

**Otázky a odpovědi k Národní zprávě ČR  
(Questions and Answers to the National Report of the Czech Republic)**

**Polsko (Poland) – CG1**

<b>Q/C No.</b>	<b>JC Article No.</b>	<b>Sect./ page</b>	<b>Question/Comment</b>	<b>Answers</b>
Po-cz-1	32	35	What does it mean &#8220;MUM monitor&#8221	MUM monitor is a system for contamination measurement of material potentially suitable for clearance. The rest of the text has not been identified in the National Report submitted to the IAEA.
Po-cz-2	Introduction	10	What are the differences between SFSF and ISFSF?	The names of SF storage facilities at Dukovany site correspond to the terminology used during their development – ISFSF in early 1990's (interim storage facility) and SFSF about 10 years later, when terminology of currently valid Atomic act (storage facility) was used. Technical differences of both SF storage facilities are described in the National Report (see Article 4).

**USA – CG1**

<b>Q/C No.</b>	<b>JC Article No.</b>	<b>Sect./ page</b>	<b>Question/Comment</b>	<b>Answers</b>
Us-cz-1	20	48	The 2013 IRRS mission observed that the Czech authorities carefully evaluated the lessons learned from the Fukushima event and defined and planned steps to further improve nuclear safety and radiation protection in the country. What lessons learned have been implemented for waste and spent fuel storage facilities away from power plants?	As all AFR SF and RAW storage facilities at Fukushima site were either not affected by the tsunami (RAW storage facility and centralized wet SF storage pool) or survived it without any substantial impact on the man and environment (dry cask storage facility) there was no need to define steps for further improvement of similar facilities in the Czech Republic as a result of lessons learned from this accident. Additionally except reactor pools, which were the subject of post-Fukushima evaluations, there are no wet SF storage facilities and large RAW storage facilities. Last but not least the safety cases of SF storage facilities consider and assess the impact of beyond design basis accidents, such as extreme weather conditions, large aircraft crash, etc.

## Slovensko (Slovenia) – CG1

Q/C No.	JC Article No.	Sect./ page	Question/Comment	Answers
Slo-cz-1	32	19	What are the expected radiological impacts from operation of dry spent fuel storage facilities? What are the dose constraints for the public during operation of the dry storage facilities?	<p>There is no substantial radiological impact of the operation of dry cask storage facilities on the environment. In 2014 the gamma dose rate inside the SFSF Dukovany was less than 7,1 <math>\mu\text{Sv/h}</math> and neutron dose rate less than 26 <math>\mu\text{Sv/h}</math> (27 of 133 casks loaded). Outside the ISFSF and SFSF Dukovany facilities the gamma dose rate was less than 0,365 <math>\mu\text{Sv/h}</math> in the same time. Similar values were identified in SFSF Temelin - less than 10,44 <math>\mu\text{Sv/h}</math> for gamma dose rate and less than 35,47 <math>\mu\text{Sv/h}</math> for neutron dose rate (14 of 152 casks loaded) and max. 0,150 <math>\mu\text{Sv/h}</math> in the vicinity of this facility.</p> <p>These values verify the results of safety assessments performed for all SF storage facilities. E. g. for fully loaded SFSF Dukovany the inside gamma dose rate should be max. 543 <math>\mu\text{Sv/h}</math> and 285 <math>\mu\text{Sv/h}</math> for neutron dose rate, collective dose rate for operating staff 152 mSv/y (in 2014 1,626 mSv/y) and max. individual dose rate 3,47 mSv/y (in 2014 0,041 mSv/y). Expected dose rate to public is at the level of <math>10^{-13}</math> Sv/y.</p>

