Report of the Steering Committee Meeting on Competence of Human Resources for Regulatory Bodies in Member States with Nuclear Power Plants (NPPs)

Vienna, 2 – 4 December 2009

Contents:

1. Introduction

This was the first meeting of the Steering Committee, which was established to advise IAEA on ways to support effective systems and strategies to ensure and maintain the necessary competence to perform the regulatory functions in Member States (MSs) with NPPs.
The Convention on Nuclear Safety requires in Article 8 each of the signatory Member States (MSs) to "establish or designate a regulatory body entrusted with the implementation of the legislative and regulatory framework referred to in Article 7, and provided with adequate authority, competence and financial and human resources to fulfil its assigned responsibilities."

IAEA has published a number of documents [1] to assist MSs on the essential elements of a training framework for staff working on nuclear activities, and this includes the regulatory bodies. It convened Technical Meetings (TM)

in December 2007
http://www-ns.iaea.org/downloads/ni/training/report_technical-meeting_2007.pdf
and December 2008
http://www-ns.iaea.org/downloads/ni/training/report_technical-meeting_2008.pdf

to advise the IAEA on how it can best assist MSs to meet their training needs and comply with these documents. The second of these TMs reached a broad consensus supporting the setting up of the Steering Committee (SC), as well as a smaller Bureau that could meet to help plan and steer the work between the main meetings of the Steering Committee.

Bureau Meetings were held at the CSN Headquarters in Madrid on 22 and 23 April 2009 and 22 and 23 September 2009. The main aims of these meetings were to establish:

- A proposed Plan of Work,
- the Agenda for the Steering Committee meeting in Vienna from 2 - 4 December 2009,
- and, finalise Terms of Reference for the Steering Committe*e (Appendix 9)*.

The Proposed Agenda for the Steering Committee is given in Appendix 1 and the participants are listed in Appendix 2.

The meeting was opened by M. Jamet, Director of the Division of Nuclear Installation Safety (NSNI), IAEA who welcomed delegates to the first meeting of the Steering Committee and spoke of the importance of competence in the Safety Fundamentals and the attention given to the topic in IRRS missions. He also outlined the two TMs, mentioned above, which had led to the setting up of the Steering Committee and the Bureau.

The meeting was also addressed by Mr Fernandez Moreno, Commissioner of CSN, Spain. Mr Moreno spoke of the importance to CSN of the management of its human and technological resources and spoke of the continuing process of exchanging experience between Regulatory Bodies (RB) and the support that IAEA was providing to help maintain and continually improve RB's competence.

---

1 IAEA Safety Standards Series No. GS-R-1, Legal and Governmental Infrastructure for Nuclear, Radiation, Radioactive Waste and Transport Safety, IAEA, Vienna, 2000. Available at: http://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/publications/PDF/Pub1093_scr.pdf
IAEA Safety Standard Series Safety Guide No. GS-G-1.1, Organization and Staffing of the Regulatory Body for Nuclear Facilities, IAEA Vienna, 2002. Available at: http://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/publications/PDF/Pub1129_scr.pdf
IAEA Safety Standards Series No. GS-R-3, The Management System for Facilities and Activities, Safety Requirements, IAEA, Vienna 2006. Available at: http://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/publications/PDF/Pub1252_web.pdf
IAEA Safety Standard Series Safety Guide No. GS-G-3.1, Application of the Management System for Facilities and Activities, Safety Guide, IAEA, Vienna 2006. Available at: http://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/publications/PDF/Pub1253_web.pdf

After a round-table of introductions, the Chairman of the SC, Mr Ian Britten, noted that the participants represented appropriately senior positions in the RBs they represent and this was important in providing opportunities to share experiences and proposing lines of enquiry. He reminded participants of the IAEA meetings which have preceded the first meeting of the SC and which had established a Mission Statement for the SC which was: "*To advise the IAEA on how it could best assist Member States to develop suitable competence management systems for their Regulatory Bodies*".

He proposed three general objectives for the meeting: "*Provide assurance that the Bureau has been moving things in the right direction; confirm that the work programme is good enough (and to change it, if necessary); and to identify task groups for new work*".

