



# European ALARA Newsletter

## Editorial

At the end of 2003, four more countries, Greece, Ireland, Portugal and Croatia, have joined the Network. The total number of participating countries is now eighteen, covering nearly all the European Union member states as well as Norway, Switzerland and a few applicant countries. Furthermore, as said in the last issue, EAN is now considered as a model to be exported by international institutions. It should be noted that the development of Networking, and particularly ALARA Networks, is now integrated into the action plan on Occupational Radiation Protection from ILO and IAEA. Therefore the co-ordinator of EAN has been asked by ILO and IAEA to participate to the Steering Committee for this action plan. Another representative of the EAN Steering Group has also been invited by IAEA to participate to the first Central and eastern European ALARA Network (CEEAN) workshop.

Some 60 participants from 11 European countries attended the 7th EAN Workshop on “decommissioning and site remediation” at Arnhem in the Netherlands last October. Very high quality papers, which are available on our web site, supported the oral presentations. As during the previous workshops the work in small groups has been very fruitful and has led to 8 recommendations dealing with four questions: Are we really implementing ALARA in decommissioning and remediation? What role for the stakeholders in decision-making? Are there specific issues for the non-nuclear sector? Are they still further needs for external dose prediction tools? A summary of the discussions as well as all recommendations are presented in this issue of the Newsletter.

The next Workshop will take place in Uppsala, Sweden, 22-24<sup>th</sup> September. It will be devoted to the “control of occupational exposure through inspection and self assessment”. Representatives from most European countries, belonging to regulatory bodies, utilities and other stakeholders have already proposed presentations to the workshop. There is still room for a few presentations, particularly from workers representatives.

Of particular interest for our network are the recommendations from the International Conference on “National infrastructures for radiation safety”, which have pointed out the importance of Networking at regional levels, and the role from international organisations for supporting these networks.

After having been created within the fourth European Framework Programme of Research and Development, EAN is now financially supported by the European Commission through the fifth Framework programme that will end in the next few months. Therefore a new proposal will be soon sent to the Commission, the main features of that proposal are presented in that issue of the Newsletter.

As members of the Network you are invited to send us your remarks and suggestions.

The Network is yours, do not hesitate to contact us, either directly or through your national contact.

C. LEFAURE

## Contents of Issue #14

<b>EAN Seventh Workshop on Decommissioning and Site Remediation: Summary and Recommendations</b> P. Shaw, C. Lefaure, J. van der Steen, P. Croüail.....	<b>2</b>
<b>Excerpts from “Findings and Recommendations of the International Conference on National Infrastructures for Radiation Safety”</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>New challenges for the European ALARA Network</b> EAN Steering Committee members .....	<b>5</b>
<b>Analysis of a Radiological Incident (case no 14)</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>ALARA News</b> .....	<b>7-8</b>
<b>The 18 EAN Contact Persons</b> .....	<b>insert A</b>
<b>8<sup>th</sup> EAN Workshop (Second Announcement)</b> .....	<b>insert B</b>

## Editorial Board

P. Croüail, P.V. Shaw, C. Lefaure  
(email: [ean@cepn.asso.fr](mailto:ean@cepn.asso.fr))

*Authors are solely responsible for their publication in this Newsletter. It does not represent the opinion of the Community. The Community and the Editorial Board are not responsible for any use that might be made of data appearing therein.*



Coordinated by CEPN, on behalf of the EC DG-RESEARCH  
Nuclear Energy Programme

European ALARA Newsletter ISSN 1270-9441  
ROUTE DU PANORAMA, BP 48 F - 92263 FONTENAY-AUX-ROSES CEDEX TEL: +33 1 58 35 74 67  
FAX: +33 1 40 84 90 34 E-MAIL: SEC@CEPN.ASSO.FR



**EAN Seventh Workshop on Decommissioning and Site Remediation: Summary And Recommendations**

*P. Shaw<sup>1</sup>, C. Lefauvre<sup>2</sup>, J. van der Steen<sup>3</sup>, P. Croüail<sup>2</sup>*

<sup>1</sup>National Radiological Protection Board, UK

<sup>2</sup>NRG, the Netherlands

<sup>3</sup>Nuclear Protection Evaluation Center, France

**Workshop structure and content**

Some 60 participants from 11 European countries attended the 7th EAN Workshop on “decommissioning and site remediation”. This was the first time that a workshop revisited a specific topic: the 1st EAN Workshop (Saclay, 1997) was devoted to “ALARA and decommissioning”.



There were 20 oral presentations, mainly devoted to case studies of work undertaken in a variety of different situations (from accelerators and hot cells, to mineral wool (NORM) facilities and contaminated apartments). In addition to a scene setting session there were sessions on:

- site remediation and prevention of internal exposure
- decommissioning of installations outside the nuclear fuel cycle; and
- effectiveness and feedback from the use of dose and dose rates estimating factors

The opening session reviewed the progress made with the recommendations from the 1st Workshop, and identified a series of issues and questions for later consideration in the Working Group sessions. There were two such sessions where the participants were split into 6 Working Groups tasked with addressing specific issues. The reports from these groups were presented and discussed in the final two sessions in order to identify the key findings and recommendations.

**Progress made since the 1st workshop**

The implementation of the eight recommendations made at the 1st workshop was reviewed in detail in a scene-setting presentation (Deboodt). In addition to this, the themes raised were also a feature of many subsequent presentations. A summary of this is given in the table hereafter.

