Panels, Roundtable and Workshop (PR&W) Sessions are organized by members of the Program Advisory Committee (PAC). The WM Symposia PR&W program is organized and maintained by seven (7) categories of support from the PAC Members, PAC Supporters and others:

1. PAC Chair, Deputy
2. Track Co-Chairs
3. Topic and Session “Lead Organizers”
4. Topic and Session “Additional Organizers”
5. Session Co-Chairs
6. Panel (Session) Reporters
7. Abstract & Paper Reviewers
   (If papers are also provided in the PR&W session)

Figure 1 shows the organizational structure of the WM Symposia. The PAC interacts with the Board of Directors through the PAC Chairman and Deputy PAC Chair.

For Panels, Roundtables and Workshops (PR&W), the organizational structure is Session Organizers, Session Co-Chairs and Panel (Session) Reporters that report to the Lead Session Organizer. The Lead Organizer then interacts with the Track Co-Chairs responsible for the Track in which the PR&W is placed.

The annual WM Symposia conference is primarily organized around panel/roundtables, oral and poster presentation sessions with their respective papers that have been reviewed and approved by the PAC. Following the conference, presented papers are documented in the WM Proceedings. Panels, Roundtables and Workshops (PR&W) are not subject to the paper review process since they usually produce no papers. However, to document the information exchange, a summary PR&W session report with the presented panel PowerPoints is prepared and added to the proceedings,
Because the roles of the PR&W Lead Organizers, Organizers, Session Co-Chairs and Panel Reporters differ only slightly from those of a regular oral or poster session, we are providing the following guidance for clarification. This guidance also defines the responsibilities for the Lead Organizers, Organizers, Session Co-Chairs and Panel Reporters.

DEFINITIONS

- **Track Co-Chairs** - Experienced PAC Members, elected by the PAC and/or solicited by the PAC Chair, to co-manage Track sessions including scheduling and solicitation of Lead Organizers and Organizers.
- **Lead Organizer** - A PAC Member who sponsors a session or topic and is responsible for its outcome, and who provides guidance and direction to assure compliance with all PAC policies and procedures.
- **Organizer** - A PAC Member or Supporter who receives prior approval of the appropriate Track Co-Chairs and/or PAC Chair to develop a Session for WM Symposia.
- **Session Co-Chair** – A designated person who facilitates and moderates the presentations for a given WM session and adheres to the Session Co-Chair responsibilities.
- **Panel Reporter** – A PAC Member or Supporter assigned by the Lead Organizer to report on the assigned Panel, Roundtable or Workshop and prepare a written report for the WM Proceedings. The written reports are due within the specified two-week time frame after the conference.
- **Panel** – An invited session that allows each panel member a brief (~10 minute) introductory statement with audience participation and exchanges of discussion with the panelists. These panelist/audience participation and exchanges are encouraged for a complete exchange of ideas and views. One or both Session Co-Chairs are expected to act as the moderator for the session.
- **Roundtable** – An invited session that encourages the free open discussion of topics amongst the participants with more interactive audience participation than that of a panel session.
- **Workshop** – This type of session resembles more of a tutorial/educational session where instructions are provided to the participants as a learning event. In either case, participants are expected to interact with the presenters and ask questions during the session.

RESPONSIBILITIES

**Track Co-Chairs Duties:**

a) Determine and identify the appropriate Session Lead Organizer, Organizers, and the Panel Reporter, if the Session does not have an identified Lead Organizer.

b) Identify and/or act as a replacement for the Panel Reporter. If the Lead Organizer is not available, the Lead Track Co-Chair (or their designee) may be the primary substitute for the Panel Reporter.

c) Attend the PDM (or send a PAC Member substitute) to ensure that the Track is properly organized, and that the online system has been updated with the required oral, poster and panel session information post PDM.

**Lead Organizer Duties:**

a) Fully understand and commit to the duties and responsibilities of the Topic/Session Lead Organizer and coordinate with the other Topic and Session Organizers before accepting this assignment.

b) Provide guidance and direction to assure compliance with all PAC Policies and Procedures.

c) Attend the Program Development Meeting (or send a PAC Member substitute) to ensure that the Topic is properly organized. Inform and verify the Track Co-Chairs know who the substitute is at the PDM and who will be responsible for your Topic. Ensure that the required oral, poster and panel session information is entered into the online system during PDM.

d) Enter (or designate someone to enter) the required Panel information into the online system during the PDM. Lead Organizer is also responsible for updating Panel information post PDM.
Identify a Panel Session Reporter.

Oversee the Organizers, Session Co-Chairs and Panel Reporter. Be responsible for reviewing the PowerPoint Presentations and session outcomes, as well as ensure the timely receipt of the panel report and its approval.

Act as the replacement for the Panel Reporter, if needed.

