



NEWSLETTER

EUROPEAN TRAINING AND EDUCATION IN RADIATION PROTECTION PLATFORM

In this issue more about the First EUTERP Platform Workshop

Editorial

This issue of the Newsletter focuses on the outcome of the first EUTERP workshop, which was held in Vilnius, Lithuania, 22-24 May 2007. The workshop was attended by 69 participants, coming from 29 countries (22 Member States, 2 Candidate States and 2 Associated States of the European Union, and 3 countries from outside the European Union) and from 7 international organisations and networks. The workshop was a real success, thanks to the excellent work of the staff of the Karolina Hotel and Conference Centre, the staff of the Radiation Protection Centre RSC (in particular Gendrutis Morkūnas) and not in the least to the active contribution of all participants, in particular during the working group and plenary discussions.

As you can read elsewhere in this Newsletter, the outcome of the workshop is laid down in 8 concrete recommendations, which are important for the revision processes of both the Euratom and the international Basic Safety Standards. They also give a clear direction of work for the Platform members for the upcoming year, in order to establish international agreement on qualifications, competence and criteria for recognition of Radiation Protection Experts and Officers.

We are happy to announce that all European Member States are now represented in the EUTERP Platform. The total number of national representatives (from Member, Associated and Candidate States and the observers from 4 countries outside the European Union region) is more than 135. Add to that the representatives of 15 international organisations and networks, and the total number of members is exceeding 150. Most of you (Big Brother is watching you!) are making use of the EUTERP website as a means for information, but I hope that the follow-up of the results of the workshop will lead to an increase of the use, by its Forum, as a means for discussion.

The National Contact Points have been addressed separately in the recommendations of the first workshop. They will play an important role in coordinating the follow-up discussions on the results of the workshop within their countries and to give feedback about national viewpoints to the Platform. Not all countries have been appointing a NCP yet. You can see the updated list in this Newsletter and on the EUTERP website. I would like to ask the missing countries to appoint a NCP as soon as possible.

The EUTERP website also contains a page with training events. I would like to invite you to add your training events in the folder on EUTERP website. I hope this Newsletter inspires you to contribute to the important work of the Platform that is in front of us. Also, if you want to contribute to next issues of the Newsletter, please send me your information. More copies of the Newsletters can be downloaded from the website www.euterp.eu.

J. van der Steen
EUTERP Coordinator
E-mail: vandersteen@nrg-nl.com



Summary of the First EUTERP Platform Workshop

The aim of the workshop was to focus on finding a common denominator for international agreement on the qualifications for training and education and requirements for mutual recognition of Radiation Protection Experts (RPEs) and Radiation Protection Officers (RPOs). The workshop specifically addressed the results of the ENETRAP¹ project, which formed the basis for the discussions on harmonisation of training and education requirements for RPEs and RPOs. A full summary of the workshop and the individual presentations can be downloaded from the EUTERP website.

THEMES AND ISSUES ARISING

The definition of RP professionals

The ENETRAP project investigated the differences in the interpretation of the definition of the QE in the national regulations. About half of the countries claimed that their definition of RPE reflects exactly the definition of the QE. About a quarter of the countries indicated that their definition reflects only partly the definition of QE, and for the rest of the countries there is no definition at all in their regulations. IRPA has made progress, in cooperation with ILO, about the inclusion of the RPE as an occupation in the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO). The proposal is to include the RPE in Unit Group 2243 (Environmental and occupational health and hygiene professionals). Apart from that, IRPA is also working on a definition of the RPE and the Certified RPE (CRPE). The representatives of the EC and the IAEA emphasized the cooperation in the revision processes of the Directive 96/29/EURATOM and the international BSS and invited the Platform to provide them with recommendations on definitions and qualifications of RP professionals.

The Medical Physicist Expert and the Radiation Protection Expert

The question was raised whether the MPE can be considered as equal to the RPE, i.e. whether the MPE could play the same role and have the same responsibilities as the RPE. There was no unanimity on this issue. In some countries the MPE also plays the role of RPE, specifically in small hospitals; in other countries,

¹ *European Network on Education and Training in Radiation Protection. ENETRAP is a research project that is being carried out under the 6th Framework Programme of the European Commission. This project has established a training scheme for professional radiation protection experts as well as an academic Master Course in Radiation Protection for students. Furthermore, the ENETRAP project has studied the differences in the interpretation of the definition of the Qualified Expert, as defined in Directive 96/29/EURATOM, in the national legislations of EU Member, Candidate and Associated States, as well as the differences in requirements for competences of RPEs and RPOs.*

advice.

