

Report of
the 6th Meeting of the Working Group on
RCA Medium-Term Strategy Coordination
Seoul, Republic of Korea
29 July to 1 August 2019

1. Introduction

Upon approval of the 41st RCA National Representatives Meeting held from 26 to 30 March 2019 in Colombo, Sri Lanka, the Sixth Meeting of the Working Group on the RCA Medium Term Strategy Coordination (MTSC WG) was held from 29 July to 1 August Seoul, Republic of Korea. The adopted Agenda of the Meeting is in **Annex 1**.

The Meeting of the MTSC WG had ten (10) participants and observers comprising representatives from AUL, BGD, JPN, MAL, NZE (by videoconference), PHI, ROK, and RCARO. The representative from AUL was the interim WG Chair. The List of Participants is in **Annex 2**.

The meeting was officially opened by the Director of RCARO, Mr Pill Hwan Park who affirmed the importance of the MTS Mid-Term Review and the role of the MTSC WG in helping direct that process.

The stated purpose of the meeting was to:

- Review and evaluate progress on the MTSC WG work plan for 2019;
- Review the MTSC WG Terms of Reference (ToR) to determine status of functions; and
- Identify and develop any documents that are needed by the Programme Advisory Committee (PAC) to undertake the Review of the Medium Term Strategy in 2020

It was expected that the meeting would produce the following documents for consideration by the 48th General Conference Meeting:

- Updated MTSC WG Work Plan;
- Document(s) required for PAC to undertake the Review of the Medium Term Strategy in 2020; and
- Working Group Meeting Report

2. Composition of the MTSC WG

The meeting endorsed Deputy Chair, Mark Alexander (AUL), to officially become the full-time Chair of the MTSC WG, subject to the approval of the 48th GCM. The previous Chair Chris Daughney (NZE) would continue as a member of the WG. AUL noted that Daughney had become a member of another IAEA working group that was looking at establishing outcome monitoring methodologies across the TC programme and that his continued

membership of an input to the MTSC WG would therefore become even more vital. Yoshiko Okamoto (JPN) was nominated as the Deputy Chair, again subject to approval by the 48th GCM.

Recommendation 1

The MTSC WG recommend that the 48th GCM officially endorse Mark Alexander (AUL) and Yoshiko Okamoto (JPN) as Chair and Deputy Chair of the MTSC WG respectively.

3. Review of MTSC WG Work

The meeting reviewed the following:

- Recommendations from the Report of the 5th Meeting of the MTSC WG;
- Recommendations from the Report of the 41st NRM that related to the MTSC WG;
- Outstanding actions from the MTSC WG Work Plan 2019; and
- MTSC WG Terms of Reference

AUL noted that much of the recent work of the MTSC WG had focused on defining the framework for the Mid-Term Review of the MTS to be conducted by PAC in 2020. This had been good work, but it was felt that the work had largely been completed, and needed only to be collated into a single guidance framework document that could be provided to PAC. This would enable the MTSC WG to finalize this aspect of its work and focus on other functions and strategic directions.

The WG agreed with this assessment, with PHI, RCARO, BGD, MAL, and JPN observing that the MTSC WG could focus on strategies to improve resource mobilization, access to RRUs, and even start to contemplate the next iteration of MTS.

The WG discussed what a Mid-Term Review guidance framework document for PAC might look like. AUL noted that it should be a collation of previously acquired data based on the Performance Indicators (PI), not new analysis. NZE noted that there should be a sixth Performance Level of “Insufficient Data” to reflect that sometimes it was difficult to obtain the required information to undertake an effective analysis.

The format and structure of the framework document was agreed and the individual WG members worked to complete the reporting templates for their previously assigned PIs. Discussion around specific PIs is included below with the final document is included as **Annex 3**.

Recommendation 2

It is recommended that the 48th GCM approve the MTSC WG Guidance for RCA PAC on conduct of 2020 Mid-Term Review and transmit it to the RCA PAC Chair.