Attend the Session where they are Lead and help facilitate the Audience, Speakers and other volunteers.

Organizers Duties:

a) Fully understand and commit to the duties and responsibilities of the Session Organizer before accepting this assignment.

b) Propose new session topics for inclusion in a future WM Symposium. Topics should be submitted using the online or printed Topic Submittal Form - WM10.

i) Each Topical Session must have a single PAC Lead Organizer. (If the Organizers are not PAC Members, the Organizers must persuade a PAC Member to act as the Session Lead Organizer.)

ii) Proposed topics shall be presented at the PAC and/or IPAC meetings and approved by these committees and the appropriate Track Co-Chairs.

iii) A maximum of two US Topic Organizers can be proposed. The third additional organizer should be non-US. In no case will more than three Topic “Additional Organizers” be listed.

c) Organize the Topic’s into Session(s) and support the Lead Organizer in completing the required oral, poster and panel session information into the online system before and during the PDM.

d) Attend the Program Development Meeting to ensure the Topic is properly organized. The Track Co-Chairs must know who at the PDM is responsible for a Topic and any resultant Session(s).

e) Review the Panelist’s PowerPoint presentation prior to the Conference to assure that WMS guidelines are adhered to (i.e. no commercialism, that the total number of slides are not excessive, nor duplicative of other panelists, and has the optimum flow from presenter to presenter, no small text or figures, etc.).

Session Co-Chairs Duties:

a) Before the Conference, discuss with the Session Lead Organizer any special concerns or restrictions of the Presenters.

b) Contact the Presenters 2-4 weeks prior to the Conference confirming attendance and determining any special conditions.

c) Attend the Presenter and Co-Chair Breakfast the day of the Session.

d) Verify that all Panelists have arrived at the Presenter and Co-Chair’s Breakfast. If a Panelist has not arrived, it is the Session Co-Chair’s responsibility to call the Panelist and confirm their attendance in the Session and let WM Staff and/or the Lead Session Organizer know if there are any cancellations or substitutions.

e) Attend the designated WM session (or send a substitute) and if they have papers, rate each presentation according to PAC procedures.

f) Perform the duties as outlined in the Instructions to Panel Session Co-Chairs (WM56)

g) Accurately complete all requested forms and reports. Submit these documents to the WMS Staff immediately after the session.

h) Provide direction to Panelists on schedule and format for the session.

i) Discuss with your fellow Session Co-Chair, preferably before the conference, how you will handle questions and answers and how you will proceed to stimulate discussion during the session.

j) Act as a WM Ambassador managing the presentations during the Conference promoting professionalism and high ethical standards.
k) Act as a moderator for the panel, as required.

Panel Reporters Duties:

a) Verify acceptance of Reporter position and Conference registration to Session Lead Organizer and the other Organizer(s) at least two weeks after the PDM.
b) Understanding of the format, content, and timing of report submittal.
c) Attend the designated panel session. Find a substitute Reporter, if unable to attend.
d) If unable to attend the Conference or the Panel, promptly notify Session Lead Organizer as well as WMS Staff.
e) Check in at the Presenter and Co-Chair Information Desk at the Conference.
f) Provide a Panel report of all Presenters’ remarks and an overview of the discussion within two weeks after the conference for inclusion in the proceedings. Panel report shall be a minimum of eight (8) paragraphs and include any recommendation(s) and/or conclusion(s). The report shall be prepared in the format shown in the example appended at the end of this document. It is helpful to have the required report format and content on hand during the Panel because it helps the Panel Reporter capture and record accurate and meaningful content. Reports received after two weeks will not be included in the conference proceedings.

* Failure to provide the Panel report jeopardizes the Session Lead Organizer’s approval of future Panels, Roundtables, and Workshops sessions and no record would be provided in the proceedings.

GUIDANCE

1. Session Lead Organizer(s) must provide justification (both sides of form WM10) to the cognizant Track Co-Chairs regarding the advantages of a Panel, Roundtable, and Workshop vs. an Oral session with papers. If the justification is unsatisfactory to the Track Co-Chairs, the Session Lead Organizer may be asked (in consultation with the PAC Chair) to convert the Panels, Roundtables, and Workshops to an Oral session with papers. A potential alternative could be Author submission of short papers, followed by a group discussion. Another solution may be an issue paper, followed by questions for Presenter’s discussion, with the results summarized by the Session Lead Organizer or Panel Reporter for the Proceedings.

2. All Panels, Roundtables, and Workshop Panelists or Presenters should be named and a written commitment received from each Presenter prior to the Program Development Meeting. The Panels, Roundtables, and Workshops will not be accepted or scheduled without ample justification and approval by the PAC Chair. (A description of the session and the organization/affiliation and email address of all Panelists are needed by the WMS Staff for contact communications and listing in the Online Preliminary and Final Programs.

