



**MEETING REPORT**

**29<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF THE NATIONAL**  
**RCA REPRESENTATIVES**

**20-23 March 2007**

**Sydney, Australia**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Annexes	iii
Opening Ceremony	1
• Welcome on Behalf ANSTO.	
• Opening on Behalf Government of Australia.	
• Remarks on Behalf IAEA.	
1. Opening Session	
1.1 Welcome Remarks by Current Chair	1
1.2 Election of the Chair and Rapporteurs	1
1.3 Remarks of the new Chair	2
2. Adoption of the Agenda	3
3. 28 <sup>th</sup> RCA NRM and 35 <sup>th</sup> RCA GCM reports - Matters arising and follow-up actions	3
4. RCA Annual Report for 2006	3
5. Report on Implementation of the RCA Programme in 2006 and RCA Programme of 2007/2008	4
6. Status of the Extension of the RCA Agreement	7
7. Adoption of the Revised RCA Guidelines and Operating Rules	7
8. Progress of the Implementation of RCA Medium Term Strategy	9
9. Review of the RCA Programme in 2005/2006	9
10. Sustainability of Closed RCA Projects	10
11. Priority areas for the RCA Programme in 2009/2011	11
12. Report of the Director RCARO	11
13. Report of the Chairman of the Standing Advisory Committee of the RCARO	11
14. Enhancement of the Roles and Status of RCARO	13

15. Collaboration with FNCA and ANSN (Asian Nuclear Safety Network)	13
16. Discussion on the proposals for collaboration with FNCA and ANSN	14
17. RCA Meetings	14
17.1 Arrangements for 36 <sup>th</sup> RCA GCM and 30 <sup>th</sup> RCA NRM	
17.2 RCA participation in the Quadripartite Meeting	
17.3 Thematic Sector Lead Country Coordinators Meeting	
18. Any other business	15
19. Adoption of the Meeting Report of the 29 <sup>th</sup> Regional Meeting of the National RCA Representatives	15
20. Closure	15
20.1 Remarks by Mr Peter Salema DIR TCAP	
20.2 Remarks of the RCA Focal Person	
20.3 Closing Remarks of the Chair	

## LIST OF ANNEXES

- Annex 1. List of Participants
- Annex 1a. Welcome on behalf of ANSTO
- Annex 2. Opening Address on behalf of the Government of Australia
- Annex 3. Response by IAEA
- Annex 4. Agenda
- Annex 5. 28<sup>th</sup> RCA NRM and 35<sup>th</sup> RCA GCM reports - Matters arising and follow-up action
- Annex 6. RCA Annual Report 2006
- Annex 7. Report on Implementation of the RCA Programme in 2006
- Annex 8. Revised RCA Guidelines and Operating Rules
- Annex 9. Progress of the Implementation of RCA Medium Term Strategy
- Annex 10. Review of the RCA Programme in 2005/2006
- Annex 11. China Presentation on Progress of Project RAS/5/043
- Annex 12. China Presentation on Progress of Project RAS/6/041
- Annex 13. India Presentation on Progress of Projects RAS/5/040 and RAS/5/044
- Annex 14. Japan Presentation on Progress of Project RAS/6/040
- Annex 15. Japan Presentation on Progress of Project RAS/6/042
- Annex 16. Korea Presentation on Progress of Project RAS/0/041
- Annex 17. Korea Presentation on Progress of Project RAS/4/024
- Annex 18. Malaysia Presentation on Progress of Projects RAS/8/099 and RAS/8/100
- Annex 19. Pakistan Presentation on Progress of Project RAS/8/097
- Annex 20. Philippines Presentation on Progress of Project RAS/8/098
- Annex 21. Sustainability of Closed RCA Projects
- Annex 22. List of Proposed Projects for 2009/2011
- Annex 23. Report of the Director RCARO
- Annex 24. RCARO Work Plan for 2007
- Annex 25. Enhancement of the Roles and Status of RCARO
- Annex 26. Presentation on the FNCA
- Annex 27. Presentation on the Asian Nuclear Safety Network
- Annex 28. Follow-up Actions

## **29<sup>th</sup> Meeting of RCA National Representatives**

**20-23 March 2007**

**Sydney, Australia**

### **Opening Ceremony**

The 29<sup>th</sup> Meeting of National RCA Representatives was held at the Novotel Brighton Beach Hotel, Australia from 20 to 23 March 2007. 47 participants from 16 RCA Member States and the RCA Regional Office (RCARO) attended the Meeting. Sri Lanka was not represented. The list of participants is given in Annex 1. The IAEA was represented by Mr Manase Peter Salema, Director Division Asia and the Pacific, Technical Cooperation Department; Mr. Prinath Dias, RCA Focal Person (RCA FP) and Mr Myung-Ro Kim, Cost Free Expert, RCA Secretariat.

