INTERNATIONAL PROJECT ON INNOVATIVE NUCLEAR REACTORS AND FUEL CYCLES (INPRO)

INPRO activities on Nuclear Fuel Cycle: Scenarios and Innovations

Presented by Zoran Drace on the behalf of NENP/INPRO Section



INPRO Objectives



INPRO International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reacto and Fuel Cycles

- To help to ensure that nuclear energy is available to contribute, in a sustainable manner, to meeting the energy needs of the 21st century
- To bring together technology holders and users to jointly consider the international and national actions required for achieving desired innovations in nuclear reactors and fuel cycles



INPRO Membership 2001-2014



INPRO International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reactors and Fuel Cycles



In 2014, INPRO has grown from an initial 10 to 40 members, which represent over 65% of the world population and 75% of the world's GDP. Several other countries have observer status as they consider membership or are participating on a project working level.







INPRO International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reacto and Fuel Cycles

- 1. INPRO provides long-term scenario evaluation using dynamic simulation of national, regional and global nuclear energy systems
- INPRO designs and convenes collaborative projects on topics crucial to future nuclear sustainability and technological innovations.
- 3. INPRO **assists** Member States to build sustainable nuclear energy program strategies and plans through Nuclear Energy System Assessments (NESAs), using the INPRO Methodology.
- 4. INPRO organises **Dialogue Forums** on subjects of immediate interest to INPRO members and to the larger nuclear energy community.





INPRO International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reacto and Fuel Cycles

INPRO Task 1: Global Scenarios

Objective:

To develop, on the basis of a scientific-technical analysis, global and regional nuclear energy scenarios that lead to a global vision on sustainable nuclear energy development in the 21st century.



Collaborative Project SYNERGIES

INPRO International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reacto and Fuel Cycles

- Synergistic Nuclear Energy Regional Group Interactions Evaluated for Sustainability (SYNERGIES)
- Duration: 2012–2014
- Objectives:
 - To identify and evaluate mutually beneficial collaborative architectures and the driving forces and impediments for achieving globally sustainable nuclear energy systems
 - To identify short-term and medium-term collaborative actions capable to develop pathways to long-term sustainability.
- Deliverable: IAEA report in 2015



Collaborative project SYNERGIES



INPRO International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reactors and Fuel Cycles

Participants:

Algeria, Armenia, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, China, France, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Malaysia, OECD-NEA, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Spain, Ukraine, USA and Vietnam are involved as participants or observers in different tasks (UK recently joined as observer at SYNERGIES meetings)



Collaborative project SYNERGIES



•Participants of the SYNERGIES meetings







Predecessor project "Global Architectures of Innovative Nuclear Energy Systems with Thermal and Fast Reactors and a Closed Nuclear Fuel Cycle"





INPRO

Innovative Nuclear Reactors and Fuel Cycles

GAINS Framework



INPRO International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reactors and Fuel Cycles



Most analyses treat world as single technology group

- Assumes all follow the same strategy and use the same facilities
- GAINS Framework also supports breaking world into three separate nuclear strategy groups following different fuel cycle strategies
 - NG1 starts with LWRs, transitions to a closed fuel cycle with fast reactors
 - NG2 maintains an open fuel cycle with LWRs and HWRs
 - NG3 starts with no reactors, develops LWRs & minimal fuel cycle infrastructure

NG1:NG2:NG3 = 0.4 : 0.4 : 0.2 with further sensitivity studies



GAINS major findings



INPRO International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reactors and Fuel Cycles

WHICH MODEL WOULD THE WORLD FOLLOW? ADDITIONAL ECONOMIC STUDY

Conclusions:

- For small programmes of the fast reactors/closed nuclear fuel cycle deployment the economic benefits from their introduction would be substantially lower than the amount of investments needed for RD&D, licensing and deployment.
- Only a few countries in the world with large nuclear energy programmes (30 GW(e) for fast reactors) can bear the burden of the technology development for fast reactors/closed nuclear fuel cycle.
- Therefore, global nuclear energy system would follow a heterogeneous world model, at least, within the present century.



