



An International Peer Review of the Safety Options Dossier of the Project for Disposal of Radioactive Waste in Deep Geological Formations (Cigéo)

**Final Report of the
IAEA International Review Team
November 2016**



IAEA

International Atomic Energy Agency

AN INTERNATIONAL PEER REVIEW
OF THE SAFETY OPTIONS DOSSIER
OF THE PROJECT FOR DISPOSAL
OF RADIOACTIVE WASTE IN DEEP
GEOLOGICAL FORMATIONS (CIGÉO)

The Agency's Statute was approved on 23 October 1956 by the Conference on the Statute of the IAEA held at United Nations Headquarters, New York; it entered into force on 29 July 1957. The Headquarters of the Agency are situated in Vienna. Its principal objective is "to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world".

AN INTERNATIONAL PEER REVIEW
OF THE SAFETY OPTIONS DOSSIER
OF THE PROJECT FOR DISPOSAL
OF RADIOACTIVE WASTE IN DEEP
GEOLOGICAL FORMATIONS (CIGÉO)

FINAL REPORT OF THE
IAEA INTERNATIONAL REVIEW TEAM
NOVEMBER 2016

COPYRIGHT NOTICE

All IAEA scientific and technical publications are protected by the terms of the Universal Copyright Convention as adopted in 1952 (Berne) and as revised in 1972 (Paris). The copyright has since been extended by the World Intellectual Property Organization (Geneva) to include electronic and virtual intellectual property. Permission to use whole or parts of texts contained in IAEA publications in printed or electronic form must be obtained and is usually subject to royalty agreements. Proposals for non-commercial reproductions and translations are welcomed and considered on a case-by-case basis. Enquiries should be addressed to the IAEA Publishing Section at:

Marketing and Sales Unit, Publishing Section
International Atomic Energy Agency
Vienna International Centre
PO Box 100
1400 Vienna, Austria
fax: +43 1 2600 29302
tel.: +43 1 2600 22417
email: sales.publications@iaea.org
<http://www.iaea.org/books>

For further information on this publication, please contact:

Waste and Environmental Safety Section
International Atomic Energy Agency
Vienna International Centre
PO Box 100
1400 Vienna, Austria
Email: Official.Mail@iaea.org

AN INTERNATIONAL PEER REVIEW OF THE SAFETY OPTIONS DOSSIER OF THE PROJECT
FOR DISPOSAL OF RADIOACTIVE WASTE IN DEEP GEOLOGICAL FORMATIONS (CIGÉO)

IAEA, VIENNA, 2017

IAEA/CIG/FRA

© IAEA, 2017

Printed by the IAEA in Austria

July 2017

FOREWORD

The French Nuclear Safety Authority (Autorité de sûreté nucléaire, ASN) is preparing the evaluation of a licence application for the creation of a deep geological disposal facility in 2018, called Cigéo, for intermediate level, high level and long lived radioactive waste. This licence is preceded by the submission of a Safety Options Dossier to ASN, which provides the French National Radioactive Waste Management Agency (Agence nationale pour la gestion des déchets radioactifs, Andra) the possibility to receive advice from ASN on the preparation of the licence application on the safety principles and approach. The Safety Options Dossier sets out the chosen objectives, concepts and principles for ensuring the safety of the facility.

ASN requested the IAEA to organize an international peer review of the Safety Options Dossier. This publication presents the consensus view of the international group of experts convened by the IAEA to conduct the review against the relevant IAEA safety standards and proven international practice and experience. The experts acted in a personal capacity and the views expressed do not necessarily reflect those of the IAEA, the governments of the nominating Member States or the nominating organizations.

The basis of this peer review is the set of documents provided by Andra, as the agency responsible for the development of the Cigéo project and for its safety. Consequently, the findings of the reviews are addressed directly to Andra. This publication, however, is primarily submitted to ASN to review the outcomes of the Andra project.

The peer review team would like to express its appreciation to ASN and Andra for the open and constructive discussions and their assistance during the preparation and conduct of the mission. The IAEA officer responsible for this peer review was G. Bruno of the Division of Radiation, Transport and Waste Safety.

EDITORIAL NOTE

This publication has been prepared from the original material as submitted by the contributors and has not been edited by the editorial staff of the IAEA. The views expressed remain the responsibility of the contributors and do not necessarily represent the views of the IAEA or its Member States.

Neither the IAEA nor its Member States assume any responsibility for consequences which may arise from the use of this publication. This publication does not address questions of responsibility, legal or otherwise, for acts or omissions on the part of any person.

The use of particular designations of countries or territories does not imply any judgement by the publisher, the IAEA, as to the legal status of such countries or territories, of their authorities and institutions or of the delimitation of their boundaries.

The mention of names of specific companies or products (whether or not indicated as registered) does not imply any intention to infringe proprietary rights, nor should it be construed as an endorsement or recommendation on the part of the IAEA.

The depiction and use of boundaries, geographical names and related data shown on maps do not necessarily imply official endorsement or recommendations on the part of the IAEA.

The IAEA has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third party Internet web sites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

CONTENTS

SUMMARY	1
1. INTRODUCTION	3
1.1 BACKGROUND	3
1.2. OBJECTIVE	4
1.3. SCOPE.....	4
1.4. STRUCTURE	5
2. CIGÉO LICENSING PROCESS.....	5
2.1. PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT	5
2.2. THE SAFETY OPTIONS DOSSIER	6
2.3. LICENCE APPLICATION AND INTERACTION BETWEEN ASN AND ANDRA.....	7
2.4. INTERACTION WITH WASTE PRODUCERS	7
3. THE STRATEGY OF RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT AND KNOWLEDGE ACQUISITION	8
3.1. CIGÉO POST-CLOSURE SAFETY STRATEGY	8
3.2. TECHNOLOGICAL READINESS LEVEL APPROACH	9
3.3. LONG-TERM PLANNING OF THE INCREMENTAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE CIGÉO PROJECT	9
3.4. THE INDUSTRIAL PILOT PHASE	11
3.5. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT	12
3.6. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	13
3.7. MONITORING	14
4. THE SAFETY ASSESSMENT SCENARIO METHODOLOGY	16
4.1. POST-CLOSURE SAFETY ASSESSMENT SCENARIO DEVELOPMENT	16
4.2. HLW CONTAINER FAILURE SCENARIO	18
4.2.1. Manufacturing defects	18
4.2.2. Microbial activity	19
4.3. HUMAN INTRUSION SCENARIO	20
4.4. SENSITIVITY AND UNCERTAINTY ANALYSIS	21
4.5. OPERATIONAL SAFETY	22
5. POST-FUKUSHIMA ACTIONS	24
REFERENCES	25
ABBREVIATIONS	27
EXPERT TEAM MEMBERS	29

SUMMARY

At the request of the French Nuclear Safety Authority (ASN), the IAEA convened from 6 to 15 November 2016 a team of international experts to review the Safety Options Dossier of the Cigéo Project on the disposal of intermediate-level, long-lived and high-level radioactive waste in the Callovo-Oxfordian (COX) formations of Meuse/Haute Marne. This strategic dossier sets out the chosen objectives, concepts and principles for ensuring the safety of Cigéo.

The review focused on the strategy for research & development and knowledge acquisition, as well as the approach for defining scenarios for operational and post-closure safety assessment. It also addressed the approach for post-Fukushima actions.

The step by step and iterative process for the development of Cigéo has included the publication of several safety and feasibility related dossiers, their regulatory review, interaction with local stakeholders and the public and national public debates. The International Review Team (IRT) considers that the decision to introduce an industrial pilot phase and the preparation of a Safety Options Dossier is commendable. It confirms the responsiveness of Andra to the public consultations.

