

## UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

## September 15, 1989

Distribution: HDenton RBernero JShea RHauber MMahy MFederline JScarborough MWeber MLopez-Otin JDunn-Lee JKotra SBilhorn

004.16

Mr. Frank Kinnelly, Director Office of Nuclear Technology and Safeguards Nuclear Energy and Energy Technology Affairs Department of State Washington, D.C. 20520

Dear Mr. Kinnelly:

7401060217 731116 PDR COMMS NRCC CORRESPONDENCE PDR

The NRC reserves its position on Item 1 on the September 20 IAEA Board of Governors Meeting Agenda for reasons such as the following:

- 1. This draft, which is dated April 1989, was not received in NRC until late August, only a few weeks before this meeting, making it difficult to complete staff and Commission review.
- 2. Preliminary review indicates that the draft\_still uses the earlier ICRP Report 26 mortality risk coefficient of  $10^{-2}$ /Sievert which results in an estimated  $10^{-5}$  per year risk based on a dose of 1 milliSievert per year. Previous comment from the U.S. and current thinking suggest use of a mortality risk coefficient about an order of magnitude higher, which would equate a dose of 0.1 milliSievert per year to a latent cancer fatality risk of  $10^{-5}$  per year. We understand that the ICRP is planning to issue a revision to its fundamental radiation protection guidance (ICRP 26) sometime next year; we expect it to support the latter suggested risk coefficient.
- 3. The draft still seems to contain no recognition of alternate standard forms such as release quantity limits which are proposed in the U.S. in conjunction with individual exposure limits.
- 4. There may be a need for significant clarification in the wording used to relate disruptive process, random events, probabilistic analysis and risk.

A proposed talking point on Number 2 above for Ambassador Kennedy's statement on Agenda Item 1 at the Board of Governors meeting follows:

2. Preliminary review indicates that the draft still uses the earlier ICRP Report 26 mortality risk coefficient. Previous comment from the U.S. and current thinking suggest use of a Mr. Frank Kinnelly

mortality risk coefficient about an order of magnitude higher. We understand that the ICRP is planning to issue a revision to its fundamental radiation protection guidance sometime next year; we expect it to support the higher risk coefficient.

Sincerely,

James R. Shea, Director International Programs, GPA

cc: R. Stratford, State/OES C. Newstead, State/OES

ź