**Francie (France) – (CG2)**

Q/C No.	JC Article No.	Sect./ page	Question/Comment	Answers
Fr-cz-1	general		<p>Name of Section 11 should be “General efforts to improve safety”, according to decision taken in May 2014 in Vienna and should be more documented, according to INFCIRC/604/Rev.3 Draft 3. This section should be less succinct in order to fully comply with these requirements. In particular, actions should be specifically described with the schedule covering the short-term period, in particular for dismantling and remediation operations at UJV Rež, in connection with extension of capacity of Richard and refurbishment of technology units to process institutional radioactive waste. In addition, plans for preparation of the new Atomic Act and steps for implementation of recommendations and suggestions coming from the IRRS mission organized in 2013 should also be indicated.</p>	<p>The report follows the structure recommended by INFCIRC/604/Rev.3. Only the title of chapter 11 (Planned Activities to Improve Safety) deviates from the recommended title (General Efforts to Improve Safety), as the final version of the document was published too late (December 2014) to be considered in this version of National Report. However the text corresponds to the expected content of this chapter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rehabilitation of environmental liabilities at ÚJV Řež, a. s. was launched in 2003 and some details of this project have already been published in previous versions of National Report (e.g. chapter 11.3 of National Report, ver. 2.3). The whole project has several stages and phases. Till the end of 2014 first stage and first phase of the project, consisting of 15 tasks, has been finished. The tasks covered e. g. dismantling and remediation of old sewage system, dismantling of storage tanks in build. 211/3, management of LLW from build. 211/6 (also a part of second phase of first stage), management of dismantled, contaminated technology from build. 241, dismantling of semi-hot cell Golem in build. 250, management of dismantled technology in build. 250 (also a part of second phase of first stage), etc. Second stage of the project has already been finished (transport of SF from RRs to RF for reprocessing – see also chapter 9 of National Report, ver. 3.3) and the third one – decommissioning of LVR-15 research reactor will start after the decision to shut down this facility will be made. As a result of this project the amount of institutional RAW has increased. E. g. in 2013 as a result of ÚJV Řež, a. s. operational activities 52,4 m<sup>3</sup> of solid RAW were generated. Additionally from rehabilitation of environmental liabilities 77,8 m<sup>3</sup> of solid RAW has to be added to the annual RAW generation rate for this year. To dispose the increased amount of institutional RAW the licensee of Richard disposal facility (SÚRAO) will prepare a feasibility study to assess and select options for reconstruction of this facility. The project is in an early stage of development.</li> <li>- The whole regulatory framework undergoes substantial development since 2010. New Atomic Act and related decrees are under development based on recent IAEA Safety Standards, recommendation of WENRA association and related Council directives. This process covers also legal framework of RAW and</li> </ul>

				<p>SF management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The final report of the IRRS mission can be found at SUJB web site (<a href="http://www.sujb.cz/en/news/detail/clanek/report-of-the-irrs-mission-to-the-czech-republic-released">http://www.sujb.cz/en/news/detail/clanek/report-of-the-irrs-mission-to-the-czech-republic-released</a>). The process of the implementation of the recommendations is still going on. Most of the recommendations and suggestions have been considered by the preparation of new legal framework. The results of the implementation process will be a subject of IRRS follow-up mission in 2016.</li> </ul>
Fr-cz-2	20	p.9/Sec.5.3.6:p.48/Sec.6.5:65-71	<p>Emergency preparedness is described in the report without references to lessons learned from Fukushima accident. But, in Section 5.3.6, it is explained that the IRRS mission conducted in 2013 observed that the Czech authorities carefully evaluated the lessons learned from the accident and defined steps to further improve nuclear safety and radiation protection. Could the report explicitly display these steps and indicate whether there are currently studies aimed at remediating post-accidental situations (in particular for management of large amount of waste including waste characterization and segregation, volume reduction and dedicated waste management facilities)?</p>	<p>Lesson learned from the Fukushima accident were reflected in the provisions of the new Atomic Act and the forthcoming implementing regulations.</p> <p>The post Fukushima National Action Plan (NACp) on Strengthening Nuclear Safety of Nuclear Facilities in the Czech Republic was compiled. There is a whole range of measures to improve emergency preparedness, e.g. 57, 59 and 66 and more (see <a href="http://www.sujb.cz/fileadmin/sujb/docs/jaderna-bezpecnost/Czech_National_Action_Plan_rev2.pdf">http://www.sujb.cz/fileadmin/sujb/docs/jaderna-bezpecnost/Czech_National_Action_Plan_rev2.pdf</a>).</p> <p>As all AFR SF and RAW storage facilities at Fukushima site were either not affected by the tsunami (RAW storage facility and centralized wet SF storage pool) or survived it without any substantial impact on the man and environment (dry cask storage facility) there was no need to define steps for further improvement of similar facilities in the Czech Republic as a result of lessons learned from this accident. Additionally except reactor pools, which were the subject of post-Fukushima evaluations and NACp, there are no wet SF storage facilities and large RAW storage facilities. Last but not least the safety cases of SF and RAW management installations consider and assess the impact of beyond design basis accidents, such as extreme weather conditions, large aircraft crash, etc.</p> <p>The remediation of post-accidental situations is addressed in the update of national RAW and SF management policy and strategy. In the case of emergencies, when radioactive substances will reach the environment, the management of this material will be in line with emergency plans of affected nuclear installation. Available RAW management technologies can deal with predictable amount of RAW from emergencies. RAW will be then managed to comply with WAC of existing disposal facilities (e.g. till the end of 2013 the disposal facility Dukovany was loaded up to 17%). If this will be not possible, RAW will be stored at the site of affected nuclear installation and then disposed in developed DGR.</p> <p>In specific cases it can be decided to develop dump sites for contaminated material.</p>