4. Performance Indicators

4.1. Performance Indicator 1.1

JPN presented the summary report of the WG deliberations on PI 1.1 on GP commitment to RCA Governance. The baseline results were as presented at the 5th Meeting Report. The definition of the Performance Level was agreed as per the final framework document. JPN

noted that reasons for GP non-attendance at NRMs and GCMs were not immediately apparent and needed to be investigated. AUL and RCARO noted discussions at the 41st NRM suggesting introductory briefings for new NRs may be beneficial in stressing the importance of NR attendance at GCMs and NRM.

4.2. Performance Indicator 1.2

JPN presented the summary report of the WG deliberations on PI 1.2 on GP commitment to implementation of their allotted activities. The baseline results were as presented at the 5th Meeting Report. The definition of the Performance Level was agreed as per the final framework document. JPN noted that a number of factors could influence the results for this particular PI, and that this should be explicitly brought to the attention of RCA PAC for the conduct of the Mid-Term Review. Further, the suitability of the Performance Level bands should be reviewed after the Review. AUL noted that this should be done for all Performance Levels across all PIs as part of the MTSC WG's review of the results of the Mid-Term Review.

Recommendation 3

It is recommended that the 48th GCM approve the MTSC WG to review the results of the RCA PAC Mid-Term Review when it is completed in 2020 to define the parameters for the MTS Final Review.

4.3. Performance Indicator 1.3

JPN presented the summary report of the WG deliberations on PI 1.3 on the level of GP in-kind (IK) and extra-budgetary (EB) support. The baseline results were as presented at the 5th Meeting Report. The definition of the Performance Level was agreed as per the final framework document. JPN expressed a view that while the proportion of IK contributions were low, that in reality it would be difficult for any GP to participate in RCA projects without contributing some level of IK support. There was wide agreement for this view, although it was noted that the WG could only report on the data that was available to it.

Recommendation 4

It is recommended that the 48th GCM reaffirm the importance of NRs fully and accurately completing their IK reports.

4.4. Performance Indicator 2.1

PHI presented the summary report of the WG deliberations on PI 2.1 on RCA alignment with the strategic priorities of the MTS. The baseline results were as presented at the 5th Meeting Report. The definition of the Performance Level was agreed as per the final framework document. PHI noted – and the WG agreed – that more stringent Performance Levels were appropriate for this PI given its centrality to ensuring an effective programme. It was also decided to remove Target Criteria 2 from this PI as this remained an issue for the NRs and it had been brought to the attention of the 41st NRM already. PHI also noted that the Energy

strategic priority remained unrepresented by any actual projects. Ultimately, it was a decision for NRs to indicate as whether Energy remained an important area for the RCA.

4.5. Performance Indicator 2.2

PHI presented the summary report of the WG deliberations on PI 2.2 on RCA alignment with the national priorities of the GPs. The baseline results were as presented at the 5th Meeting Report. The definition of the Performance Level was agreed as per the final framework document. MAL questioned whether separate targets were actually needed for developing and developed countries. After considerable discussion, it was ultimately decided to keep the two criteria as they result from different origins (e.g. CPFs vs PPFs)

4.6. Performance Indicator 2.3

PHI presented the summary report of the WG deliberations on PI 2.3 on the soundness of RCA project design. The baseline results were as presented at the 5th Meeting Report. The definition of the Performance Level was agreed as per the final framework document. PHI noted – and the WG agreed – that more stringent Performance Levels were appropriate for this PI given its centrality to ensuring an effective programme. It was noted that while a baseline result of ‘Excellent’ was achieved this was a result of a very protracted project design process which could often be confusing for new LCCs, NPCs and NRs. Continued training on the project design process through fora such as PDMs and more general workshops be continued.

4.7. Performance Indicator 2.4

PHI presented the summary report of the WG deliberations on PI 2.4 on the links of RCA project design to next- and end-users. The baseline results were as presented at the 5th Meeting Report. The definition of the Performance Levels and were agreed as per the final framework document. PHI noted – and the WG agreed – that more stringent Performance Levels were appropriate for this PI given its centrality to ensuring an effective programme. It was noted that the two previously selected Target Criteria were very similar and in effect the analysis previously done was an amalgamation of the two. After considerable discussion, it was decided to merge the two criteria into one. BGD questioned whether the information provided in the PPFs was accurate. AUL noted that while a lot of LCCs and NPCs had expressed difficulty in using the PPF, in practice simplification was not immediately apparent. However, at least a review of the PPF was probably called for in this regard.