Dr Ian Smith, Executive Director and CEO, Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation (ANSTO), welcomed the participants (Annex 1a). Dr Ron Cameron gave the opening address (Annex 2) on behalf of the Government of Australia. Mr David Ritchie, Deputy Secretary, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade had been scheduled to make this address but his flight from Canberra had been delayed and he was therefore unable to be present. Mr Salema made remarks on behalf of the IAEA (Annex 3).

### **1. Opening Session**

#### **1.1 Welcome Remarks of the Current Chair**

Mr. Chouvana Rodthongkom thanked the participants for the support they had provided to the Chair over the past year. He called for nomination for the new Chair.

#### **1.2 Election of the Chair and Rapporteurs**

Viet Nam proposed Dr. Ron Cameron, the National RCA Representative for Australia to be the new Chair of the RCA. Japan seconded the proposal. Dr. Cameron was unanimously elected by the National Representatives. Dr Cameron welcomed all the delegates to Australia and thanked Thailand for the work undertaken during the year while RCA Chair. He expressed particular appreciation for the contribution of Dr Manoon Aramrattana, not only for his inputs when Chair but also for his significant contribution to the RCA over many years.

Dr Cameron announced that Dr Nahrul Khair Alang Md Rashid and Dr John Easey had agreed to be rapporteurs for the meeting and they would be assisted by Ms Michelina Bajjada.

### **1.3 Remarks of the new Chair**

Dr. Cameron briefly reviewed the tasks ahead for the Meeting. He noted that there was going to be a thorough review of the projects during this Meeting and that this was the first time for some years that the National RCA Representatives (NRs) had this task on the agenda. From his experience he had observed that successful projects had the following features; good design; commitment from the Member States (MSs), NRs and Project Lead Country Coordinators (PLCCs); required the strong support and commitment of individuals; and also had the required level of resources.

He was of the opinion that the revision of the Guidelines and Operating Rules (GOR) would further strengthen the role of the NRs. He noted that the senior positions of the NRs in their institutes limited the time and effort that they could spare to carry out their RCA tasks and the move to appoint support personnel to aid them in the RCA related work was a practical means of achieving a balance in their duties and obligations.

The future RCA programme was expected to require additional funds and he asked all NRs to consider ways in which new funds could be attracted. He suggested that the renewal of the Agreement this year presented an ideal opportunity for the NRs to inform senior levels of Government about the achievements and successes of the RCA and it was a very opportune time for the NRs to have them consider allocating resources to bolster support for RCA activities and national activities related to sustainability.

In respect of the future RCA programme he said that he was looking forward to feedback from the NRs on their priorities in the various technical areas. This would be a difficult task since the adoption of the Medium Term Strategy (MTS) imposed reductions in the number of projects in the programme so that each new project could achieve increased impacts. He advised that the NRs would be asked to provide their priorities not just in terms of broad sectors but would have to focus on detailing activities to address specific needs.

He informed the Meeting that during his discussions with the Australian NPCs there had been a clear message that sustainability had to be designed into the project from the start and not be an afterthought. For many projects successes would not be realized until after the Agency support had ceased and consideration had to be given to the ways and means of promotion of such successes.

In concluding he observed that the circulated background papers showed that MSs were providing strong support in the form of extrabudgetary funds but the major funding was still coming from the Agency TCF. There were unallocated funds that had been deposited by MSs but not allocated to activities and he urged the NRs to look at the programme and allocate these funds to further the implementation of the programme.

## **2. Adoption of the Agenda - RCANRM(29)/1**

AUL noted that significant tasks had to be undertaken to comply with the timetable in the GOR for the preparation of projects for the next TC cycle and asked if this could be inserted as a specific agenda so that all aspects could be thoroughly covered. AUL also expressed concern about the time allocated for review of the Meeting report.

It was agreed to insert an item on project concept proposal under item 11 of the Agenda. The Chair said that he had noted that there was a need to align the Agency's and RCA's project development processes so that the final design documents could be approved by the NRs at the GCM.

PAK noted that the reference to the 34<sup>th</sup> GCM in Session 1 item 3 should have been the 35<sup>th</sup> GCM.