Recommendations from the 1 <sup>st</sup> EAN workshop (Saclay)	Follow-up: EAN workshop or activity	Number of papers at the 7 <sup>th</sup> workshop <sup>1</sup>
External dose tools		5
Internal dose tools	Workshop no 3 (1999)	2
Total risk approach	Workshop no 4 (2000)	
Decision aiding (transparency)		1
ISOE	Research reactor sub-network	
Non-nuclear sector	Workshop no 2 (1998)	3
Harmonised system of control		8
Clearance criteria / acceptability		2

**Findings and recommendations**

Although there were a range of subjects covered during both the presentations and the working groups, four general themes emerged from the workshop. These are discussed below.

**1. Are we really implementing ALARA in decommissioning and remediation?**

In many of the cases presented, it was clear that a diverse range of factors were involved in real decommissioning-remediation operations. The end-point, in many cases, was a decision to remove all detectable activity, irrespective of whether this constituted a significant residual risk. This raised questions about whether this approach is ALARA, or indeed whether the optimisation principle has a role. Specific conclusions reached during the workshop were:

- The costs associated with decommissioning and remediation are complex. Although these costs can be very high, they are not all associated with dose restriction. Decision-aiding techniques, such as cost-benefit analysis, have a very limited impact in practice, and should be applied with care.
- “Social issues” are often an overriding factor, especially where public exposures are involved. These issues include public opinion and media pressure, and the overall effect is to produce a situation referred to as “ALATA” (as low as technologically achievable), a phrase introduced at the Workshop.
- Although social factors and pressures are valid and important, the Workshop expressed concerns at the establishment of “zero risk” endpoints. These are never entirely possible, are often impractical, and encourage unrealistic expectations and the disproportionate use of resources.

<sup>1</sup> Represents the number of papers that addressed the particular subject. Some papers covered more than one subject, and many papers focused on new issues entirely.

In comparison, the ALARA principle does appear to be well-implemented in cases where occupational, rather than public exposure, is the issue: many of the presentations confirmed the key role that optimisation now plays in planning and undertaking such operations. One possible exception to this is internal exposures, which are, in some cases avoided at the overall expense of increased external doses.

### RECOMMENDATION 1

#### Management of occupational internal exposure

In some cases, too much emphasis is placed on avoiding occupational internal radiation exposures, to the detriment of external radiation control. This approach is sometimes necessary, for example because the internal radiation hazard is unpredictable. In other cases, **operators** should aim to ensure an overall balance between internal and external radiation doses to workers.

Another clear factor to emerge is that both decommissioning and site remediation involve other (non-radiological) hazards, and an integrated or “holistic” approach to risk management is desirable. Adoption of this approach throughout the lifetime of operations would be especially beneficial to the final decommissioning-remediation operation.

### RECOMMENDATION 2

#### Integrated risk approach

An integrated (or “holistic”) approach to risk management in decommissioning and site remediation should be encouraged by **international bodies** such as IAEA, ILO, NEA and EC. This should be supported by **regulators** and implemented by **operators**, and should aim to include:

- a simultaneous consideration of radiological and non-radiological hazards and risks, so as to provide the best overall protection of persons and the environment; and
- greater emphasis on life-cycle planning of facilities, where the issues of decommissioning and remediation are considered throughout.

### 2. What is the role of the stakeholders in decision-making?

Examples were presented in which increased stakeholder involvement, especially from members of the public and their representatives, had been actively pursued. These involved more proactive ways of providing information (telephone “help-lines”, open days, etc), as well as encouraging participation in the actual decision-making process. The evidence suggests that this has helped raise wider public awareness and acceptance, which in turn has been beneficial to the overall operation. The workshop concluded that wider application of this approach should be encouraged.

### RECOMMENDATION 3

#### Stakeholder involvement

Experiences presented in the workshop have shown the importance of involving all interested parties (stakeholders) in the decision making process dealing with site remediation. To encourage this, it is recommended that:

- **EC** and other **international organisations** provide guidance and spread feedback experiences;
- **national authorities** provide suitable regulatory frameworks; and
- **decision makers** make arrangements to invite views from different stakeholders, and set up forums in which each may make a relevant contribution. These arrangements should normally be the responsibility of **operators**, where they exist, in consultation with the relevant **authorities**.

### 3. Are there factors that are specific to the non-nuclear sector?

It was very clear during the workshop that this sector can be defined in different ways, and covers a broad range of situations, for example:

- low level contamination, e.g. in research laboratories;
- very high contamination levels in source production facilities; and
- NORM sites with large volumes of waste.

Many differences with nuclear sites were noted, for example in terms of the historical use of sites, their location, etc. Overall, however, it was felt that appropriate decommissioning/remediation techniques exist but need to be adequately selected, in many cases using lessons learned from the nuclear industry. At this stage, although there appears to be no need for new tools/techniques to be specially developed for this sector, the decommissioning industry is far from being mature. It was moreover suggested that an inventory of relevant sites to be decommissioned/remediated would help encourage the sharing of experience and good practice.

### RECOMMENDATION 4

#### Inventory of non-nuclear sites

The workshop identified a need for national and international inventories of non-nuclear sites to be decommissioned and/or remediated. This should include past operations as well as sites still in operation. In the first instance, **national authorities** are encouraged to assemble such an inventory, and to make it available to interested parties to encourage the sharing of experience and feedback, and to ensure transparency.