				As there is no idea about the physical and chemical properties of RAW from emergencies (amount, activity, physical and chemical form, ...) it is not expected to develop any specific installations or facilities for the management of these potential (and unlikely) waste streams.
Fr-cz-3	14	p8/S8.4:p106/S8.5.3:p117/S11.4:p134	Safe disposal of waste is performed in near-surface disposal facilities operated by SURAO. Waste has been disposed of for a long time in RAW disposal facilities Richard (1964) and Bratrstvi (1974). Waste Acceptance criteria have been proposed after safety analysis performed in 2000-2008. Do these criteria, applicable to waste currently disposed of, take into account an uncertainty margin on the waste characteristics disposed of before these dates? Is the Bratrstvi site seen as safe enough for disposal considering the high humidity in the underground premises and the flowrate of mine water nearby the disposal chambers?	Volume and activity including radionuclides composition of RAW disposed till 2000 have been assessed using all available sources, i.e. RAW characteristics provided by waste producers and/or repository operator. Two independent methods of inventory calculation were used to assess real inventory. Safety analyses performed in the period 2000 – 2014 used conservative values for this historical inventory. Disposal facility Bratrstvi is planned to be closed in near future. The activity of natural radionuclides disposed of in the repository does not exceed the activity of uranium ore that was mined out from the repository site. But in fact, unfavourable hydrological conditions of the site head to the decision of its closure. Considering ALARA principle, waste will be safely stabilized in the site. Mine water flow is regarded as one of potential pathways after closure. Despite of this fact, regarding inventory and dilution, effective doses are well below authorized regulatory limits.
Fr-cz-4	32	p8/S.4.2:p24-28/S.6.3:p.54-60	New immobilization technologies are now used in Dukovany and Temelin. Nevertheless, a part of the solid waste is sent abroad for treatment and conditioning (incineration, high-pressure compaction) according to information provided in Section 9 on Transboundary movement and in Section 11. What are the criteria applied when sorting out the solid waste to decide about the type of treatment that will be carried out? Is there any additional conditioning in Dukovany and Temelin of the waste sent back from foreign countries? What are the quality control and QA procedures for waste treated and conditioned abroad? Is there any supervision by SUJB	To minimise the amount of disposed RAW some categories of RAW suitable for treatment by technologies not available at NPPs are send abroad (for incineration and high pressure compaction). Treated RAW is then disposed, without the need for its further conditioning (ash, compressed solid RAW) SUJB requires, that each contractor performing treatment and conditioning of RAW has implemented his own QA and QC system for all activities which are a subject of this contract. SUJB staff is usually present at the first treatment and conditioning campaign in contractor's facility.
Fr-cz-5	32	p.8 / Section 2.1: p.13	The report mentions low and intermediate level waste disposed of in near-surface disposal waste to be ultimately disposed of in the DGR and also waste to be cleared, sometimes after decay. What about very low level waste, too active to be cleared but not enough to justify its disposal in the existing near –surface disposal facilities ? Is there any specific regulatory category for this type of waste?	The first part of the comment does not make any sense. There is no need to use the VLLW class of RAW in practice in the Czech Republic at this moment. This class will be introduced into the new legal framework, but it is not practical to segregate VLLW from LLW and ILW. Almost all these RAW classes can be disposed in existing disposal facilities. The class of VLLW is assumed to be used mainly during the decommissioning of currently operated NPPs and other nuclear facilities.

