

DRAFT

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

*General Meeting in Vienna on Monday
20 September 2004 at 1530 hours*

Present:

Neville Chamberlain, Chairman
Gail de Planque, Vice chairman
Gerald Clark, Secretary
Bertrand Barre
Chiou Syh tsong
Peter Jelinek

Yanko Yanev of the IAEA was present for the second half of the meeting in order to give a presentation on Nuclear Knowledge Preservation.

Apologies:

Walt Kato
Witold Lepecki
Jorge Spitalnik
Dan Meneley
Clarence Hardy
Georges Cornet
Andy Kadak
Jacques Bouchard
Lucille Langlois

The Chairman welcomed those present. In addition to the Draft Agenda which had been circulated there would be a short presentation by Mr Yanev of the Agency on the Preservation of Nuclear Knowledge project. He also wished under Any Other Business to seek the meeting's endorsement of his proposed successor, Dr Jorge Spitalnik. Subject to these amendments, the meeting adopted the Agenda.

Item 1: Minutes of the last meeting

The minutes of the Annual General Meeting, held in New Orleans in 16 November 2003 were agreed without amendment or comment.

Item 2: Matters arising

Membership listing

The Secretary said that he had carried out the wishes of the AGM to call all inactive members Emeritus Members, and to list them by country of origin rather than by their present address.

Preservation of Nuclear Knowledge

The Secretary said that the project had expanded, and had changed direction. He had had a number of somewhat frustrating exchanges with the IAEA, and Mr Yanev would be able to give an up-to-date account of their thinking in his presentation. The chairman said that it was for the Agency to specify what they wanted, and for the secretary to follow up. Action: Secretary

Item 3: Accounts for 2003, and interim Financial Statement for 2004

The Secretary explained that bank charges and currency conversion had led to some odd looking figures. He had learnt by experience that cash was not necessarily charges-free, and the most economical way for members to pay their subscriptions was by cheque. The Secretary said that about 20% of the membership had paid their subscriptions in 2004; this was a better performance than previously, attributable to the fact that he had sent out invoices three times. He asked in view of the sound financial situation for agreement for him to attend the next Executive Committee meeting in Washington in mid November. He confirmed that it would tie into the usual back-to-back meeting with the INSC. The Accounts were accepted on a motion proposed by Peter Jelinek and seconded by Gail de Planque. The meeting took note of the Interim Statement for 2004.

Item 4: Chairman's report

The Chairman said that the main thing he wished to report was that the Spring Executive Committee meeting had successfully taken place by telephone on 22 March 2004. This had enabled more people to be present than a meeting in the flesh would have permitted. Gail de Planque said that it was also possible to combine the two: have telephone participants as well as people in a room. In discussion it was suggested that this was more difficult to bring off successfully.

Item 5: Task Force reports

The Secretary said that an Executive Statement on the Management of Radiotoxic Waste had been circulated to the membership with encouragement to give it wide publicity and to pass it to persons in authority. A second paper on Terrorism had been completed and was ready for circulation. The Low Level Radiation Group had got bogged down in an acrimonious discussion of the significance of the papers produced by Dr Chen in Taiwan about the Cobalt 60 incident there, so were far from producing a paper. He had heard nothing further from Jacques Bouchard about the paper on the Future of Nuclear Power, nor from Mr Hori who was supposed to producing a paper for the INSC on the Hydrogen Economy. (Bertrand Barre agreed to chase Mr Bouchard.) The INSC paper to which he had contributed on Nuclear Non-proliferation had now been published. Action: Mr Barre

The Chairman said that it was worth reminding the membership that the INEA now sought to produce three different types of paper as appropriate: position papers, which required proper academic peer review type approval, review papers which needed the approval of the full membership, and Executive Statements which could be cleared by the Executive Committee in the interests of speed (so that they might be published while the issue was still topical), but which would have a mild disclaimer making it

clear that they did not necessarily represent the views of the whole membership but had been endorsed by the Committee.

In a short discussion on how best to distribute these papers when they were ready it was agreed that they should be sent to the INSC with a request that the INSC ask all its member societies of distribute them to their respective memberships, to put them on their websites and to print them in their Journals.

The Academy should also send a covering Note which would list the different sorts of paper it was issuing, with an appropriate disclaimer in the case of Executive Statements, and which would also give a short description of the Academy's aims and how it could be contacted.

