



EUTERP WORKSHOP, CYPRUS
Radiation protection training in Europe – the next
steps.

Proceedings & Conclusions



Session 1 – role of EUTERP

EUTERP will provide:

- Details of national legislation: National contact points
- Website
- Database of training events
- Workshop
- Quality criteria
- Networking – a forum for communication
- International projects – as a legal entity EUTERP can join.
- Young generation

Invitation to join as associates.



Discussions on the revision of the BSS.

MPE – Responsible for dosimetry. Can be carried out by the medical physics unit. Clarified that occupational dosimetry is the responsibility of the RPE. Also use of the word responsibility could be misleading in this context since the final responsibility for ensuring all aspects of radiation protection rests with the undertaking.

The roles of MPE and RPE can be incorporated into a single person – the important point is that this person must have the competencies to carry out both roles.



Identified the need for solid guidelines on MPE and RPE recognition to ensure harmonisation.

ECVET workshop was held earlier in the year. European system for vocational education and training.

- ECVET Learning is vocational training based, and outcomes based on competencies. Knowledge plus skills.
- Further information on ECVET on website.
- European qualifications framework – plea to stick to the definitions on knowledge and skills given in EQF. Published in 1998.



Session 2: EFOMP experiences

The MPE project: to provide improved implementation of MED requirements related to MPE and to facilitate harmonization of MPE aiming at cross border mobility.

Outcomes will be a set of standards for MPE in Europe.

Will be discussed at Seville workshop.



❑ EMAN project. European Medical Alara Network. Project to set up a sustainable network.

❑ MEDRAPET project

Study on the implementation of the ME Directive requirements in
rp training of medical professionals in the EU.

Started 31 Dec 10. Ends March 2013. Outcome to be a
permanent working group setting standards on education and
training.



- ❑ The first choice of RPE should be the MPE.

Complex modern procedures make it impracticable to separate MPE and RPE roles.

- ❑ Debate on MPE needing to have the role of RPE, as distinct from RPE having the role of MPE. Some concern over this debate confusing the distinction between the two roles.
- ❑ No reason for the RPE not to be a medical physicist but doesn't need to be an MPE. Competence and suitability is the issue. The RPE can equally well be a medical physicist.



Session 3: ENETRAP II activities & results

- Reference standard done for RPE, good progress with RPO
- Pilot sessions organised of specific modules
- Course materials in progress
- Started looking at mechanism for evaluation of training materials courses and providers
- Developing a quality label for training
- Database of training events and providers
- Finalise work package for attracting early stage rp researchers.
- European passport not yet started.



Requirements for RPE and methodology for mutual recognition

- National recognition: ensure flexibility but also ensure a degree of commonality sufficient to facilitate mutual recognition.
- Broad outline of scheme developed and distributed to stakeholder groups for comment.
- Proposal for requirements for core competence developed.
 - Education to BSc or academic equiv,
 - Knowledge and understanding
 - Knowledge of operational methods
- Proposed national scheme for RPE recognition.
- Mutual recognition:
- Mechanism for mutual recognition proposed.



- ❑ Assessing body – should be clarity between member states as to how these are set up. Minimum criteria should be specified.
- ❑ The person's suitability for specific practice has to be finally judged by the employer. Schemes will never ensure 100% of recognised persons are good. Issue of suitability.
- ❑ Language might be a problem. An issue of suitability.
- ❑ Proposal that mutual recognition would work better if the recognition process for RPE specifically included restriction to certain applications. However this is a suitability issue. Mutual recognition is concerned with core competence.



- ❑ Reference standards for RPE training
- ❑ Organisation of the RPE training scheme
- ❑ Requirements and guidance for European RPO training
 - Guidance on RPO training currently being developed. Will consist of one doc covering both RPO competencies and training. Hope to publish this in the Radiation Protection series.
 - Should there be mutual recognition for RPOs as well? No requirement for national recognition but a European system for the recognition of RPO training would be helpful.



