PROVISIONAL TERMS OF REFERENCE
Working Group 1
Initial Review of Guidance Document TS-G-1.4
A. Background:
Following the recommendation of TRANSSC 33 that TS-G-1.4 should be revised, a consultants meeting will be convened in 2018 to begin the process of preparing a draft of the revised document and an update will be provided to TRANSSC 36 in mid-2018.

The purpose of this working group in TRANSSC 35 is to provide proposed edits to TS-G-1.4 text and concepts for the revised document using the output from TRANSSC 33 working group 1 (see Appendix 1) as a stimulus for the development of proposed changes. These proposals will be provided as input to the CSM in 2018 to stimulate discussion and begin the detailed development of revised text.

The findings of the regional capacity building programmes conducted by the TSU in recent years in Africa and the Asia and Pacific Island regions is that there is a need to target the developing Member States with guidance material that addresses their needs in an appropriate and understandable way.

The guidance material should be such that a Member States can readily identify targeted guidance for its industry sectors such as industrial and medical. As such the guidance provided should reflect the range of size and complexity of the target operators involved, with consideration given to the revised document providing examples of documented systems that may apply.

The approach developed for this document should provide the necessary assurances that the guidance is concise, easy to understand and applicable, and therefore effective for small to medium size organisations.

B. Work to be done

Members of TRANSSC will be notified of this working group and if they intend to participate in Working Group 1 they are requested to bring to the meeting their initial proposals of revised text to facilitate discussion.

The review of TS-G-1.4 will be in the context of current day knowledge and practices and be cognisant that one of the target audiences are the developing Member States. The scope, structure and content of the document should be considered and any initial proposals for proposed revised text and improvements are to be noted by the Working Group in a tracked change version of TS-G-1.4.

Due to the time limitations of the working groups a complete detailed set of proposals for changes to the technical content is not expected but examples of some proposed changes will be welcomed to set the scene for the formal document review process which will begin in 2018.

The output from TRANSSC 33 Working Group 1 (Appendix 1) is provided to stimulate discussion and a basis upon which to build further elaboration and additional ideas.

C. Expected Output

A working group report will be drafted including:

a) Initial considerations on the scope, content and format of the guidance document which would improve the effectiveness of the document for the target audience involved in the transport of radioactive material.
b) A short presentation for TRANSSC plenary to provide feedback to TRANSSC which summarizes (a) and includes initial considerations and examples of proposed changes to be considered.

c) A draft schedule for the production of the draft document.
The Management System for the Transport of Radioactive Material

Chair – David Pstrak (USA)

Secretary – Iain Davidson (UK)

Attendees: Frank Wille (Germany); Adelia Sahyun (Brazil); Ito Daiichiro (WNTI); Nathalie Cordier (France); Julie Krochmaluk (France); Ben Dekker (WNTI); Pierre Malesys (ISO); Fernando Zamora (Spain); Christophe Karasinski (Belgium); Ikoma Yutaka (Japan); and Gerhard Wortmann (ISSPA).

Summary:
1. Group agreed to consider the proposed changes from SSR-6 and SSG-26 i.e. 2018 editions for TS-G-1.4 revision considerations.
2. Reference to shipment after storage/ageing may be useful (see (1)).
3. Paragraphs 106 and 306 of SSR-6 define the scope for TS-G-1.4. Paragraph 1.4 of the introduction may benefit from review e.g. to narrow the focus to SSR-6 requirements rather than the fairly broad focus of facilities and (all) activities, which included in a general way health, environment, economic element considerations.
4. Recognition of developments in ‘Human Factors’ (HF) may be useful to add. TRANSSC to consider a member state to present on HF in the future.
5. If not included in the new version of SSG-26, augment the paragraphs on document retention, data management etc. which is becoming more of an issue in ageing facilities.
6. Need to update all references for current revision(s) and any consequential changes plus any new references that need to be included. [Secretariat Note – this is standard procedure in SPESS]
7. Recommendation to the TS-G-1.2 (EP&R) working group to cover the latest thinking on Management Systems (so that it is not needed in TS-G-1.4). [How do we get the balance right between referencing out and providing a useful document and duplication of info?]
8. Concerning the graded approach, consensus was that more examples would be useful for duty holders not involved in the nuclear fuel cycle (terminology that everyone agrees with for this community may be needed!)
9. Recommend that Table 3 of the Appendix for Graded Management Controls be reviewed and revised as necessary to reflect current standards/thinking.
10. To help the target audience, the document should be rationalized and simplified where possible. [do we need more intelligence from IAEA on who the users/target audience of the document are?]

Consensus to revise to reflect 2018 standards and other improvements identified.
Discussion

France - Shipment after storage/ageing should be included to reflect recent amendments.
Spain – TS-G-1.4 is adapted to 2005 edition but 2012 exists – should we look at this or 2018 edition?
Group agreed to look forward to 2018 edition.
UK – need to make sure that we don’t repeat what may go in SSG-26 but refer to ageing?
Germany – used TS-G-1.4 for its own guidance.
Spain – need to bear in mind TRANSSC secretariat advice to keep in mind the less developed/non-nuclear sector.

Para. 1.4
Germany – is everyone happy with ‘management system’ rather than ‘QA’ and/or CA?
France – helpful to have mgt system as this includes Human Factors etc.
Spain – the nuclear Competent Authority present does not regulate health, environment, economics, etc so difficult to implement this integrated concept (out of scope of SSR-6?)
ISO – term was brought in to align with GS-R-3 rather than ISO 9001 (NB Quality Management System).

Chair – Ref [3] talks of facilities and activities (which would include transport). Is the definition too broad/too general for transport and therefore make applicability difficult?
Germany – [1.6] is clear on the scope (add ageing).
France – emergency preparedness and recovery, and
Spain – security?
France/UK – keen to have recognition of Human Factors. The group thought that this may be too detailed for the guide; France to present at T34?
Japan – keen to augment record retention/data management paragraphs; wait for SSG-26 revision wording.
ISO – need to update all references for current revision(s) and any consequential changes plus any new references that need to be included.

General discussion - It was agreed that Emergency response management systems should be covered somewhere in TS-G-1.4 (if it is not clear in the new revision of TS-G-1.2).
France – further explanation on the expectations of the graded approach for smaller users would be useful.
UK suggested that a specific example for the medical sector might be useful as there are so many of these entities. Other examples within the range may also be useful to help the non-nuclear community.

Germany – is Table 3 of the Appendix for Graded Management Controls up-to-date, consistent and accurate?
Discussion on whether RPP management systems should be referred to – agreed that as reference to management systems was already in TS-G-1.3 (page 30) then not needed here.
Spain - could the document be rationalized with more use of tables of examples/appendices (reference out to e.g. ISO 9001) rather than words? A long document is less useful to small users/single entities in the transport chain. Simplicity!
UK – discussion on a need for an over-arching QP to cover a number of different interfaces that may be involved in a transport operation. Paragraph 5.48 seems to cover this.

Discussion on who might use TS-G-1.4 going forward and target the document and its potential revision to this audience. Target the small users/ countries under the IAEA regional approach programme, who would benefit most.

Decision to revise or not – consensus to revise to reflect 2018 standards and other improvements identified.

END.