As far as the management of the Cigéo project is concerned, the IRT acknowledged that the Operations Master Plan is a good project management tool that can play an important role in the communication of Andra's planning of future activities to the safety authority, the public and other stakeholders. In order to enhance management and build confidence among the regulator and stakeholders, the IRT considers that Andra should:

- Specify how new information will be used when proceeding from one stage to the next in the incremental development of the Cigéo project and describe the link between the milestones of the Cigéo development process, the regulatory authorization process and key milestones in Andra's R&D plan.
- Develop a strategy to ensure that data and information important for operations and post-closure safety of Cigéo can be updated, preserved and understood over the expected operation lifetime of more than one hundred years.
- Clarify its updated R&D plan consistent with the development of Cigéo by identifying and prioritising R&D activities, describing the intent of the R&D, and defining the link between the R&D and the stage in the programme.
- Further address the relationship between the monitoring parameter(s) and post-closure safety and the feasibility of the monitoring activities planned over the operational period, including equipment maintenance or replacement and potential detrimental impact on post-closure safety barrier performance, when developing the monitoring plan for implementation during the operational phase.
- Further strengthen dialogue with the waste producers and seek possibilities for overall optimization of waste predisposal management and disposal of the waste.

Based on the Safety Options Dossier and the discussions during the review mission, there is reasonable assurance about the robustness of the disposal concept. Noting that in many areas research is ongoing both for demonstration of safety or confirmation, the IRT identified a few other areas for further study in order to strengthen confidence in the safety case. Areas

identified include: gas generation and transport, description of disposal facility components ageing during the operational period, uncertainties related to the re-saturation time of the disposal cells and effects on the degradation of the waste packages, role of microbes and potential for biofilms during the operational period and implications of undetected faults.

The IRT considers that Andra implements a good overall management process to systematically define and investigate safety scenarios. The IRT appreciates the use of what-if scenarios, as this enables Andra to gain a good understanding of the robustness of the disposal facility system behaviour under extreme conditions and to illustrate the disposal system. However, the IRT is of the opinion that, in order to further demonstrate the robustness of the disposal system, Andra should:

- Consider water conducting features within the Callovo-Oxfordian (COX) in the frame of what-if calculations in order to further demonstrate the robustness of the disposal system.
- Substantiate why there is no need for including any initially defective high level waste (HLW) containers or early failure of HLW containers in the normal evolution scenario.
- Include in its safety case and safety assessment microbial activity at the sleeve/back fill interface, supported by research on microbial activity, as necessary.

Andra has covered the human intrusion scenarios in depth, assigning them to altered evolution scenarios or to the group of what-if scenarios. Internationally, it is understood that there is no reliable scientific basis for predicting the process or likelihood of inadvertent human intrusion. In accordance with international practice, Andra should treat human intrusion separately from the other scenario groups without any judgement on probability of occurrence.

The IRT considers that Andra's methodology for evaluating operational safety is comprehensive and systematic. With regard to post-Fukushima actions, Andra has used ASN specifications for the "stress tests" on nuclear installations as a guideline for integrating complementary safety assessments into the design of Cigéo. The IRT is of the opinion that Andra should consider the use of filtration of exhaust air from the underground facility and evaluate the robustness of its design for the removal of high water ingress from tunnels/ramp sections.

The time schedule for preparing the Cigéo licence application by 2018 is challenging. The Safety Options Dossier is a valuable preliminary step before licence application as it provides a basis to evaluate, at a strategic level, the key aspects relevant for Cigéo development and preparation of the licence application. The IRT therefore encourages ASN, IRSN and Andra to use the review of the Dossier as a basis to further define the expectations for the licence application. This is especially important as the planned Cigéo facility is unique.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

The French Nuclear Safety Authority (ASN) is preparing for the evaluation of the licence application for the Cigéo project on geological disposal of high-level radioactive waste and intermediate-level, long-lived radioactive waste in argillaceous formations, to be submitted by Andra – the French National Radioactive Waste Management Agency – in 2018.

Cigéo will consist of surface facilities which, among other things, will be used to receive and prepare waste packages and an underground disposal facility at a depth of around 500 metres in an argillaceous rock formation.

Following a public debate in 2013, Andra proposed the establishment, once the licence has been granted, of an industrial pilot phase for the development of the project. Andra also proposed to submit – ahead of the licence application – a “Safety Options Dossier” to ASN. The dossier is a strategic step prior to the licence application, presenting the main technical options that would ensure the safety of the disposal project.

At the request of ASN, the whole Safety Options Dossier will be submitted to evaluation prior to the licence application by the French Standing Groups of Experts on Waste and Laboratories and Plants with the support of IRSN (French Technical Support Organization).

ASN expects that the dossier "explicitly sets out the chosen objectives, concepts and principles for ensuring the safety of the facility when in operation and over the long term [...]. These demands are accompanied [...] by a detailed list of the information needed for the safety options report to be properly examined" (letter from ASN dated 19 December 2014 [1]).

With a view to complementing its instructions, ASN requested the IAEA to organize an international peer review of the Safety Options Dossier.

The review was organized by the IAEA Department of Nuclear Safety and Security in cooperation with the Department of Nuclear Energy. The international review team, hereafter referred to as IRT, comprised Felix Altorfer (Switzerland), Björn Dverstorp (Sweden), Klaus Fischer-Appelt (Germany), Jussi Heinonen (Finland), Doug Ilett (UK), Timothy McCartin (USA) and Geert Volckaert (Belgium). The team was supported by two Scientific Secretaries from the IAEA, Gérard Bruno, from the Waste and Environmental Safety Section and Philippe Van Marcke from the Waste Technology Section.

The review was based on the examination of reports which were delivered to the experts in July 2016. Following a preliminary analysis of the reports, a series of questions was sent to Andra in October 2016, which served as a basis for the presentations and discussions during the review mission from 7 to 10 November 2016 in Paris.

This report presents the consensus view of the experts based on the documentation submitted by Andra, the presentations by Andra during the review mission and the subsequent discussion. The experts acted in a personal capacity and their views may not necessarily coincide with those of their country or organization or the IAEA.

The peer review was requested by ASN. The basis of this review is the documents provided by Andra as the agency responsible for the development of the Cigéo project and, as such, responsible for its safety. Consequently, for practical reasons, the findings of the reviews are addressed directly to Andra. The report is, however primarily submitted to the French Nuclear Safety Authority; it is for ASN to use the review outcomes to further follow on with Andra's project.

1.2. OBJECTIVE

The objective of the peer review was to provide an independent international evaluation of the Safety Options Dossier. The following reports were submitted to the review team:

- Safety Options Report – Post-closure part;
- Safety Options Report – Operating part;
- Proposed operations master plan;
- Development plan for Cigéo project components.

Further reference to the Safety Options Dossier in this report means the above set of reports.

The objective of the review was to provide ASN with recommendations and suggestions for further development of the facility and, where appropriate, to identify good practices to be shared. For each point discussed during the review, the report gives the position of ANDRA and observations from the experts, followed, if necessary by a suggestion, recommendation or good practice. In some cases, observations are not followed by any suggestion, recommendation or good practice, the aim being to draw attention to the opinion of the experts without proposing specific action from the counterpart. Suggestions or recommendations that may be offered to ASN on the review of ANDRA's documents are supported both by IAEA safety standards (Safety Requirements and Safety Guides) and international good practice. Recommendations may suggest/indicate non-compliance with Safety Requirements and require actions from Andra, while suggestions give an opportunity to ASN to enhance the safety of the facility without highlighting a non-compliance issue. For this reason, each suggestion and recommendation is followed by a reference to the relevant safety standards. In addition, good practices may be highlighted for consideration by other states.

1.3. SCOPE

The review assessed the following aspects:

- The strategy for research & development and knowledge acquisition (including the demonstrators) and its adequacy with the phased development of the facility. In particular, the review addressed expectations at the different phases of development of the facility to match the authorization process.
- The approach for definition of long-term safety scenarios, including intrusion scenarios, safety scenarios during operation (excluding malevolent acts), and plans for surveillance during operation.

- Post-Fukushima actions¹ (e.g. extreme scenarios).

The review was carried out against the relevant IAEA safety standards and proven international practice and experience. In the present report, the findings from the experts are supported by the IAEA safety standards.

1.4. STRUCTURE

During the review mission, Andra first explained the history and context of Cigéo, the role of the Safety Options Dossier in relation to the licensing process and its safety strategy. Following this discussion the review areas defined in the terms of reference were addressed.