For NORM-contaminated sites, it was noted that historical processes were often undertaken with no knowledge of the associated radiation hazard - this may still be the case with some existing processing plants.

This can result in large-scale decommissioning-remediation problems for operators, many of which lack relevant knowledge of the radiological issues that need to be addressed.

**RECOMMENDATION 5**  
**Guidance for NORM sites**

In the case of NORM-contaminated sites, there is often less awareness of radiological problems and hazards. Guidance should be developed by **international bodies** to help those responsible for such sites to:

- identify likely sources of contamination;
- assess the radiation hazards; and
- select suitable techniques for decommissioning and site remediation.

**4. Are they still further needs for external dose prediction tools?**

The session devoted to these tools indicated that they continue to be developed and are increasingly sophisticated. One major development has been in the graphical interfaces used to display the results in 3D. These tools clearly have a role in ALARA planning, especially for work in high dose rate areas, and are also a useful training aid. With the increasing number of available tools, it was suggested that a means of benchmarking and comparing different systems was a priority. It was also noted that the Workshop had provided a useful forum for communications between different organisations using different tools, and that this should be encouraged further.

**RECOMMENDATION 6**  
**External Dose Prediction Tools network**

The EAN (with the support of the **EC**) should establish a European “sub-network on dose prediction tools”, involving **users, developers, and other stakeholders** to share experiences, develop common standards and identify future needs for decommissioning and site remediation operations.

The workshop noted that the current sophistication of dose prediction tools needs to be matched by the training of users.

**RECOMMENDATION 7**  
**Training for users of dose prediction tools**

Training for users of prediction codes and tools is necessary to help ensure that the results obtained are both consistent and reliable, and that they are interpreted correctly. IAEA have already developed training material on this topic. One of the functions of the recommended **sub-network on dose prediction tools** should be to review and comment on existing training material. These comments should be disseminated to **users and suppliers** of dose prediction tools, and also fed back to **IAEA**.

One of the working groups on dose prediction tools also considered the protocols for obtaining radiological data prior to site remediation, and concluded that this was an area of concern. IAEA have produced guidance on the radiological characterisation of sites prior to remediation operations. However, the Workshop noted evidence that site characterisation costs were becoming increasingly significant. This was often due to uncertainty about the amount of radiological monitoring and sampling required. The demands of different national regulatory systems were also noted.

**RECOMMENDATION 8**  
**Site characterisation tools**

Further guidance from **international bodies** on site characterisation protocols (sampling requirements, etc.) is recommended at the beginning and end of the remediation/decommissioning process. This guidance should aim to provide a common framework for decision-making within the context of different national regulatory systems.

□ **Conclusion**

Many improvements have been achieved since the first Workshop on “ALARA and decommissioning”, both in practice (as shown during the exchanges on case studies) and in the methodological area (recommendations from national and international bodies on management strategies, methodology and tools for estimating doses to public and the workers...). The role of a network, such as EAN, to widely spread information to interested parties appears to be very efficient and will help in promoting further progress.

**Excerpts from “Findings and Recommendations of the International Conference on National Infrastructures for Radiation Safety”**

1-5 September 2003, Rabat, Morocco

IAEA, WHO, ILO, OECD-NEA, PAHO

□ **Findings of the President of the Conference**

(...)The key request from all participants was that the IAEA manage the transition of radiation safety infrastructures to sustainability in a positive manner, so that there would be no loss of IAEA assistance. Preference was expressed for a regional or sub-regional approach, so that the benefits of synergism, harmonization and networking might continue and be increased. Throughout the Conference, emphasis was placed on the importance of networking as an effective means of improving co-operation and fostering an integrated safety approach. Networks can facilitate exchanges of knowledge and experience among regulators, radiation protection



personnel and professional societies, helping to create "critical masses" of professionals in individual countries. Also, they can be used for communicating with workers. They can have databases such as the ISOE, they can be primarily scientific, like EURADOS, or they can focus on interactions among groups of specialists fostered through professional societies and the ALARA Networks. Overwhelmingly, networking was recognized by participants as a very effective instrument for enhancing the sharing of knowledge and experience - a key to the prevention of accidents and to implementation of the ALARA concept. Networking can facilitate the transition from dependence to self-sufficiency and sustainability, so it should be promoted and become an integral part of international co-operation. Conference participants noted the importance of the relevant scientific and professional societies in supporting the IAEA's efforts to promote the control of sources. To ensure the sustainability of networks, it is important to create an environment within which they can flourish; they should therefore be adequately supported by international organizations. Existing successful networks should be examined with a view to identifying ways of improving their coverage as regards regions, languages, topics and stakeholder involvement.

...

#### □ **Additional findings and recommendations on networking**

... Networking is an effective way for less experienced persons to rapidly improve their knowledge and benefit, through feedback, from the greater or wider experience of others. Networking can also be a very effective instrument for involving stakeholders and increasing their willingness to accept responsibility for the management of radiation safety. Networking should complement other mechanisms, which have proved to be effective for sharing experience, such as co-operation between institutes, conferences and workshops, scientific and expert visits and professional societies. Outputs from networks should be accessible to a large audience and serve as a basis for informing the public, workers and patients. Whenever possible, the outputs should be put into perspective through reference to similar activities involving harmful substances. The relevant international organizations should, by providing sufficient human and financial resources, facilitate the creation and support the maintenance and improvement of networks. It was recognized that the ingredients for successful networks include the commitment of the participants, the recognition of mutual benefit, a common language, a shared objective, a critical mass, access to appropriate technology and the ability to adapt to the evolution of techniques.

