



Monday, September 26, 2016

Mr. B. Torrie
Director General, Regulatory Policy Directorate
Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission
P.O. Box 1046
280 Slater Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5S9

1.03.02

FILE DOSSIER	1-8-8-0
REFERRED TO / REFERÉ À	Torrie, B.

Dear Mr. Torrie:

Canadian Nuclear Association Comments on DIS-16-02: Radiation Protection and Dosimetry

The Canadian Nuclear Association (CNA) and its members would like to thank the CNSC for the opportunity to comment on DIS-16-02: Radiation Protection and Dosimetry. Our members particularly appreciate the willingness of CNSC staff to discuss the critical issues.

While industry supports the CNSCs move to create succinct, clearly written regulatory documents, we have concerns that some elements of this discussion paper are premature and are actually counter-productive to the CNSC's goals.

The CNA worked with its members to compile the attached list of comments. I would however like to highlight the following points:

- Our members believe very strongly that it is premature to adopt proposed dose of the eye limits. CNA members and others in the nuclear industry (medical) met with CNSC staff in August to express our concerns that it is too early to reduce the dose limit to the lens of the eye. There are two key points we would highlight: First, there is no evidence of increased health effects to Canadian nuclear energy workers and research results have been inconclusive. Secondly, there is no available instrumentation to accurately measure dose to the lens of the eye. Given these two points, the CNA would urge the CNSC to implement regulations only when solid evidence is provided to support changes in the dose limits for lens of eye and approved methods for workplace monitoring and measurement are developed.
- Although, CNA members appreciate the attempt to clarify and streamline documents, we feel that in this case consolidation would create such massive and complicated documents that in practice their effectiveness is likely to be diminished. Our members suggest that REGDOCs be organized into sections or chapters. This will make it easier for compliance, reviews and revisions as well referencing the documents within licenses.

- CNA members feel that there is some need for guidance on Section 21 of the Radiation Protection Regulations regarding the posting of signs at boundaries and points of access. Traditionally, the posting has been in the immediate area of dose rate. This has been problematic because the dose rate fluctuates over time and has resulted in multiple reports of non-compliance due to the fluctuating rates. Our members suggest guidance should be developed to avoid these low safety significant reports.

Once again, we appreciate the opportunity to provide comment on this Discussion Paper and encourage the CNSC to continue to engage licensees further as these proposed REGDOCs are developed. If you require further information or have any questions regarding this submission, please feel free to contact me directly.

Yours sincerely,



Steve Coupland
Director, Regulatory and Environmental Affairs
Canadian Nuclear Association

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change (if applicable)	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, if major comment
1.	General	The timing of the proposed documents is premature because the new RP regulations have not been finalized. The stated purpose of the proposed documents is to "align with and provide relevant information to licences for meeting the new requirements resulting from the forthcoming amendments to the Radiation Protection Regulations." Since these have not been published, it is difficult to provide many specific comments on potential points that need clarification or further information in the proposed documents.	Industry suggests the CNSC defer the discussion on the proposed documents until the new RP regulations have been adopted.	MAJOR	Industry is unable to fully assess the potential impact of the documents because the revised RP regulations have not been published.
2.	General	There appear to be a number of new topics in the proposed documents, particularly proposed REGDOC-2.7.1 Radiation Protection , that do not relate to the regulations, but to the generic science of radiation protection. The need for a number of sections of REGDOC 2.7.1 is unclear. For example, the CNSC has stated it will not adopt the concept of Dose Constraint in DIS-13-01: Proposals to Amend the Radiation Protection Regulations .	Limit the scope of the documents to areas directly tied to the RP regulations.	MAJOR	As stated, the proposed content of REGDOC 2.7.1 could introduce a number of unnecessarily prescriptive practices that are not needed nor tied directly to implementing the radiation protection regulations.

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change <i>(if applicable)</i>	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, <i>if major comment</i>
		Given this, why is this section in the document? This reinforces industry's view that it is not possible to fully comment on this document because the revisions to the RP regulations have not been published. Other than the sections on exceedances of dose limits, it is not clear what would be covered in the section on radiation dose limits that wouldn't be covered in the regulations.			
		Most of the sections of Control of Radiological Hazards are likely to be facility-specific and/or matters of general science. For example, shielding, ventilation, dust control, various types of monitoring and control, radiation protection equipment and instrumentation.			
3.	General	The scope of the document is very large, especially when all additional regulatory documents referenced are considered. This makes it difficult to provide comprehensive and meaningful comments on any concerns with these referenced documents. Despite this, the paper says the "CNSC would like to hear	Industry seeks assurance that there will be extended discussion periods when the actual regulatory guides are developed, including workshops particularly for any new content.	MAJOR	The CNSC's expectations will create a resource burden for licensees who will find it difficult to provide needed resources to properly assess the large scope of the documents in a short period of time.

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change (if applicable)	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, if major comment
		comments on the CNSC's assessment of each existing documentation for inclusion in the regulatory documents and the proposed updates").			
4.	General	Industry questions the fundamental benefit of consolidating these REGDOCs.	Rather than create two large REGDOCs, industry suggests they be divided into a series of smaller, more user-friendly documents with logical chapters or parts.	MAJOR	As stated earlier, this document is very broad in terms of content and scope. As a result, both guidance documents will be very large. Making changes to a 20-page document requires significant effort and time. By extension, documents of the breadth and size of the proposed documents will be a massive undertaking to update and keep current with evolving science and/or international recommendations. Consolidation runs the risk of creating documents that are so large they cannot be reviewed comprehensively and updated at sufficient intervals to be aligned with current best practices.
5.	Section 3.1, page 3	Under 'Changes to international benchmarks,' industry has concerns with the line, "These revised international benchmarks need to be reflected in the Radiation Protection Regulations." This is particularly true with regard to dose limits to the lens of the eye. As discussed with CNSC staff in August 2016, industry believes it is too early to reduce the dose limit to the lens of the eye for the	<p>Industry believes it is premature to adopt proposed dose of the eye limits until existing technical and operational issues are resolved.</p> <p>The CNSC is urged to implement regulations only when solid evidence is provided to support changes in the dose limits for lens of eye and approved methods for workplace monitoring and measurement of lens of eye dose are developed.</p>	MAJOR	The Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the United States has not accepted the International Commission on Radiological Protection recommendation and will not be changing the dose limits to the lens of the eye. As such, it is too soon for the Canadian industry to adopt all of the proposed limits as written. For example, the instrumentation is not currently available to perform workplace monitoring and measure lens of eye dose with any type of accuracy or precision in the power industry. The substantial costs licensees would incur to measure and control the eye dose appear out of line