This report follows the same structure:

- Chapter 2: Cigéo licensing process;
- Chapter 3: The strategy for research & development and knowledge acquisition;
- Chapter 4: The safety assessment scenario methodology;
- Chapter 5: Post-Fukushima actions.

2. CIGÉO LICENSING PROCESS

In 1991, the Act n° 91-1381 of 30th December 1991 on the management of radioactive waste gave Andra the task of assessing the feasibility of a waste disposal facility in a deep geological formation, particularly through the construction of underground laboratories. ASN issued a basic safety rule (RFS III.2.f) in 1991 that set out the long-term safety expectations for the disposal facility, the design principles, the criteria used to select suitable geological media and the terms of studies, and defined the fundamental objectives that should guide research on disposal. ASN replaced the basic safety rule in 2008 with the Safety Guide on the permanent disposal of radioactive waste in deep geological disposal facilities [2].

During the disposal site screening, site selection and Cigéo development, Andra published safety and feasibility related dossiers [3] to support decision making. Each intermediate iteration associated with the various milestones in the development of the Cigéo project was reviewed by ASN.

The licence application for Cigéo to be submitted in 2018 is framed by the Environment Code (L. 542-10-1), the Decree n° 2007-1557 of 2 November 2007 and required by the Act n°2006-739 of 28 June 2006.

2.1. PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

Andra's position

The main Cigéo milestones included public engagement and dialogue. Besides the interaction with local stakeholders and the public, e.g. the Local Information and Follow-up Committee (CLIS), national public debates were organized in 2006 for Andra's Dossier in 2005 and in 2013 for the Cigéo project.

¹ The Post-Fukushima actions bullet point addresses how the lessons learnt from the Fukushima Daiichi accident have been used in the development of the Cigéo project, with a view to further demonstrating its safety.

The 2013 public debate had a notable effect on the Cigéo project. For example, Andra decided to introduce an industrial pilot phase for confirmation of planned disposal facility operations. Andra also decided to submit the Safety Options Dossier to the ASN to prepare for review of the licence application for Cigéo.

IRT observation

The decision to introduce an industrial pilot phase and prepare a Safety Options Dossier is commendable. It confirms the responsiveness of Andra to public consultation and is a good example of taking account of the public's concerns in the Cigéo development programme.

2.2. THE SAFETY OPTIONS DOSSIER

Andra's position

French nuclear legislation states that nuclear operators may ask ASN for its opinion concerning all or some of the options it has chosen to ensure the safety of the installation. Legislation and regulations do not specify in detail the content of the Safety Options Dossier prepared for this request for ASN's opinion. According to Andra based on examples from other nuclear facilities, reports usually present— at least in general terms—the key safety options which govern the project design, but do not describe in detail the safety demonstration or the technical solutions.

ASN decided, based on the specificity of the deep geological disposal, to outline its expectations for the Safety Options Dossier in a letter to Andra in December 2014 [1]. In particular, ASN requested that “First of all, these safety options must cover the entire installation, that is to say the surface facilities, the underground facilities and the surface-underground connections, at the preliminary design study stage. Particular attention must be paid to the completeness of the submitted dossier with regard to the concept of disposal system defined in the ASN Safety Guide. The submitted dossier shall be a standalone dossier, explicitly presenting the objectives, concepts and principles adopted to ensure the safety of the facility when in operation and over the long term, at the different phases of the facility's life cycle: design, construction, functioning, final shutdown, decommissioning or closure, maintenance and surveillance, depending on the facility sub-units concerned. The level of detail presented shall be proportional to the significance of the risks and associated drawbacks.”

IRT observation

The concept of a Safety Options Dossier is a valuable preliminary step before the submission of a licence application. It provides a basis to evaluate at a strategic level the main options for demonstrating safety, key design options and planned facility construction and operation. The IRT recognizes that the Safety Options Dossier is not meant to demonstrate compliance with regulatory requirements. However, it contributes to the dialogue between Andra and ASN on the key aspects relevant for Cigéo development and preparation of the licence application. This is especially important as the planned facility is unique.

2.3. LICENCE APPLICATION AND INTERACTION BETWEEN ASN AND ANDRA

Andra's position

Andra indicated during the peer review discussion that the plan is to further develop the exchange with ASN regarding the licence application preparation by the end of 2016 or beginning of 2017. Andra presented the work necessary for preparing the licence application by 2018. This work involves, for example, completion of the overall safety demonstration and safety and sensitivity analysis, finalization of facility detailed design and other elements discussed later in this report.

At the same time the ASN review process for Safety Options Dossier and related documents is ongoing.

IRT observation

The time schedule to prepare the Cigéo licence application by 2018 is challenging. It is good practice that regulator and operator have a dialogue to ensure common expectations for licence application content. The IRT therefore encourages ASN, IRSN and Andra to use the review of the Dossier to clearly address the expectations for the licence application.

2.4. INTERACTION WITH WASTE PRODUCERS

Andra's position

Andra presented the broad variety of waste types to be disposed in Cigéo, resulting from France's diverse nuclear programme. Regarding the respective responsibilities, Andra is responsible for the disposal of the waste packages. The waste producers are responsible for the predisposal activities. Drawing up a qualitative and quantitative inventory for Cigéo, it is necessary that there is collaboration between Andra and the waste producers discussing the industrial scenario for the operation of nuclear facilities adopted in the industrial waste management programme (PIGD). During the review discussions Andra described the interactions with the waste producers in compiling the waste inventory and package types.

IRT observation

The IRT understands that optimizing the waste forms and conditioning methods involves both the waste producers and Andra's waste acceptance criteria. Taking into account the long operational lifetime of Cigéo, it is important for Andra to ensure that waste producers are regularly informed of the waste acceptance criteria and that post-closure safety aspects are considered for future optimization of waste conditioning methods and waste forms. In accordance with IAEA safety standards (e.g. GSR Part 5, Requirement 6 [4]), the interdependences between all steps of radioactive waste management, including disposal, should be taken into account.

SUGGESTION

The IRT encourages Andra to further strengthen the dialogue with the waste producers and to seek possibilities for overall optimization of waste predisposal management and disposal of the waste.

Requirement 6 of GSR Part 5 [4] states that:

“Interdependences among all steps in the predisposal management of radioactive waste, as well as the impact of the anticipated disposal option, shall be appropriately taken into account.”

3. THE STRATEGY OF RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT AND KNOWLEDGE ACQUISITION

3.1. CIGÉO POST-CLOSURE SAFETY STRATEGY

Andra’s position

Cigéo is designed to isolate the waste from humans and the biosphere and to confine it in the deep geological formation. These post-closure safety functions apply over very long time scales (up to hundreds of thousands of years), passively, i.e. without the need for maintenance or monitoring. According to the Safety Options Dossier, post-closure safety relies principally on the favourable properties of the selected host formation, which is based on extensive knowledge accumulated from past siting and on research conducted over the last 25 years. The underground facility and the engineered barriers are designed to limit radionuclide releases by favouring the migration pathway through the clay rock.

IRT observation

Based on the Safety Options Dossier and the discussions during the review mission, the IRT concludes that there is reasonable assurance about the robustness of the disposal concept. Noting that there are many research areas where studies are ongoing, both for demonstration of safety or confirmation (e.g. the knowledge of the Callovo-Oxfordian clay, the seals, etc.), the IRT identified the following areas to strengthen Andra’s existing knowledge base (not in priority order):

- Gas generation and transport;
- Description of disposal facility component ageing during the operational period, in particular of the disposal cells;
- Uncertainties related to the re-saturation time of the disposal cells and effects on the degradation of the waste packages;
- Role of microbes and potential for biofilms during the operational period;
- Assessing implications of undetected faults.

SUGGESTION

The IRT encourages Andra to continue studies on the areas identified above to further strengthen confidence in the safety case.