Recommendation 5

It is recommended that the 48th GCM endorse the MTSC WG to undertake a review of the PPF to see if it can be made more useable.

4.8. Performance Indicator 3.1

AUL presented the summary report of the WG deliberations on PI 3.1 on ensuring that required financial resources were available for the RCA Programme. The baseline results were as presented at the 5th Meeting Report. The definition of the Performance Level was agreed as per the final framework document. AUL noted that the selected Target Criteria was perhaps

not ideal but represented a long discussion over time where different methodologies for generating extra financial resources were ultimately unsuccessful or rejected (e.g. more money from TCF, setting up an AFRA-style fund, sending a Declaration to the Vienna-based missions of the RCA). It would also need an update to the project design documents in the GOR to properly execute the requirement for the 2022-23 project cycle.

Recommendation 6

It is recommended that the 48th GCM endorse the MTSC WG to update to the relevant documents in the GOR to reflect the need to include explicit extra-budgetary components.

4.9. Performance Indicator 3.2

BGD and MAL presented the summary report of the WG deliberations on PI 3.2 on ensuring that required human resources were available for the RCA Programme. This had been a difficult PI to undertake quantitative analysis due to very limited, and often inaccurate and contradictory, information available in the PPFs. This led to an ‘Insufficient Data’ baseline result. However, new Target Criteria were proposed to address these inconsistencies, including highlighting the need for RTC nominations to come from NPT members and the importance of information sharing following RTCs. It was also noted that HRD needs should consistent with project design. The need for a review of the PPF as per Recommendation 5 was reemphasised.

4.10. Performance Indicator 3.3

ROK presented the summary report of the WG deliberations on PI 3.3 on ensuring that required physical resources were available for the RCA Programme. The baseline results were as presented at the 5th Meeting Report. The definition of the Performance Level was agreed as per the final framework document. Again, the difficulty of undertaking this analysis was stressed due to the limited number of PPFs received, as was the need for a review of the PPF itself. There was considerable discussion on how the concept of RRUs were defined within the context of the RCA. While it was appreciated that RRUs would by their nature vary substantially from project-to-project, and that guidance was available in the RCA GOR, this guidance could benefit from a review to ensure that it was usable and up-to-date.

Recommendation 7

It is recommended that the 48th GCM endorse the MTSC WG to review, and if needed propose updates to guidance on RRUs within the RCA GOR.

4.11. Performance Indicator 4.1

NZE presented a summary of discussions to date in the WG on outcome monitoring and PI4.1. This is included as **Annex 4**. He also described his participation in a new Working Group established to support a proposed new Secretariat led project *on Case Studies of Social and Economic Value of RCA Projects*. The draft Terms of Reference for this project are included as **Annex 5**. The idea of this Working Group was to undertake a systematic approach to

outcome monitoring, using the RCA as a model, noting that such case studies could be produced for the 50th anniversary of the RCA in 2022. It was noted that a lot of the work undertaken during the deliberations of the MTSC WG would be input into the Case Studies. It was deemed important that the MTSC WG continue to participate in this new Working Group.

Recommendation 8

It is recommended that the 48th GCM endorse the MTSC WG to work with TCPC on the development and implementation of the project on *Case Studies of Social and Economic Value of RCA Projects* to provide feedback into the Mid-term Review and subsequent Final Review of the MTS.

The MTSC WG held protracted discussion on how this PI should be analysed in the Mid-Term Review given the challenges faced and decisions of the 41st NRM. NZE presented proposed Performance Levels as per the final framework document. Importantly, the MTSC WG did not want the work done to be lost, especially as it was currently the only model available for outcome monitoring in the Mid-Term Review and the 41st NRMs desire for outcome monitoring to be integrated into the design of projects for the 2022-2023 project cycle.

Recommendation 9

It is recommended that the 48th GCM endorse the MTSC WG to prepare recommendations for inclusion in the GOR summarizing their findings and methodologies on outcome monitoring that can be used by project designers in the 2022-2023 project cycle, as well as LCCs finalizing their project reviews.

Recommendation 10

It is recommended that RCA PAC provide training on the MTSC WG outcome monitoring concepts at Project Design Meetings so they can be included in project designs, once the recommendations are approved by the NRs.