Mr Britten then referred to the proposed Agenda for the meeting (Appendix 1), pointing out that it was flexible and could be altered as needed, as the meeting developed. The meeting agreed to this Agenda.

Mr Britten drew member's attention to the Minutes of the last technical meeting which proposed the setting up of the SC and Bureau and the Terms of Reference of the Steering Committee**,** circulated before the meeting.

2. Review of the Proposed Plan of Work

Mr Britten gave an outline of the Draft Proposed Plan of Work (PW) developed in the Bureau meetings (See Appendix 4). The approach proposed by the PW was intended to give: clear direction; a viable and meaningful plan; and manage delivery. The structure of the PW was: that the aspiration of the SC was clearly described in "Vision" and "Mission" statements; "Aims" are identified as discrete outcomes which are needed in order to achieve the Vision; and a number of actions are required, together with associated strategies and plans, with which to deliver those outcomes.

The Vision is that: "*Adequate policies and strategies for providing sufficient and competent human resources are in place in Member States to ensure effective nuclear safety regulation at NPPs consistent with IAEA Safety Standards*", and the corollary of this is that the role of Steering Committee is to advise the IAEA and that the work of the SC is to be incorporated into IAEA programmes.

Three "Aims" are identified in the proposed WP; these are:

"***Aim I****: Adequate tools are available for helping the RB to establish and implement an adequate competence management system.*
Aim II: *A system is in place for sharing knowledge, training materials and exchanging information on training events.*
Aim III: *To incorporate the outcome of the Steering Committee's work into the development of IAEA safety standards which deal with competence of the regulatory body*".

Three Breakout Working Groups were proposed (Appendix 3 identifies the group members), each group to discuss one Aim. The framework for the discussion was:

> *Is the aim sensible? – timing; realistic; and relevant to all MS*
> *The "Actions" identified in the Draft Work Programme for each Aim - will they deliver the aim?; Are there enough / too many?*
> *How to deliver the Aims? - volunteers / task groups; how to monitor progress?*

Appendix 5 summarises the detailed discussion thread proposed for this breakout session and a summary (in note form) of the outcomes of these discussions and the concluding plenary session.

3. Reports from IAEA

Ms. M. J. Moracho NSNI, IAEA started the second day (4 December) by giving a presentation in which she demonstrated navigating through the IAEA website. Using the route: *Our Work> Safety and Security> Training> Nuclear Installation Safety> Training for Nuclear regulatory Bodies (NPPs)*, she showed the repertoire of training material and DVDs of training courses and referred to the Basic Professional Training Course (BPTC which is an IAEA course for new junior professionals.
In the page "Nuclear Installation Safety Training Support" a link also allows persons to sign up for a newsletter which will regularly identify new material on the website.

A major comment on Ms Moracho's presentation from several members of the SC was that although there was a considerable amount of useful material available a user had to be aware of the navigation route through the site to access material. The IAEA search facility would not, in the absence of this knowledge of navigation routes, enable the material to be efficiently accessed and this led to a later recommendation from the SC.

Ms Moracho then went on to give a presentation on the IAEA "Guidelines for Self Assessment of Competence Needs for Regulatory Bodies" (SACoN). She addressed the need for SACoN for Regulatory Bodies; a systematic approach to identify current and desired competencies, determine the gaps, and design and implement training programmes to address the desired competencies. SACoN can be used either to expand or refocus an existing training programme or to build a new training programme, but she recognised that SACoN may require extensive resources and time. She referred to IAEA-TECDOC-1254, *[ftp://ftp.iaea.org/dist/nsni/rgbd_trg.pdf]* which provides guidance for planning the training of the various types of staff required by the regulatory body. It organises the competencies in a 'quadrant' structure the four arms being: *1. Legal basis and regulatory processes competencies; 2. Technical disciplines competencies; 3. Regulatory practices competencies; and, 4. Personal and interpersonal effectiveness competencies.*

Ms Moracho showed examples of the IAEA self-assessment computer-based questionnaire that provides an aid to establish the competence (Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes) profile of a regulatory body, which in turn enables a gap analysis to be performed and training programmes planned. Thus it can be used as an integral module within the overall planning system of the RB.