**The Meeting agreed to adopt the Agenda with the above amendments.**

The adopted Agenda is given in Annex 4.

## **3. 28<sup>th</sup> RCANRM and 35<sup>th</sup> RCA GCM reports - Matters arising and follow-up action – RCANRM(29)/2**

RCA FP reviewed the items listed in the briefing paper (Annex 5) and noted the actions taken.

MAL commented on the actions taken to establish an intranet on the Members Homepage and informed the Meeting that each MSs would be provided with a username and password to enable entry to the site. The new features included separate pages for each project. Uploading could be undertaken in Vienna or in MAL.

IND commented on the importance of the Mutual Recognition of Schemes of Certification of NDT personnel and informed the Meeting that IND had also adopted it.

## **4. RCA Annual Report for 2006 – RCANRM(29)/3**

RCA FP reviewed the report (Annex 6). He noted that success stories were presented in the report as well as by the RCARO and asked the NRs to consider whether it might be better to have the reporting of success stories confined to the RCARO. After discussions and interventions by MAL, PHI, CPR, JPN and AUL, it was generally agreed that the success stories presented in the Annual report were a useful feature and could aid the RCARO in its focus on the selection of suitable success stories to publicise the RCA more widely. It was also agreed that there was value in each MSs presenting a national report on projects which would be included in the Annual Report but guidelines were requested to be prepared to assist in having a uniform approach. RCA FP agreed that guidelines should be prepared.

**The Meeting agreed that MSs would prepare national project reports for inclusion in future RCA Annual Reports. These would be prepared in accordance with guidelines to be circulated to NRs by the RCA Focal Person.**

AUL was of the opinion that the reviews of project progress in Part 1 of the Annual Report were quite variable both in terms of presentation and the type of information presented. He also noted that it was sometimes difficult to identify where a nuclear technique was being applied. AUL proposed that the progress of each project would be much more effectively assessed if the reporting were done against the agreed milestones and performance indicators (PIs) as this would bring more uniformity to the presentations and provide an improved base against which the NRs could undertake their assessment and evaluation tasks. The technical information in Part 2 of the Annual Report was seen to deal with project information and inputs but not outputs, PIs, milestones etc and so the proposed change to the reporting could then provide the NRs with a fuller view on the projects and lessen the efforts required by them. RCA FP said that it should be possible for projects to report against PIs and milestones, which were now specifically detailed in the new project log frames. The Chair agreed that this type of reporting would add value. He also agreed on the need to emphasize the nuclear techniques being employed.

**The Meeting agreed that the project progress reports submitted for inclusion in Part 1 of the Annual Report should report against any PIs and milestones set out in the related project design documents. These reviews should also emphasize the nuclear techniques being used in the project.**

AUL drew the attention of the RCA Focal Person to some apparent inconsistencies in the budget documentation. It was agreed that these entries would be reviewed and adjusted if required.

**The Meeting endorsed the Annual Report for 2006 subject to any revisions required on the basis of comments received by 20 April 2007 by National RCA Representatives.**

### **5. Report on Implementation of the RCA Programme in 2006 - RCANRM(29)/4**

RCA FP gave an overview of the programme (Annex 7), concentrating on the major issues. He expressed disappointment with the performance on 6 monthly project reporting, with some MSs not reporting at all. He requested NRs assistance in improving the situation and reiterated that these reports needed to be presented on time and with sufficient detail to enable assessment to take place. If there were reluctance in reporting because of the lack of progress at the national level, then NRs should re-evaluate whether participation was really appropriate. RCA FP suggested that MSs might need to be more selective about the projects in which they participated.

He reported that difficulties were still being experienced with nominations for events, with insufficient information on nominees making it difficult for the Agency to assess the appropriateness of candidates. It was useful for the evaluation process if nominations identified that National Team Members were being nominated.

Late applications were also reported to be a problem. In response to information from the NRs concerning difficulties with lengthy approval processes before official nomination could be lodged, he explained that he was able to accept advance nominations ahead of official confirmation. He requested the NRs' assistance in identifying who were appropriate nominating authorities in their countries. In some cases it was not possible to verify if there were compliance with the GOR. He commented that two MSs had still not informed him on their nominations for NPCs.

The Chair emphasised the importance of the 6 monthly reporting and questioned the reasons behind MSs' difficulties in preparing these reports. He said that if these difficulties could be identified, it might be possible to then devise means of responding to the problems. He agreed with the comments of RCA FP on the need for MSs to be more selective about the projects in which they participate.