Fig.1. Return of RD&D and construction investments for the INS of 10 GWe $\,$



GAINS major findings



INPRO International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reactors and Fuel Cycles

SYNERGISTIC HETEROGENEOUS CASE: MINIMIZED SPENT FUEL ACCUMULATION

➢Although few (NG1) countries will master fast reactor/fuel cycle technologies, all other countries (NG3 and NG2) could benefit from this if they follow synergistic approach in fuel cycle back-end, by sending their SNF to NG1 for reprocessing and used in fast reactor programmes

➢ Progressive accumulation of SNF on a regional and global scale could be mitigated or even reversed to limit the inventory of such fuel to MA and FP, or even only FP if MA are further incinerated in FR or dedicated transmutation systems





2100: 2500 GW(e) scenario

SYNERGIES Structure



NPRC

Task 1 (Core Task). Evaluation of Synergistic **Collaborative Scenarios of Fuel Cycle Infrastructure** Development

> Task 4 (Cross-cutting Task). Elaboration of key indicators specific for synergistic collaboration, including economic assessment methods

Task 2 (Support Task). **Evaluation of Additional Options for NES with Thermal** and Fast Reactors



Task 3 (Support Task). **Evaluation of Options for Minor Actinide Management (NES** Expansion & Legacy Waste)

Task 1: About 30 case studies on-going around selected items of the SYNERGIES Storyline

SYNERGIES Task 1: Storyline



International Atomic Energy Agency

SYNERGIES Scenarios



INPRO International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reactors and Fuel Cycles

- LWR mono-U/Pu recycling
- Multi-recycling Pu-management in LWR+FR
- FR-centred scenarios
- Transition to Th/²³³U via U/Pu HWR-LWR-FR Phase
- Alternative Complete U/Pu/Th-cycle
- Scenarios with advanced MA management





INPRO International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reactors and Fuel Cycles

2

SYNERGIES Case Studies

Attachment 2. Synergies planned deliverables table

#	Task/ Title	Responsible	Country	Status/Deadline		
	Task 1					
1	Chapter on SYNERGIES storylines	L. Van den Durpel	France	Second Draft Submitted Complete draft to be provided by February 28 th 2014		
2	Task 1. Comparative assessment of collaborative fuel cycle options for Indonesia	B. Herutomo	Indonesia	In progress/ April- May 2014		
3	Task 1. Recycle of REPU in PHWRs	D. Wojtaszek and G.W.R. Edwards	Canada	In progress/ Draft report in May 2014		
4	Task 1. Scenario A.1 EU27 scenario with the extended use of regional fuel cycle centre composed of the La Hague and MELOX facilities and including Scenario A.1.1: Pre-cycling and /or TOP-MOX variant of introducing LWR-MOX in countries before domestically produced Pu can be recycled	L. Van den Durpel	France	In progress/ 31 January 2014		
5	Task 1. National Romanian scenarios with reliance on domestic and imported U //tuel supply, by considering regional collaboration in nuclear fuel cycle and including economic analysis	C. Margeanu	Romania	In progress/ Draft report in May2014		
6	Task 1. Scenario A.4 - National Argentinean scenario with cooperation options	S. Jensen	Argentina	Submitted		
7	Task 1. Scenario B.1 with introduction of a number of fast reactors aimed at supporting the multi-recycle of Pu in LWRs and FRs: EU27 Framework	L. Van den Durpel	France	In progress/ 28 February 2014		
8	Task 1. Scenario B.1 with introduction of a number of fast reactors aimed at supporting the multi-recycle of Pu in VVERs and FRs	G. Fesenko and V. Usanov	IAEA and Russia	Submitted		
9	Task 1.Scenario B.2: ADRIA study	J. Manzano, M. Ciotti	Italy	In progress/ April 2014		
10	Task L. Scenario C. L. – Demo study on China simple case of NES scenario with Pu multi-recycling based on LWR and FR and CNFC	Keyan Zhou	China	In progress/ request to submit a report needs to be issued from IAEA/ April- May 2014		
11	Task 1 Scenario C.2 and Task 3 - Long-term Scenario Study for Nuclear Fuel	K. Mukaida	Japan	Submitted, additional		