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change <i>(if applicable)</i>	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, <i>if major comment</i>
		following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence of increased health impacts to Canadian nuclear energy workers. • Research results have been inconclusive and contain large uncertainties at the very low exposure levels (0-1 Gy). • The instrumentation is not currently available to measure lens of eye dose with any type of accuracy or precision in the power industry. 			with the detriment compared to other potential safety improvements.
6.	Section 3.2, Strengthening existing CNSC documents	It is not clear what the references for “current best practices” are for the development of meaningful action levels. How will CNSC staff determine current best practices?		<i>Clarification</i>	
7.	Section 3.2 G-91, Ascertainin g and Recording Radiation Doses to Individuals	Currently, G-91 provides sufficient guidance as well as flexibility to make decisions on a risk based approach that is appropriate for each site. It also acknowledges there needs to be some flexibility on reasonableness with regard to use of a dosimetry service for internal dosimetry. For implementation purposes, it is important for this flexibility to remain. Industry awaits	If there are intended changes regarding how G-91 is applied then further discussions are required with industry.	<i>Clarification</i>	

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change (if applicable)	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, if major comment
		further information regarding "additional guidance clarifying the interpretation of section 5 (e.g., "direct measurement" and "estimation") and section 8 (i.e., use of licensed dosimetry services) of the <i>Radiation Protection Regulations.</i> "			
8.	Section 3.2 G-129: Keeping Radiation Exposure and Dose ALARA	The CNSC has stated it will not be introducing dose constraints into the RP regulations. Therefore, industry does not believe dose restraints should be introduced into a regulatory guide document as a mandatory requirement. Beyond the comment above, this document currently provides good general guidance and framework for an ALARA program.	Industry recommends the document remain largely as is, though items that may strengthen it include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of the monetary cost per rem concept (for individual and collective dose); how it is derived and applied in dose optimization and cost-benefit analysis. • Guidance on how to keep dose ALARA for different phases of the plant, e.g. Commissioning, Operation, Decommissioning and Waste Management. • Provide examples of what good looks like, including good and best practices. 	<i>Clarification</i>	
9.	Section 3.2 General -G-147, Radiobioas say Protocols for Responding to Abnormal Intakes of Radionuclides	Industry awaits further information.	Provide additional information.	MAJOR	Industry will be better able to assess the impact of potential changes once a detailed draft is made available for comment.

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change <i>(if applicable)</i>	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, <i>if major comment</i>
10.	Section 3.2 GD-150, Designing and Implementi ng a Bioassay program	Industry awaits further information.		MAJOR	Industry will be better able to assess the impact of potential changes once a detailed draft is made available for comment.
11.	Section 3.2 G-218	G-218 is acceptable as currently written. It provides sufficient guidance along with the recognition that a Code of Practice can be quite site dependent. Specifically, it provides a well-worded summary of action levels, including the recommendation they should be linked to effective dose as this is a useful indicator of a potential loss of control. If any additional detail or guidance is added, care must be taken to avoid reducing the flexibility in the existing text.		<i>Clarification</i>	
12.	Section 3.2, G-313 Radiation Safety Training Program for Workers Involved in Licensed Activities	This has the potential to create confusion and duplication of information. Industry maintains both NSRD and /or Class II licences and its training programs include elements of the appropriate regulations and recommended training content.	Do not include G-313 in proposed REGDOC .This is covered under REGDOC-2.2.2 Personnel Training . It is suggested that using an Annex similar to what was done for the Workers Involved in Licensed Activities with Nuclear Substances and Radiation Devices, and with Class II Nuclear Facilities and Prescribed Equipment may be appropriate	MAJOR	Consolidating G-313 with REGDOC-2.2.2 will avoid confusion and duplication of information.

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change (if applicable)	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, if major comment
	with Nuclear Substances and Radiation Devices and with Class II Nuclear Facilities and Prescribed Equipment				
13.	Section 3.2, GD-314, Radiation Protection Programs for the Transport of Nuclear Substances	Industry awaits further information. Industry may have comments when the draft changes are incorporated into the Packaging and Transport regulatory document.	Provide additional information.	Clarification	
14.	Section 3.2, RD-58 Thyroid Screening for Radioiodin e	Industry awaits further information.	Provide additional information.	MAJOR	Industry will be better able to assess the impact of potential changes once a detailed draft is made available for comment.
15.	Section 3.2, S-106, rev. 1, Technical and Quality Assurance Requireme nts for	Industry does not agree with the inclusion of this document in REGDOC-2.7.2 because S-106 is the license document for dosimetry lab licensees and is detailed, specific and focused on dosimetry labs. Industry does	S-106 should be integrated into a separate REGDOC or a specific chapter within the proposed document.	MAJOR	Placing this QA document into a larger guidance document would impact the dosimetry licencing process and lead to potential confusion of requirements. S-106 would become applicable to companies who are not actually licensed operators under any additional regulations. Combining it with all other