**The Chair put an action on all NRs to inform the RCA Focal Person within 1 month on the status of reporting of 6 monthly progress reports and to identify any difficulties in completing all of their reports.**

At the request of the Chair each NR outlined the process used for selection of candidates to be nominated to participate in RCA activities. The Chair commended those MSs that had established liaison offices specifically to deal with RCA matters and those that were making full use of the NPCs and the National Project Teams. He re-emphasised the importance of having the correct people involved in the activities and having their nominations sent to the Agency in good time and before the set deadline.

RCA FP requested MSs to inform him as soon as possible on their proposed extrabudgetary contributions for the current programme and the utilisation of reserve funds for RCA activities. He noted that the RCARO and JPN had already provided this information.

**The Meeting agreed to inform the RCA Focal Person on their proposed extrabudgetary contributions for the current programme, the utilisation of reserve funds for RCA activities and the identity of those who are authorised to provide official nominations for RCA activities.**

IND, AUL and JPN congratulated the RCA FP on the substantial increase in implementation rate in 2006, which was 74.4% compared to 66.8% in 2005. The high level of utilisation of regional experts was praised by AUL but concerns were expressed on the overall decrease in the number and extent of expert field missions in 2006. RCA FP reported that there had been no problems with implementation and no missions had to be deferred because of capacity problems. He revealed that RCA could have 45 to 50 regional events implemented each year, which would provide good intensity of inputs when the number of projects was reduced.

The Chair noted that the RCARO initiated project was an RCA project but had not been included in the list. RCA FP explained that there was a separate report by the RCARO but the project could be listed with the other projects. The Director RCARO agreed with such a change. He also advised that the fast track method for the initiation of RCARO projects might have some incompatibility with the limitation on project numbers. RCA

FP suggested that the Meeting should come to a decision on whether the RCARO projects were to be included with the numbers of IAEA supported projects when determining the limit on total numbers.

ROK provided information on the measures taken to set up procedures for over-viewing the national participation in RCA projects.

The Chair expressed concern on the Agency's restricted classification of events into either "meetings" or "training courses" and suggested that it would be beneficial to recognise working groups which were a very important part of the RCA programme. JPN agreed and said that it was important to be able to differentiate between overhead meetings and technical meetings when evaluating the projects.

Mr Salema explained that "meetings" as used by the Agency included workshops, seminars, expert group meetings, etc. which were quite distinct from "training courses" in nature as well as financial entitlements of participants. He said that there was no barrier to "meetings" being sub-classified to making their purpose clearer. He also provided some additional information on matters related to the project budgets and implementation performance, emphasizing the progressive reduction in budget carryover from one year to another was a positive sign of the good implementation achieved.

The Chair invited Mr Salema to brief the Meeting on the current status of the Agency's position on the development of Regional Programme Frameworks. Mr Salema reviewed the situation noting the success of the Country Programme Frameworks and the attraction of having similar resources available for assisting in the setting of regional priorities. He noted however the difficulties in producing such a document because of the diversity in the situation of individual Member States. He noted that SAGTAC had considered this matter at their last meeting and requested the Chair SAGTAC, Dr Dela Rosa, to brief the Meeting if appropriate.

Dr Dela Rosa briefed the Meeting on the SAGTAC deliberations and said that, for reasons already canvassed, they had made a recommendation for "Regional Profiles" to be prepared rather than "Regional Programme Frameworks". It was noted that TC had submitted a paper to SAGTAC on regional programming. A number of MSs including JPN and IND inquired about the possibility of the TC paper being made available to the MSs. Mr Salema said he would convey this request to the SAGTAC Secretariat in TC Department and advise the MSs on the outcome. He also assured the MSs that there would be full consultation with them about this issue before any decisions were made on matters that impact on RCA. The Chair thanked Mr Salema for this undertaking and the opportunity for the RCA to contribute to any discussions.

**The Chair requested that the report record the Meeting's request for actions by Mr Salema and Dr Dela Rosa to ascertain the availability of the TC paper and whether it could be circulated to NRs.**

## **6. Status of the Extension of the RCA Agreement – RCANRM(29)/5**

The Chair recalled that the decision of the NRs had been to retain the wording used in the previous extension in 2002 and not incorporate the changes suggested by the IAEA Office of Legal Affairs. He noted the advice from the RCA FP that the Agency had received notification of agreement to the extension from the Governments of BGD, IND and INS. PAK informed that they had already notified of their Government's acceptance on 9 August 2006. The Chair asked to Secretariat to note this. Each MSs provided the Chair with an update on the progress of the approvals in their country. The RCA FP again reminded the NRs that the agreement on the extension had to be signed by the Head of State, the Minister for Foreign Affairs or a designated representative.