...

### **New challenges for the European ALARA Network**

*EAN Steering Committee members*

#### □ **Introduction**

It is now clear that there are many common themes arising from the EANs consideration of different sectors, and there is scope to develop a global approach for better protecting all workers from ionising radiations. Therefore, there is a need for continuing such a network at the European level, and there is a strong case for expanding certain roles and activities. First and foremost, it should remain an efficient and lively independent network - its flexibility is a guarantee for the future. However, new actions should be envisaged and new partners should be involved. Specifically, these include the creation of a new sub-network on NORMs, the involvement of the workers themselves into the EAN's life as well as into the management of their own risk, the setting up of "stakeholders panels" and the evolution of the website in order to create a "portal of occupational radiological protection in Europe", are the new challenges, while consolidating all existing actions.

The following statements describe these objectives.

#### **To create a new sub-network on NORM**

80 percent of the world wide annual collective dose from occupational exposure is due to to NORM (UNSCEAR 2000). The SMOPIE project indicated that the total number of workers within the European member States might be in the order of 85000. The largest group of exposed workers seems to be welders using thoriated welding electrodes (with doses between 6 to 20 mSv a year). The second largest group of exposed workers seems to be those involved in the production and use of phosphatic fertilisers.

Because NORM industries traditionally have often not been subject to radiological protection measures, there is a general lack of awareness and knowledge of radiological hazards and exposure levels by legislators, regulators and operators (particularly in SMEs). There is a need for practical guidance on appropriate control measures and the extent to which this can be achieved. Internal exposure is in many cases the dominant potential exposure way. There is considered to be much potential in these industries for dose reduction through the optimisation principle. A network is considered to be an effective means of bringing (previously unrecognised) NORM problems to EU-wide attention, and for sharing experience on how to resolve these problems in practice.

Therefore it is proposed to create such a NORM network as a very important new contribution from the EAN, allowing integrating new partners and new countries.

#### **To set up an expert group on dose and dose rate prediction tools**

Following a recommendation from the 7th Workshop on "decommissioning and site remediation", it has been decided by the EAN to set up an expert group on dose and dose rate prediction tools. It will aim at checking all

existing tools (software, hot spot detectors, dose rates monitors...) that are useful for predicting doses and dose rate (particularly in the case of decommissioning) as a first step of the optimisation process. The group will make available on the web and through all means considered as adequate, information on these tools and their potential uses. The group will define further needs and propose recommendations to the EAN Steering Committee and the European Commission on new developments in equipment and methods, benchmarking of dose prediction tools, and the training of users.

#### **To set up “stakeholders panels”**

As a new tool, stakeholder panels on specific topics identified within the Network should be set up. These panels should be organised by elected network members following recommendations from workshops or proposals from the Steering Committee. The purpose of these panels is to deliberately “give a voice” to different stakeholders, especially those that are not normally well represented in the development of occupational exposure control (e.g. workers, SMEs, public groups). The aim is to assemble panels containing a mixture of different stakeholders to consider different viewpoints and to arrive at a greater understanding and consensus.

#### **To favour workers involvement**

Increasing the involvement of workers has been a common recommendation arising from many of the workshops. However, during the first two periods it appeared quite difficult, for financial and practical reasons, to directly involve industrial or medical workers/trade unions. It will then be necessary to have new financial support to allow some representatives of the workers themselves to participate to the workshops. It should also be possible, within some countries, to organise some “ad hoc” surveys among the workers in order to provide their results as an input for workshops.

Moreover, a very important evolution of the research and development in the 6th PCRD program is the stakeholders’ involvement within a new governance scheme. The EAN activity will therefore be expanded to identifying and promoting new ways of involving the workers themselves into their occupational risks management. This will be one of the new targets of the next EAN life-cycle as it has been noticed that during the last four workshops there was a recommendation “to favour the involvement of the workers in their radiological risk management”. Some stakeholders panel groups might then be set up to specifically explore “workers involvement” in different countries. This might, for example, take different forms when dealing with nurses, aircraft crew, outside workers in the nuclear field, industrial radiographers or workers in the phosphate or mineral sands industries.

#### **To enlarge EAN to other countries**

The EAN consortium size has progressively been increased from 8 countries to 18 since four more countries have proposed to participate at the end of 2003: Greece, Ireland, Portugal and Croatia. Only one Member State is not yet represented: Luxembourg. Norway and

Switzerland are members. Two applicant countries belong to EAN (Czech Republic and Croatia), Baltic countries belong with Armenia and Belarus to the first other regional ALARA Network set up by IAEA: the CEEAN (Central and Eastern European ALARA Network. EAN will have to help others...to become members of EAN or of CEEAN, if more appropriate.

#### **To support other regional networks**

There is a need from other regions in the world that similar networks be created. It is not the scope of EAN to create these other networks. However EAN has already been contacted several times by representatives from Middle East, Africa or South America. ILO and IAEA have decided within their action plan on occupational radiation protection to support the setting up of regional ALARA networks using the EAN model. EAN members should be ready to help in providing advices and exchanging experiences.