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change (if applicable)	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, <i>if major comment</i>
	Dosimetry Services	not feel it is appropriate for dosimetry labs to be audited against other elements of REGDOC 2.7.2.			content listed in these documents would be difficult and confusing for those companies.
16.	S-106, rev. 1, Technical and Quality Assurance Requirements for Dosimetry Services	The proposed replacement for existing performance criteria: DIS 16-02 , does not specifically identify the document. When this paper says, "New performance criteria for bioassay have recently been published by the American National Standards Institute in 2011" is it referencing ANSI/HPS N13.30-2011 Performance Criteria for Radiobioassay? If so, industry is concerned that adopting the ANSI standard would lead to additional administrative burden with no improvement to safety and quality.	It is strongly recommended that references and the basis of ANSI/HPS N13.30-2011 be scrutinized to prevent inadvertent consequences or to become incompatible with current accepted practices. Industry should be consulted to identify what problems are being solved.	<i>Clarification</i>	
17.	Section 3.2, S-106, rev. 1, Technical and Quality Assurance Requirements for Dosimetry Services	On page 6, this paper says, "clarifications regarding CNSC expectations with respect to quality assurance programs for licensed dosimetry programs are proposed to be included."	Industry requests guidance on how missing dosimeter results constitute a test failure, as well as how to deal with cases where the group/ organization exposing dosimeters (or providing bioassay performance test samples) provide incorrect values.	<i>Clarification</i>	
18.	Section 3.2, S-106, rev. 1,	Some jurisdictions are moving towards implementing only one primary dosimeter,	Include guidance for using electronic personal dosimeters as primary dosimeters for whole body, skin, extremity and lens of the eye.	<i>Clarification</i>	

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change (if applicable)	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, if major comment
	Technical and Quality Assurance Requirements for Dosimetry Services	and it is electronic.			
19.	Section 3.2, S-106, rev. 1, Technical and Quality Assurance Requirements for Dosimetry Services	Current industry dosimetry service licence conditions specify that events which affect the reliability of dosimetry results obtained shall be reported.	Define what standard of reliability is expected in dosimetry service.	Clarification	
20.	Section 3.2, S-106, rev. 1, Technical and Quality Assurance Requirements for Dosimetry Services	Re Section 4.2.7.2: In industry's experience, this particular test has been historically problematic to coordinate and evaluate. As a result, one has not taken place in more than five years.	Industry recommends eliminating this section from S-106.	MAJOR	There will be an additional burden with no corresponding improvement to safety or quality.
21.	Section 3.2, S-106, rev. 1, Technical and Quality Assurance Requirements for Dosimetry Services	Industry will need to know the performance and type test criteria for lens of the eye dosimetry.	Please address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What phantom to use (for a dosimeter specifically designed for the lens, a variant of the ORAMED cylindrical phantom is suggested, but for using existing WB TLDs, a 15 cm x 30 cm x 30 cm PMMA water-filled phantom is appropriate to minimize re-doing type testing). • What Dose Conversion Factors to use, for beta and photons, for the two phantoms. • How to do beta type testing, when only the Beta 	MAJOR	This will be required so licensees can either amend their dosimetry service licences or enable them to be smart buyers of these services.

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change <i>(if applicable)</i>	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, <i>if major comment</i>
			<p>Secondary Standard 2 (BSS2) Sr/Y-90 beta source is the only one available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accuracy and precision specifications for lens dosimetry. • Specific requirements for use of existing H_p(3) lens dose results from WB TLDs. 		
22.	<p>Section 3.2,S-260, Making Changes to Dose-Related Information Filed With the National Dose Registry,</p>	<p>The current version of S-260 treats all dose record changes as a dose correction. There is no provision for making changes that are purely of an administrative nature and should not require CNSC approval. These administrative changes include such things as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wrong employer serial number • Late submission/report • Change to dose data as a result of error in quantities used to obtain analytical result (e.g. TLD ECC, calibration data) • Correction made to a dose algorithm <p>These points should be considered dose record changes and not a dose correction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define what constitutes a dose correction. • Add the concept of an administrative change that does not require CNSC approval. • Remove CNSC authorization of dose corrections to the NDR for licenced facilities. Rephrase from worker approval to worker notification. 	<p>MAJOR</p>	<p>There will be an additional burden with no corresponding improvement to safety or quality.</p>
23.	<p>Section 3.2,S-260, Making Changes to Dose-</p>	<p>Industry supports a streamlined process to address “mass changes” to dose records. Currently, each dose record change requires</p>	<p>Streamline the process to address “mass changes” to dose records.</p>	<p><i>Clarification</i></p>	

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change (if applicable)	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, if major comment
	Related Information Filed With the National Dose Registry,	completion of a CNSC Dose Information Correction Form, which requires CNSC approval to proceed with a change to dose previously submitted to NDR. There is no provision for processing large numbers of dose corrections, without use of the form for each record.			
24.	Section 3.2, S-260, Making Changes to Dose-Related Information Filed With the National Dose Registry,	<p>Re Section B of the CNSC Dose Information Change Request Form: This form requires the person to acknowledge and accept in writing that a change is being made to their dose information filed in the NDR. The form further requires that Section B must be completed before industry may submit the request. While industry believes in the necessity of notifying an individual that a correction to their data filed in NDR has been made and why, it is very difficult to comply with this requirement when the person has left a facility and has not provided a forwarding address or contact or when the person is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A contractor to a facility and has left the site, • Retired from a facility , or • Deceased. <p>Further, there is an</p>	<p>Remove the requirement that workers must accept dose record change.</p> <p>Require workers to acknowledge being told record has been changed and why.</p> <p>The NDR should flag dose corrections in their system for communication to the worker.</p>	Clarification	

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change (if applicable)	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, if major comment
		implication that if the person does not accept the change, then the process ends and no change is made. Making this change will result in improved timeliness in processing dose corrections.			
25.	Section 3.3, Improvement opportunities	The CNSC has identified a number of specific improvement opportunities, the first three of which relate more directly to radiation protection programs while the others relate to radiation dosimetry. As previously stated, the intent to combine all regulatory guidance into two documents may generate an exceedingly long document or omit significant relevant detail if the individual documents are shortened in the process. Another challenge with large documents is that their very size and wide range of topics make the revision process problematic.	Industry would like the CNSC to provide: examples where the proposed approach has worked well; more information regarding the standards or international guidance upon which they are based.	Clarification	
26.	Section 3.3, Improvement opportunities	All of the elements listed in this section may have an impact on industry. See specifics in the comments below.	Where appropriate, it may be beneficial to identify an existing, recognized external standard and identify the extent to which licensees are expected to follow those documents. Industry also asks for guidance on using electronic personal dosimeters as primary dosimeters.	MAJOR	Any changes may require licence amendments and significant resource commitments with no corresponding improvement to safety or quality. Industry will be better able to assess the impact of potential changes once a detailed draft is made available for comment.
27.	Section 3.3	Licensees have invested	Any changes need to acknowledge that licensees have	MAJOR	Any changes may require licence