ľ

	Cycle in Japan			part to be submitted by May 2014	
12	Task 1. Scenario C.3: Russia, Ukraine and Armenia study on the VVER-FR collaborative deployment scenarios aimed at solving the problem of accumulating spent fitel inventory to match FR deployment needs	V. Usanov, A. Egorov, O. Godun, V. Sargsyan	Russia,Ukraine, Armenia	Draft prepared/ May 2014	
13	Task 1. Scenario C.3 with the VVER-FR collaborative deployment scenarios	O. Godun	Ukraine	Draft report under review/ May 2014	
14	Task 1. Study on sensitivity of key indicators to the shares of the GAINS NG1/NG2/NG3 country groups	G. Fesenko and A. Egorov	IAEA and Russia	Submitted	
15	Task 1. Study on sensitivity analysis to the shares of NG1/NG2 country groups in GAINS scenarios	A. Egorov	Russia	In progress/ February 2014	
16	Task 1. Scenario D.1 - Evaluation of a scenario of transition of Th/233U fuel cycle	U. Malshe	India	In progress/ April 2014	
17	Task 1. Scenario D.2 - Where, e.g. India though also considerable in other regions, Th is introduced earlier already in a LWR-phase to slowly breed 233U (despite not optimal) in view of furthering the malti-recycling potential of U and/or Pa in LWRs in complement to FRs	L. Van den Durpel	France	In progress/ 28February 2014	
	Task 2				
18	Task 2. Alternative deployment strategy of Fast Reactors - start-up on enriched uranium fuel	A.Egorov	Russia	In progress/ May 2014	
19	Task 2. Study on alternative fast reactor start-up deployment strategies	G. Fesenko and A. Egorov	IAEA and Russia	Submitted, economics to be added	
20	Task 2.2 – Analysis of ALWR based scenario	K. Mukaida	Japan	In progress/ May 2014 (to be checked)	
21	Task 2. Homogeneous and heterogeneous world mode scenarios with VVER-S, SMR and HTR, including non-electrical applications	E. Andrianova	Russia	Draft developed/ February 2014	
22	Task 2. Scenarios with (i) replacement heat generation by small nuclear units, (ii) wide deployment of SCWRs	O. Godun	Ukraine	Started/ May 2014	
	Task 3				
23	Task 3. Summary of a French study on radioactive waste transmutation options	L. Van den Durpel	France	TBD, once the report is translated into English, expected by March 2014	

4	Task 3: Summary of EU scenarios with transmutation option for nuclear phase-out and continued nuclear scenarios	G. Van den Eynde	Belgium	Report in preparation/ Submission of a summary conditione by a EU permission
5	Task 3. Analysis of Belgium nuclear phase-out scenario with and without ADS	G. Van den Eynde	Belgium	In progress/ May 2014
6	Task 3. Analysis of advanced European scenarios including transmutation and economical estimates	F. Martin-Fuertes	Spain	Partly completed, economic assessments to be added/ March 2014
7	Task 3. Transmutation using fast reactors	Keyan Zhou	China	In progress/ request to submit a report needs to be issued from IAEA/ April- May 2014
8	Task 3. A scenario analysis of re-burning LWR Americium in HWRs	D. Wojtaszek and G.W.R. Edwards	Canada	In Progress/ Draft report in May 2014
lew	Task 3. Luc Van den Durpel to provide Task 1 Scenario A.1 full data to Gert Van den Eynde to perform transmutation options analysis	L. Van den Durpel G. Van den Eynde	France Belgium	December 9 th 2013
lew	Task 3. Contribution on Am use for space applications	D. Mathers	UK	To be checked
	Task 4			
9	Task 4. Economic data on nuclear reactors and fuel cycle facilities/services	G. Fesenko and D. Shropshire	IAEA	In progress/ current version available on SYNERGIES Web page
0	Task 4. Comparative economic analysis of selected synergistic and non- synergistic GAINS scenarios	G. Fesenko	IAEA	Submitted
1	Task 4 – Report on KI down selection	IV. Dulera, C. Johari, Leaders of Tasks 1-3	India and IAEA	Draft report developed/ Availabl on SYNERGIES web-page



SYNERGIES Final Report Outline



INPRO International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reactors and Fuel Cycles

Attachment 1.

Outline of the Final Report of the INPRO Collaborative Project " Energy Regional Group Interactions Evaluated for Sustainabilit

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION (to be developed by the INPRO Sec.