#### **To pursue and expand the role of Newsletters, Workshops, website**

The issuing of Newsletters should be continued. The organisation of Workshops leading to recommendations from the Network remains essential; it should be continued and may be diversified.

The success of the Website demonstrates that it is now fundamental to the aims of EAN. It is suggested that in the next three years it could evolve into a kind of “portal of occupational radiological protection in Europe”, where it should be possible to find national regulations, statistics, national guidance... The use of the website to create forums for “on-line” discussions on radiation protection topics is also envisaged. Finally the website will be used to provide all trainers in radiological protection with up to date material concerning ALARA.

#### **To consolidate existing sub networks**

The existing sub-networks (research reactors, medical) and working group (EAN/European Federation of Non Destructive Testing) have demonstrated their usefulness. The participation to these sub-networks implies more effort and time than the participation to other EAN activities. Contrary to the Nuclear sector, NDT and medical sectors correspond to small and medium firms and institutions. There is actually a need for a stronger support for these sub-networks.

#### **□ Conclusion**

The objective of the network during that new phase of its existence will be to involve even more stakeholders belonging both to the research community and all types of end users (regulatory bodies, major utilities, small companies, manufacturers, medical institutions... and the workers themselves) in restricting occupational exposure to ionising radiation. EAN being a real Network, the new proposals came from recommendations from participants during Workshops and other EAN activities. Any other suggestion or proposal from readers of the Newsletter are welcomed ( [ean@cepn.asso.fr](mailto:ean@cepn.asso.fr) ).

**Analysis of a radiological Incident**  
*Case study (no 14) taken from the IRID database:  
 Transport of gauges from a refurbished brewery*

**❑ Description**

As part of a refurbishment programme in a brewery, four liquid level gauges, each containing a 3.7 GBq Americium-241 source, were removed from a production line to safe storage prior disposal. The sources were beyond their useful working life and as a consequence were no longer covered by a Special Form Certificate, thus requiring a Type B container to transport them. The Am-241 source assembly of each gauge was sandwiched between stainless steel plates, attached to which were a shutter mechanism and mounting bracket. The radioactive material was incorporated within a thin-walled, stainless steel tube.

The company that was contacted to dispose of the sources brought only one Type B container to site. The contractor intended to dismantle the gauges on the site and transport all four Am-241 sources in one trip. It was discovered that source assemblies, which were each about the size of a 13-amp fuse, were fixed in place with adhesive. The contractor's employee prised them out of their housing using screwdriver and placed them in the type-B container. The sources were damaged in the process. The work was carried out in the back of a small van in the visitors' car park of the brewery, adjacent to a busy main road. The van driver then went to a second location about 100 miles away to collect some more equipment for disposal before returning to base. A few days later, it was discovered that both the container and the van itself were contaminated with Am-241. Subsequent monitoring revealed that the contamination was rather more extensive, and included other vehicles and properties. The company reported the incident and a detailed investigation commenced. The investigation showed:

- a) the contractor did not discuss the job with the brewery or their RPA and had inaccurate information about the size of the gauges;
- b) alternative methods of work had not been considered; and
- c) there was doubt about whether the available radiation monitoring instrument was capable of being used – when the specialist batteries of the radiation monitor were checked some days later these were found to be flat.

**❑ Radiological Consequences**

The doses involved were primarily from intakes of americium-241 and the committed effective dose equivalents were estimated to be 20 mSv and 2 mSv for employees of the disposal contractor and less than 1 mSv for the wife of the former.

**❑ Lessons Learnt**

1. Equipment holding radioactive sources should, wherever possible, be transported with the source undisturbed to suitable facilities before dismantling takes place;
2. Where removal of sources on the site is unavoidable, close liaison between the companies (and their respective RPAs) should take place with a view to ensuring that adequate facilities are available for the work to proceed safely;
3. Local rules should clearly and unambiguously state what should be done (or not done) if conditions change during the work;
4. Contingency plans should be incorporated into local rules, made known to relevant employees, and practiced;
5. After source manipulations appropriate monitoring should be undertaken. In situations such as this, contamination should always be considered possible; not just from the manipulation procedure, but also due to degradation of the source integrity due to the environment.
6. Means should be provided for the checking of radiation monitoring instruments on-site before each use (eg, check source). Spare batteries should be carried with equipment.

ALARA NEWS

**The French “Priorities in Radiation Protection”**  
*“Proposals for a better protection of people against ionising radiations hazards”*

Twelve months ago, M. André-Claude Lacoste, the Head of the French Radiological Protection and Safety Authority (DGSNR), set up an expert group to identify the short and medium-term priorities to improve radiation protection in France.

After consulting more than fifty stakeholders from the industrial, medical and research sectors as well as from universities and non-governmental associations, the expert group - “the Vrousos Commission” - has issued its conclusions and recommendation in a report entitled “Priorities in Radiation Protection”. This report identifies the priorities in terms of action as well as recommendations on different topics such as communication, information, training in RP, research, feedback experience analysis, expertise, users empowerment, stakeholders implication, management of radioactive sources, etc. The targeted topics concern the radiation protection of workers, patients and the public.