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change (if applicable)	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, if major comment
	Radiation Protection program design and associated processes	large amounts of time, expertise and experience to develop their RP programs. CNSC acceptance/ notification are required for key program documents. Revisions need to respect the maturity and robust design of the NPP programs and the safety culture that uses and depends upon them. Revisions must not impede the progressive changes to program design which allow refinement of their Nuclear Safety Culture. They must reflect the business need to align with CSA N286-12 . As an inclusion to REGDOC-2.7.1 , it should be as guidance only.	invested significant resources to develop mature RP programs that will need to evolve over time to align with other standards and refine their nuclear safety culture		amendments and significant resource commitments with no corresponding improvement to safety or quality. Industry will be better able to assess the impact of potential changes once a detailed draft is made available for comment.
28.	Section 3.3 Calibration and maintenance of radiation protection equipment	Technology in the radiation protection equipment area is developing quickly and regulators need to keep pace. Given the speed of technological advancements, licensees need the ability to develop acceptance criteria and adopt these unforeseen technologies.	Guidance is sought on the framework of acceptable processes including the following attributes: QA; use of secondary standards; frequencies.	<i>Clarification</i>	\
29.	Section 3.3 Radiation dose rate and contam control program	Industry seeks guidance only that allows flexibility of application. NPPs already invest significant effort with CANDU owners, nuclear vendors and INPO/WANO to	Any changes need to acknowledge that licensees have invested significant resources to develop RP programs that are mature and already recognized as effective by the CNSC	<i>Clarification</i>	

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change <i>(if applicable)</i>	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, <i>if major comment</i>
		develop excellence in dose rate and contamination control.			
30.	Section 3.3 Ascertaining radiation doses to workers, when no licenced dosimetry service is utilized	Maturity of existing programs should be recognized. The stations already have a requirement to know their source term, and should be considered a mature program. This program can be utilized to ascertain or estimate radiation doses to workers.	Define trivial dose (no further action required) and provide guidance on use for dose calculations. Industry recommends 1 mSv per year or less than 0.1 mSv per event.	MAJOR	Any changes may require licence amendments and significant resource commitments with no corresponding improvement to safety or quality. Industry will be better able to assess the impact of potential changes once a detailed draft is made available for comment
31.	Section 3.3 Use of monitoring results from direct reading dosimeters	The guidance document should allow licensees to pursue use of direct reading dosimeters as licenced dosimetry.	The guidance document should allow licensees to pursue the use of electronic direct reading dosimeters as licenced dosimetry. A different set of standards/technical requirements (Specific section is REGDOC 2.7.2 as a licenced dosimeter) will be required for the acceptance of electronic direct reading dosimeters.	<i>Clarification</i>	
32.	Section 3.3 Dose calculation methods for skin contamination, multiple badging and non-uniform exposures	NPPs are rarely limited by skin dose limits given the protections used when conducting work. Thus, unlicenced dosimetry should be considered. Using available reference material, simple field instruments should be permitted to give initial dose estimates. And, similar to derived activities for internal dosimetry, combinations of field instrument results and exposure times should be used to determine if further	Guidance is sought on what would constitute unlicenced dosimetry for these situations. Criteria for current multiple badging should remain unchanged.	<i>Clarification</i>	

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change (if applicable)	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, if major comment
		dose investigation is required.			
33.	Section 3.3 Radionuclide-specific methods for internal dosimetry (for example, dose assessments for transuranics, uranium compounds, and tritium)	Industry does not concur with radionuclide-specific methods detailed in a guidance document. The pressure to measure for trivial hazards will increase.	<p>It is the licensee's responsibility to define the hazards and provide adequate dosimetry for them. The guidance document should, at a high level, detail these dosimetry requirements.</p> <p>Some improvements could be made to the dosimetry methods mentioned in guidance documents. Ratio analysis is not covered, whereby hard-to-detect nuclide dose can be computed from known ratios to indicator nuclides.</p> <p>A graduated response is necessary for hard-to-detect nuclides since it's not reasonably likely for exposures over 1mSv/annum to occur.</p> <p>Personal Air sampling is the easiest technique to screen for intakes of TRU. The field of internal dosimetry for TRU is too complicated for a regulatory document. High level guidance based on a graduated response similar to other internal hazards should be considered, but this document should not delve too deeply into internal dosimetry considerations. This is not done for other readily available nuclides, (Cobalt, Zirconium) and should not be specified here.</p> <p>Any internal dosimetry section should be able to encompass all nuclides of concern. At best, some distinction for radiation types which drive appropriate analytical types can be made.</p>	MAJOR	Any changes may require licence amendments and significant resource commitments with no corresponding improvement to safety or quality. Industry will be better able to assess the impact of potential changes once a detailed draft is made available for comment.
34.	Section 3.3 Ascertainin g the equivalent dose to the lens of the eye	Clear language is needed to allow the licensee to correctly determine the required dosimetry protocols. Clear methods of calculation are desirable in tabular format to provide clear go/no-go criteria for selection of estimates or	Line 4 of table 1 of eDoc:4894468 might imply that estimates or computations of Hp(3) using Hp(10) and Hp(07) might be acceptable. Line 9 suggests that direct measurements will be mandated for beta if there is energetic beta, safety glasses but no further protections. This intent needs to be clarified. Provide standards for protective eye wear for prevention of lens of eye dose.	MAJOR	The language chosen for the document -- estimate vs direct measurement -- has a significant impact on resource and implementation cost. Estimating from available dosimetry systems would minimize the costs of implementation. Direct measurement would be very costly to implement. The determination of which