4.12. Performance Indicator 4.2

NZE noted that this PI had been difficult to assess and questioned its value, especially compared against PI4.1 which was more substantive, going to the heart of impact assessment. NZE presented proposed Performance Levels as per the final framework document, but noted that there was no source data for RCA PAC upon which to conduct the Mid-Term Review. Construction of a web survey was considered but ultimately not pursued at this time.

5. Review of Terms of Reference

The WG reviewed its Terms of Reference to ensure they were still fit for purpose. A number of suggested updates were made as per **Annex 6**. The reasons for the changes were:

- The duration of the MTSC WG is proposed to be extended to 2023 to explicitly enable it to work with RCA PAC to implement the MTS Final Review. This was considered vital.
- A provision for MTSC WG function to be reviewed after the conclusion of the Mid-Term Review was included to give the NRs the chance to task the WG following the results obtained during the Mid-Term Review.
- The function of the MTSC WG was expanded to cover the MTS Final Review. Again, this was considered vital.
- A function was added to enable the MTSC WG to provide recommendations and advice to a future WG on drafting the MTS 2024-2029. Acknowledging that this drafting would be the role of a separate Working Group, the experience of the MTSC WG gained through its deliberations would be of significant interest to such a drafting group.
- Minor alterations were made to the membership criteria to better reflect the current needs and attributes of the MTSC WG.

Recommendation 11

It is recommended that the 48th GCM endorse the updates to the MTSC WG Terms of Reference.

The WG noted that to ensure that ample time was enable for drafting, review, revision and approval, work on the MTS2024-2029 would need to start in 2021. As such, the NRs would need to form a Working Group at the upcoming GCM.

Recommendation 12

It is recommended that the 48th GCM consider forming a Working Group to prepare the MTS 2024-2029.

It was noted that the regular observer from RCA PAC on the MTSC WG may not be able to continue in this capacity. The WG stressed the vital need for RCA PAC participation in MTSC WG meetings and requested that this participation continue.

Recommendation 13

It is recommended that the 48th GCM confirm the importance of RCA PAC support of the MTSC WG.

6. Review of Annual Work Plan

The MTSC WG reviewed the Annual Work Plan 2019 in light of discussions at the 6th meeting with a mind to update actions and identify new actions for the Annual Work Plan 2020. AUL noted that the approach to the MTSC WG Annual Work Plan to date had been centred around

the PIs. While this was appropriate given the focus of the WG so far, with the work on the Mid-Term Review drawing to a close, the Work Plan should become more strategic to reflect the discussions and the review of the Terms of Reference.

From the 2019 Work Plan, there were 11 actions that were outstanding or overdue. These were reviewed and dispositioned as follows.

PI1.2 - By GCM 2019, the approach(es) selected by NRs have been implemented to close any identified gaps between baselines and targets 1-3 under indicator 1.2.

Consistent with the discussion under PI 1.2, it was noted that there were a number of factors that could influence the results obtained for this PI, largely outside the control of the MTSC WG. As such, there were no obvious approaches to try and rectify gaps observed in the baseline results. It was suggested by JPN to review this action again following the completion of Mid-Term Review

Replacement Action: The MTSC WG should review the target criteria for PI 1.2 following completion of the Mid-Term Review.

Timeframe: Following Mid-Term Review

PI1.2 - By NRM 2019, lists of NPC, ANPC and members of National Project Team are available through RCARO website for each GP and each project (on-going or new)

RCARO showed the new database on their website which captured NPC, ANPC and RRU details as provided by PPFs, noting that this information was not always complete. NPT details were not captured specifically as they were found to be incomplete variable and there was concerns about privacy of including this amount of personal information. This action was deemed closed out, although it was recommended that the RCA Chair remind NRs to stress the importance of lodging NPC and ANPC data.

Recommendation 14

It is recommended that the RCA Chair remind NRs of the need to lodge full NPC and ANPC details when completing PPFs.

PI1.2 - By GCM 2019, a baseline is determined target 4 (100% of nominations for RTCs are from members from National Project Teams)

In the discussion under PI 3.2, a new target criteria was established to measure a RTC participants coming from NPTs. This will enable PAC to determine the data associated with this requirement in the Mid-Term Review. This action was closed out.