## **7. Adoption of the Revised RCA Guidelines and Operating Rules – RCANRM(29)/6**

The RCA FP reviewed the changes proposed in the background document (Annex 8), which had been made in response to the adoption of the Medium Term Strategy (MTS). He noted that this version incorporated the comments he had received from MSs. He again emphasised the critical role of the NRs in the efficient and effective working of the programme and sought their cooperation in the smooth running of all aspects.

There was a discussion on how best to address the requirements for informing individuals on matters relating to policy and those who were only interested in project matters such as NPCs. In principle there were options for having a single document or split document. The relative merits of these two options were discussed and there was a clear preference for maintaining a single document with guidelines on its use for the two principal user groups.

PHI suggested that section 4.6, which was concerned with the roles and responsibilities of the SAC, should have item (d) under "Functions" amended by inserting the phrase "on behalf of the NRs" so that the item would read "*On behalf of the NRs, evaluate the performance of the Director of the RCARO annually according to the procedure outlined in Annex 3 and report the result of the evaluation to the NRM for its consideration*". There were no objections to this revision.

**The Meeting agreed to maintain the Guidelines and Operating Rules as a single document. The RCA Focal Person was requested to provide guidance notes to facilitate the use of the document by the two main interest groups namely those seeking information on policy related matters and those seeking guidance on project related matters.**

The Chair noted that the chart on page 20 needed a minor editorial change to bring the activities into chronological order but that the overall timing would need to be adjusted.

Following discussions with NRs and the Agency a revised process for the development and approval of RCA projects was agreed and the chart on page 20, GOR, would be revised accordingly.

The Meeting approved the following revised schedule:

Activity	Time Frame
Agree projects and assign PLC	NRM Year N-2
Drafting of the Concept Papers by PLCCs in consultation with the other stakeholders.	31 July Year N-2
Interaction with IAEA on Concept Papers	
Review of Concept papers and assignment of priorities by NRs	GCM Year N-2
Detailed project design undertaken on selected projects in conjunction with IAEA TO.	
Review of detailed design by NRs	NRM Year N-1
Refinement of design by PLCCs	30 June Year N-1
Agency to review design with respect to funding and support issues	
Final approval of projects by NRs including discussion of proposed Agency funding	GCM Year N-1
Information on projects approved by the Board of Governors conveyed to the Member States	November Year N-1
NRs inform the RCA Secretariat of the projects in which they wish to participate.	December Year N-1

**The RCA Focal Person was requested to revise the flow chart for the development of the RCA projects in the Guidelines and Operating Rules in line with the agreed changes.**

The Meeting was informed by Mr Salema that it would be possible for the NRs to have access to the Agency's website with the Programme Cycle Management Framework (PCMF) during the development project design and it was suggested that it would be beneficial for all NRs to have access so that they could be directly informed and could take part in this process if they wished.

## **8. Progress of the Implementation of RCA Medium Term Strategy – RCANRM(29)/7**

The Chair reviewed the background document (Annex 9). He noted that item C.1.4 on communicating the details of the MS RCA Liaison Office to the RCA FP had not been completed by INS, ROK, MON, MYA and NZL. He was provided with updates on the actions set out in Annex 1 by CPR, JPN, IND and PHI. He noted that all actions listed in Annex 2 had either been done or were being done.

**The Meeting took note of the document containing information on the progress of the implementation of the RCA Medium Term Strategy.**

## **9. Review of the RCA Programme in 2005/2006 – RCANRM(29) /8**

The progress of the implementation of the projects was presented by each Project Lead Country:

Australia	Background document (Annex 10) – projects No. 6, 8, 9, 10, 17, 18 & 19
China	Annex 11 & 12
India	Annex 13
Japan	Annex 14 & 15
Republic of Korea	Annex 16 & 17
Malaysia	Annex 18
New Zealand	Background document (Annex 10) – project No. 5
Pakistan	Annex 19
Philippines	Annex 20

After each presentation there was a discussion on implementation issues and especially constraints that were affecting the smooth delivery of the project.