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change <i>(if applicable)</i>	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, <i>if major comment</i>
		direct measurements requirements (align with table 1 of CNSC e Doc:4894468)			is acceptable must be very clear so the additional costs are justified.
35.	Section 3.3 Methods for monitoring neutron dosimetry	Neutron dose is difficult to accurately measure in fields with 7 decade spectrums. Industry has few options.	Clear guidance on acceptable protocols for use-of-stay times, survey meters or personal dosimeters is required.	<i>Clarification</i>	
36.	Section 3.3 Use of radiation personal protective equipment and respiratory protection	<p>Choice and selection of RP personal protective equipment and respiratory protection needs to be guidance only and give licensees the flexibility to meet work requirements and adopt/develop new equipment.</p> <p>If equipment or protections provided to workers reduce the dose estimates to less than trivial dose levels, dosimetry is not required unless those protections fail.</p> <p>Current guidelines state that dosimetry is recommended if respiratory protection is worn to protect a worker against a given hazard. The term 'recommended' is too restrictive. If it can be demonstrated that the exposure to the worker is less than trivial values, it is not</p>	Clarification is requested in that if a-priori dose estimates indicated worker exposure to less than trivial levels, no dosimetry is required unless protections fail.	<i>Clarification</i>	

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change <i>(if applicable)</i>	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, <i>if major comment</i>
		ALARA to go further with dosimetry unless those protections fail.			
37.	Section 3.3	Thoughts on additional guidance	Industry requests guidance on how to ascertain eye dose for workers originating from other countries that are not required to adhere to the lens of eye dosimetry requirements. It is believed the USA and other countries may not implement the new lens of eye dosimetry limits, which would imply that workers who have worked in those countries will not have lens of eye dose on their dose records.	<i>Clarification</i>	
38.	Section 4.1 General	<p>There is significant danger of 'scope creep' in the inclusion of existing regulatory documents with clearly defined scopes, e.g. G-313, into a common document with potential applicability across all licensees. Applicability of each section may not be consistent across industries and licensees, resulting in confusion. Also, if documents such as RD/GD-369 continue to exist, there will be redundant information and potential confusion since two documents will provide guidance on the same thing.</p> <p>Some of the proposed new content and referenced documents for inclusion are not applicable across all licensees. For example, G-313, thyroid screening, training, etc. How is content</p>	Provide a scope of applicability (i.e. to whom does the section apply) before each section in the REGDOC	<i>Clarification</i>	

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change <i>(if applicable)</i>	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, <i>if major comment</i>
		from this regulatory guide to be applied to all licensees if they do not all have the same risks and or requirements?			
39.	Section 4.1 Content from G-129, rev. 1 will be adopted & refined to provide guidance on the framework for radiation protection including the application of the ALARA principle	Additional guidance and definitions are required.	A definition of trivial dose, i.e. dose at which further RP efforts are not required is requested. Maintain the management commitment statements which translate into effective action.	MAJOR	Significant station resources are spent considering trivial doses. If there were hard guidelines stating these values, once that level is achieved, efforts at further protections could be put to more productive use.

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change <i>(if applicable)</i>	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, <i>if major comment</i>
40.	Section 4.1 Content from G-313 on categories of workers and corresponding radiation protection training topic areas (skills and knowledge) will be adopted and refined	This has the potential to create confusion and duplication of information. Industry maintains both NSRD and /or Class II licences and its training programs include elements of the appropriate regulations and recommended training content.	Do not include G-313 in proposed REGDOC .This is covered under REGDOC-2.2.2 <i>Personnel Training</i> . It is suggested that using an Annex similar to what was done for the Workers Involved in Licensed Activities with Nuclear Substances and Radiation Devices, and with Class II Nuclear Facilities and Prescribed Equipment may be appropriate.	MAJOR	Consolidating G-313 with REGDOC-2.2.2 will avoid confusion and duplication of information.
41.	Section 4.1 CNSC guidance for principles of worker dose control will be established and aligned with CNSC's G-91, RD-58, G-121, G-147, G-150, and RD/GD-369 (section 11)	Better definitions sought.	Define trivial dose (no further action required) and provide guidance on use for dose calculations. Industry recommends 1 mSv per year or less than 0.1 mSv per event. Define "component" in G-91 table in section 7.	<i>Clarification</i>	

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change <i>(if applicable)</i>	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, <i>if major comment</i>
42.	Section 4.1 Thoughts on additional guidance	Consider alignment with CSA N286-12, <i>Management System requirements for nuclear facilities</i>		<i>Clarification</i>	
43.	Section 4.1 Content from G-91	Industry agrees with integrating the document if it is maintained in its entirety	If there are intended changes regarding how G-91 is applied, then further discussions are required with industry.	<i>Clarification</i>	
	will include the interpretation of section 5 of the Radiation Protection Regulations (e.g. "direct measurement" and "estimation"), and section 8 of the Radiation Protection Regulations (when a licensed dosimetry service must be used to ascertain workers' doses)				

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change (if applicable)	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, if major comment
44.	Section 4.1 Guidance on ascertaining doses from intakes of radionuclides will be aligned with GD- 150 and G- 147	<p>G-147</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ascertaining of dose, dose interpretation as it pertains to assignable dose, or dose below the minimum recordable dose or below the derived activities, to be clarified. 2. The specific mention of Ce144 is difficult to achieve in practice. There are other nuclides which are more readily detectable by commercially field instrumentation (NaI based) and have higher fission yields (Zirconium, Cesium). Ce144 gamma emissions are below manufacturer's specified detection capabilities for many NaI based in-vivo counting systems. With the low to no dose assignments estimates for WBC, resource commitments to move to more sensitive/expensive instrumentation does not meet G91 ALARA principles. 3. Common terminology 	<p>G-147</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A table with these various levels, (dose from special, dose from routine) above and below MRD, and derived activities as well as actions and required NDR reporting would clarify these issues. 2. It would be better to incorporate statements of known source term ratios to other, easily identifiable nuclides which may be in the source term. 3. As far as common terminology, section 4.3 could be aligned better with GD-150 and the use of derived activities which drives facility response based on bioassay results. 	<p>MAJOR</p>	<p>G-147</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPPs maintain a source term characterization that produces actual ratios of all nuclides to each other in different areas of the plant. Ce144 is difficult to detect by WBC and is rarely found in these surveys. More useful nuclide and the concept of indicator nuclides and known source term ratios would better serve the NPP industry. • Use of derived activities for all internal dosimetry is ALARA and would be of benefit to the NPP industry. Derived activities shows true understanding of internal dosimetry. Routine sampling does not know the date of intake, and derived activities take this into consideration. A positive sample does not automatically result in dose assignment because if the intake occurred recently compared to sample submission, the dose is small to trivial. The derived activity protocol as defined in GD-150 then collects a second sample. If the intake was worthy of dose computation and assignment, it will still be observable in the second sample. If the intake was recent compared to the first sample, the second will not likely detect it given the intervening time between samples. This is especially of use for fecal sampling when the periods of intake concern may extend over many months. For low intakes