This report (in French) can be downloaded from the French Radiological Protection and Safety Authority website.  
 Address: <http://www.asn.gouv.fr>

### **Educational and training platform on the harmonization of criteria to be a RP expert**

*J. van der Steen*

The European Commission has launched recently the following project: *“Initiation of the Establishment of European Radiation Protection Training and Education Platform”*.

Article 33 of the Euratom Treaty requires that Member States shall lay down appropriate provisions to ensure compliance with the Basic Safety Standards and shall take the necessary measures with regard to teaching, education and vocational training.

A recent survey carried out for the Commission indicates a considerable variation in the approaches of EU Member, Accession and Candidate States, to the education and vocational training arrangements for radiation protection. Furthermore the study underlines the diversity in the qualifications and diplomas necessary for the recognition of qualified experts in the sense of the Basic Safety Standards Directive. This diversity creates an obstruction to the mobility of experts in the current and the enlarged European Union. Therefore, the Commission wishes to create a European Radiation Protection Training And Education Platform, aimed at establishing mechanisms for harmonising national radiation protection training and education arrangements and for facilitating mutual recognition of diplomas and qualifications in the radiation protection field.

The Platform will aim to identify the needs for harmonisation of qualifications and diplomas. It should develop conclusions and issue recommendations on the scope and the extent of a planned European radiation protection training and education network. Such a network should be a tool for the establishment of a general system for training and qualification and for the mutual recognition of diplomas awarded on completion of specific professional education or vocational training. Collaboration, in the form of networking between the involved national training and education bodies, seems to be appropriate in order to facilitate their compliance with obligations provided by EU radiation protection legislation.

The survey showed a general interest of Member and Candidate States to participate in such a Platform. The objective of this project is to initiate the necessary steps towards the creation of the Platform. It will make recommendations, based on the summary and conclusions obtained as a result of the exchange of information and experience between all involved radiation protection training and education bodies.

(...)

The project will identify how the future Platform should be initiated and developed in order to achieve the expected results.

Part of the work plan of the project is to organise a workshop, aiming to:

- recommend a preferred structure of the Platform;
- propose a draft action plan;
- investigate the willingness to participate;
- investigate co-operation with other international projects and networks; and to
- indicate which activities need financial support.

The workshop will be organised from 20-21 May 2004 at CIEMAT, Madrid, Spain. The date has been chosen just before the 11th IRPA Congress, which will also be held in Madrid. The preliminary results of the workshop will be presented at the 11th IRPA Congress. The workshop proceedings, describing the recommendations for establishing the European Radiation Protection Training and Education Platform, including the recommended structure and the draft action plan, will be submitted to the European Commission. The project is scheduled to be finalised in Autumn 2004.

At this stage of the project, contact points have been identified in each of the 15 Member States, the 10 Acceding States and the 3 Candidate States, as well as with international organisations and associations, in order to establish direct contacts with possible platform participants in the future. To ensure a representative composition of the Platform, participation of all involved stakeholders in radiation protection training and education will be pursued, in particular from:

- the national competent radiation protection authorities;
- the national bodies responsible for professional education and vocational training;
- the providers of training and education in the radiation protection area;
- professional organisations representing the receivers of training and education;
- international organisations and associations; and
- operators and employers.

For more information, please contact Mr. J. van der Steen:  
Email: [vandersteen@nrg-nl.com](mailto:vandersteen@nrg-nl.com)

.....



.....  
THE 18 EUROPEAN ALARA NETWORK Contact Persons  
.....

• **AUSTRIA**

Mr. Chris SCHMITZER,  
Division of Health Physics, Austrian Research Centers  
Seibersdorf, A-2444 SEIBERSDORF  
Tel: +43 50550 2500; Fax: +43 50550 2502  
E-mail: [christian.schmitzer@arcs.ac.at](mailto:christian.schmitzer@arcs.ac.at)

• **BELGIUM**

Mr. Pascal DEBOODT,  
SCK/CEN, Boeretang 200, B-2400 MOL  
Tel: +32 14 33 28 53; Fax: +32 14 32 16 24  
E-mail: [pdeboodt@sckcen.be](mailto:pdeboodt@sckcen.be)

• **CROATIA**

Mr. Mladen NOVAKOVIC,  
EKOTEH Dosimetry,  
Vladimira Ruzdjaka 21, 10000 ZAGREB  
Tel: +385 1 604 3882; Fax: +385 1 604 3866  
E-mail: [minovako@inet.hr](mailto:minovako@inet.hr)

• **CZECH REPUBLIC**

Mr. Zdeněk PROUZA,  
SUJB (State Office for Nuclear Safety),  
Senovážné náměstí 9, CZ110000, PRAHA 1  
Tel: +420 221 624 509; Fax: +420 221 624 710  
E-mail: [zdenek.prouza@sujb.cz](mailto:zdenek.prouza@sujb.cz)

• **DENMARK**

Mr. Jens SØGÅRD-HANSEN,  
Danish Decommissioning  
Fredriksborgvej 399, DK-4000 ROSKILDE  
Tel: + 45 46 77 43 03; Fax: + 45 46 77 43 43  
E-mail: [jens.soegaard@dekom.dk](mailto:jens.soegaard@dekom.dk)

• **FINLAND**

Mrs. Satu KATAJALA,  
Fortum Power and Heat Oy, Loviisa Power Plant,  
P.O. Box 23, FIN-07901 LOVIISA  
Tel: +358 10 455 5011 Fax: +358 10 455 4435  
E-mail: [satu.katajala@fortum.com](mailto:satu.katajala@fortum.com)