Requirement 13, para 4.17 of SSR-5 [5] states that:

“With regard to safety after closure, the expected range of possible developments affecting the disposal system and events that might affect its performance, including those of low

probability, have to be considered in the safety case and supporting assessment by the following means:

- (a) By presenting evidence that the disposal system, its possible evolutions and events that might affect it are sufficiently well understood;
- (b) By demonstrating the feasibility of implementing the design;
- (c) By providing convincing estimates of the performance of the disposal system and a reasonable level of assurance that all the relevant safety requirements will be complied with and that radiation protection has been optimized;
- (d) By identifying and presenting an analysis of the associated uncertainties.”

3.2. TECHNOLOGICAL READINESS LEVEL APPROACH

Andra's position

In the report on the Development Plan for the Cigéo project components (PDD) Andra describes the application of the international TRL (technical readiness levels) scale for quantification of the technological readiness of an item (equipment, component, system, etc.). The TRL scale, originally applied in other industrial areas, is part of the international standard [6]. The use of the TRL scale is primarily related to the level of readiness of the performance of the components of the disposal system and is not a safety analysis as such. The TRL scale has previously been applied to industrial operations, but its application to the Cigéo project involves unique aspects regarding the conditions in the underground facility and the gradual development of the disposal facility.

Andra has established a Requirement Management System to organize and trace the requirements related to the safety functions (operational and post-closure) which will be used to check that the technical solution fulfils the requirements and therefore the safety functions.

IRT observation

The application of the TRL scale appears to be a good tool for the internal management of the development of disposal facility components, including interaction with sub-contractors. It provides a structured overview of the different steps of development of individual components and the successive demonstration and confirmation of their performance in the disposal facility, which is particularly important considering the operational and gradual-construction period of more than 100 years. However, because the TRL scale primarily is linked to requirements on the performance of individual components, it cannot replace overall updates of the post-closure safety case.

Once the safety case is developed, the benefits of the TRL could be enhanced by clarifying the link between the TRL scale and post-closure safety, for example by describing the role of the TRL scale in the periodic updates of the post-closure safety case.

3.3. LONG-TERM PLANNING OF THE INCREMENTAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE CIGÉO PROJECT

Andra's position

The proposed Operations Master Plan (PDE) describes the reference progression of the Cigéo project, i.e. the waste inventory to be emplaced in it and the consecutive steps in building the

industrial, operational and closure facilities, as envisaged by Andra, based on studies conducted up to 2015. It also describes how Cigéo, in terms of reversibility and during its entire service life, will not bind future generations to the choices this generation has made. Rather, it will provide them with options for managing radioactive waste. These options may relate to future developments of the facility, changes to the inventory — particularly in the event of changes to France's energy policy (e.g. the decision to dispose of spent fuel) — or the removal of emplaced packages. The PDE will be submitted to the stakeholders for consultation according to the process outlined below.

IRT observation

The Safety Options Dossier outlines a comprehensive national programme and a credible long-term plan for the management of intermediate-level (ILW) and high level (HLW) radioactive waste in France. This plan, which is based on 25 years' of siting, site characterisation, research and development in the Bure underground research laboratory, allows for successive adaptation of the disposal facility, taking into account technical and scientific developments and confirmation of facility operation.

As a result of the public debate on the Cigéo project held in 2014, Andra drafted the PDE, which outlines the so-called "reference" progression of the Cigéo project, as envisaged by Andra at the end of the basic engineering design, explains the objectives of the industrial pilot phase, and presents the choices offered by retrievability as regards the management of the Cigéo project. According to Andra, this document is a forerunner of a project governance tool that will be periodically updated throughout Cigéo's operation. This tool can play an important role for communication and consultation of Andra's planning of future activities in the development of the Cigéo project with the safety authority, the public and other stakeholders.

Key stages and milestones in the disposal facility development have been identified in the PDE, but there are some uncertainties regarding what information is needed to move from one stage to the next and how the key milestones in the Cigéo development process match the regulatory review process. One such example concerns the transition from the pilot phase to routine operations.

There is a need for Andra to clarify the process for systematic updating of the site description and the safety assessment during the pilot phase and the following gradual construction of the underground facility. This description should take into account the main steps in the incremental development of the facility, milestones in the long-term research and development plan for the Cigéo disposal facility and regulatory authorizations required.

GOOD PRACTICE

The Operations Master Plan is a good project management tool that can play an important role for communication and consultation of Andra's planning of future activities in the development of the Cigéo project with the safety authority, the public and other stakeholders.

SUGGESTION

Andra should specify in more detail how new information will be used when proceeding from one stage to the next in the incremental development of the Cigéo project (outlined in the PDE) and describe the link between the milestones of the Cigéo development process, the regulatory authorization process and key milestones in Andra's R&D plan.

Requirement 11 of SSR-5 [5] states that:

“Disposal facilities for radioactive waste shall be developed, operated and closed in a series of steps. Each of these steps shall be supported, as necessary, by iterative evaluations of the site, of the options for design, construction, operation and management, and of the performance and safety of the disposal system.”

Requirement 12 of SSR-5 [5] states that:

“A safety case and supporting safety assessment shall be prepared and updated by the operator, as necessary, at each step in the development of a disposal facility, in operation and after closure. The safety case and supporting safety assessment shall be submitted to the regulatory body for approval. The safety case and supporting safety assessment shall be sufficiently detailed and comprehensive to provide the necessary technical input for informing the regulatory body and for informing the decisions necessary at each step.”

Requirement 3 of SSR-5 [5] states that:

“The operator of a disposal facility for radioactive waste shall be responsible for its safety. The operator shall carry out safety assessment and develop and maintain a safety case, and shall carry out all the necessary activities for site selection and evaluation, design, construction, operation, closure and, if necessary, surveillance after closure, in accordance with national strategy, in compliance with the regulatory requirements and within the legal and regulatory infrastructure.”

3.4.THE INDUSTRIAL PILOT PHASE

Andra's position

Following the public debate on the Cigéo project held in 2013, Andra introduced an industrial pilot phase with the objective of confirming different aspects of facility operation and allowing for optimisation of disposal facility components and design solutions. The experiences of the pilot phase will be evaluated and documented in a report supporting the transition to the routine operations.

IRT observation

The concept of an explicit industrial pilot phase to confirm different aspects of disposal facility technology and operation is commendable, although the exact scope remains to be developed. It provides a framework for dialogue with ASN and other stakeholders and for developing confidence in Andra's capability to operate the facility safely prior to the start of routine operations. The inclusion of inactive demonstrators for disposals cells and seals will

also provide additional information in support of the post-closure safety case (Safety Requirements on Disposal of Radioactive waste (SSR-5), Requirement 11 [5]).

3.5. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

Andra's position

Andra states in its Safety Options Dossier that, due to the gradual deployment of the Cigéo facility and the continuous increase in knowledge, the project's development will exceed the scope of the detailed engineering design and continue for several decades.

Andra has a number of databases and information systems in place (e.g. science for geological site, engineering components, radionuclide inventories, waste packages, requirements management system).

At the construction licence application deadline, project reference will comprise the entire set of:

- The robust, demonstrated solution for the construction phase (T1) and for the subsequent construction phases (TU) proposed at that time and proposed as constructed for the T1 phase;
- The design changes envisaged for the subsequent TU phases in the light of their completion deadlines; and
- The method and the estimated schedule for their demonstration and gradual integration into Cigéo construction.

At each stage of the project's development, progress on the studies of these various optimizations and analysis of their intersecting impacts in terms of safety and technical execution and cost challenges will be used to define which of these variants can be integrated into a proposed construction configuration and which must continue to be studied concomitantly and according to what timeline.

IRT observation

The IRT acknowledges the effort Andra is making to collect and document scientific data and the decision-making process. During the construction and operational period of Cigéo, an enormous amount of information will be produced and filed. In the view of the challenges of preserving up-to-date, accessible and understandable information about the safety case over many decades, Andra will need to develop a coherent long-term strategy for knowledge and information management.

RECOMMENDATION

Andra should develop a strategy to ensure that data and information important for operations and post-closure safety can be updated, preserved and understood over the more than one hundred years of expected operation of Cigéo.

Requirement 25 of SSR-5 [5] states that:

“Management systems to provide for the assurance of quality shall be applied to all safety related activities, systems and components throughout all the steps of the development and operation of a disposal facility. The level of assurance for each element shall be commensurate with its importance to safety.”