- Methodology and QA for comparison and evaluation using ECVET
- Creation and use of the ENETRAP dbase
- Accompanying text book



Session 4: Recognition arrangements

- QE for radioactive waste management, UK
- Comparing courses in Germany & Netherlands

Too little attention to RWs. Need for recognition of level of knowledge etc for RWs.

- Harmonisation & mutual recognition in Switzerland & Germany

Debate on impact: what are the outcomes in each country? What is the most cost effective option for regulatory control and training? **Future workshop topic?**



Group 1: Impact of revised BSS.

- ❑ Most countries have RPE/RPO structure but under different names. RPO is usually part of the organisation.
- ❑ Implementation not seen to be a major problem.
- ❑ Group 3 also looked at this and agreed that implementation should not be an issue. Strong view that guidance on roles and duties of RPE and RPO in draft BSS extremely useful and must be retained.
- ❑ Further national survey recommended: all issues in the BSS will be discussed in the Atomic Questions Group.



Group 2: QA for evaluation

ECVET – European credit system for e & t in terms of learning outcomes

Important to understand difference between objectives & outcomes. EUTERP asked to develop glossary of terminology.

Assessment of knowledge easy. Difficult to assess learning outcomes. Also need to develop methodology for training course comparison. **TOPICS FOR NEXT WORKSHOP?**

No objection to development of a EUTERP stamp.

Reference training standards should take account of required learning outcomes.



Working Group 3

What training & staffing shortfalls in rp foreseen?

- ❑ Medical sector: problems with lack of harmonisation across Europe re medical physics. Different levels. EUTERP should be involved in MPE workshop and should work alongside EFOMP in promoting a common approach. Also difficulties in establishing true staffing levels. Current EC project. **Future**

Workshop topics?

- ❑ Competent authorities: should have appropriate competency. Recommendation to HERCA?
- ❑ Nuclear industry: potential skills gap in nuclear power roles and decommissioning.



Session 5: Implementation of legislative requirements on training

- The effect of new BSS definitions on Greece
- The role of the regulatory authority in Lithuania
- Systematic approach to training

Session 6: Attracting a new generation

- Attracting a new generation of rp professionals.

Debate on the cause of graduates not going into science careers: lack of encouragement and lack of job prospects.



EUTERP action plan

- EUTERP a legal entity
- Objectives and organisation – Foundation and associates.
- Membership euro 395.
- Reduced workshop fees (reality check!)
- Invitation to complete National pages.
- Invitation to provide assistance.
- Stakeholder expectations:
 - Develop minimum requirements for qualification
 - RPE/RPO guidance
 - Comparisons of qualification systems
 - Recognition of training



- Stakeholder issues.
- Need to develop and expand EUTERP role.



CONCLUSIONS

1. Impact of revised BSS definitions seen to be positive, with most countries needing only minor changes in legislation. EUTERP to provide updates to members on status and can provide a focus for information.
2. QA for training should take account of ECVET. Ensure use of EQF terminology. TOPIC FOR NEXT WORKSHOP: assessment of learning outcomes.
3. Significant variation in training and qualification approaches in the medical sector. Need for EUTERP to work alongside EFOMP to promote harmonised approach to training. TOPIC FOR NEXT WORKSHOP.
4. Future skills gap for rp professionals in nuclear industry.



1. Identified need for improved training programmes for regulatory authorities.
2. The roles of MPE and RPE: separate and distinct competencies - can be incorporated into a single person – the important point is that this person must have the competencies to carry out both roles.
3. Need to continue to develop certification and mutual recognition processes, and reference training standards. Dissemination of ENETRAP II outcomes.
4. Broader focus needed to encompass radiation workers as well as RPE/RPO.
5. Benefit in looking at the impact of training activities in member states – FUTURE WORKSHOP TOPIC?.



Next Workshop?

- Date
- Location
- Topic



Thanks to:

- Stelios
- EUTERP Board
- Griet
- And all participants for making this such a lively workshop.