

## **Future direction RCA – RCARO: Reflections and Notes**

**Nahrul Khair Alang Md Rashid**  
**MINT, Malaysia**

The setting-up of RCARO is a great leap forward; any other outstanding issues are only to be expected in the early stage of such an initiative. Those issues, with time, experience and resolve of MS would be resolved one after another.

Strategic planning is needed to place the RCARO, in essence such planning is necessary to ensure that it adds value to RCA and that resource usage can be optimized. Need to get vision – what we want to be, mission – why we exist, objectives – those we want to attain, goals, gaps (future – current), strategy to close the gap, action plan.

Dr Anand SWOT analysis of RCARO is a welcome start that could be followed through in more detail. Dynamic SWOT incorporating PESTELS factors (political, economic, social, technical, environment, legislation, safety/ security) can be a suitable approach.

1. RCA
  - a. Needs to enhance ownership
2. RCARO
  - a. The history leading to the formation of the RCARO was reviewed by Dr. J.K. Chung in his morning presentation. Several options were considered over the years since late 1980s. Set up 27 March 2002. Now in full operation beyond the interim period (27<sup>th</sup> NRM, March 2005, KL) – this indicates its usefulness and contribution of to the RCA as well as the strong and commendable commitment of the movers in Korea.
  - b. Mandate – (i) enhancing visibility and (ii) enhancing viability by partnership and fund raising. The two Vs.  
(Good if J.K. Chung presentation can be re-written for possible publication in relevant journals such as the IAEA Bulletin. This would give RCA and RCARO added exposure.)
3. RCA, RCARO, MS
  - a. Three parties that can make impact and contribute to the region – but how? What else?
  - b. Must strategize on how those mandates can this be attained.
  - c. RCA Office in Vienna – implementation/ RCARO – macro issues.  
RCARO also need to be involved in the up-stream project initiation/ conceptualization stage to be able to strike partnership.
4. Issues

- a. Identity to Korea central agencies/ budget provider; to other organizations (when knocking on the doors), legal status (when signing contracts).  
Examples of regional offices of international development organizations e.g. UNDP, IAEA, UNIDO, FAO, etc. can be used as model – may need to study the [legal provisions as well as the financial resources supporting their existence](#).
- b. Budget security and sustainability (Mr Choi indication of funding by host government of USD 50K and a further USD 0.2 – 0.3 million to match UNDP USD 50K contribution for tsunami relief projects).

5. Others

- a. Joint organization of forum – PEMSEA attended the BGD meeting/ perhaps to be discussed before wrap-up discussion

6. Future?

- a. Visibility – branding/ salesmanship
- b. Viability – alignment with current/ regional needs (projects with high impact/ political/ social)
- c. RCARO as an entity
  - i. current – a unit in KAERI
  - ii. independent domestic organization
  - iii. independent international organization
- d. Need to engage the next generation and impart on them the value of cooperation.