The meeting decided that the Terrorism paper should now be distributed to the full membership after a final consultation with Dave Rossin. In the discussion about the possibility of a Low Level Radiation paper, Dr Chiou said that the Taiwan Health Authority had been pushed into doing a study, which was likely to be completed in about six months, which it was hoped would make up for the epidemiological deficiencies in Dr Chen's papers. The meeting noted that the ICRP was shortly going to agree new guidelines to replace ICRP-60 which would keep the LNT hypothesis as its central tenet. This gave added urgency to the project to produce an INEA Statement. It was agreed that the complications of the subject could easily lead to an extensive paper on the lines of a doctoral thesis, but what was needed was a review paper at most, or better an Executive Statement. The Chairman said that the aim should be to cut through the controversies surrounding this subject. He believed that the way forward was an Executive Statement which set out that there were three rival theories, and which concentrated on pointing out that at very low doses of radiation regulatory action was not required, emphasizing the fact that the Linear No Threshold position was merely a hypothesis in the absence of conclusive evidence one way or the other. He offered to provide a first draft. Action: Mr Chamberlain

Item 6: Membership

The Secretary said that on the basis that there were still a number of members who were in limbo (drifting from active to emeritus membership) it would be a legitimate aim to recruit up to a dozen new members, bearing in mind the need for geographical balance. Peter Jelinek said that the new East European members of the EU had hardly any representatives in the INEA. This should be remedied. He also pointed out that Dave Nichols had given up his post as CEO of the PBMR project in South Africa, and his successor might be approached. It was agreed that the Secretary would circulate the current list again, and write to the INSC asking them to nominate members from specific countries in eastern Europe and other places where nuclear was strong but there were no INEA Members (such as Finland). Action: Secretary

Item 7: World Nuclear University

The Secretary said that after almost a year in which very little progress had been possible because of lack of resources the impasse had been resolved: the WNA had accepted offers of secondments of 3-4 people from France, China and the United States to its core group, charged with providing the administrative underpinning of the University. The first one would arrive the following week. A Summer Seminar had been announced for July-August 2005 at the US National Laboratory in Idaho. Mr Yanev (who had by now arrived) added some more detail: The Korean Minister of Science and Technology had convinced a

meeting the Agency ran in June that the proposal for a six-week summer seminar had a good enough business plan to support. There were several competing proposals to hold it in Trieste, Sweden or China, but in the end Alan Waltar had persuaded Bill Magwood of the DoE to bankroll it on the basis that it would be held at the US National Laboratory in Idaho. In these circumstances the Agency would be able to provide support to young scientists from developing countries from the TC Budget, and would co-ordinate the applications to attend. The Chairman proposed that the INEA should repeat its general offer of 2003 to John Ritch of the WNA of support with the academic side. It was so agreed.

Item 8: Preservation of Nuclear Knowledge

Mr Yanev said that the Agency now had 62 countries participating in its Preservation of Nuclear Knowledge project. It was agreed that it was needed in the public interest, to promote the responsible use of nuclear knowledge and for its own sake. There were many ways in which the transfer of nuclear knowledge had been insufficient up to now. The supporters of nuclear energy needed better knowledge in order to act efficiently. The IAEA programme fell into three main segments:

1. to enhance nuclear energy and training;
2. preserving and maintaining existing nuclear knowledge; and
3. pooling and analysing this knowledge. He wanted to discuss the second and third of these with the INEA.

He believed that the Academy was uniquely well placed to capture nuclear knowledge. We needed to examine why we had to maintain nuclear knowledge, how best to do (principles and processes), and to look closely at methodology so as to find how best to extract it from those who had it.

The first step would be to find appropriate territory in which to set up joint action: the INEA might take the initiative in deciding what was important, and explore the possibility of filming or interviewing appropriate persons. It might be a fertile field to examine where the nuclear industry had failed in its objectives, and consider the reasons for that. For its part, the Agency could create a consultancy meeting to consider how to take the project forward from here.

Gail de Planque said that the INEA and INSC would be having a joint meeting in Washington in Mid November. Perhaps Mr Yanev could be the speaker at the usual joint luncheon. The Chairman summing up thanked Mr Yanev for his presentation. The Academy had welcomed the Agency's initiative in 2003. It would be useful if the Agency could now ask some specific questions which we could now put to the membership. Mr Yanev promised to write to the Secretary setting out some proposed terms and references Gail de Planque said that an interesting line to explore might be what you have to do if you decide to outsource vital services. One of the Californian Generators had a couple of years ago decided to outsource its engineering services, and in order to make sure that it got what it required it first made a fundamental and very detailed review of its needs. An analogous approach could be very helpful in the preservation of nuclear knowledge

Item 7: Any other business

The Chairman said that it had been agreed in principle for some time that he should be succeeded by Dr. Jorge Spitalnik when his term as Chairman of the INSC came to an end at the end of 2004. The meeting

therefore confirmed the appointment on a proposal from Bertrand Barre seconded by Gail de Planque. The Chairman said further that Dr Spitalnik had asked Gerald Clark to continue as Secretary. The meeting accordingly confirmed Mr Clark in his position for a further two years on a proposal from Gail de Planque seconded by Dr Chiou.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 5p.m.

Gerald Clark
Secretary