In his summing up following the presentations the Chair emphasised the importance of training materials being delivered in a timely manner as well as the need to have them maintained to ensure their currency and continued usefulness. In addition he noted that most of the presentations were on projects that were completed. There was a discussion on whether the project on osteoporosis should be terminated or continued. However since the project was due to terminate in 2007 and there were still some low cost but important activities to be implemented, it was agreed to let the project run its course.

**The Chair requested New Zealand to prepare a report on the take up of the technologies being used in the air pollution project and identify where there were any requirements for further assistance with these techniques.**

Mr Salema informed the Meeting that the TC Department was looking at synergies that could be gained through cooperation with projects outside of the RCA programme. He was interested if there had been any linkages to the non-RCA regional project on the sustainability of nuclear institutions and noted that issues such as commercialisation, marketing and related activities were important elements in assisting nuclear institutions to become more sustainable. In the subsequent discussions it was emphasised that there

were two levels of sustainability at play. One was the sustainability of the individual project and the other was at the institute level.

### **10. Sustainability of Closed RCA Projects RCANRM(29)/9**

RCA FP briefed the Meeting on this item at the invitation of the Chair and noted that the issue of project sustainability had been discussed on several occasions. He said it was now necessary to come to some agreement on how to deal effectively with projects once the Agency funding support had ceased. This was especially important since the major benefits might not be realised until some years later. He sought the Meetings opinions and recommendations on this issue and especially the four dot points listed in the background paper (Annex 21).

AUL agreed that the issue of sustainability was important and suggested that a number of precursors needed to be set so that MSs could commit to their part in supporting the sustainability of the project. Sustainability had to be part of the initial project plan not something undefined or an afterthought. The design of the national sustainability action plan had to be dovetailed into the regional plan so that the required resources could be funded and in place when required. NPCs needed to consult nationally on possible access to HRD and other projects that might be suitable to support their sustainability activities.

There would also be a need to have a champion at both the regional and national level to ensure momentum is maintained and the activities implemented.

NZL agreed with the AUL proposal and also pointed out that sustainability needed to take account of whether it was required. In some cases once the project was completed there was no need for sustaining the project. In other cases future technological advances might make the sustainability for that project redundant. He suggested that the first dot point should be modified to read "*National RCA Representatives in consultation with the National Project Coordinators before the closure of projects should evaluate the need and, if appropriate, develop mechanisms to sustain project activities*" This proposal was supported by the NRs in subsequent interventions.

PAK and ROK raised issues on the practicality of being able to maintain the required level of support to both the current RCA projects and the closed ones.

Following full discussions the Chair summarised the major points of agreement. He said that projects needed to be considered in the following phases: design, transfer, transition and closure. He suggested that, at the Mid Term Review before the Final Review, the NPCs could agree and confirm the resources required for the sustainability programme. The PLCC would be the most appropriate person to champion the project in this later phase and prepare the closure report. It was hoped that the Agency would be able to assist with some resources in the transition phase. He agreed with PAK, JPN and others on the need for a cautious approach and the suggestion that these recommendations should commence in 2007 and progress reviewed at future NRMs."

He observed that there also had to be recognition that Member States formed two categories; ones that were mainly information recipients and the other that were mainly technology recipients.

**The Meeting decided that projects closing in 2007 would indicate the level and types of support required for achieving sustainability and the contributions to come from national as well as Agency inputs. The capacity of the participating MSs to absorb the technology should also be taken into account. In parallel the project design process would be examined to look at the introduction of sustainability as a component in the design of future projects.**

### **11. Priority areas for the RCA Programme in 2009/2011 – RCANRM(29)/10**

The Chair said that the NRs needed to advise what balance they required for the future programme. This was a very important task and required specific focus on activities not just broad areas. Initially it was expected that more concept papers would be prepared than the number of project able to be incorporated into the next cycle. These concept papers would be reviewed by the NRs and prioritised to enable the final programme to be selected.

The MSs submitted their proposals for projects for 2009-11 cycle. After further discussion it was agreed to amalgamate some proposals and delete some duplication. The other proposals should go forward to the concept stage. PLCs were agreed for the new proposals as listed in Annex 22.

**The Meeting decided that the proposed projects (Annex 22) should be developed into concept papers by the PLCs and then evaluated for consistency with the RCA criteria. These will be discussed at the GCM.**

### **12. Report of the Director RCARO –RCANRM(29)/11**

### **13. Report of the Chairman of the Standing Advisory Committee of the RCARO**

The Director RCARO delivered his report and Work Plan for 2007 as set out in the background documents (Annex 23 and Annex 24).