## Bělorusko (Belarus) – CG2

Q/C No.	JC Article No.	Sect./ page	Question/Comment	Answers
Be-cz-1	16	H	We would like to clarify about radiation safety requirements for management of liquid RW of medical origin which are applied in the Czech Republic? Under which circumstances the construction of a special sewage and septic tanks for liquid RW is required, under which conditions discharge of liquid RW of medical origin into the drainage system is possible?	<p>Liquid RAW, which are discharged from medical workplaces where only diagnostic procedures are made, contain radionuclides with low activity and short half-life (usually Tc-99m and F-18). Therefore they can be discharged in accordance with defined clearance levels.</p> <p>According to the Czech legislation (Decree No. 307/2002 Coll. ., on Radiation Protection) materials, substances and objects containing radionuclides or having been contaminated by radionuclides can be discharged into the environment without approval issued by State Office under terms that clearance levels are not exceeded.</p> <p>Inspectors of State Office check the compliance with these criteria during their inspections.</p> <p>Generally at category II and III workplaces with unsealed sources, unless otherwise stipulated in the licence, (e.g. therapeutic procedures with I-131) the separate sewer connected to an independent catch tanks must be installed .There are no specific general requirements for tanks for storage of liquid RAW (number, volume, construction material etc.). It depends on conditions on the workplace, amount of activities, discharges, and size of usage.</p>
Be-cz-2	32	2.1/13	We would like to know what criteria for classifying liquid and gaseous wastes as RW <del>which</del> are used in the Czech Republic?	<p>RAW is in general categorised as gaseous, liquid and solid. Solid radioactive waste is classified, according to Decree No. 307/2002 Coll., on Radiation Protection, into three basic categories, namely temporary, low-level and intermediate level waste and high-level waste.</p> <p>More precise categorisation of gaseous and liquid RAW is performed by the licensee according to the expected RAW processing methods. E. g. at NPPs liquid RAW is categorized into four categories – concentrate, used ion exchange resins, sludge and organic liquid waste. Gaseous RAW are not separately categorized as they are treated by filtration and then managed and categorized as solid RAW.</p>
Be-cz-3	32	2.1/13	Are there any plans for its revision and introduction of the category of very low activity waste (VLLW)? If such plans exist, where and how such waste will be disposed of?	<p>No, there is no need to use the VLLW class of RAW in practice in the Czech Republic at this moment. This class will be introduced into the new legal framework, but it is not practical to segregate VLLW from LLW and ILW. Almost all these RAW classes can be disposed in existing disposal facilities.</p> <p>The class of VLLW is assumed to be used mainly during the decommissioning of currently operated NPPs and other nuclear facilities.</p>