1.1.Background

- Sustainable nuclear energy systems,
- Levels of sustainability,
- Pathways to sustainability,
- INPRO project "Global scenarios",
- GAINS SYNERGIES –ROADMAPS activity line
- 1.2. Definitions
- 1.3. Objectives
 - ToR for the SYNERGIES collaborative project
- 1.4. Scope and structure of the report

References to Chapter 1

CHAPTER 2. SYNERGIES STORYLINES AND SCENARIO FAI developed by Mr Luc Van den Durpel and Mr Brent Dixon)

- Major drivers and impediments towards nuclear energy deployn regional and/or global scale
 - muclear energy's key features and key drivers defining si scenarios for nuclear energy deployment
- Key challenges towards global sustainable deployment of nuclei
- Significance of international collaboration and types of synergie sustainable nuclear energy deployment
- Synergies among technologies
- Synergies through collaborations among countries/ entities
- Scenario families
- Drivers and impediments for collaboration among countries, get specific
- Collaborations among countries/ entities as a mechanism to amy technologies
- Key recommendations towards increased synergies for nuclear (

References to Chapter 2

CHAPTER 3. MAJOR FINDINGS OF SYNERGIF

3.1. Introduction to Chapter 3 (to be developed by th

Summary table of studies explaining their attributes:

- (a) Scenario family: global, regional, national;
 (b) Material flow analysis (MFA only)/ (MFA and
- (c) Relevance to heterogeneous/homogeneous wor
- framework); for heterogeneous case: synergisti
- (d) Reactor and fuel cycle types used in the analys
- (e) Category of synergies examined: technology of (f) Where to read the full material, i.e., number of
- (i) where to read the full material, i.e., halloer of report;

3.2. Scenarios of regional cooperation based on exis be developed by Mr V. Usanov, Mr. A. Egorov, Ms G. 1 and Mr O. Godun)

- Russia, Ukraine and Armenia study on the VV. scenarios aimed at solving the problem of accu FR deployment needs (# 12 and 13 in Attachm
- ADRIA study (# 9 in Attachment 2);
- Study on sensitivity of key indicators to the shi country groups (#14 and 15 in Attachment 2);
- Comparative economic analysis of selected syn scenarios (# 30 in Attachment 2) and others, as
- Recycle of REPU in PHWRs (# 3 in Attachme

3.3. Scenarios illustrating the potential of a variety approaches (to be developed by Ms E. Andrianova, M den Durpel, Ms K. Mukaida and Ms G. Fesenko)

- Scenario B.1 with introduction of a number of multi-recycle of Pu in LWRs and FRs (# 7 and
- Alternative deployment strategy of Fast Reacts (# 18 and 19 in Attachment 2);
- Analysis of ALWR based scenario (# 20 in Att
- Homogeneous and heterogeneous world mode HTR, including non-electrical applications (#)
- Scenarios with (i) replacement heat generation deployment of SCWRs (# 22 in Attachment 2)

3.4. Medium and long term national scenarios (to b Jensen, Mr. U. Malshe, Ms C.A. Margeanu)

- National Argentinean scenario with cooperatio
- Long-term Scenario Study for Nuclear Fuel Cy
- Scenario D.1 Evaluation of a scenario of tran Attachment 2).

National Romanian scenarios with reliance on domestic and imported U /fuel supply, by considering regional collaboration in nuclear fuel cycle and including economic analysis (# 5 in Attachment 2)

3.5. Scenarios with advanced minor actinide management (to be developed by Mr G. Van den Eynde and Mr L. Van den Durpel)

 All scenarios related to Task 3 (## 23-28 and the following two new activities in Attachment 2)

References to Chapter 3

CHAPTER 4. ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT METHODS AND KEV INDICATORS (to be developed by Mr U. Maishe, Ms G. Fesenko, Ms C. Johari and Task leaders for Task 1-3)

4.1. Introduction to Chapter 4

4.2. Economic assessment methods and data

4.3. Key indicators for transition scenarios to sustainable nuclear energy systems (NES) References to Chapter 4

CHAPTER 5. NEAR AND MEDIUM TERM ACTIONS TO ENSURE LONG TERM SUSTAINABILITY OF NUCLEAR ENERGY SYSTEMS (to be developed by Mr Luc Van den Durpel, Mr Brent Dixon, IAEA Secretariat and Task leaders for Tasks 1-4)

This was part of the original SYNERGIES ToR, and it is recognized that this is in many parts non-technical and policy related. Since that time a proposal for the ROADMAPS collaborative project has been developed and reference is made to this new project to elaborate on non-technical issues. However, some technical issues will be summarized in this chapter, such as FR development, development of advanced technologies for MA transmutation, etc. Additionally, a link between the SYNERGIES project and the remaining questions to be addressed by the ROADMAPS project would be highlighted, pointing to the overall (strategic) decisions that would need to be timely made to ensure a meaningful contribution of nuclear energy to global sustainable development.