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change (if applicable)	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, if major comment
					the bioassay sample quickly falls to less than detection limits. For larger intakes, it will be observable for many months.
		<p>GD-150 Industry seeks clarity on language and limits for a number of items. In this guidance document.</p>	<p>GD-150 Clear language and limits are required for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Routine bioassay samples are submitted on a set frequency. They are intended to be set for workers who are possibly exposed to internal radiation hazards. They can be analyzed by licenced or unlicenced laboratories. • Screening bioassay samples use protocols which may not meet the 1 mSv per year or 0.1 mSv per infrequent event, but the licensee has demonstrated that such exposures are not reasonably probable. • Licenced dosimetry is a statement of quality assurance of the laboratory. Licenced dosimetry is to be used if the anticipated hazard will expose the worker to more than 5 mSv, or 1 mSv if there are combinations of hazards which may expose the worker to more than 5 mSv. • Unlicenced dosimetry services do not need to demonstrate the quality assurance as required for licenced dosimetry. • Dose Estimate is a preliminary calculation of the dose to a worker in an actual or theoretical scenario. If the estimate is below threshold levels, no further refinement or protections are required. The threshold levels are to be tied to 1 mSv/annum. Estimates can be reported to the NDR as dose records. • Ascertaining dose is a methodology to calculate a dose which will be reported to the national Dose Registry. It is to be performed by qualified individuals using approved protocols. The protocols may or may not be considered licenced dosimetry. • Reportable doses are those required to be sent to the National Dose Registry. They may come from licenced 	MAJOR	<p>GD-150</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The section on of derived activities is found to be a good ALARA practice. It drives appropriate station response based on bioassay findings. It reflects a good understanding of internal dosimetry specifically excretion characteristics. For example real significant intakes are observable many months after exposure. Routine samples do not know the intake date. To find out the station response to a sample over the DA is to obtain another sample. This involves a time delay. For a real significant intake, this sample too will be positive. If the intake was recent, then it will not be observable, the dose is small (trivial?) and no further action including non-reporting to the NDR is appropriate.

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change (if applicable)	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, if major comment
			<p>or unlicensed protocols. All dose estimates over 1 mSv per year must be considered reportable doses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trivial dose is a dose, possibly from an estimate which warrants no further consideration. This is taken to be 0.10 mSv per event or 1 mSv per annum. The application of this is varied but could include items such as the GD-150 recommendation for bioassay samples if PPE is worn to protect against a hazard. If the PPE reduces the dose estimate to less than trivial levels, then no bioassay is recommended (unless the PPE fails). • Reasonably probable is a professional judgement that a given event could occur in a given time frame. Historical or mathematical arguments can be used for this determination. For routine sampling considerations, this could be considered annually for example. If an event does not occur in a given year with many challenges to that event occurring, it should be considered not reasonably probable. For example if no dose has been assigned via a methodology type which has a routine frequency by many workers, exposure to that hazard is not reasonably probable, and the dosimetry should be unlicensed and or reduced from routine to screening at best. • Maintain the preference for PAS for the screening of intakes. Fecal is not appropriate for screening. • Could expand definition of what screening implies, where it can be used and dose response if positive. Screening is useful when anticipated dose is < 1 mSv/annum or 0.1 mSv per infrequent event. Licensed screening methods are not required (though they can be used) 		
45.	Section 4.1 S-106 Rev. 1 will be incorporated, with changes	Industry does not agree with the inclusion of this document in REGDOC-2.7.2 because S-106 is the license document for dosimetry lab licensees and is detailed,	<p>S-106 should be integrated into a separate REGDOC or a separate chapter.</p> <p>Industry also recommends strongly that references and the basis of ANSI/HPS N13.30-2011 be scrutinized to prevent inadvertent consequences or to become incompatible with</p>	MAJOR	<p>There will be an administrative burden with no improvement to safety and quality if this standard is adopted</p> <p>Placing this QA document into a larger guidance document would impact the</p>

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change (if applicable)	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, <i>if major comment</i>
	reflecting the updates described in section 3.2 of the discussion paper	<p>specific and focused on dosimetry labs. Industry does not feel it is appropriate for dosimetry labs to be audited against other elements of REGDOC 2.7.2.</p> <p>Also, the proposed replacement for existing performance criteria: DIS 16-02, does not specifically identify the document. When this paper says, "New performance criteria for bioassay have recently been published by the American National Standards Institute in 2011" is it referencing ANSI/HPS N13.30-2011 Performance Criteria for Radiobioassay? If so, industry is concerned that adopting the ANSI standard would lead to additional administrative burden with no improvement to safety and quality.</p>	current accepted practices. Industry should be consulted to identify what problems are being solved.		dosimetry licencing process and lead to potential confusion of requirements. S-106 would become applicable to companies who are not actually licensed operators under any additional regulations. Combining it with all other content listed in these documents would be difficult and confusing for those companies.
46.	Section 4.1 Thoughts on additional Guidance	Consider alignment with CSA N286-12, Management Systems requirements for nuclear facilities.			Depending on the extent that ANSI/HPS N13.30-2011 is to be followed, industry will be better able to assess the impact of additional changes.
47.	Section 4.2 – New Content	Under new content, the first bullet suggests the use of licensed dosimetry services for annual doses to			