## Řecko (Greece) – CG2

Q/C No.	JC Article No.	Sect./ page	Question/Comment	Answers
Gr-cz-1	General	9	Could you please elaborate on the reason for the “increased demands” for ( <i>disposal of</i> ) RAW of institutional origin?	As a result of ongoing rehabilitation of environmental liabilities in ÚJV Řež, a. s. the amount of institutional RAW has increased. E. g. in 2013 as a result of operational activities 52,4 m <sup>3</sup> of solid RAW were generated. Additionally from rehabilitation of environmental liabilities 77,8 m <sup>3</sup> of solid RAW has to be added to the RAW generation rate for this year.
Gr-cz-2	10	10/132	In your report it is noted that “To store disused sealed sources, which fail to meet acceptance criteria for disposal in the Richard disposal facility, ...”. Could you please provide a few examples of such sources, their origin and their particular characteristics that are inconsistent with the acceptance criteria of the Richard disposal facility?	Disused sealed sources, which do not comply with waste acceptance criteria for Richard disposal facility, have to be safely stored and once available disposed in geologic disposal facility. E.g. Cs-137 sealed sources which activity exceeds the disposal limit of 1.10 <sup>11</sup> Bq for conditioned RAW (package No. 0007/382/U/2014 – 4,3909.10 <sup>11</sup> Bq, No. 0007/380/U/2014 – 2,7942.10 <sup>11</sup> Bq, ...), PuBe source exceeding the disposal limit of 1.10 <sup>8</sup> Bq for conditioned RAW (package No. 0007/444/U/2013 – 2,031.10 <sup>12</sup> Bq), etc.
Gr-cz-3	General	8.7.1/124	In your report it is noted that “Institutional control is anticipated for a period of 300 years after the operation is terminated” for disposal facility Richard. Could you please outline what the institutional control consist of?	Details of the institutional control will be defined in the decommissioning/closure safety case of the disposal facility. According to the recent operational safety case the institutional control period will be shortened to 100 yrs. It will consist of active and passive part. During the active part, planned for some lower tens of years, environmental monitoring will take place and security control of the site will be maintained in the same extent as during the operational period. In the passive part, monitoring will be finished, security control activities will be minimized, but records will be kept and restriction of the site use will be implemented.
Gr-cz-4		6.2.3/53	Could you please specify the estimated total cost of decommissioning of the LVR-15? Does this cost cover also the cost for the up-to-end management of the radioactive waste predicted to arise from the decommissioning? What is the method used for estimating the cost for the decommissioning of the research reactor?	The latest estimated cost of decommissioning of the LVR-15 research reactor (2010) is 144 805 600 Kč (1 Euro = 27 Kč). This sum covers also the management of resulting RAW. Additionally the cost for the decommissioning of the research reactor also covers the cost of the labour, technologies and energy needed and the cost for clearance of material from research reactor dismantling.



## Jihoafriická republika (South Africa) – CG2

Q/C No.	JC Article No.	Sect./ page	Question/Comment	Answers
Za-cz-1	32	4/25	<p>Low pressure compacting is used as compared to the previous rented high pressure compacting. Is there a reason why the high pressure compacting is not in use and why the low pressure one is used for the treatment of solid waste? (Is the change due to cost, safety, engineering (equipment challenges)</p>	<p>Production of solid RAW suitable for high pressure compaction at NPPs is so low, that it represents about one week capacity of a stable high pressure compactor operation.</p> <p>High pressure compaction campaign performed with use of mobile equipment in 2006 failed to meet the expectations of NPPs operator. The approach to high pressure compaction has been re-evaluated later on. In 2010 a contract with Slovak supplier (JAVYS) was signed. High pressure compaction is performed in its facility. Annually it is processed from 10 to 15 tons of solid RAW. For further details see chapter 9 of the National Report.</p>
Za-cz-2	32	4/24	<p>Section 4.2.1.1.1.1 refers to the facilities for the management of solid RAW, the steps of managing temporary classification is not addressed.</p> <p>Bullet 2 of the same referenced paragraph refers to hand held devices that are used for measurements, what is the purpose of these devices?</p>	<p>Solid waste is from its inception to final processing or its release into the environment several times measured and sorted. Initial measurement is performed using handheld device directly at the area of origin, respectively in collection areas. Part of waste sorted out for release into the environment passes semiautomatic measuring gauge. Then sorted waste is then transported to a special building, where spectrometric measurement of the activity / mass activity is performed.</p> <p>Only on the basis of this activity measurement results it is decided on clearance of waste and release into the environment, respectively on his return back to controlled area, where waste is managed as RAW.</p>