References to Chapter 5

CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (to be developed by the LAEA Secretariat and Task leaders for Tasks 1-4)

6.1. Possible directions of future activities

References to Chapter 6

ANNEXES – Contributions from Member States (## 1-31 and two new activities in Attachment 2) – Argentina, Armenia, Belgium, Canada, China, France, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Romania, Russian Federation, Spain, Ukraine, including those developed in cooperation with the LEA's INPRO Group

ACRONYMS

3

Task 4. Example: Economic data Report

Table 1.3. Enrichment facilities costs	(data sources [6])
--	--------------------

			Overnight	O&M	Lev. Inv.	Tot. Lev.	
Firm/Facility	Capacity	Investment	cost	cost	cost	cost	
	MSWU/yr	M 2008\$	\$/kgSWU	\$/kgSWU	\$/kgSWU	\$/kgSWU	
Future Centrifuge Capacity							
Urenco NEF	3.0	1650	550	21	41	62	
Eurodif Besse II	7.5	4066	542	20	41	60	
Areva Idaho	3.0	2000	667	23	50	73	
USEC ACP	3.8	3500	921	32	69	101	
Brasil Resende	0.2	278	1369	54	103	156	
Operating Centrifug	e Capacity (E	urope and Japa	an)				
JNFL Rokkasho	1.5	1095	730	33	47	80	
Urenco Gronau	1.8	1445	803	32	52	84	
Urenco Almelo	2.9	2076	716	27	47	73	
Urenco Capenhurst	3.4	2342	689	26	45	70	
Existing Centrifuge Capacity (Russia)							
TENEX Angarsk	2.5	1854	742	18	48	66	
TENEX							
Zelenogorsk	7.4	4226	572	16	37	53	
TENEX SKhK	3.7	2472	677	19	44	63	
TENEX UEKhK,	12.5	6282	505	15	33	47	



Fig.1.5. Overnight Enrichment cost (2008\$/kgSWU) versus installed capacity



Fig.1.6. Levelized Enrich cost (2008\$/kgSWU) versus installed capacity

Training course on evaluation of collaborative scenarios of transition to sustainable nuclear energy systems using IAEA's energy model MESSAGE (jointly with PESS)













ΑΕΑ





SYNERGIES: Expected Outcomes



INPRO International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reacto and Fuel Cycles

- SYNERGIES is deemed to support development of comprehensive national nuclear energy strategies regarding international collaboration to achieve sustainable regional and global NES.
- In particular, SYNERGIES will help:
- define attractive innovative fuel cycle options possible at a regional level and promote an improved understanding of associated front-end and back-end regional interactions
- identify technical and institutional gaps that still need to be addressed within the specific future projects

- Next logical step could be to identify *"who could do what, where and when"* to achieve sustainable NES



RUSSIA:



REGIONAL CENTER (HIGH AND LOW FR SHARE)

Total NP capacities: 100 GWe by 2050, 160 GWe by 2100;

High share of FR (based on Pu availability): ~50% by 2050; ~80% by 2100;

Low FR share: ~25% by 2050; ~40% by 2100.

Slowing down with the FR introduction results in SF accumulation in the storages
Under high FR share in the NES and without impediments, Pu from SF of Russian and Ukraine VVERs could be reused by 2050

WO – FR share without regional cooperation; dSF3000 – High scenario of Ukraine NE development dSF5500 – Moderate scenario of Ukraine NE development







Canada: A Scenario Analysis of Re-burning LWR Americium in HWRs



INPRO International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reactors and Fuel Cycles



Italy: ADRIA Regional Scenario

Regions:

- I. SEE (South East Europe)
- II. Slovenia, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary

III. Italy

IV. Ukraine







•Sharing the Enrichments facilities bring an accumulated difference of 12.8 billion\$

•Synergies allows 35% save on total Enrichment Expenditures.