Requirement 25, para 5.22 of SSR-5 [5] states that:

“An appropriate management system that integrates quality assurance programmes will contribute to confidence that the relevant requirements and criteria for site selection and evaluation, design, construction, operation, closure and safety after closure are met. The relevant activities, systems and components have to be identified on the basis of the results of systematic safety assessment. The level of attention assigned to each aspect has to be commensurate with its importance to safety. The management system is required to comply with the relevant IAEA safety standards on management systems.”

3.6. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Andra's position

Since 1991, Andra has been running a comprehensive research project including a broad combination of laboratory research, surface- and drilling-based site investigations, research in the Bure URL and model development.

In the Dossier 2005 Andra gave a state of the art global overview of this research on the basis of which it confirmed the Callovo-Oxfordian clay (COX) as suitable geological medium. The review of the Dossier 2005 guided further research and e.g. further geological investigation led to the proposal of the zone of interest for detailed investigations –ZIRA– in 2009. Continued R&D led in 2015 to the confirmation of the favourable properties and robustness of the COX in the Safety Options Dossier.

The current R&D plans for the Cigéo project are developed along 3 possible lines of action:

1. Understanding of processes
2. Supporting the development phases of the disposal installation i.e. DAC (licence application), Industrial Pilot Phase (T1), later phases; and
3. Understanding of the behaviour of components of the disposal installation.

There is a process for deriving the key R&D challenges. Plans for the further R&D are drawn up and updated in a bi-annual cycle. This is based on reviews and design studies, among other factors. Andra's R&D plan was not included in the Safety Options Dossier.

IRT observation

Although the R&D plan was not part of the review documents, the process for planning the R&D in support of Cigéo development was discussed during the review. The process by which the R&D activities are identified and prioritized was not explained to the IRT. Consequently, it was not always clear what Andra expects as an outcome from the planned

research, development and demonstration projects. The sensitivity and uncertainty analysis should be used to help identify those priorities (See Section 5.4).

As part of Andra's strategy for research and development, an updated R&D plan in support of the development of Cigéo should distinguish between R&D to be included in the safety evaluation (update of the safety file for the "confirmation authorization by ASN"), R&D done for further optimization of the facility design and R&D performed to maintain knowledge and understanding on the disposal concept.

It should also be clarified which R&D outcomes are expected at what stage in the programme, i.e. (1) R&D that is completed at the time of the licence application, (2) R&D planned during the industrial pilot phase, and (3) R&D planned for after the industrial pilot phase. For the R&D planned during the pilot phase, it should be made clear what confirmation this is expected to provide.

The updated plan should also highlight which R&D will be done in the Meuse/Haute Marne URL.

According to the IRT, such an updated R&D plan should be made available to regulatory bodies to support the regulatory review process.

RECOMMENDATION

Andra should clarify its updated R&D plan consistent with the development of Cigéo by:

- Identifying and prioritising R&D activities;
- Describing the intent of the R&D; and
- Defining the link between the R&D and the stage in the programme.

Requirement 3, para 3.13 of SSR-5 [5] states that:

"The operator has to conduct or commission the research and development work necessary to ensure that the planned technical operations can be practically and safely accomplished, and to demonstrate this. The operator likewise has to conduct or commission the research work necessary to investigate, to understand and to support the understanding of the processes on which the safety of the disposal facility depends. The operator also has to carry out all the necessary investigations of sites and of materials and has to assess their suitability and obtain all the data necessary for the purposes of safety assessment."

3.7. MONITORING

Andra's position

Monitoring is a regulatory requirement, as is the case for any Basic Nuclear Installation, with the purpose of protecting public security, health and safety, and the environment. Some additional requirements specific to the disposal installation have been formulated in the framework of pre-closure surveillance requirements and post-closure safety. Andra has started to take into account the specific nature of the monitoring related to the long period over which the disposal facility is implemented. The PDE presents the evolution of monitoring activities over the implementation of Cigéo. Andra presented the approach to monitoring for the different phases of the development of the disposal and how the needs evolve.

The monitoring principles for the operational and post-closure phase are given in the respective Safety Options reports. In particular, Andra has proposed the components important for post-closure safety and the related monitoring parameters during construction and operation. The principles for the monitoring in the Industrial Pilot Phase and for the possibility to retrieve the waste are described in specific documents. A summary of this was presented.

Monitoring and data acquisition will be undertaken during excavation of the structures in order to validate the geological model and its supporting physical-chemical parameters. The verification of the important characteristics of the host rock, as input data for the assessment of post-closure safety (mechanical behaviour, extension, structure, permeability of the damaged area around the structures, etc.) forms part of the monitoring programme conducted at the start of construction of the structures, during the industrial pilot phase (and continued beyond).

As part of the monitoring programme, special monitoring measurements will be taken on parts of the underground structures, (stretches of ramp and of shafts, stretches of drifts or parts of intersections, of ILW and HLW disposal cells), chosen as being representative of a series of structures, or because of their particular location (e.g. at the position of a future seal) in respect of the operating or post-closure safety objectives.

Additionally, regarding surveying of the environment, Andra established in 2007 the Perennial Observatory of the Environment (OPE) to provide a precise description of Cigéo's environment and to monitor its long term development. The OPE has implemented a multi-disciplinary observation programme (water, air, flora, fauna, human aspects) for a period of at least 100 years. Andra presented the comprehensive environmental monitoring that is already running and is publicly available through its website, i.e. the Perennial Observatory of the Environment.

IRT observation

Andra is establishing the OPE and is in the process of developing a monitoring programme for the underground facility. Public access to this environmental data is consistent with international practice and an element for building public confidence. Andra is encouraged to continue this practice.

Andra's monitoring plans implemented during the operational phase and related to long term safety are less mature. From the documentation and discussions with Andra, the feasibility of the proposed post-closure safety monitoring activities and their relationship to safety was not always clear.

Andra should specify its intentions for the monitoring activities for the each of the next phases of the development of the disposal facility (e.g. monitoring for operational safety versus performance of barriers relied on for post-closure safety).

RECOMMENDATION

Andra should further address in the development of its monitoring plan implemented during the operational phase:

- The relationship between the monitoring parameter(s) and post-closure safety;
- Their feasibility of the monitoring activities planned to function over the operational period including equipment maintenance or replacement; and
- Potential detrimental impact on post-closure safety barrier performance.

Requirement 21 of SSR-5 [5] states that:

“A programme of monitoring shall be carried out prior to, and during, the construction and operation of a disposal facility and after its closure, [...]. This programme shall be designed to collect and update information necessary for the purposes of protection and safety. Information shall be obtained to confirm the conditions necessary for the safety of workers and members of the public and protection of the environment during the period of operation of the facility. Monitoring shall also be carried out to confirm the absence of any conditions that could affect the safety of the facility after closure.”

4. THE SAFETY ASSESSMENT SCENARIO METHODOLOGY

4.1. POST-CLOSURE SAFETY ASSESSMENT SCENARIO DEVELOPMENT

Andra's position

Andra's approach to deriving scenarios to assess post-closure safety, taking into account existing uncertainties, is based on the following steps:

- Phenomenological Analysis of Repository Situations (PARS): to describe the evolution of phenomenological processes which affect natural and engineering components for operational and post-closure safety;
- Qualitative Safety Analyses (QSA): to derive normal and altered scenarios.

These steps are the basis for the subsequent numerical conceptualisation for processes that affect safety functions as well as the quantitative post-closure safety assessment. Andra also uses the Nuclear Energy Agency Features, Events and Processes (NEA FEP) catalogue as a verification tool to ensure completeness of its safety understanding.

Andra developed different categories of scenarios:

- Normal Evolution Scenarios ,which describe a reference situation with best estimated values, and a bounding situation which takes conservative parameter values into account;
- Altered Evolution Scenarios ,(which cover less likely scenarios assuming malfunctions of technical components (seals and container failures);
- What-If-Cases, based on extreme, very unlikely assumptions in order to investigate the reaction and robustness of the disposal system;
- Human Intrusion Scenarios.