The Chair advised that advice had been provided to RCARO during the SAC meeting. In particular he noted that the work plan had been prepared according to the designated procedures. The targeting of end users was discussed extensively and it was recommended that the RCARO should develop a strategy for this and they will prepare a document after consultation. It was noted during the discussions that MSs were sometimes in a better position than the RCARO for some tasks. UN bodies had offices in various MSs and they could greatly assist the RCARO in some of the linkages and networking.

It was noted that participation in international and regional conference was very successful when linked to an RCA activity as evidenced by the impact made at the

PEMSEA conference in China in 2006. The proposed focus on the ICI-6 conference in 2008 was supported as very appropriate.

**MSs were requested to advise the RCARO on other potential target conferences.**

The Chair noted the importance of early negotiations in gaining entry to the planning of conferences or other projects. Once such events began to firm up their arrangement entry by parties such as RCA would only be possible if funds were contributed and RCA became a donor.

The nuclear knowledge activities carried out through the RCARO were seen to be very valuable especially for those MSs thinking about moving into nuclear power programmes. Some of the scope of these projects was beyond RCA's current needs but advice had been given that tailored courses could be established in future years that would align with the RCA programme but this was not possible for 2007. RCARO would report back to SAC.

The brain storming workshop on RCARO future strategy was expected to take place in July so that the RCA FP could participate.

Five success stories had now been written and versions selected for publication. Seven had been selected as possible input for the next round.

Proposals had been received for collaboration with FNCA. Two projects had been selected by Dr Machi, one on radiation processing and one on radiation oncology. Alternative proposals had been made and forwarded by the Agency. The main thrust of the interaction with FNCA from the RCA perspective was considered to be through information sharing. The funding of clinical trials was not part of the RCA programme. In the report of the RCARO it was mentioned that the ROK Government was providing US\$90,000 for the RCA to fund extrabudgetary activities. It was suggested that these funds might usefully assist in facilitating the presence of NPCs at appropriate FNCA activities. The funding of an established RCA project might also be considered as an additional or alternative use of these funds.

The selection committee for the next director would need to be established. The term of the present Director was expected to finish in April 2008. It was proposed that the next selection committee should comprise one representative from the IAEA and ROK and one representative each from the MSs occupying the positions of past, current and future Chair. This formula would allow for rotation of the Committee members and provided opportunities for all MSs to participate.

**The Meeting supported the proposal that the composition of the next selection committee for the next Director to be one representative from the IAEA and ROK and one representative each from Thailand, Australia and Viet Nam as these countries were currently occupying the positions of past, current and future Chair.**

The Committee were sympathetic to the situation with respect to the problems with the legal status of the RCARO.

**The Meeting supported the RCARO Work Plan with the recommendations for implementation suggested by SAC.**

#### **14. Enhancement of the Roles and Status of RCARO– RCANRM(29)/13**

ROK detailed their position on the legal status of the RCARO as set out in the background document (Annex 25).

There was extensive discussion concerning these needs and modalities that could be used to review the issues set out in the paper. It was proposed that this issue could be considered as an additional task for the brainstorming meeting planned for July. A number of MSs indicated that they would like to have time to discuss this issue with their capitals and, if this matter were to be raised at the coming RCA GCM, then there would need to be sufficient lead time for consultation and advice.

The Meeting agreed that the Terms of Reference for the Working Group on the status of the RCARO would include:

- a) discussions with the IAEA on options for recognising the status of the RCARO;
- b) discussions with the Government of Korea on the options for recognising the status of the RCARO; and
- c) clarification of the status for the RCARO when representing the RCA.

Pakistan raised concerns over the formation of a Working Group.

It was emphasised by the Chair that participation would have to be at the level of NR's. The Chair called for expressions of interest for participation in the Working Group. These were received from AUL, ROK, PHI and CPR. JPN expressed interest but might not be able to participate because of timing constraints.

**The Meeting agreed to form a Working Group to have initial discussions on the roles and status of the RCARO in conjunction with the brainstorming meeting scheduled for July. Following this meeting, the report would be distributed to all MSs so that they could consult with their appropriate national bodies. The issue would then be discussed at the September 2007 RCA GCM. RCARO was requested to take the necessary actions organise the July event.**

#### **15. Collaboration with FNCA and ANSN (Asian Nuclear Safety Network) – RCANRM(29)/12**

A presentation on the FNCA was made by Dr Sueo Machi, FNCA Coordinator Japan (Annex 26).