## Irsko(Ireland) – CG2

Q/C No.	JC Article No.	Sect./ page	Question/Comment	Answers
Ir-cz-1	4	90-91	It is noted that the Czech Republic anticipates the development of a national Deep Geological Repository (DGR) after 2050 with an anticipated operational date of 2065. It is also noted that SURAO is encountering resistance from municipalities involved in the site selection process which is leading to delays in the project. It would be appreciated if the Czech Republic would provide additional information in relation to their long term plans for disposal of SF in the event that the DGR project is not developed.	The DGR is a part of the national RAW and SF management policy and strategy. According to current knowledge this facility has to be available in due time and there is no other option how to cope with the requirement of ultimate responsibility of each Contracting Party for management of RAW and SF. Other options, such as disposal in third countries, seem to be not realistic.
Ir-cz-2	21	74	It is noted that the Czech Republic in 2010 established a multi-organisational Working Group to strengthen the transparency of the process to select a suitable location for the Deep Geological Repository (DGR) and to respect the interests of the general public and that steps were to be taken in 2014 to institutionalise this Working Group. It would be appreciated if the Czech Republic would provide additional information on this process of institutionalisation and if any public disquiet has surfaced on foot of this development.	The Working Group for Dialogue on the Deep Geological Repository was established in 2010, supported by the Ministries of Industry and Trade and of the Environment. The Working Group has 33 members – representatives of the various communities concerned, environmental organisations, the state, Parliament, academic institutions etc. It is concerned both with ways in which to improve the transparency of the decisionmaking process regarding deep geologic repository siting whilst fully respecting the interests of the general public and with strengthening the active involvement of the public and, specifically, the communities involved in the process. The group's activities are based, in terms of methodology, on the results and experience gained from the EC ARGONA project conducted as part of the 6th Framework Program for Research and Training. The 7th Framework Program of the European Commission, known as IPPA, is concerned with the activities of the Dialogue working group in 2013. The main priority of the Working Group for Dialogue is to strengthen the role of the communities concerned through legislative means in connection with which the group prepared a proposal for draft legislation relating to the involvement of such communities in the decisionmaking process regarding deep repository siting. SURAO has a representative in the Working Group for Dialogue and takes an active part in the activities of the secretariat and the preparation of documentation on issues to be discussed at the group's meetings. At present time the Working group is transformed and becomes a part of the Governmental Council for Energy and Raw Materials Strategy (Board). This process will be finished early 2015 and then the Working group will submit its priorities and working plan to the Board.
Ir-cz-3	18	48	It is noted that the IRRS Mission to the Czech Republic in 2013 identified areas where the overall performance of the Czech	The final report of the IRRS mission can be found at SUJB web site ( <a href="http://www.sujb.cz/en/news/detail/clanek/report-of-the-irrs-mission-">http://www.sujb.cz/en/news/detail/clanek/report-of-the-irrs-mission-</a>

			Regulatory System might be further strengthened. It would be appreciated if the Czech Republic would provide an update on how the implementation of the recommendations is progressing.	<a href="#">to-the-czech-republic-released</a> ). The process of the implementation of the recommendations is still going on. Most of the recommendations and suggestions have been considered by the preparation of new legal framework. The results of the process will be a subject of IRRS follow-up mission in 2016.
Ir-cz-4	32	16	It is noted in the National Report that a review of national policy was completed in 2013 and that SURAO submitted a report to the Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Czech Republic for review. It would be appreciated if the Czech Republic would provide an update on the present status of this policy review.	The national RAW and SF management policy and strategy has been updated in 2010-2014, submitted to Ministry of Industry and Trade in the end of 2014 and then the Government has approved its draft on 15 December 2014 by resolution No. 1061. The updated document considers the structure of national programmes as defined in Art. 12 of Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom . Before the final approval of the national policy and strategy by the Government the document has to be reviewed within the scope of SEA process. Ministry of Environment will initiate this process, which is expected to be finished in first half of 2016.