It is also recommended that the European Commission include a definition of the RPO which reflects the supervisory role and duties of this radiation protection professional. The revised Directive should also place requirements on the license holder with respect to supervision and the appointment of an RPO.

Recommendation 2: Criteria for the qualification of the RPE and RPO

To support the definitions, it is recommended that the European Commission develop guidance on criteria for the qualification of the RPE and the RPO, as well as guidance on education and training of these professionals to meet the criteria. The criteria should consist of a combination of theoretical knowledge, training and competence for practical radiation protection. Competencies and skills should be obtained by a period of on the job training followed by a period of work experience. The minimum period of OJT and work experience depends on the risk and the sector of work, but it should be common for all Member States.

Recommendation 3: The MPE in relation to the QE/RPE

The Workshop concluded that there were different views about the question whether the MPE could play the same role and have the same responsibilities as the QE (or RPE). With a view on the revision of Directive 96/29/EURATOM, it is recommended that the European Commission, in cooperation with EFOMP, set up a special group for that purpose.

Recommendation 4: Cooperation of the European Commission, IAEA and IRPA

The Workshop took notice of the cooperation between the European Commission and the IAEA in the revision process of the Directive 96/29/EURATOM and the International Basic Safety Standards, respectively. The Workshop also noticed the progress made by IRPA in the development of a definition of the RPE. The Workshop therefore invites these organisations to cooperate and agree to the extent possible on the definitions and qualifications of the QE/RPE and the RPO as mentioned in Recommendations 1 and 2.

Recommendation 5: Training material and training courses

The Workshop concluded from the results of the ENETRAP project that there exists a large variety of training material and training courses throughout the European Union, of which the quality is difficult to compare. This is believed to be caused by the lack of detail given in the syllabus in Communication 98/C133/03. On the other hand, standardised training material on a modular basis has been developed (by the IAEA, by the European Master Course on Radiation protection, and by ENETRAP). It is recommended that the European Commission promote the use of standardized syllabi and training materials in order to assure the quality of E&T, and investigate a methodology for comparing training materials and courses.

It is recommended that the EUTERP Platform establishes a data base of training materials and training events, with the ultimate goal of applying a quality label on such materials and events.

Recommendation 6: Elements for recognition of RPEs and RPOs

It is recommended that national authorities develop a formal recognition process of the competence of RPEs and RPOs on a sector-specific and risk-specific basis. National authorities should take into account the guidance provided by the European Commission, as mentioned in Recommendation 2.

Recommendation 7: Methodology of assessing recognition

The Workshop recommends the EUTERP Platform to draft a standardized methodology of assessing the recognition of RP professionals as a basis for future mutual recognition, based on Career Profile consisting of a description of roles and duties, education, training and work experience. This draft should be discussed by the National Contact Points to give feedback on the acceptability of the methodology by the Member States. It is recommended that the results be discussed at the second Workshop of the EUTERP Platform.

The European Commission is invited to consider the means to place a duty on Member States to implement such a methodology for recognition of RP professionals from other Member States.

Recommendation 8: Work programme for the EUTERP Platform

The Workshop recommends that the Platform coordinates the drafting of suitable definitions for the RPE and RPO as an input to Recommendation 1. To this end, the National Contact Points are invited to consider the required core competencies for the RPE and RPO.

The National Contact Points are also invited to

- discuss with the national regulatory authorities the EUTERP recommended methodology for recognition of RPEs and RPOs by a combination of education, training and competence;
- provide the EUTERP office with details of suitable training events and training materials to form the basis of a training database.



The Belgian delegation to the workshop was not very lucky. Lodewijk van Bladel fell ill after the first day and had to stay in bed for the rest of the workshop. Herwig Janssens broke his leg. You can see him here leaving the "battlefield". We wish both a quick recovery and hope to see them again at the next workshop.

Follow-up of the Workshop recommendations

The results of the workshop have been presented to the Expert Group according to Art 31 of the Euratom Treaty, at its meeting of 12-13 June 2007 in Luxembourg. Although no formal opinion of the Art 31 Group was asked about the findings, there was general agreement about the importance of the conclusions and recommendations for the revision of Directive 96/29/Euratom with respect to education, training, qualification and recognition of radiation protection professionals. The Group took specifically notice of the interaction between the qualifications and duties of the Medical Physics Expert and the Radiation Protection Expert and agreed on the proposal to invite a member of the Medical Working Party of the Group to participate in the Steering Committee meetings of the EUTERP Platform.