Considering the particular what-if scenario identified in the Safety Options Dossier regarding the **undetected heterogeneities**, Andra said it needed to be able to define the assumption of this scenario with ASN and IRSN.

IRT observation

In general, the IRT considers that Andra is implementing a good overall management process for systematically defining and investigating safety scenarios. The IRT especially considers the PARS system to be a comprehensive method of describing significant phenomena and their interaction with respect to safety implications. Furthermore, Andra's overall process is an important part of updating the disposal facility design, with the overall aim of optimization.

The IRT also appreciates the use of what-if scenarios, as this enables Andra to get a good understanding of the disposal facility system behaviour under extreme conditions and to illustrate the disposal system robustness.

Although Andra has argued, on the basis of the results of its extensive site investigation, that the likelihood of water conducting features (e.g. fractures) occurring in the ZIRA area will remain insignificantly low, the IRT suggest that Andra should take into account fracturing of the COX in the frame of what-if scenarios.

Scoping calculations of the required spatial extent and hydraulic characteristics of water conducting features would enable Andra to illustrate:

- The high safety performance of the COX, contributing significantly to the overall disposal system robustness in the post-closure phase;
- The impact of the range of these features within the ZIRA COX on safety to evaluate the robustness of the concept.

RECOMMENDATION

Andra should consider water conducting features within the COX in the frame of what-if calculations in order to further demonstrate robustness of the disposal system, especially the safety performance of the COX.

Requirement 13 of SSR-5 [5] states that

“The safety case for a disposal facility shall describe all safety relevant aspects of the site, the design of the facility and the managerial control measures and regulatory controls. The safety case and supporting safety assessment shall demonstrate the level of protection of people and the environment provided and shall provide assurance to the regulatory body and other interested parties that safety requirements will be met.”

Requirement 13, para 4.17 of SSR-5 [5], states that

“With regard to safety after closure, the expected range of possible developments affecting the disposal system and events that might affect its performance, including those of low probability, have to be considered in the safety case and supporting assessment by the following means:

- (a) By presenting evidence that the disposal system, its possible evolutions and events that might affect it are sufficiently well understood;
- (b) By demonstrating the feasibility of implementing the design;
- (c) By providing convincing estimates of the performance of the disposal system and a reasonable level of assurance that all the relevant safety requirements will be complied with and that radiation protection has been optimized;
- (d) By identifying and presenting an analysis of the associated uncertainties.”

4.2. HLW CONTAINER FAILURE SCENARIO

4.2.1. Manufacturing defects

Andra’s position

Andra assumes for the normal evolution scenario of its safety analysis that no high-level waste (HLW) containers are defective at the time of the disposal facility closure. This will be achieved by a robust design and quality control process. For the reference situation and the bounding situation, the containers are assumed to lose their leak-tightness after 4,300 years and 500 years respectively.

An Altered Evolution Scenario and a what-if scenario consider the immediate loss of containment of a limited number of emplaced HLW containers, and all emplaced HLW containers, respectively. Neither scenario suggests a significant effect on dose in the post-closure period.

IRT observation

Due to the large number of containers to be disposed of, there is always a residual probability of defects related to manufacturing and welding (every industrial process has some deviations in the production process). Defects (penetrating and/or non-penetrating) might lead to early failure of containers. The IRT recognizes that, because of the strength of the Cigéo geology, loss of containment of HLW containers earlier than expected after facility closure is not predicted to cause a significant effect on dose. However, the IRT suggests that Andra clarifies its reasoning for excluding the possibility that any of the HLW containers lose their containment earlier than expected in the post-closure period.

RECOMMENDATION

Andra should substantiate why there is no need for including any initially defective HLW containers or early failure of HLW containers in the normal evolution scenario.

SSG-14 [2], Requirement 7 of SSR-5 [5], para 4.16 states that:

“The performance of a geological disposal system is dependent on different physical components and other features having different safety functions, the importance of which may vary over different time periods. To meet the requirement for multiple safety functions, it is necessary for the safety case to explain and justify the functions provided by each physical component and other features and indicate the time periods over which they are expected to perform. It is also necessary for the safety case to identify the complementary

safety functions that will be effective if a physical component or other safety function does not fully perform.”

4.2.2. Microbial activity

Andra’s position

Andra states in the Safety Options Dossier that the size of the pores in the undisturbed COX or clay seal cores do not allow for significant bacterial growth, due to a lack of space, free water or nutrients. Within the cement-based materials, it is expected that microbial activity will be unlikely, in particular at the interfaces and/or in fractures. In the connected fracture rock zone, the occurrence of bacterial activity will depend on the size of fractures. Any activity that did develop would be limited due to the diffusion conditions and the pore size. The possibility of migration can only be envisaged in a medium that presents high porosity and under the effect of convective transport conditions.

IRT observation

The IRT learned that no effect from bacterial activity in the concrete components, undisturbed clay rock or clay seal cores have been considered in the scenarios. Microbial activity at interfaces such as the sleeve/clay in the excavated disturbed zone or cementitious material could lead to an increased corrosion rate for metallic parts in the disposal facility. An increased corrosion rate and thus an early loss of the protection function of the sleeve could, in turn, lead to an increased corrosion rate of HLW containers. Microbial activity might have an influence on the layout of the HLW cells.

RECOMMENDATION

Andra should include in its safety case and safety assessment microbial activity at the sleeve/back fill interface supported by research on microbial activity as necessary.

SSG-14 [2], Requirement 3 of SSR-5 [5] states that:

“The operator of a disposal facility for radioactive waste shall be responsible for its safety. The operator shall carry out safety assessment and develop and maintain a safety case, and shall carry out all the necessary activities for site selection and evaluation, design, construction, operation, closure and, if necessary, surveillance after closure, in accordance with national strategy, in compliance with the regulatory requirements and within the legal and regulatory infrastructure.”

Requirement 3, para 3.13 of SSR-5 [5] states that:

“The operator has to conduct or commission the research and development work necessary to ensure that the planned technical operations can be practically and safely accomplished, and to demonstrate this. The operator likewise has to conduct or commission the research work necessary to investigate, to understand and to support the understanding of the processes on which the safety of the disposal facility depends. The operator also has to carry out all the necessary investigations of sites and of materials and has to assess their suitability and obtain all the data necessary for the purposes of safety assessment.”

4.3. HUMAN INTRUSION SCENARIO

Andra's position

Andra considers borehole drilling from the surface as the only type of inadvertent human intrusion (HI), given the geological context of the zone of interest for detailed survey (ZIRA) and the depth at which the disposal facility is located. The six borehole scenarios are derived regarding three aspects:

- The purpose of the borehole and the geological target formation: target depth and borehole diameters are determined by the technical objective of the borehole and the target geological formation.
- The location of the borehole: the types of possible consequences in terms of deterioration of disposal facility function and modification of the migration conditions for radionuclides and toxic elements are determined by the location of the borehole with respect to the facility architecture (disposal cells and other structures), and to the hydrogeological context.
- Time-based aspects: the possible types of interaction between the borehole and the disposal facility, along with the activity levels of the radionuclides that may be mobilized, are determined by borehole life phases (drilling, use and disuse), in association with the re-saturation situation and evolution of disposal facility components.

According to an estimated risk of occurrence Andra assigns four human intrusion scenarios to the group of altered evolution scenarios, while two “very unlikely” HI scenarios, which tend to maximise impacts, were assigned to the group of what-if cases (conservative characteristics for the intrusive borehole, position of the borehole in the highest activity areas of the ILW or HLW sections).

IRT observation

In general Andra covered the human intrusion scenarios in depth. The analysis of the purpose and location of the borehole and the influence of the borehole depth was carried out according to ASN's “Safety guide on the permanent disposal of radioactive waste in deep geological disposal facilities”.

Internationally, it is understood, that there is no reliable scientific basis for the prediction of the process or likelihood of inadvertent human intrusion. Since the prediction of resource needs and technological abilities of generations in the far future is speculative, human intrusion scenarios intrinsically cannot be classified according to their probability of occurrence. Furthermore, it has to be taken into account that it is impossible to completely eliminate the risk of HI. The risk of HI is a consequence of the principle of concentrate and contain.

