

**Review of draft Terms of Reference for proposed RCA**  
**Committee on Comprehensive Nuclear Human Development**  
**by Australia**

**1. Intro and background**

- We suggest the proposed term length of committee is included in this section.

**2. Functions**

- HRD seems be addressed at the project level through project performance forms (PPF) and PPARs. Will the creation of this new committee duplication existing work? Is this a doubling up of these efforts? Or is this a beneficial way to bring all information together?
- Rather than the usual surveys, it may be a new option to outsource to a neutral source of **expertise to design the surveys**.
- The reference to **suggesting changes to the GoR** is not clear. We suggest this is rewritten to make the meaning a little clearer.

**3. Membership**

- We note the suggested 4-6 committee members do not **represent the 22 Government Parties**. Instead, consider voluntary representation from all 22 GPs to ensure all GPs have an opportunity to represent their nation's HRD needs. Alternatively a rotating voluntary model where all countries can voluntary designate an individual to sit on this CNHRD for a certain amount of time could also be suitable. Can we give a stronger representative voice to the new RCA GPs, LDCs and SIDS?
- We note the **RCA Focal Person** within the IAEA Secretariat already has a significant workload – we question the value of this additional workload on the RCA FP. It is possible the time of the RCA FP is best served on other activities, such as the RCA technical cooperation projects, NRM and GCM.
- We query whether the members need to be experts in the RCA GoR, the RCA MTS, RCA RPF and RCA project management. Instead, it would be valuable to **attract new minds** to thinking about how we can revolutionise human resource development. Limiting applications to the current RCA pool will limit the number of eligible applicants and discourage new participation.
- We recommend potential members have expertise in **workforce development** (their experience may not necessarily need to come only from the nuclear field).

- We recommend considering use of the term '**capability development**' rather than 'capacity development'.
- We suggest all **membership applications are shared with all NRs**, and that decisions on membership are made collectively at an NRM or GCM. We consider selection by all NRs by consensus an inclusive and sustainable approach.
- We suggest it might be appropriate for the **Chair to act as Secretariat** (for the term of the Chair year). The Chair may wish to seek assistance from RCARO in performing these secretariat functions as appropriate.
- We recommend membership includes **equal gender representation**, and includes representation by **young people**.
- The proposed **three-year term** is commendable and allows for the introduction of new members. However, we suggest limiting to **one term per person** or there must be a mandatory period in between terms before reapplying to allow for representation from other members and to **foster new perspectives**.
- We suggest there might be value in establishing a list of pre-screened and approved **advisors** prior to commencement, representing all GPs.

#### 4. Meetings

- We note the proposal suggests this Committee meet in person once a year – we would like to understand who is **expected to cover these costs**. Will GPs self-fund members appointed from their country? Will the IAEA Secretariate fund attendance drawn from the RCA budget? If it is drawn from the RCA budget then what projects/other activities will need to cease to fund this new committee? Or will new funds need to be identified for the RCA? If countries must self-fund, is there a mechanism for the IAEA to support the travel or fund travel for participants from LDCs and SIDs?
- As an alternative, **virtual attendance** could be the preferred operational mode.
- We consider decisions must be **consensus based**. We do not support majority based decision making. If the Committee cannot reach consensus, then it is very likely NRs could not reach consensus on the same item at the NRM or GCM. By ensuring that only consensus-based decisions are presented at the GCM, it supports a more productive high-level meeting.