

K - 4

Kirk, Mark

From: Kirk, Mark
Sent: Friday, October 26, 2012 9:19 AM
To: Mark
Subject: FW: Doel 3 review board meeting

From: Ramsey, Jack
Sent: Friday, October 26, 2012 7:32 AM
To: Kirk, Mark
Cc: Fehst, Geraldine; Sangimino, Donna-Marie; Barnes, Robin
Subject: RE: Doel 3 review board meeting

Mark,

Thanks for the update on the Doel situation. I agree that participating in both meetings is important. As such, I'm ok paying for your travel to attend both.

Jack

From: Kirk, Mark
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2012 3:08 PM
To: Ramsey, Jack; Fehst, Geraldine
Subject: Doel 3 review board meeting

Dear Jack & Gerri -

I wanted to let you know that the leader of the review board I am serving on in Belgium (Professor Labeau) has asked if I can support a second meeting to be held on 17 December (again in Brussels). The purpose of the second meeting (the 1st one is scheduled for November 27th to 28th ... and you should already have the travel request for that) will be to finalize our assessment of Doel 3 for transmission to the FANC. Based on the schedule I have seen for the November 27-28 meeting I think that during the November meeting we will do much listening and discussing, but very little writing. I expect the writing will be done between the meetings. We will therefore need to finalize the writing, compile it, agree on language (& so on) during the meeting on the 17th.

Given the attention this matter has received I believe it would be best if I could attend the meeting in December in person. Previously you (OIP) had kindly agreed to cover the cost of my travel (see below for reference). If you are able to support the meeting on the 17th I feel it would be most beneficial.

Please let me know your views. If you wish to discuss please call me on my cell [REDACTED] (b)(6)

Thanks

clm

mark

-----Original Message-----

From: Ramsey, Jack
Sent: Friday, August 31, 2012 1:18 PM
To: Csontos, Aladar
Cc: Abrams, Charlotte; Richards, Stuart; Kirk, Mark; Case, Michael; Afshar-Tous, Mugeh; Smith, Wilkins; Sangimino, Donna-Marie; Jackson, Diane; Hopkins, Jon; Rosenberg, Stacey; Schwartzman, Jennifer; Fehst, Geraldine
Subject: RE: Visit to KINS; Kori unit 1 reactor vessel integrity

AI,

Thanks for the heads up on this. Having both the Belgians and the South Koreans ask for our advice/support, in a relatively short amount of time, gives us a very clear message on how seriously the international regulatory community is responding to the RPV integrity questions. In all honesty, it wouldn't surprise me that other countries, the NEA and/or the IAEA might also make similar requests of us.

We think it's a very good idea to support these requests. We're also very glad RES can make Mark available to support them. With this, I think you/yours are ok to respond positively to both the Belgians and the South Koreans. Please keep the OIP desk officers for both countries (Wilkins Smith for South Korea and Gerri Fehst for Belgium) in the loop on any correspondence with their respective countries.

For a variety of reasons I think it's best that NRC not accept any funding from either the Belgians or the South Koreans for provision of this advice/support. With this, I'd like to propose (for at least these initial activities) that RES cover Mark's time while OIP can cover Mark's travel expenses (that is, if RES is tight on travel funds).

Also, just FYI. Early next week OIP plans on informally advising the Commission of these developments. I'm sure that, as this moves forward, they'll be interested in both how the international community responds to this as well as whether any insight gained internationally might have domestic implications.

Jack