RECOMMENDATION

In accordance with international practice, Andra should treat human intrusion separately from the other scenario groups, without any judgement on probability of occurrence.

Requirement 4 of SSR-5 [5] states that

“Throughout the process of development and operation of a disposal facility for radioactive waste, an understanding of the relevance and the implications for safety of the available options for the facility shall be developed by the operator. This is for the purpose of providing an optimized level of safety in the operational stage and after closure.”

Requirement 4, para 3.20 of SSR-5 [5] states that:

“Consideration has to be given to locating the facility away from significant known mineral resources, geothermal water and other valuable subsurface resources. This is to reduce the risk of human intrusion into the site and to reduce the potential for use of the surrounding area to be in conflict with the facility. The safety of the facility has to be considered at every step in the decision making process to ensure that safety is optimized in the sense discussed in the Appendix.”

Appendix, para A.6 of SSR-5 [5] states that:

“A.6 The possibility exists that in the future, an activity or activities undertaken by people could cause some type of intrusion into a disposal facility for radioactive waste. It is not possible to say definitively what form such an intrusion will take or what the likelihood of the intrusion event will be, owing to the unpredictability of the behaviour of people in the future. [...]”

4.4. SENSITIVITY AND UNCERTAINTY ANALYSIS

Andra's position

Andra quantifies the uncertainty of its performance assessment and safety assessment indicators (uncertainty analysis) and the weight of those uncertainties (sensitivity analysis) using a broad range of modern tools and techniques. The investigation of scenario situations and models is treated by deterministic and stochastic approaches, while input data are analysed using mono- and multi-parametric deterministic or probabilistic methods. Correlations and constraints between input data are identified.

At a higher, concept design level, Andra uses performance assessment to investigate the influence of factors such as inventory location, thermal loading, presence of organics and drift geometry on facility performance. This allows optimisation of the facility design.

IRT observation

Through discussion with the IRT, Andra showed that it applies a systematic and state of the art approach to sensitivity and uncertainty analysis. However, the process by which Andra uses the results of its sensitivity and uncertainty analysis to help set the priorities and direction of its R&D programme is unclear (see also section 4.6).

4.5. OPERATIONAL SAFETY

Andra's position

The Safety Options Dossier describes three primary principles for design of the disposal facility considering specific characteristics of a facility:

1. An underground facility located at a depth of around 500m, of reduced geometry and long connecting drifts, requires specific operating, intervention and evacuation conditions.
2. An operating phase lasting around one hundred years, with the disposal facility being developed in successive phases, presents a need to factor in the risks related to performing underground construction work and nuclear operations in parallel.
3. A coordinated approach encompassing operating safety and post-closure safety that will integrate any changes in the design, while ensuring post-closure safety, throughout the entire development cycle of the Cigéo project.

Andra considers that such an approach, connecting operating safety with post-closure safety, will enable possible optimisation and operating feedback to be managed effectively, integrating any changes in national and international regulations and practices, while ensuring implementation of the principle of defence in depth. The possibility of integrating new technical solutions into the design of the disposal facility will thus be confirmed, based on analysis of whether they are compatible with safe facility operation and comply with the post-closure safety requirements.

Andra has explained in the dossier that its objective throughout the operating period is to protect people (workers and the public) and the environment through effective management of the risks resulting from the radioactivity of the waste. Risk management is achieved by the performance of the nuclear safety functions in the facility design for:

1. Containment of radioactive substances to protect against the risk of their dispersion;
2. Protection of people from exposure to ionising radiation;
3. Preventing criticality;
4. Removal of the heat produced by waste; and
5. Removal of gases formed by radiolysis in order to manage explosion risks.

IRT observation

The following observations are based on the documentation and information provided by Andra. The IRT focused its review on the methodology of defining the scenarios to consider for the demonstration of safety. Andra has described its approach for the surface facilities and underground facility and has, appropriately, given greater attention to the special challenges of operational safety underground, e.g. fire and evacuation from the underground. The IRT considers Andra's methodology for evaluating operational safety to be comprehensive and systematic. Andra has presented information in the Safety Options Dossier that covers a wide range of internal and external hazards and risks for the surface and underground facilities. Andra has also considered retrieval operations and closure activities in assessing the risks for the public and workers. The IRT appreciates that Andra has considered both combinations of events, as well as the risks associated with co-activity resulting from simultaneous or successive performance of operations in the same geographical zone or requiring the same utilities or services (various operations and interferences between these operations are likely

to transfer potential hazards from one zone to another, or from one activity to another).

Andra has highlighted concern for the potential for fire underground and has appropriately provided significant information on the prevention and protection measures required to reduce the risks identified. The discussions included ventilation and filtration systems for the ILW disposal cells (e.g. redundant air supply and extraction functions, sensors at the ILW cell exit, switches to emergency generators located at the surface); simple, robust ventilation system operating principles for underground drift ventilation (e.g. limiting actions and changes required when switching ventilation between nominal conditions and fire conditions); the design of the disposal cell and the ventilation system to withstand potential hazards (in particular collision, earthquake, rising temperatures, etc.); and the presence of filtration rooms (“Dernier Niveau de Filtration” – last level of filtration - DNF of cells) containing the filtration housings of the ILW disposal cells. However, a scenario where the wrong compartment doors are closed, or where the wrong ventilation protocol is activated, is not described. Such a scenario could result from human error and examining the effects of such a scenario could be useful to give an idea of the robustness of the system.

The IRT considers that Andra has also given significant and appropriate attention to evacuation of personnel from underground, given the current stage of design. In particular, Andra has described in the dossier its approach for evacuation of a large number of construction personnel at the bottom, compared with the evacuation routes to the surface (a combination of shelter in place and organized and accompanied evacuation) as well as evacuation in a fire situation (each zone has its own routes for evacuation of personnel, however, in the case of a fire, evacuation of personnel is possible from the operating zone via the construction zone and vice versa).

The IRT was impressed with Andra’s approach to document lessons learned from other tunnel and mine accidents to provide guidance on best practices for the future construction and operation of Cigéo and, more especially, for the underground infrastructure: surface-bottom connections including the waste package ramp, service ramp, shafts and underground facility. The IRT understands that, at this stage of the design, the risk analysis is expected to continue and Andra will use the results to further assist the detailed design.

Andra discussed its approach to estimate radioactive exposure to the public during operations and stated its intention to use the same assumptions, where appropriate, for estimating worker exposures. The IRT observed that certain conservative assumptions (e.g. radionuclide release from the waste containers) for use in estimating public exposures could be overly conservative in estimating worker exposures due to the proximity of workers to potential releases. Estimates for worker exposures may require the use of more realistic assumptions.

SUGGESTION

Andra should consider the use of filtration of exhaust air from the underground facility as a defence in depth measure for limiting radioactivity releases due to incidents or accidents.

Requirement 10 of GSR Part 4 (Rev. 1) [7] states that:

“It shall be determined in the safety assessment whether a facility or activity uses, to the extent practicable, structures, systems and components of robust and proven design.”

5. POST-FUKUSHIMA ACTIONS

Andra's position

The Safety Options Dossier describes Andra's approach to complementary safety assessments (CSA), which may also be referred to as stress tests. The CSA assesses the safety margins of nuclear facilities with regard to extreme natural phenomena, and testing facility safety functions that could lead to undesired situations. In particular, the dossier states "the purpose of the stress tests is to assess the robustness of the installation in the light of the events which occurred at Fukushima that is extreme natural phenomena compromising the safety of the installations."

For example, the Dossier describes the potential for an explosion in the ILW cells resulting from the consequences of an earthquake of greater intensity than the safe shutdown earthquake or a long-duration loss of electrical power and of design controls for such a scenario (e.g. enhanced stability of air return drifts to prevent obstruction of renewal air circulation in the cells; the presence in the installation of ultimate backup mobile electrical power means, and the deployment on the site of trained response crews able to utilize the emergency power within a time-frame shorter than the time taken for the lower explosion limit to be potentially reached in an ILW disposal cell).

