



INTERNATIONAL SOURCE SUPPLIERS
AND PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION

WWW.ISSPA.COM

SAFE AND SECURE AT THE SOURCE



Paul A. Gray
CHAIRMAN

John J. Miller
SECRETARY

Bernd Hagelskamp
TREASURER

TRANSSC-28 Trip Report June 16 – 20, 2014

The following report summarizes the TRANSSC – 28 meeting.

Like TRANSSC 27, TRANSSC 28 was conducted in two parts, with plenary and working group sessions. This format will likely continue and works well and makes for a more efficient use of time. TRANSSC 28 was also the first meeting with the new TRANSSC Chair, Mr. Paul Hinrichsen for the South African competent authority.

The new work term for TRANSSC has been moved from 3 years to 4 years. This was to support the alignment of advisory material documents. One general item that we need to be aware of was an issue raised by the UK Competent Authority questioning the ability of a TRANSSC Observer, i.e. WNTI, ISSPA, WNA, etc. to submit proposed changes to SSR-6. There was a significant amount of discussion on this topic and the outcome was that Observers should submit a proposal to a Competent Authority and the Competent Authority would then submit the proposal, (if found agreeable) to TRANSSC for consideration. The question then becomes which Competent Authority should the observer submit a proposal to. WNTI was used as an example and since WNTI is based in London it was suggested then that the UK Competent Authority would be the appropriate avenue. As far as ISSPA goes, we are based in Vienna and I would not recommend submitting a proposal through the Austrian CA, I would suggest we submit proposals to a CA of an Executive Committee member. This is an item that should be discussed further during an EC meeting and then disseminated to the members.

The most important aspect of the meeting was the working group outputs. The working groups worked for 2 days and then provided reports during the last 2 days of TRANSSC. The following items from the working groups would be of interest to ISSPA members.

- IN TRANSSC 27 a proposal on Package Hierarchy was introduced. The idea was to include a new set of paragraphs into SSR-6 that describes the package hierarchy. For example a Type B package can be used as a Type A package, so a UN2915 shipment can be shipped in a Type B(U) package. The real nexuses of this proposal is for Empty Packages that utilize DU shielding and exceed 5 uSv/h on contact can be shipped as LSA-1 without covering the Type B(U) marking on the package. The working group assigned this proposal rejected it. It does not seem that there is sufficient support to resurrect this proposal.
- Issues regarding “Storage prior to shipment”. These issues are really intended for Dual Use Casks for spent fuel, some of which are being given CoCs with a 40 year life. This raises several issues, such as what actions need to be taken to ship a container that has been in storage for several years to ensure it is still compliant with the CoC and current transportation regulations,



INTERNATIONAL SOURCE SUPPLIERS
AND PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION

WWW.ISSPA.COM

SAFE AND SECURE AT THE SOURCE



and how does the design of the package address age management and a requirement in the SAR to address age management. The problem that this raises for ISSPA members is that TRANSSC does not want to develop a new package (i.e. defining a dual purpose cask in SSR-6) that these requirements can be specific for. Therefore ALL Type B and Type C packages would need to address Age Management in the SAR and ALL packages would need to consider storage prior to transport regardless of the length of time. I raised the concern regarding sources, specifically sources that are being imported or exported that require government to government consent. I stated that it is now not uncommon for a manufacturer to load a package and have it ready for shipment but then have to wait for a month or more before shipping while the government to government consent process is completed. Is this the “storage” that needs to be addressed? I was happy that several member state representatives agreed with the example I gave and that clarification would be needed in SSR-6 to ensure that onerous pre-shipment requirements and age management consideration for Type B packages does not cause problems for what I defined as an Operational activity and not a Storage activity. There is still a significant amount of work needed to incorporate age management requirements into SSR-6 to address the dual purpose casks. This issue will be watched closely and I will provide any proposed language to ISSPA members when it is issued. I do believe most Member State Competent Authorities will support efforts to revise SSR-6 to address storage prior to transport so that short term storage of packages is not affected by the revision.

- There were 2 separate proposals from France regarding the design of new Type B packages that are of interest to ISSPA members. One proposal was to increase the immersion test from 8 hours to 1 week, the other proposal was to remove the package density requirement from the crush test. I don’t believe either of these proposals will be accepted. However, we should be sure to comment on the 8 hour to 1 week proposal should it be pushed through. The crush test change would not likely effect source packages because it is limited to containers that weigh less than 500 kg, contains radioactive material not in special form and contains activity > 1000 times the A2 value. The only containers that I can think of that would be affected are containers for high activities of Mo-99, and of this I know of only one package that would be affected.

The final TRANNSC 28 reports and working group reports have not been issued and will be provided when these become available.

John Miller