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change (if applicable)	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, if major comment
		extremities greater than 50 mSv. This is acceptable to industry.			
48.	Section 4.2 –	Regarding the second bullet, the current proposal for the new RPRs specifies a fixed 5-year dosimetry period. Industry suggests users also be allowed to use a 5-year rolling average dose to determine compliance with dose limits.			
49.	Section 4.2 – New Content	Please provide a definition of the hands and feet, otherwise known as extremities.	In the past (circa 1997), extremities included the elbows and knees (see ANS/HPS N13.41 (1997)). Current thinking does not include the elbows and knees (see ANS/HPS N13.41 (2011)).	<i>Clarification</i>	
50.	Section 4.2 – New Content	Industry supports limiting intakes to infants from breast feeding parents.			
51.	Section 4.2 – New Content	What is being included in radiation protection equipment and instrumentation? Other than the requirements for the annual calibration of radiation instruments, the current regulations are vague on requirements.	Any guidance provided should not preclude the use of new and innovative technology to enhance the safety of workers. If defined, the document should provide guidance only.	<i>Clarification</i>	
52.	Section 4.2 – New Content	The latest ICRP recommendations (ICRP 103, OIR, and associated documents) might be considered by the CNSC for adoption in Canada. Before we adopt them, we need to understand their implications.	Industry requires that it be consulted prior to consideration of the latest ICRP.	MAJOR	Implementation of the new/revised dosimetry regulatory documents with recommendations for the use of revised ICRP dosimetric and biokinetic models as presented in the ICRP OIR series of documents will have significant impact on Industry's licenced internal dosimetry services. Industry's internal dosimetry

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change <i>(if applicable)</i>	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, <i>if major comment</i>
		<p>Any discrepancy or misalignment between the new regulatory document and the ICRP recommendations may result in regulatory requirements that may not be technically sound. The impact of such situations on industry is difficult to assess at this point, but it is clearly not desirable for such discrepancies to exist.</p>			<p>program and its technical basis document was developed using IMBA (Integrated Modules for Bioassay Analysis) Professional software, which is based on dosimetric and biokinetic models as per recommendations in ICRP60 publication. With the CNSC recommendation for use of the latest ICRP dosimetric and biokinetic models as presented in the ICRP103 publication, industry will be required to re-model its current internal dosimetry program and technical basis document to conform to the new models. ICRP dosimetric and biokinetic models are relatively complex mathematical compartmental models and require sophisticated software to complete the calculations. Industry will be required to find and purchase software, which would incorporate the latest ICRP dosimetric and biokinetic models. This poses a significant challenge that cannot be addressed until the updated software can be obtained.</p> <p>If adopted following consultation with industry, licensees request the CNSC allocate an adequate amount of time to implement and comply with the revised dosimetry regulatory documents.</p>
53.	Section 4.2 – New Content	<p>It was noted that neutron and eye dosimetry were listed in topics under New Content in the discussion paper, but do not appear to be covered in the table of contents of either proposed guidance</p>	<p>Industry notes the CNSC has issued a separate technical document on eye dosimetry. As this is a dynamic area, both from a scientific and licensing perspective, it is recommended this topic not be incorporated into this guidance until it is more stable.</p>	MAJOR	<p>Any changes may require licence amendments and significant resource commitments with no corresponding improvement to safety or quality. Industry will be better able to assess the impact of potential changes once a detailed draft is made available for comment.</p>

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change (if applicable)	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, if major comment
54.	Section 4.2, Provide guidance for new requirements stemming from the amendments to the Radiation Protection Regulations:	document. Technology of RP instruments is rapidly developing, some of it unforeseen. Any guidance needs to allow these improvements to be engaged within a managed framework. It will be difficult to include all of the relevant guidance on requirements for radiation protection equipment and instrumentation. Perhaps this aspect could be separated from the proposed new document and issued as a stand-alone guidance document (considering that CNSC staff previously compared the proposed requirements to those outlined in the IAEA Safety Series Report No.16).		<i>Clarification</i>	
55.	Section 4.2 Provide guidance for ascertaining and recording the equivalent dose to the lens of the eye and methods to	As discussed with CNSC staff in August 2016, industry believes strongly that it is too early to reduce the dose limit to the lens of the eye for the following reasons: - There is no evidence of increased health impacts to Canadian nuclear energy workers. - Research results have inconclusive and large uncertainties at the very low	Industry believes it is premature to adopt proposed dose of the eye limits until the existing technical and operational issues are resolved. Clear direction on expectations will eventually be needed. What is the process to evaluate this? Provide criteria at which estimates are acceptable. If estimates are low enough, is there a trivial dose whereby further considerations and protections are not required? What doses are sent to the NDR? What methods for estimates are acceptable; is a skin dose reading from the head location acceptable and up to what dose? Industry also requests language which would permit the application of eye dosimetry to be pinpointed to only those	MAJOR	The substantial costs licensees would incur to measure and control the eye dose appear out of line with the detriment compared to other potential safety improvements. There would be a large variation in implementation costs depending on the language chosen in the guidance document, estimate vs direct measurement.