• **FRANCE**

Mr. Christian LEFAURE,  
CEPN, BP 48, route du Panorama  
F-92263 FONTENAY AUX ROSES CEDEX  
Tel: +33 1 58 35 74 67; Fax: +33 1 40 84 90 34  
E-mail: [lefaure@cepn.asso.fr](mailto:lefaure@cepn.asso.fr)

• **GERMANY**

Mrs. Annemarie SCHMITT-HANNIG,  
BfS, Inst. für Strahlenhygiene, Ingolstädter  
Landstrasse 1, D-85764 OBERSCHLEISSHEIM  
Tel: +49 1888 333 2110; Fax: +49 1888 333 2115  
E-mail: [schmitt@bfs.de](mailto:schmitt@bfs.de)

• **GREECE (New Member!)**

Mrs. Vassiliki KAMENOPOULOU,  
Greek Atomic Energy Commission (GAEC)  
P.O. Box 60092,  
15310 AG-PARASKEVI, GREECE  
Tel: +30 210 6506731; Fax: +30 210 6506748  
E-mail: [vkamenop@gaec.gr](mailto:vkamenop@gaec.gr)

• **IRELAND (New Member!)**

Mr. Stephen FENNELL,  
Radiological Protection Institute of Ireland,  
3 Clonskeagh Square, Clonskeagh Road,  
DUBLIN 14, IRELAND  
Tel: +353 1 269 7766; Fax: +353 1 269 74 37  
E-mail: [sfennell@rpii.ie](mailto:sfennell@rpii.ie)

• **ITALY**

Mr. Mario PAGANINI FIORATI,  
APAT, Via Vitaliano Brancati 48,  
I-00144 ROMA  
Tel: + 39 06 5007 2853; Fax: +39 06 5007 2941  
E-mail: [paganini@apat.it](mailto:paganini@apat.it)

• **THE NETHERLANDS**

Mr. Jan VAN DER STEEN,  
NRG Arnhem, Utrechtseweg 310, P.O. Box 9035,  
NL-6800 ET ARNHEM  
Tel: +31 26 3563370; Fax: +31 26 4423635  
E-mail: [vandersteen@nrg-nl.com](mailto:vandersteen@nrg-nl.com)

• **NORWAY**

Mr. Gunnar SAXEBØL,  
Norwegian Radiation Protection Authority, Grini  
Naeringspark 13, Postal Box 13, N-1345 OSTERAS  
Tel: +47 67 16 25 00; Fax: +47 67 14 74 07  
E-mail: [Gunnar.saxeboel@nrpa.no](mailto:Gunnar.saxeboel@nrpa.no)

• **PORTUGAL**

Mr. Fernando P. CARVALHO,  
Instituto Tecnológico e Nuclear  
Estrada Nacional 10, P2686-953 SACAVEM  
Tel: +351 21 994 62 91; Fax: +351 21 994 19 95  
E-mail: [carvalho@itn1.itn.pt](mailto:carvalho@itn1.itn.pt)

• **SPAIN**

Mr. Juan Jose MONTESINOS,  
CSN, Justo Dorado 11, E-28040 MADRID  
Tel: +34 91 346 0634; Fax: +34 91 346 0588  
E-mail: [jjmc@csn.es](mailto:jjmc@csn.es)

• **SWEDEN**

Mrs. Birgitta EKSTRÖM,  
Swedish Radiation Protection Authority,  
S-17116 STOCKHOLM  
Tel: +46 8 729 7186; Fax: +46 8 729 7152  
E-mail: [birgitta.ekstrom@ssi.se](mailto:birgitta.ekstrom@ssi.se)

• **SWITZERLAND**

Mr. Nicolas STRITT,  
Swiss Federal Office of Public Health, Radiation  
Protection Division, CH-3003 BERN  
Tel: +41 31 324 05 88; Fax: +41 31 322 83 83  
E-mail: [nicolas.stritt@bag.admin.ch](mailto:nicolas.stritt@bag.admin.ch)

• **UNITED KINGDOM**

Mr. Peter SHAW,  
NRPB, Northern Center, Hospital Lane, Cookridge,  
LEEDS - LS2 6RW  
Tel: +44 113 267 9041; Fax: +44 113 261 3190  
E-mail: [peter.shaw@nrpb.org](mailto:peter.shaw@nrpb.org)

# 8th EAN Workshop on "Occupational Radiological Protection Control through Inspection and Self-assessment"



Uppsala, Sweden  
22-24 September 2004



*Statens strålskyddsinstitut*  
Swedish Radiation Protection Authority



## APPLICATION FORM

The Programme Committee reserves the possibility of  
limiting the attendance to 100 participants.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Company \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Telephone \_\_\_\_\_

Telefax \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail \_\_\_\_\_

**Work in small groups** is an essential part of the workshop. Please indicate two topics you prefer to discuss:

Inspection     Self-assessment     Workers involvement     Communication between stakeholders

Are you interested in a **visit** at Uppsala University Friday afternoon?  yes

Registration Fee 350 Euro (include 2 lunches, conference dinner, the proceedings)

Please send this form before **15 June 2004** to:

SSI EAN workshop  
Åsa Olson  
SE-171 16 STOCKHOLM, Sweden

Telefax: +46 8 729 71 08  
E-mail: [eanworkshop@ssi.se](mailto:eanworkshop@ssi.se)

**Please do not pay now! Confirmation and invoice will be sent out 22 June 2004.**

# 8th EAN Workshop on “Occupational Radiological Protection Control through Inspection and Self-assessment”



Photo: Uppsala kommun

Uppsala, Sweden  
22-24 September 2004



Photo: Uppsala kommun

## SECOND ANNOUNCEMENT

### OBJECTIVE OF THE WORKSHOP

The objective of the workshop is to assess how regulatory authorisation and inspection, and internal controls (peer reviews, self assessment...) contribute to achieving ALARA for occupational exposure.