IRT observation

Andra has used specifications for the stress tests on nuclear installations drawn up by ASN in the wake of the accident in Fukushima as a guideline for integrating complementary safety assessments into the design of Cigéo. In discussions with Andra, the IRT learned that Andra has considered an appropriate range of natural events (e.g. tornadoes and seismic activity) in the design of the facility to withstand extreme events (e.g. seismic event with a ground motion 1.5 times larger than events considered credible for the region). Additionally, the Safety Dossier discusses the types of accident conditions that could lead to extreme conditions that are being evaluated as part of the detailed engineering design (APD) to help ensure the robustness of the design of the facility. In particular, Andra has considered fires, explosions, and container falls resulting from a large seismic event, as well as a total loss of on-site electrical power.

The IRT supports Andra's use of the CSA as a means to identify the main functions and systems/equipment affected by extreme events and to improve, as necessary, important protective safety functions as part of the APD.

SUGGESTION

Andra should evaluate the robustness of its design for removal of high water ingress from tunnels/ramp sections crossing the upper aquifer, combined with failure of power supply to pumps due to the occurrence of a potential extreme event.

Requirement 10 GSR Part 4 (Rev. 1) [7] states that:

"It shall be determined in the safety assessment whether a facility or activity uses, to the extent practicable, structures, systems and components of robust and proven design."

REFERENCES

- [1] Lettre ASN CODEP-DRC-2014-039834 of December 19th 2014
- [2] INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY, Geological Disposal Facilities for Radioactive Waste, IAEA Safety Standards No. SSG-14, IAEA, Vienna (2011).
- [3] NATIONAL RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT AGENCY, Dossier 2005 Argile: Synthesis Evaluation of the Feasibility of a Geological Repository in an Argillaceous Formation, ANDRA, Paris (2005).
- [4] INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY, Predisposal Management of Radioactive Waste, IAEA Safety Standards No. GSR Part 5, IAEA, Vienna (2009).
- [5] INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY, Disposal of Radioactive Waste, IAEA Safety Standards No. SSR-5, IAEA, Vienna (2011).
- [6] INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR STANDARDIZATION (ISO), Space systems – Definition of the Technology Readiness Levels (TRLs) and their criteria of assessment, ISO 16290: 2013, Geneva (2013)
- [7] INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY, Safety Assessment for Facilities and Activities, IAEA Safety Standards No. GSR Part 4 (Rev.1), IAEA, Vienna (2016)

ABBREVIATIONS

AES	altered evolution scenarios
APD	detailed engineering design
ASN	Autorité de Sureté Nucléaire (French Nuclear Safety Authority)
CLIS	Local Information and Follow-up Committee
COX	Callovo-Oxfordian clay
CSA	complementary safety assessments
DAC	Licence application
DNF	dernier niveau de filtration (last level of filtration)
HI	human intrusion
HLW	high level waste
ILW	intermediate level waste
INB	basic nuclear installation
IRSN	Institute for Radiological Protection and Nuclear Safety
IRT	International Review Team
NES	normal evolution scenarios
OPE	Perennial Observatory of the Environment
PDE	operations master plan
PDS	preliminary design study
PIGD	industrial waste management programme
RD&D	research, development and demonstration
THMCR	thermo hydro mechanical chemical and radiological
TRL	technical readiness levels
TU	construction phases
ZIRA	zone of interest for detailed survey

EXPERT TEAM MEMBERS

Altorfer, F.	Swiss Federal Nuclear Safety Inspectorate – ENSI, Switzerland
Dverstorp, B.	Swedish Radiation Safety Authority (SSM), Sweden
Fischer-Appelt, K.	Gesellschaft fuer Anlagen- und Reaktorsicherheit (GRS), Germany
Heinonen, J.	Finnish Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Authority (STUK), Finland
Ilett, D.	Environment Agency (England), United Kingdom
McCartin, T.	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), United States of America
Volckaert, G.	Federal Agency for Nuclear Control (FANC), Belgium
Bruno, G.	International Atomic Energy Agency
Van Marcke, P.	International Atomic Energy Agency



IAEA

International Atomic Energy Agency

No. 25

ORDERING LOCALLY

In the following countries, IAEA priced publications may be purchased from the sources listed below or from major local booksellers.

Orders for unpriced publications should be made directly to the IAEA. The contact details are given at the end of this list.

CANADA

Renouf Publishing Co. Ltd

22-1010 Polytek Street, Ottawa, ON K1J 9J1, CANADA

Telephone: +1 613 745 2665 • Fax: +1 643 745 7660

Email: order@renoufbooks.com • Web site: www.renoufbooks.com

Bernan / Rowman & Littlefield

15200 NBN Way, Blue Ridge Summit, PA 17214, USA

Tel: +1 800 462 6420 • Fax: +1 800 338 4550

Email: orders@rowman.com Web site: www.rowman.com/bernan

CZECH REPUBLIC

Suweco CZ, s.r.o.

Sestupná 153/11, 162 00 Prague 6, CZECH REPUBLIC

Telephone: +420 242 459 205 • Fax: +420 284 821 646

Email: nakup@suweco.cz • Web site: www.suweco.cz

FRANCE

Form-Edit

5 rue Janssen, PO Box 25, 75921 Paris CEDEX, FRANCE

Telephone: +33 1 42 01 49 49 • Fax: +33 1 42 01 90 90

Email: formedit@formedit.fr • Web site: www.form-edit.com

GERMANY

Goethe Buchhandlung Teubig GmbH

Schweitzer Fachinformationen

Willstätterstrasse 15, 40549 Düsseldorf, GERMANY

Telephone: +49 (0) 211 49 874 015 • Fax: +49 (0) 211 49 874 28

Email: kundenbetreuung.goethe@schweitzer-online.de • Web site: www.goethebuch.de

INDIA

Allied Publishers

1st Floor, Dubash House, 15, J.N. Heredi Marg, Ballard Estate, Mumbai 400001, INDIA

Telephone: +91 22 4212 6930/31/69 • Fax: +91 22 2261 7928

Email: alliedpl@vsnl.com • Web site: www.alliedpublishers.com

Bookwell

3/79 Nirankari, Delhi 110009, INDIA

Telephone: +91 11 2760 1283/4536

Email: bkwell@nde.vsnl.net.in • Web site: www.bookwellindia.com

ITALY

Libreria Scientifica "AEIOU"

Via Vincenzo Maria Coronelli 6, 20146 Milan, ITALY

Telephone: +39 02 48 95 45 52 • Fax: +39 02 48 95 45 48

Email: info@libreriaaeiou.eu • Web site: www.libreriaaeiou.eu

JAPAN

Maruzen-Yushodo Co., Ltd

10-10 Yotsuyasakamachi, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160-0002, JAPAN

Telephone: +81 3 4335 9312 • Fax: +81 3 4335 9364

Email: bookimport@maruzen.co.jp • Web site: www.maruzen.co.jp

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Scientific and Engineering Centre for Nuclear and Radiation Safety

107140, Moscow, Malaya Krasnoselskaya st. 2/8, bld. 5, RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Telephone: +7 499 264 00 03 • Fax: +7 499 264 28 59

Email: secnrs@secnrs.ru • Web site: www.secnrs.ru

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Bernan / Rowman & Littlefield

15200 NBN Way, Blue Ridge Summit, PA 17214, USA

Tel: +1 800 462 6420 • Fax: +1 800 338 4550

Email: orders@rowman.com • Web site: www.rowman.com/bernan

Renouf Publishing Co. Ltd

812 Proctor Avenue, Ogdensburg, NY 13669-2205, USA

Telephone: +1 888 551 7470 • Fax: +1 888 551 7471

Email: orders@renoufbooks.com • Web site: www.renoufbooks.com

Orders for both priced and unpriced publications may be addressed directly to:

Marketing and Sales Unit

International Atomic Energy Agency

Vienna International Centre, PO Box 100, 1400 Vienna, Austria

Telephone: +43 1 2600 22529 or 22530 • Fax: +43 1 2600 29302 or +43 1 26007 22529

Email: sales.publications@iaea.org • Web site: www.iaea.org/books