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change <i>(if applicable)</i>	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, <i>if major comment</i>
	afford worker protection with regard to the lens of the eye	<p>exposure levels (0-1 Gy) - The instrumentation is not currently available to measure lens of eye dose with any type of accuracy or precision in the power industry.</p>	<p>workers who may have eye dose greater than whole body dose.</p> <p>Provisions are needed to drop whole body dose monitoring if lens of eye dosimetry is implemented.</p>		
		<p>Lens of eye dosimetry, if fully developed will render the requirement for whole body dosimetry redundant. Eye dose is everywhere and always more than Whole body dose, and with the same dose limits; eye dose therefore becomes the limiting dose for the human person.</p>			
56.	Section 4.2, Provide guidance for principles of radiological hazard control...	<p>Licensees have mature programs developed with the CNSC and industry peers. NPPs need to have flexibility to design controls based on work to support their ALARA principles.</p>	<p>Provide high level guidance only</p>	<p><i>Clarification</i></p>	
57.	Section 4.2 Provide guidance on methods for monitoring for neutron	<p>Accurate neutron dosimetry is still a challenge to the NPP industry. Ascertaining neutron dose from stay times and pre-determined dose rates are questionable given the large and generally conservative, uncertainties in time, and</p>	<p>Clarification is required in S-106 to permit personal neutron dosimeters. If there are intended changes, then further discussions are required with industry.</p>	<p><i>Clarification</i></p>	

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change (if applicable)	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, if major comment
	exposures	generally conservative uncertainties in geometry between where the pre-determined dose rate measurement occurred and where the worker generally is.			
58.	Section 4.2 Provide guidance on ascertaining the equivalent dose to the skin as a result of nuclear substances deposited on or absorbed in the skin (i.e. skin contamination)	Guidance is needed. It must be a graduated response, with low level dose estimations first coming from field instrumentation possibly in the form of CPM by a pancake. This can then be graduated based on defined dose estimates to nuclide identification, specific shielding calculations etc. What are the exact NDR reporting criteria? Consideration should be given for available software to perform dose calculations.		<i>Clarification</i>	
59.	Section 4.2, page 9	What standards or international guidance is the proposed guidance on monitoring for neutron exposures and wearing of multiple badges based?		<i>Clarification</i>	
60.	Section 4.2, page 9	What are the certain dosimetry types not typically part of a licensed dosimetry service?		<i>Clarification</i>	

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change (if applicable)	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, <i>if major comment</i>
61.	Section.5.1, Operational and administrative burden	REGDOC-2.7.2, <i>Dosimetry</i> - - For the QA requirements, define an equivalency statement to align with existing standards (e.g., ISO 17025)		<i>Clarification</i>	
62.	Section 5.1/6.0	While it is impossible to accurately assess the operational and/or administrative burden without clarification on some of the points expressed in these comments, industry believes they would be significant. Industry will only be able to ascertain the full cost when the CNSC distributes draft version(s) of the new document(s) for review and comment.	Industry recommends updating the existing regulatory and guidance documents rather than consolidating them..	MAJOR	Industry has a mature program developed with the CNSC and industry peers. Any change will have a significant administrative impact just to respond to the change. Operational burden can't be determined due to the breadth of the proposals. Implementation challenges would include documentation changes and change management as well as potential requirement to purchase new equipment. The true impact is impossible to assess at this stage of the consultation process.
63.	Section 6, Implementation Challenges with REGDOC- 2.7.2, <i>Dosimetry</i>	Consolidation runs the risk of creating documents that are so large they cannot be reviewed comprehensively and updated at sufficient intervals to be aligned with current best practices. As detailed earlier, there would also be significant challenges to implement specific items such as eye dosimetry. It is simply too soon to impose changes at a time when there is no method of measuring accurately or any proven, licenced	Undertake proper R&D and technical basis development before making changes.	MAJOR	The substantial costs licensees would incur to measure and control the eye dose appear out of line with the detriment compared to other potential safety improvements. There will be significant start-up costs if new dosimetry systems are to be specified, designed, type tested, tested, and implemented. All procedures relative to ALARA and work planning will require revision. Training will require revision. Software will have to be revised to include data fields for lens of eye dosimetry. The National Dose Registry will also have to revise its data handling protocols to receive new lens of eye

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change (if applicable)	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, if major comment
		technology.			dosimetry fields.
64.	Section 7	REDOC- 2.7.2 Dosimetry Proposed Table of contents	Under "Requirements for Licenced Dosimetry Services, external radiation" – add new section for Electronic Dose Control Devices		
65.	Appendix A	<p>All of the following proposed new elements will have an impact on industry:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justification, Limitation, Optimization, and dose constraints. As stated above, there are many different opinions on how to implement the concept of dose constraint. This would lead to significant administrative burden to demonstrate regulatory compliance. • Radiation Protection Training and Qualification Training requirements for Class II and NSRD licences should be included in their respective Regulations. Adding them to this regulation may conflict with OPGs Systematic Approach to Training (SAT) requirements for its Class I operating licenses. • Radiological personal protective equipment. 	If there are intended changes then further discussions are required with industry.	MAJOR	Industry will be better able to assess the impact of potential changes once a detailed draft is made available for comment.

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change <i>(if applicable)</i>	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, <i>if major comment</i>
		<p>What new requirements will be added regarding RPPE, as the current regulations and regulatory documents provide minimal guidance on their use?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respiratory protection for airborne nuclear substances. Respiratory protection is generally addressed by meeting CSA standards. Will this model continue or will there be new requirements? Design features / engineered controls for radiation protection (shielding, ventilation, dust control). Will the CNSC be introducing requirements over and above what has currently been accepted? If so, the changes could introduce significant monetary burdens upon licensees. 			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classification of Areas and Access Control. The requirements Classification and Access control has historically been set by licensees Radiation Protection programs. This should be left as such, as 			

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change <i>(if applicable)</i>	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, <i>if major comment</i>
		<p>changes to engineered systems are cost intensive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Labelling of containers and devices containing nuclear substances The requirement for labelling containers and devices in the RPRs conflicts with the requirements in the NSRD regulations. An exception should be added to not require labelling on containers or devices that are exempt under the NSRD regulations (e.g. a radium watch). Radiation protection equipment and instrumentation. Depending on what is meant by RP equipment and instrumentation, this could introduce a significant regulatory burden on licensees (e.g. decontamination kits or chemistry stack monitors being considered radiation protection equipment). Clearance of persons and materials from regulatory control. This heading is not addressed in the 			

#	Document/ Excerpt of Section	Industry Issue	Suggested Change <i>(if applicable)</i>	Major Comment/ Request for Clarification ¹	Impact on Industry, <i>if major comment</i>
		discussion paper, but could introduce a significant impact on current industry programs.			