



Document ID 1532572	Version 0.2	Status Preliminary	Reg no	Page 1 (3)
Author Mary Westermark			Date 2016-02-16	
Reviewed by			Reviewed date	
Approved by			Approved date	

Short notes SCM Berlin 03.02.2016



Date: 03.02.2016 Time: 19.00-20.00

Present: Patrik Sellin, SKB, Tiziana Missana, CIEMAT, Thorsten Schäfer, KIT, Amy Shelton, RWM, Radek Cervinka, UJV, Anne Kontula, Posiva, Mary Westermark, SKB.

We are moving towards the end of the BELBaR project, the end date is the 29th of February. The focus of this meeting was on remaining deliverables and deadlines for remaining work.

1. Request for amendment

The request for amendment to the Grant Agreement was sent to the commission 2/2, and the changes were submitted in NEF last week. The main issues were the partial transfer of rights and obligations from NDA to RWM, and the request from UNIMAN to transfer budget from own personnel to subcontracting for Nick Bryan. We're hoping for a swift process.

2. Remaining deliverables from participants (at the time)

Those marked in red need your input

D3.10 Mechanical model of radionuclide colloid interaction

D3.11 Experimental results on micro-to macroscale colloid rock and radionuclide interaction

- » Thorsten had been trying to get in touch with Nick Bryan and Francis Livens to get information on D3.10, and input to D3.11, and needed some help with this. Nick has now sent Thorsten some input to D3.11. Mary has been in contact with Francis Livens about D3.10. They had not understood that D3.10 needs to be submitted before 29th of February. Now they know, and Francis has promised to solve this, D3.10 will be submitted before 29th of February. Is this ok?

D4.11 WP4 partners final report on experimental results on clay colloid stability

D5.3 Synthesis report of model development and validations to support and to be referred to in D1.4

- » D4.11 and D5.3 were work in progress and would be delivered shortly

D1.4 Synthesis report of colloids and related issues in the long term safety case

- » D1.4 needed input from all the rest and Amy was working on it. A first draft has now been sent to Patrik.

3. Remaining deliverables from coordinator but may need contributions from participants

D1.3 - Verification of first workshop (now submitted)

Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB

Swedish Nuclear Fuel and Waste Management Co
PO Box 250, SE-101 24 Stockholm
Visiting address Blekholmstorget 30
Phone +46-8-459 84 00 Fax +46-8-579 386 10
www.skb.se
556175-2014 Seat Stockholm

- » Presentations, agenda and participant list now submitted

D6.1 - Updated website

- » Work remaining (i.e. publishing the presentations from the conference in Berlin)

D6.7 - Presentation of project and initial results at international conference

D6.7 Has been submitted but was rejected on the grounds that it needs to be completed with the corresponding abstracts/posters/presentations, agendas and participant lists regarding at least the following conferences.

- Clays in natural and engineered barriers for radioactive waste confinement, October 22 - 25 2012, Montpellier, France (Who was there?)
 - EURADISS 2012 workshop October 25-26 2012, Montpellier, France (Patrik)
 - International Clay Conference 2013, 07-11 July 2013, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (Patrik)
 - Clay Mineral Society, October 6–10 2013 Urbana-Champaign, United States (Patrik)
 - Migration, September 8 -13 2013, Brighton, United Kingdom (Thorsten? Any one else)
 - EURADWASTE, October 14-16 2013, Vilnius, Lithuania (Patrik)
- » Mary will fix agendas and, if available, participant lists. Those of you that were present at respective conference were to provide Mary with abstracts/posters/presentations, and corresponding information. **Make sure everything contains the flags/logo (attached) and acknowledgement text!** Radek and Thorsten have delivered. Most of it is in place. I think Tiziana was to send me an abstract?

D6.8 – Publication of proceedings based on output from Workshop 1

- » According to Patrik there was an agreement that it was not constructive to make a collective publication of abstracts from the first workshop/annual meeting in the form they were presented there. Instead I think the publication plan (that was just emailed to you 16.02.2016) was updated and the plan was that papers/articles would be published individually after the first workshop. Now this needs to be shown. Mary will write something about this, and submit it. But I need to be able to refer to published articles. So follow the instructions in the email about Publications

D6.11 – Training course

- » Agenda, participant list and presentations have now been zip:ed and submitted

D6.12 – Second workshop, the conference in Berlin, submission of agenda, minutes, participant list, presentations and abstracts.

D6.13 – Final publication of work – a full report that includes synthesis report from WP1-WP5

- » Patrik's view is that this is a peer reviewed and published/printed D1.4. It will be very, very difficult to finalize it and submit it before February 29th so we needed to reason with Christophe Davies about it. We asked Christophe his view on this, and he did not quite agree with us on what this deliverable consists of, and he has not replied to Patrik's last email yet. But I think the conclusion is that we can process and make an express peer review of D1.4 when it is ready, and submit in the near future of the 29th of February

D6.14 Publication of proceedings based on the output from the WP2 (this) workshop (including report from the scientific rapporteurs/End user review board)

D6.15 Preparation and publication of project summary (shorter, simpler, glossier, for the general public).

- » **All WP-leaders** provide Mary with a favourite picture/illustration of their WP and/or work in the project. Deadline for this is 21/2, but since I'm late with the notes, I'll give you until the afternoon of the 22nd.

D6.5 - End user review board evaluation report on first annual meeting

D6.9 - End user review board evaluation report on second annual meeting

D6.10 - End user review board evaluation report on third annual meeting

4. Something was said about keeping an eye on that not everything is proven hypothesises, not only expected results should be presented.
5. Something was also said about a revision of D1.2?