PI1.3 - By GCM 2019, strategies have been developed and implemented to close any identified gap in IK contributions from GPs

In the discussion of PI 1.3, the WG noted that the apparent low IK contributions result was likely to arise from incorrect or incomplete IK reporting from NRs. RCARO further

highlighted that PAC had recently reviewed the IK reporting form which would hopefully make this process easier. As such, it was decided that this action was effectively completed, noting that it would be useful for the RCA Chair to remind NRs of the need to complete their IK reports.

PI2.2 - By NRM 2019, process developed and implemented for effective collection of relevant information on national programmes, to assess alignment of RCA projects to national programmes in all GPs.

PHI noted that this had essentially been closed out. The analysis of CPFs had definitively described the alignment of RCA projects with national priorities. For developed countries, the information obtained from PPFs was less complete, but the only source from which such information could be obtained.

PI 3.2 - By GCM 2019, evidence that all recipient GPs have defined their workforce (HRD) requirements for key nuclear science competencies for 2020/21 project designs

As noted in discussion under this PI, new target criteria have been set for PI 3.2, providing the framework for RCAP PAC to measure progress in this area. It was decided to close out this action.

PI3.3 - By NRM 2019, update database on the region's expertise and nuclear and associated facilities (including baseline and needs)

As noted above, the creation of the database on the RCARO website included the details of RRUs. This action was closed out.

PI3.3 - By GCM 2019, develop and implement any necessary strategies to close the gap between availability of and need for physical resources. Ensure that RCA Annual Report contains a section on RRUs, if agreed by NRs.

From the analysis conducted at the 5th Meeting of the MTSC WG, there was actually no gap between availability and need for physical resources, admittedly on limited data (two projects). It was also noted that the Annual Report was not necessarily the appropriate place for RRU information, but that this had been included on the RCAO website. This action was closed out.

PI4.1 - By Jun 2019, LCCs and NPCs for other RCA projects (only those with a history of similar projects) complete Outcome Cases

PI4.1 - By July 2019, MTSC WG members review and score Outcome Cases

PI4.1 - By Aug 2019, MTSC WG meeting (location TBC) to harmonise scoring of Outcome Cases and draft report to GCM

These three actions had all been overtaken by the decision at the 41st NRM not to undertake a second outcome monitoring pilot study on RAS7030. As such, these actions were all closed out.

A series of new actions were proposed.

1. The MTSC WG undertake a review of the usability of the PPFs (Timeframe: 7th Meeting of the MTSC WG)
2. The MTSC WG undertake a review of the guidance on RRUs in the RCA GOR (Timeframe: 7th Meeting of the MTSC WG)
3. The MTSC WG update project design documents to include the requirement for project designs to allocate 25% of project activities as extra-budgetary (Timeframe: End of 2019)
4. The MTSC WG review the results of the Mid-Term Review conducted by RCA PAC before being submitted to the NRs (Timeframe: On completion of Mid-Term Review)
5. The MTSC WG work with PAC to establish the parameters for the Final Review of the MTS 2018-2023 (Timeframe: 2021)
6. The MTSC WG prepare a guidance document for inclusion as an Annex in the GOR summarising their findings on outcome monitoring that can be used by project designers in the 2022-2023 project cycle, as well as LCCs finalising their project reviews (Timeframe: 7th Meeting of the MTSC WG).
7. The MTSC WG continue to participate in the Working Group advising the project on Case Studies of Social and Economic Value of RCA Projects (Timeframe: Ongoing)
8. The MTSC WG prepare a summary document outlining their recommendations and advice for input into the MTS 2024-2029 (Timeframe: 7th Meeting of the MTSC WG).

All of these Actions were included in a new Annual Work Plan 2020, included as **Annex 7**.

Recommendation 15

It is recommended that the 48th GCM endorse the MTSC WG Annual Work Plan 2020.

7. Closing

It was agreed that the 7th Meeting of the MTSC WG would be hosted in Vienna, from 20 to 24 January 2020 subject to confirmation of these details by the IAEA. It was noted that the MTSC WG would likely move to annual meetings thereafter.

The Acting Chair thanked the WG members and RCARO for their active participation and contributions at the Meeting and wished them a safe journey home.