A presentation on the Asian Nuclear Safety Network (ANSN) was made by Ms Cait Maloney (Annex 27).

## **16. Discussion on the proposals for collaboration with FNCA and ANSN**

There was extensive discussion on the two proposals by Dr Machi.

**The Meeting welcomed the offer from the FNCA to share information on their work to date. Although RCA could not be involved in clinical trials, individual MSs would be able to make a decision on their requirements outside of the programme. It was agreed that the FNCA contact person would be invited to attend the next project workshop to identify MSs who are interested in participation.**

**RCA would look at the possibility of providing funds to facilitate national participation in the project. Reports of national participation would be presented through FNCA and then to RCA when the combined results were available.**

**The Meeting agreed that information exchange on radiation processing at this stage would be very beneficial to the RCA, especially when the development of the commercialisation of some of our existing products was being considered. It was agreed that an FNCA contact person should be invited to attend the planning workshop in April. During that time that meeting would seek to identify any gaps in the current process and any areas where benefit might come from working jointly in the future.**

**The Meeting welcomed the presentation by Ms Maloney on the ANSN and invited her to consider a link between the ANSN website and those of RCA.**

## **17. RCA Meetings**

### **17.1 Arrangements for 36<sup>th</sup> RCA GCM and 30<sup>th</sup> RCA NRM**

It was noted that the arrangements for the past two RCA GCMs were to have the meetings on the Friday before the General Conference. This arrangement seemed to have worked well. The Meeting was asked whether this timing should be used for the 36<sup>th</sup> RCA GCM or whether the Meeting should be held during the week of the General Conference.

**The Meeting agreed to hold the 36<sup>th</sup> GCM on the Friday before the start of the General Conference.**

VIE announced their intention of hosting the 30<sup>th</sup> NRM in Viet Nam in 2008. The exact details would be conveyed to the MSs in due course.

### **17.2 RCA participation in the Quadripartite Meeting**

The Chair reviewed the previous discussions at NRMs concerning participation of the RCA in the Quadripartite Meetings. RCA had tried to have the discussion there focused but the Meeting had tended to be just presentation of statements. RCA had concluded that participation was of no value.

**The Meeting agreed that RCA would not participate in the Quadripartite Meeting.**

### **17.3 Thematic Sector Lead Country Coordinators Meeting**

The Chair noted that the programme was now moving to the strengthening of the role of the PLCCs and concentrating on the reduction of the programme to 15 projects as well as the related issue of project funding. There did not appear to be value in conducting a TSLCC meeting in July 2007, especially in view of the need for the PLCCs to work on the concept documents so that they are ready by the 31 July deadline.

**The Meeting agreed that the TSLCC Meeting should not be held.**

### **18. Any other business**

No issues were raised under this item as they had been dealt with elsewhere. The Meeting was reminded that one of the actions at the coming September RCA GCM was the appointment of the PLCCs when approving the project concepts for the 2009/11 TC cycle.

### **19. Adoption of the Meeting Report of the 29<sup>th</sup> Regional Meeting of the National RCA Representatives**

The Draft Meeting Report was presented, discussed and revisions made to the conclusions and recommendations. The draft report would be circulated to the NRs and comments and correction had to be provided to the rapporteurs within one month.

### **20. Closing**

#### **20.1 Remarks by Mr Manase Peter Salema, DIR TCAP.**

Mr Salema thanked Australia for hosting the Meeting, which had been well organised. He commented that it had been very useful for him to follow the deliberations and take note of the decisions. This helped guide the IAEA in playing its part in this partnership. Mr Salema was pleased to note that the RCA was happy with the Secretariat's contributions. He reaffirmed that the IAEA would continue to fulfil its obligations as stipulated under the Agreement and continue to provide support for the RCA.

#### **20.2 Remarks of the RCA Focal Person**

Mr Dias joined with Mr Salema in congratulating Australia in the excellent arrangements and thanked Dr Cameron for very ably Chairing the Meeting. Mr Dias thanked all the NRs for their cooperation and assistance during the past year. He reminded the NRs of the importance of good communication and sought their assistance particularly in regard to communication issues raised during the Meeting.

#### **20.3 Closing Remarks of the Chair**

The Chair thanked all the delegates for their participation and contributions to the Meeting. He said that substantial progress had been made in previous years and this was

contributing to the effectiveness and impact of the RCA in the future. In closing the Meeting he wished all the delegates a safe return journey home.