## Rakousko (Austria) – CG2

Q/C No.	JC Article No.	Sect./ page	Question/Comment	Answers
At-cz-1		5.36/48	<p>According to the National Report of the Czech Republic, the IRRS mission recommended “the Czech Republic’s government should introduce a national safety policy and strategy to ensure that the safety standards are present directly in a top-level document.”</p> <p>What is current status of introducing the national safety policy and strategy for nuclear and radioactive waste management into top level regulation and standards?</p>	<p>The whole regulatory framework undergoes substantial development since 2010. New Atomic Act and related decrees are under development based on recent IAEA Safety Standards, recommendation of WENRA association, related Council directives and outcomes of IRRS mission in 2013. This process covers also legal framework of RAW and SF management.</p>
At-cz-2	General		<p>The National Report provides an overview about planned activities for the time period 2013-2016 to improve safety of spent fuel and radioactive waste management, also indicating the “updating of the national Policy, which will particularly take into account increased demands on the disposal of RAW of institutional origin and generation of spent fuel and radioactive waste from the planned new builds,”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Could you specify the status of the updating of the national programme?</li> <li>- Could you confirm that the updating of the national programme will meet the requirements of Art. 12 “Contents of national programmes” of Council Directive establishing the Community framework for the responsible and safe management of spent fuel and radioactive waste (Directive 2011/70/Euratom)</li> <li>- Could you indicate, when the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the national programme in the meaning of the Directive 2011/70/Euratom will take place?</li> </ul>	<p>The national RAW and SF management policy and strategy has been updated in 2010-2014, submitted to Ministry of Industry and Trade in the end of 2014 and then the Government has approved its draft on 15 December 2014 by resolution No. 1061 . The updated document considers the structure of national programmes as defined in Art. 12 of Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom . Before the final approval of the national policy and strategy by the Government the document has to be reviewed within the scope of SEA process. Ministry of Environment will initiate this process, which is expected to be finished in first half of 2016.</p>

## Mad'arsko (Hungary) – CG6

Q/C No.	JC Article No.	Sect./ page	Question/Comment	Answers
Hu-cz-1	20.1	5.3.4/47	What is the reason that "science and research" financing disappeared from the budget for 2011-2013? (Or, is it just a typing error?)	No, it is not a typographical error. The explanation is provided in the text ("From 2011 the funding of R&D activities has been assigned to different agencies and to the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports").
Hu-cz-2	15.2	8.5.3.3/ 116	Operational safety report has been updated in 2012 considering... updated hydrogeological transport model" Question: Just the parameters were updated, or: was the physical model itself improved? In the latter case: What are the main features (advantages) of the new transport model?	Hydrogeological transport model is updated as a part of periodical safety review of the disposal facility. Not only the parameters, but the whole hydrogeological and transport model have been recalibrated using recent results of hydrogeological monitoring of the site. New transport model better identified and quantified the transport of radionuclides from the source term (RAW in disposal facility) into the biosphere. The observation points were verified with respect to relevant scenarios and wider radionuclides vector was included as well.
Hu-cz-3	13.1.3	7,7/90	SURAO still seeks to obtain positive response from municipalities' to start with geological survey." Question: Does it mean that there is not any voluntary candidate municipality up to now?	No, up till now there is no voluntary candidate municipality to host the DGR. The site selection process in the current phase is based on geological characterisation.
Hu-cz-4	6.1.3	6.7/74	"Steps to institutionalize the Working Group will be taken in the second half of 2014 - the Working Group will be transformed and it will work within the Government Council for Energy and Raw Materials Strategy of the Czech Republic." Question a: Has it been transformed? Question b: How many people are there in the Working Group?	The Working Group for Dialogue on the Deep Geological Repository was established in 2010, supported by the Ministries of Industry and Trade and of the Environment. The Working Group has 33 members – representatives of the various communities concerned, environmental organisations, the state, Parliament, academic institutions etc. It is concerned both with ways in which to improve the transparency of the decisionmaking process regarding deep geologic repository siting whilst fully respecting the interests of the general public and with strengthening the active involvement of the public and, specifically, the communities involved in the process. The group's activities are based, in terms of methodology, on the results and experience gained from the EC ARGONA project conducted as part of the 6th Framework Program for Research and Training. The 7th Framework Program of the European Commission, known as IPPA, is concerned with the activities of the Dialogue working group in 2013. The main priority of the Working Group for Dialogue is to strengthen the role of the communities concerned through legislative means in connection with which the group prepared a proposal for draft legislation relating to the involvement of such communities in the decisionmaking process

				<p>regarding deep repository siting. SURAO has a representative in the Working Group for Dialogue and takes an active part in the activities of the secretariat and the preparation of documentation on issues to be discussed at the group's meetings. At present time the Working group is transformed and becomes a part of the Governmental Council for Energy and Raw Materials Strategy (Board). This process will be finished early 2015 and then the Working group will submit its priorities and working plan to the Board.</p>
Hu-cz-5	4.2	2.2/16	<p>The final version of the updated Policy should be ready in 2014 at the latest and subsequently it will be submitted to the Government for approval."  Question:  What is the current situation?</p>	<p>The national RAW and SF management policy and strategy has been updated in 2010-2014, submitted to Ministry of Industry and Trade in the end of 2014 and then the Government has approved its draft on 15 December 2014 by resolution No. 1061. The updated document considers the structure of national programmes as defined in Art. 12 of Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom . Before the final approval of the national policy and strategy by the Government the document has to be reviewed within the scope of SEA process. Ministry of Environment will initiate this process, which is expected to be finished in first half of 2016.</p>