The Workshop will encourage views from regulatory bodies, licensees, workers and their representatives and promote communication between these and all other interested parties.

The main output from the Workshop will be recommendations to the different stakeholders on good practices and effective tools of control through regulatory authorisation and inspection, and internal control.

### SCOPE OF THE WORKSHOP

The Workshop will be in four sessions half the time and in four working groups the rest of the time. The four sessions will cover the following topics:

- Setting the scene
- Regulatory bodies & control organisations
- Licensees
- Workers

Themes for the working groups:

- Inspections
- Self assessment
- Involvement of workers
- Communication between stakeholders

The programme committee reserves the possibility of limiting the attendance to 100 participants.

### ORAL PRESENTATIONS & POSTERS

There is still room for a few oral presentations in session 4 (see the programme hereafter). Abstracts for posters are still welcomed. Authors wishing to provide poster or oral presentations (in English) are invited to submit an abstract of 15-20 lines (A4) typed single-spaced in Times 12 pt (Word format) to Mrs. A. ALMEN by email : [Anja.Almen@ssi.se](mailto:Anja.Almen@ssi.se)

### REGISTRATION & FEES

A registration form is available on the internet :

<http://ean.cepn.asso.fr/workshop.html>

Fees amount is fixed to 350 € (lunches & coffee pauses included)

# 8<sup>th</sup> EAN WORKSHOP – PRELIMINARY PROGRAMME

## Wednesday 22 September 2004

8 <sup>30</sup> 9 <sup>00</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Registration</li><li>• Welcome address</li></ul>	<i>SSI, EC, EAN</i>
9 <sup>15</sup>	<b>SESSION 1</b> <b>Setting the scene</b> (Chair: Mr. Lars-Erik Holm, Sweden)  <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Introduction</li><li>• The EC experience and suggestions in terms of controlling radiological protection.</li><li>• IAEA/ILO support for European regulatory authorities and other stakeholders in controlling occupational exposure</li></ul>	<i>C. Lefauve /P. V. Shaw (EAN)</i> <i>J. Naegele (EC)</i> <i>K. Mrabit (IAEA), S. Niu (ILO)</i>
11 <sup>00</sup>	<b>SESSION 2</b> <b>Regulatory Bodies and Control Organisations</b> (Chair: Mr. Kaare Ullbak, Denmark)  <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The control and regulation of occupational exposure through the inspection process in the Czech republic.</li><li>• Inspections by the Swedish Radiation Protection Authority</li><li>• The control of radiation protection in France</li><li>• The German Radiation Protection Infrastructure with Emphasis on the Control of Occupational Exposure</li><li>• The independent qualified expert as an inspector</li></ul>	<i>K. Petrova (Czech Republic)</i> <i>SSI (Sweden)</i> <i>A. Jouve (France)</i> <i>R. Czarwinski, K. Coy (Germany)</i> <i>K. Persyn (Belgium)</i>
pm	<b>Working Groups</b>	

## Thursday 23 September 2004

9 <sup>00</sup>	<b>SESSION 3</b> <b>Licensees</b> (Chair: Mr. John Croft, UK)  <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Authority audits – from an operator's point of view</li><li>• On the relationship between user survey and central administration vigilance in the medical use of radiation in Italy, Repercussions on the application of the ALARA principle</li><li>• Implementation of occupational radiation protection control at university and hospital work places</li><li>• Role of independent inspections in achieving ALARA</li><li>• Occupational Radiological Protection Control through Inspection done by Qualified Experts for licensing procedures in Austria</li></ul>	<i>A. Valseth (Norway)</i>  <i>M. Marengo (Italy)</i> <i>H. Pettersson, E. Lund (Sweden)</i> <i>A. Mac Donald (UK)</i> <i>A. Hefner, A. Steurer (Austria)</i>
11 <sup>30</sup>	<b>SESSION 4</b> <b>Workers</b> (Chair: Mr. Shengli Niu, ILO)  <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Perception of the radiation protection's controls organization by the stakeholders in the medical field in France</li><li>• Punishment or learning?</li><li>• A way to confront stakeholders point of view on radiological protection topics</li><li>• ...</li></ul>	<i>C. Gauron (France)</i> <i>G. Svensson (Sweden)</i>  <i>C. Murith (Switzerland)</i> ...
pm	<b>Working Groups</b>	

## Friday 24 September 2004

9 <sup>00</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Summary reports from working groups</li><li>• Final recommendations</li></ul>	<i>C. Lefauve / P.V. Shaw</i>
12 <sup>30</sup>	<b>End</b>	

For more information, please send an email to: [eanworkshop@ssi.se](mailto:eanworkshop@ssi.se)