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e-Safety Standards

CSS 32\textsuperscript{nd} meeting:

- The Secretariat to investigate issues relating to issuing safety standards essentially as electronic versions and the Safety Standards Committees to be consulted on future challenges on the publication process and use of electronic versions of safety standards, noting the support for the CSS on moving from a document by document revision process to a feedback based, topical oriented revision and addendum process.
Feedback Process

• Since 2010 a new Process to deal with the Feedback for Safety Standards is under development in NS,

• 3 subprocess were proposed:
  • The management of information which allow to collect, organise and store the information,
  • The review subprocess which conduct lead section Heads to analyse the information and to summarize the feedback into a report approved by the committees,
  • The revision subprocess that allows to upgrade parts of a set of safety standards under the control of CSS.

Example with SSRTF: DS462
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### Feedback Process

**GSR Part 3:**

Requirement 17: Radiation generators and radioactive sources
Registrants and licensees shall ensure the safety of radiation generators and radioactive sources.

3.49. Registrants and licensees who are manufacturers or other suppliers of radiation generators or radiation sources shall ensure that the following responsibilities are discharged, as applicable:

(a) Supplying a well designed, well manufactured and well constructed radiation generator or radioactive source and device in which the radiation generator or radioactive source is used that:

(i) Provides for protection and safety in accordance with the requirements of these Standards;

(ii) Meets engineering, performance and functional specifications;

(iii) Meets quality standards commensurate with the significance for protection and safety of systems and components, including software;

(iv) Provides clear displays, gauges and instructions on operating consoles in the appropriate language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Supplying a well designed, well manufactured and well constructed radiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generator or radioactive source and device in which the radiation generator or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radioactive source is used that:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Text proposed by TO**

(a) Supplying a well designed, well manufactured and well constructed radiation generator or radioactive source and device in which the radiation generator or radioactive source is used that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Review outcome**

- Accepted
- Acc. w/mod.
- Rejected

**Comment**
Software

- Development by MTIT; cost: 130 to 210 kEuro
  - The first estimate is for a system that reflects the feedback process to its full extent, including:
    - a Web site with a public and secured area
    - the 14 steps of the revision process
    - an offline feedback tool which users can use as an alternative to the online system for providing feedback
    - a function to export any iteration as a Word file
    - a function for Word-style comparison of precisely what changed between drafts/iterations
    - a planning tool visualizing what stage of the revision process a certain standard is currently in, with milestones and projection for worst-case/best case process duration.
Preliminary Implementation Roadmap

✓ Stage I (2013)
  ➢ Safety Standards Feedback

✓ Stage II
  ➢ Safety Standards Knowledge Management

✓ Stage III
  ➢ Reporting
  ➢ Any other requirements

IAEA
Work up to date

✓ Analyzed requirements for Stage I (workshop with NS, December 2012)
  ➢ Agreed on generic feedback pattern
  ➢ Identified system components
  ➢ Started documenting requirements

✓ Presented to SSCC (January 2013)

✓ Conducted conceptual review (MTIT, February 2013)
  ➢ Confirmed technologies in question

✓ Started market research
Outstanding activities

✓ Finalize market research
✓ Produce Project Brief towards project initiation
  ➢ Propose project structure
  ➢ Describe technology options
✓ Produce Project Initiation Documentation
  ➢ Finalize project structure
  ➢ Provide project plan and schedule
  ➢ Allocate developer resources

IAEA
## Choice of Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>On-premise</th>
<th>Off-the-shelf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Benefits**  | • Tailored to precise need  
• Fully extensible in the future  
• Already integrates with NUCLEUS WebSSO  
• Already integrates with IAEA visual identity  
• Browser support is flexible | • Faster delivery  
• Subject matter experience |
| **Drawbacks** | • Slower delivery  
• Risk | • May not implement some requirements  
• May or may not be extensible  
• Browser support is not flexible  
• MTIT must integrate product with IAEA infrastructure (time, cost)  
• Upgrade dependencies |
| **Unknowns**  | Which one is less expensive?                                               |                                                        |
Thank you
This sub-process is fully supported by SharePoint…

- Create the possibility for anybody (public/stakeholders) as well as selected people (committee members/IAEA staff) to enter data/information in the tool;
- All information is linked (manually or automatically) to a specific item (OaR);
- Related information is easily extractable and can be sent to a new table;

…Necessitate to customize this tool as to be dedicated for Safety Standards.
Review sub-process

- The Technical Officer responsible for a range of items should be able to extract the information in order to comment them with committees members
  - Periodically (once a year), data/information are removed from her previous location and sent to a new table to be review by the committees, states members;
  - A feedback text is proposed for all relevant data/information;
  - At the end of the process a precise location into a Safety Standards is given for each feedback text.

A routine should be installed into SharePoint to run this sub-process
Revision sub-process

- The feedback texts approved by the committees are entered in a precise location into dedicated “word format” Safety Standards documents under a provisory status;
- Texts are reviewed by the Commission of SSs;
- When adopted, the final texts appear in defined locations into Safety Standards under a definitive status;
- Version of Safety Standards is upgraded;
- A communication about all changes is accessible.

Necessitate of programming!