## Německá spolková republika (Germany) – CG6

Q/C No.	JC Article No.	Sect./ page	Question/Comment	Answers
Ge-cz-1	16	8.5.1/95	<p>Radioactive waste management</p> <p>The report states: “A part of solid RAW suitable to be released into the environment is after previous segregation and measurements officially measured to check the content of radionuclides. [...] The wastes which meet criteria specified in the Decree No. 307/2002 Coll. are released into the environment without any SÚJB permit, to the dump for solid municipal waste Petruvky.”</p> <p>Which authority is responsible for the control of compliance with the relevant criteria?</p>	<p>Contaminated material (waste) can be discharged into the environment without SÚJB permit only if SÚJB is informed about the kind of radionuclides, activities, location, date and method of the discharge into the environment as well as about an estimated exposure rate at least 60 day beforehand. SÚJB is also responsible for the control of compliance with the relevant criteria.</p>
Ge-cz-2	19	5.2.1./	<p>Legislation: Decree No. 208/2008 Coll.</p> <p>According to the report, “... the following additional decrees shall apply: ... Decree No. 208/2008 Coll., implementing the act on some measures associated with the ban of chemical weapons.”</p> <p>Please explain in more detail what is meant by “some measures associated with the ban of chemical weapons”.</p>	<p>This question is not related to the objectives of JC (see Article 1). This act is a part of legal framework defining the activities of SÚJB, which include also the execution of state administration and inspection of chemical weapons ban. For further details of this act see <a href="http://www.sujb.cz/en/legal-framework/decrees">http://www.sujb.cz/en/legal-framework/decrees</a>.</p>
Ge-cz-3	16	4.2.2(28)	<p>Storage capacity</p> <p>The report states: “If RAW cannot be disposed in RAW disposal facility due to their high specific activity of radionuclides they are stored in the storage area while final treatment and disposal will be addressed in the NPP decommissioning process.”</p> <p>How is it ensured that sufficient storage capacity will be available?</p>	<p>The primary strategy in the Czech republic is to dispose all RAW which meets acceptance criteria of existing disposal facilities. The amount of RAW which does not meet acceptance criteria is minimal. The amount of RAW produced, stored and disposed are assessed in annual reports prepared by each holder of license for RAW management.</p> <p>Every five years the operators of nuclear installations provide an update of initial decommissioning plans containing the assessment of RAW coming from dismantling activities.</p> <p>The national RAW and SF management policy and strategy (Policy) provides also estimations on future RAW generation rates. Based on these three types of documents it is possible to identify in time the needs for additional storage and disposal capacities. At present time and in the foreseeable future the RAW storage capacities can be considered as sufficient.</p>
Ge-cz-4	32	General	<p>Structure of the report</p> <p>The structure and layout of the fifth national report of the Czech Republic does not comply with the general recommendations for JC national reports but mainly with the Council Directive 2011/70/EURATOM.</p> <p>Frequent back-reference to former national reports is valid practice</p>	<p>From the comment it is not clear what is missing in the structure of the National report. The report follows the structure recommended by INFCIRC/604/Rev.3. Only the title of chapter 11 (Planned Activities to Improve Safety) deviates from the recommended title (General Efforts to Improve Safety), however the text corresponds to the expected content of this chapter. With respect of the Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom only one chapter (6.7) on transparency</p>

			but impedes readability considerably.	has been added to the structure of the document. According to INFCIRC/604/Rev.3 "In each section, the following information should be provided, as appropriate: ... (d) references to annexes or other material, as appropriate." Not to repeat some information from previous reports and to keep the extent of the National Report in reasonable scope it has been decided to refer to previous versions of National Reports, which are available at JC and SUJB web pages.
--	--	--	---------------------------------------	---