3. Additional justification will be required for discussions proposed to extend beyond a single time slot, or for a Panel, Roundtable or a Workshop with very similar topics.

4. Requests for specific time slots must be fully justified realizing that Monday and Tuesday time slots are limited. This request or condition shall be known at the WM Spring PAC meeting and is a critical factor in the approval of a Panel, Roundtable, and Workshop.

5. Each Lead Organizer must appoint a Panel Reporter who is required to provide a summary in the required format of all Presenters’ remarks and an overview of the discussion, within two weeks after the Conference, for inclusion in the proceedings. Failure to provide the summary jeopardizes the Session Lead Organizer’s approval of future Panels, Roundtables, and Workshops.

6. Panels, Roundtables, and Workshops, that are scheduled for less than two hours, should be coordinated with another short Panel, Roundtable, Workshop, or Oral session to share the same room for optimum utilization. One session can be scheduled for the first 1-1/2 hour period, with a 10 minute break and then the second session for the last 1-1/2 hour period. Preferably the coordination is within the same Track using the same Session Co-Chairs, however if this is not feasible other Tracks and arrangements will be considered.
7. Panelists who present a PowerPoint presentation at the conference are asked to share their presentations in the proceedings, and if they agree, a copyright authorization must also be submitted prior to presentation at the conference.

8. Panelists should limit their presentations to ~10 minutes in order to allow sufficient time for questions from the audience.

INVITED/SOLICITED ABSTRACTS:

1. The PAC Chair or Managing Director must pre-approve any “Invited” or Solicited Abstracts that require financial arrangements with WMS. Any registration waivers or other reductions that impact WMS financially must be pre-approved by the PAC Chair or Managing Director.

2. Both PAC Members and Supporters may request the PAC Chair to invite presentations deemed vital to a Panel, or to assure that a well-known or otherwise special Presenter participates. “Invited” Abstracts may carry additional requirements compared to “Solicited” or “Stimulated” Abstracts. Requests for “Invited Abstracts that require financial arrangements with WMS should be sent to the PAC Chair and include the Topic, Author, Telephone, and email address for the invitation.

REGISTRATION FEES

Registration fees are required of all Panelists. Special compensation is occasionally provided by the Managing Director or Deputy Managing Director of the Conference. Any requests for compensation should be addressed directly to gbenda@wmsym.org.

PRESENTERS and CO-CHAIR BREAKFASTS

The Presenter and Co-Chair Breakfast is held each morning at 0700 and Panelists are required to attend. Both Session Co-chairs should attend the Presenter and Co-chair Breakfast on the day of your Session so that your presenters will know the Leaders of the Session and so that any last-minute directions, potential questions or discussion topics for the session can be discussed.
EXAMPLE PANEL REPORT

WM2024 Conference Report

PANEL SESSION 74: Waste Management from Remediation of Legacy Sites or Unplanned Releases

Co-Chairs: Malgorzata K. Sneve, Norwegian Radiation Protection Authority, Norway
           Ilkhom Mirsaidov, Nuclear and Radiation Safety Agency, Tajikistan

Panel Reporter: Graham Smith, GMS Abingdon Ltd, UK

Panelists:
2. Leo van Velzen, Environmental and Nuclear Consultant, EURSSEM, Netherlands
3. Yoshiharu Hashizume, Obayashi Corporation, Japan
4. Stuart Walker, US Environmental Protection Agency
5. Ilkhom Mirsaidov, Nuclear and Radiation Safety Agency, Tajikistan

Planning of remediation of legacy sites and contaminated areas arising in unplanned situations needs to take account of the management and regulation of radioactive wastes arising. However, these wastes commonly present unusual characteristics which were not accounted for in design and development of national radioactive waste management strategies nor the corresponding regulatory frameworks. All these activities need to be coordinated, accounting for exposure conditions at a site and in its continuing management. This panel was designed to consider these issues, taking into account developments in guidance on the application of international recommendations to different exposure situations and practical experience at example sites.

Horst Monken-Fernandes: Mr. Monken-Fernandes described the characteristics of legacy sites in the same terms as those used in the IAEA presentation on the International Forum for Regulatory Supervision of Legacy Sites (RSLS), see WM2014 proceedings. Regarding legacies generally, he noted a focus on control of contamination, rather than the real interest, radiation dose. Remediation should not be taken to imply complete removal of measurable radioactivity. Rather, a suitable alternative could be the concept that contamination implies a level of radioactivity that is significant enough to be of concern. To understand what can be of concern requires stakeholder communication. As part of this, it can be useful to consider the balance between the different benefits and dis-benefits to be achieved within a range of spending and identify the level of spending that provides the greatest different between total benefits and total costs. For example, it can be understood that adoption of very tight standards can result in generation of a correspondingly large volume of waste requiring management as radioactive waste. The question then requires consideration of where best to use resources to meet social needs, once again a matter for stakeholder communication. There is no single model effective in all circumstances, and none would work for everyone.

