mission
- 2009: follow-up mission
- **2014: full scope mission**

including all relevant installations and activities:

- Review of processes relating to:

- Radiation sources applications
- Research reactors
- Nuclear power plants
- Fuel cycle facilities
- Waste management facilities
- Decommissioning

- Interfaces with nuclear security

- Additional areas:

- Transport
- Control of medical exposures
- Occupational radiation protection
- Control of radioactive discharges and materials for clearance
- Environmental monitoring
- Control of chronic exposures and remediation

- Tailored module on Fukushima



IRRS mission in France

Preparatory phase: Budget

- **Significant increase in the estimation of IRRS team expenses less than 2 months before the mission.**
- **Last minute discussion between ASN and IAEA secretariat on how to deal with this increase.**



IRRS mission in France

Preparatory phase: Devoted resources

- **No doubt about importance of self-assessment**
- **Self-assessment workload:**
 - Around 3600 questions for a full scope mission.
 - Almost all ASN Headquarters departments involved (as well as some ASN regional offices).
 - Increase with regard to the workload for the preparation of the IRRS mission in 2006.
 - Impact on regular activities of the Regulatory Body.



IRRS mission in France

Preparatory phase: Tools for the preparation

- **Seminar with IAEA:**

- Very informative training.
- A fundamental milestone to engage the relevant staff in the self-assessment work.

- **SARIS:**

- Very detailed and fragmented questions (3600).
- Not helping to focus on most important issues.
- Heavy task.
- A potential for optimization.

IRRS mission in France

Preparatory phase: Tools for the preparation

- **Action plan:** main outcome of the preparatory phase together with the self-assessment synthesis
 - Essential step for future progress.
 - Regulatory Body commitment for improvement.
 - Management tool for implementation.

- **17-28 November 2014:**

- Smooth and positive mission
- Open and constructive discussion
- Reasonable number of conclusions (16 R, 27 S, 7 GP)
- Not strong enough connection between results of self-assessment and discussions / conclusions
- Final media communication too general compared to French journalists' expectations



IRRS mission in France

Two-week mission: Preliminary assessment

- **Usefulness** of recommendations and suggestions defined as:
 - Support of interactions between ASN and external institutions (Government, TSO...).
 - Actions that will be implemented to improve ASN regulatory practices.

IRRS mission in France

Two-week mission: Preliminary assessment

- **Percentage of useful recommendations and suggestions:**

90%

- **Percentage of recommendations and suggestions already included in the action plan resulting from ASN self-assessment:**

60%

- ➔ **Complementary outcomes** from the self-assessment process and the IRRS itself

Optimization of the self assessment:

- Optimization of the self-assessment questionnaires
- Strengthening of the graded approach in the self-assessment:
 - For each IRRS module, first focus on high level questions (Requirement level)
 - Then use detailed questions, if felt necessary

Recommendations versus action plan resulting from self-assessment:

- In case of a deviation from a requirement, if an appropriate action is already planned in the Regulatory Body action plan:
 - Should at least be explicitly mentioned
 - No recommendation?
 - Creation of a 4th category:
 - « Action plan commitment »?

Scope of recommendations:

- Reviewers should not look exclusively at formal aspects.
- Should assess whether objectives are met in practice and, if so, avoid related recommendations or suggestions.
- Important justification of:
 - Difference between peer review and inspection.
 - High level of reviewers.

Public communication:

- Provide media with substantial conclusions from the mission, if requested by host country.

Follow up mission organization:

- Commitment from the member state to host a follow up mission should be part of the request for an IRRS mission.

General architecture of different types of peer review missions:

- IRRS: reference overarching mission covering a broad scope
- Other peer reviews (EPREV, ARTEMIS...): In-depth peer review focusing on a specific topic in order to supplement the IRRS scope

Creation and implementation of a steering committee for the development and the future evolution of IRRS missions:

- Systematic collection of Member States' needs and proposals.
- Review of mission added-value and evaluation performed by the host country.
- Enhancement of transparency of decisions.
- Contribution to visibility of IRRS development and evolution.
- Contribution to credibility of IRRS.



www.asn.fr