At the meeting, the representatives of the European Commission and the IAEA reiterated their statements on cooperation in the revision of their respective basic safety standards. The representative of IRPA recalled the presence of the three organisations in the Steering Committee of the EUTERP Platform, thereby assuring the close cooperation in the field of training and education, and expressed the willingness of IRPA to cooperate in the development of definitions of radiation protection professionals.

The Art 31 Group invites the Platform to elaborate the recommendations and awaits with great interest the further work of the Platform.

This means that we have to set the ball running. The Steering Committee will make proposals for definitions (**Recommendation 1**) and guidance on criteria for qualifications (**Recommendation 2**) of the RPE and RPO. These proposals will be put on the Forum of the website for discussion. We would like to see a coordinated discussion, meaning that within each country the proposals are discussed under coordination of the National Contact Point, and that national views are fed back on the Forum.

With respect to **Recommendation 3**, we propose that the European Commission will formally ask the Art 31 Medical Working Party to contact EFOMP and (when established) the European Medical ALARA Network (EMAN) to address the links between the RPE and the MPE with regard to education, training, duties and responsibilities of these experts. The results will, in due time, be put on the Forum page of the website.

Recommendation 4 is waiting for input from Recommendations 1 and 2. The intention of EC, IAEA and IRPA to cooperate is already expressed above.

With respect to the promotion of standardized training material (**Recommendation 5**), it is concluded that it is necessary to establish a methodology for objectively comparing training materials and courses. This requires some research funds, for which we are investigating the possibilities within the European Commission (both DG-TREN and DG-RTD).

In the meantime the National Contact Points are invited to assemble information on training materials and training events within their countries in order to establish a data base (see also the Editorial of this Newsletter).

Recommendation 6 and **Recommendation 7** are both dealing with recognition of RPEs and RPOs. Here again research is necessary to develop a methodology for assessing the recognition of RPEs and RPOs, based on a career profile consisting of a description of roles and duties, education, training and work experience. As for Recommendation 5, we are investigating the possibilities for carrying out the work. The methodology, when established, should be discussed by the National Contact Points for its acceptability as a system for (mutual) recognition of RPEs and RPOs. Depending on speed of finding the research possibilities, the results may be discussed at the second EUTERP Workshop.

The total of these activities encompasses **Recommendation 8**.

List of National Contact Points

Country	National Contact Point	Affiliation
Austria	Th. Geringer	ARC Seibersdorf
Belarus	A. Timoshchenko	International Sakharov Environmental University
Belgium	L. van Bladel	Federal Agency for Nuclear Control
	P. Kockerols	Belgian Association for Radiological Protection
Czech Republic	H. Podskubkova	State Office for Nuclear Safety (SUJB)
Denmark	K. Ulbak	National Institute of Radiation Protection
Estonia	M. Lust	Radiation Protection Centre
Finland	R. Havukainen	STUK
France	Th. Lahaye	Ministry of Labour
Greece	P. Dimitriou	GAEC
Italy	A. Luciani	ENEA
	G. Cucchi	General Secretary of ANPEQ
Kazakhstan	I. Khvoshnyanskaya	Radiation Protection and Ecology Center
Latvia	M. Caikovska	Ministry of Environment; Radiation Safety Centre
Lithuania	J. Karpenko	Radiation Protection Centre
Luxembourg	N. Harpes	Ministry of Health
Macedonia	G. Angelovski	Radiation Safety Directorate
Malta	P. Brejza	Radiation Protection Board
Netherlands	A. Vermeulen	Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment
Norway	T. Wøhni	National Radiation Protection Authority
Poland	P. Krajewski	Central Laboratory for Radiological Protection
Portugal	C. Oliveira	Nuclear and Technological Institute
Romania	M. Ceclan	Politechnic University of Bucharest
	V. Zsombori	National Commission for Nuclear Activities Control
Spain	M. Marco	CIEMAT
Sweden	B. Ekström	SSI
Switzerland	S.-G. Jahn	Swiss Federal Nuclear Safety Inspectorate
United Kingdom	R. Paynter	HPA-RPD

Last update: 26 June 2007

Colophon

Coordination

Jan van der Steen

Layout

Cora Blankendaal

Webmaster

E-mail: info@euterp.eu

Internet: www.euterp.eu