To progress in this area, it can be noted that we still have lessons to learn from the Goiana accident in Brazil. There is a need to pre-plan the policy in the event of an accident, i.e. to be prepared with a transparent process even if the details of implementation will be different for every accident, remembering that short term decisions can have a big impact in the long-term.

Leo van Velzen: How to Improve Scientific Support and Assessments to support Regulatory Supervision Mr. van Velzen highlighted the IAEA RSLS focus on avoiding the creation of new legacy sites through strong, independent regulatory oversight, and the IAEA ENVIRONET program which encompasses, in addition to dealing with existing contaminated sites (legacy sites), sound environmental management practices to be implemented by active operations and planned operations. This is aimed at preventing the occurrence of relevant environmental contamination and other safety hazards, and consequently the need to implement extensive and costly environmental remediation programs. (NB link to comments of Mr. Monken-Fernandes.) Mr. van Velzen provided examples of best practices in scientific support and assessment, noting IAEA documentation, MARSSIM and EURSSEM, and the need for support:
  • to ensure that wastes arising are correctly radiologically characterized and disposed;
  • to ensure control of radiological and other hazardous contamination levels at a site;
in the case of unexpected challenges, ensure regulatory measures can be taken in due time.

Examples of legacies from NORM industry, mentioning historic failure to have in place decommissioning policy and funding arrangements. There are many standards and guidance, but they are not consistent and often do not take into account lessons learned. This needs to be improved.

Yoshiharu Hashizume: Fukushima Remediation, a Contractor’s View Mr. Hashizume described some of the logistical challenges that were linked to recovery after the emergency phase of the Fukushima Daiichi accident; including the need to transport and store up to 22 million m³ of contaminated material. Demanding constraints in procurement included recovery on construction investment, impact on engineer/worker/equipment supply. Additionally, there was not experience in many of the required activities, including clean-up of houses, forests, roads and fields. Mr. Hashizume presented data on surface contamination density before and after cleanup, and corresponding reductions in air dose-rate. He also presented a variety of mechanisms that have been put in place to support successful completion of the work, including the application of modified and new technologies. The role of contractors and the need for adequate training and supervision was highlighted. Pilot projects for transportation and interim storage were also outlined.

Stuart Walker: Superfund Policy Statements and Guidance on Disposition of Radioactive Waste in non-NRC Licensed Disposal Facilities Mr. Walker provided an overview of current EPA guidance, policy statements, and resources on radioactive waste management at Superfund sites and described evaluations under existing guidance and policy statements. Mr. Walker noted the importance of facility design and operation in order to safeguard the public and the environment, and the role of community involvement. He then illustrated the process by reference to two sites: McClellan Air Force Base, CA (Region 9) and Safety Light, P (Region 3). Protection is afforded by risk-based standards. In a clarification question, it was noted that the Westlife Landfill in Missouri is a superfund site.

Ikhom Mirsaidov: International Support to Regulatory Challenges Related to Legacy Sites in Tajikistan Mr. Mirsaidov first explained the infrastructure for regulatory control in Tajikistan. He then described the evolution of the uranium mining legacy in Tajikistan, noting for example the very close proximity of some tailings piles to residential areas, and the lack of access control. An urgent remedial measure at Taboshar should be the treatment of the overflowing mine water discharging directly into accessible water bodies. Because of the lack of other water sources, the local population uses this water, which is highly contaminated. Mr. Mirsaidov noted the lack of a relevant modern regulatory basis to provide a driver for implementing improvements, as well as the recent progress made via bi-lateral regulatory cooperation with the NRPA. Deficiencies had been identified by a Regulatory Threat Assessment, and a range of actions put in place to address them, including measures to improve the trust of the public. Implementation projects of the EU, EURASEC and the IAEA were also described.

Strengthening regulatory body, well targeted project, resulting in new and amended laws. Including a new law on radioactive waste management, Rules on radiation safety, monitoring, remediation strategy, then reviewed by IAEA mission has reviewed these outputs and working with schools for drafting regulations (legal documents).

Questions, Answers and Discussion

1. A question was raised as to why some authorities regulate on risk and others on dose. Panel representatives said that you can use both.

2. There was broad support for the suggestion to improve the use of the term contamination. It was also noted from the audience that uncertainties in risk estimates at low doses and low dose rates are significant and that this should be considered when seeking to achieve a given level of protection when analyzing remediation alternatives.

3. The panel noted the value of confidence in the relationship between operators and regulators. Standards are important, but a common-sense attitude is needed to their application and it is not just about results of numerical models. It is necessary to work within the processes for managing land use and to take care over knowledge management.

4. It was noted that if the rules change then a remediated site may revert to being a legacy. At the same time, society has a natural desire to improve standards.