•Sharing the Reprocessing facilities bring an accumulated difference of 60 billion\$.

• Synergies allow 39% save on total Reprocessing Expenditures.





- NG1 share always a nominal fraction (40% in 2100)
- NG3 share in 2100 varied as 10%, 20% (nominal), 30%, 40%, 50% of total demand
- Separate (non-synergistic) and synergistic case : NG1 provides 100% of the fresh fuel and taking back 100% of the spent fuel
- Impact of NG3 share on key output parameters for Front end and Back end requirements





Impact of NG3 and NG2 on NG1 (nominal case and high NG1 growth case)







LWR long term storage in NG1 (nominal case, NG3&NG2 impact) High NG1 growth case, NG3&NG2 impact)



25

Relative investments in NFC for separate and synergistic nominal cases



INPRO International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reactors and Fuel Cycles











INPRO International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reacto and Fuel Cycles

Objective:

- The objective is to investigate innovations in selected nuclear energy technologies, related R&D and innovative institutional arrangements for deployment of innovative NESs in the 21st century.
- INPRO wants to focuses on specific innovations, recommended by Member States as well as on subjects that are complementary to activities in the areas of INPRO Methodology and Global Scenarios
- Action Plan 14/15 provides new projects on Nuclear Fuel and Fuel Cycle analysis for future NES and Waste from Innovative Types of Reactors and Fuel Cycles



CP Nuclear Fuel and Fuel Cycle analysis for future NES (FANES), 2014-2015



INPRO International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reacto and Fuel Cycles

Objective:

- Carry out feasibility analyses of advanced and innovative fuels and its influences on development of future NES.
- Analyse spent fuel management options for advanced and innovative FC addressing potential technology improvements.

Scope:

- ✓ Provide an overview of advanced and innovative fuels for different NES.
- ✓ Identify influences of advanced and innovative fuels on development of NES.
- Consider the technical viability of several options for fabrication of advanced fuel and its reprocessing in order to identify key innovations which are necessary for deployment of future NES.

Output: A TECDOC series publication.



CP Waste from Innovative Types of Reactors and Fuel Cycles (WIRAF), 2014-2015



Objective:

- Identify the potential wastes arising from for advanced and innovative reactors and their fuel cycles and eventually the technical needs for managing such wastes.
- Identify if there are any potential or known show-stoppers to for advanced and innovative reactors and their fuel cycles resulting from new or existing waste types.

Scope:

- Identify the optimal disposition (processing and disposal) pathways for the most common of these wastes (e.g., combustible, ferrous metals, resin, sludge, etc.); and
- Identify any problematic wastes from particular advanced and innovative reactor design which will require further study as part of a separate project and publication.

Output: A TECDOC series publication.



Back End Study



INPRO International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reacto and Fuel Cycles

- At a number of INPRO meetings such as SYNERGIES Technical Meetings, the 4th INPRO Dialogue Forum on Drivers and impediments for regional cooperation on the way to sustainable Nuclear Energy Systems (NESs) and others, it was noted that particular legal and institutional impediments for collaboration among countries in Fuel Cycle Back End exist.
- Examination of such impediments and outlining the pathways for their resolution might be an important near term step to ensure effective cooperation among countries toward long term sustainable nuclear energy.
- Therefore it could be recommended to initiate a new study on Multilateral Approaches to the Back End of Nuclear Fuel Cycle: drivers and legal, institutional and financial impediments.



Objectives of Study on Multilateral Approaches () to the Back End of Nuclear Fuel Cycle



Objective:

- Carry out feasibility analyses of mechanisms for international cooperation in the area of Nuclear Fuel Cycle Back End, such as return of spent fuel to the country of origin, etc.
- Analyse legal aspects of international cooperation in the area of Nuclear Fuel Cycle Back End.
- Analyse institutional impediments of international cooperation in the area of Nuclear Fuel Cycle Back End.
- Study economic aspects of international cooperation in the area of Nuclear Fuel Cycle Back End.
- Analyse spent fuel management options for advanced and innovative fuel cycles addressing potential technology improvements.



THANK YOU !

Zoran DRACE Z.Drace@iaea.org