4. Review of the IAEA Self Assessment Model

The SC broke into the same breakout groups as previously to discuss the Guidelines for Self assessment of competence needs for Regulatory Bodies. The groups discussed (See Appendix 5, for detailed questions): *Group 1 - Examine the application of the guide to technical competence (quadrant 2); Group 2 - Consider how to use the document to predict future staffing and competence needs; Group 3 - Consider the routine application of the tool for assessment of current staff.*

Appendix 6 summarises the detailed discussion thread proposed for this breakout session and a summary (in note form) of the outcomes of these discussions and the concluding plenary session.

5. Review of the use of questionnaires by the SC

A further breakout session was held to discuss the questionnaires that had been distributed after the Bureau meeting. Rather than discuss the answers provided by MSs, which have not yet been analysed, the Breakout Groups concerned themselves with whether the use of questionnaires is likely to be a valuable and useful working method for the future work of the steering committee. *Group1 discussed the "Training Systems"*

questionnaire; Group 2, the "web-links" questionnaire; and Group 3, general questions on the future use of questionnaires by the SC.

Appendix 7 summarises the detailed discussion thread proposed for this breakout session and a summary (in note form) of the outcomes of these discussions and the concluding plenary session.

6. Presentations on recent developments in MSs

On the third day, 5 December, presentations were made by Ms Katalin Petőfi-Tóth, Hungary**;** Mr Mohammad Sadiq, Pakistan**;** Mr Pierre Mignon, Belgium; Mr Viktor Szabó, Slovakia and Mr Ian Britten, UK on recent developments in their countries.

Ms Petőfi-Tóth described knowledge management at HAEA and its training system which was part of the QA system. Annual and Longer term training plans were made and the system was based on the IAEA systematic approach to training system. The methodology of Internal review and corrective actions was described. An example Lotus Notes based training needs assessment was shown, which broke needs down into 13 technical areas, similar to those used in IAEA guidance.

Mr Sadiq described the very intensive pressure on training in PNRA resulting from an increase in the size of the organisation from 35-40 in 2001 to over 240 now. With a Vision statement that PNRA was to become a world class RB; there had been the twin problem of ageing staff and rapid expansion. Training started out using IAEA packages. A two-pronged approach for recruitment and training Regulatory Staff adopted: a fast-track direct recruitment drive; and recruitment through fellowship schemes with external Institutes. In 2003-04, PNRA performed a TNA based on the IAEA four-quadrant competency model (TECDOC-1254). This identified 52 training modules for junior, intermediate and senior level regulatory staff delivered in-house and externally. Mr Sadiq gave a very comprehensive analysis of a further TNA carried out this year, which members of the SC found very valuable in showing in detail an example of the IAEA model in action.

Mr Mignon first described the new RAMG (EU) programme of training assistance to RBs. A number of European training organisations will offer training, either to one or several beneficiaries, or in some cases, as part of EC-IAEA cooperation. A training agency will act as an intermediary contracting organisation in charge of administration and payment of the costs. He also described well-established regulatory training offered by STUK and the activities of ENSTTI the European Nuclear Safety Tutoring and Training Institute.

He then reported on activities in the recently formed BEL V, the Technical Safety Organisation performing regulatory activities and controls, in support to the Regulatory Authority (FANC). The staff, of 60, includes 20 newcomers in the last 2 years. Intensive training has been needed at reasonable cost using: self-study, internal training sessions, external training and on the job training or tutoring. Internal training for newcomers has used the quadrant model of TECDOC 1254 as a base.

Mr Szabó described a computer based training system for regulatory staff in the Slovak Republic. ÚJD SR has had its own training system since 2000, the Systematic Approach to Training (SAT) was used as the basic methodology in the project. But the module delivering specific technical knowledge and skills/attitudes was too big and expensive and disproportionate. A new model has been developed, using computer-based training. Training needs and competency analysis was carried out for all staff in order to develop training programmes for particular categories of employees depending on required competences, taking into account future/middle-term activities of the NRA SR, valid legislation and international practice (e.g. the IAEA documents-TECDOC 1254) and other factors. 100 modules were developed and an evaluation tool with a 3000 question-set. A number of example pages from the computer-based training were presented.

Mr Britten used his session to share a problem. He showed an example page from an "On the Job" (OJT) training record used in NII. This describes the competence in question and identifies several competence

objectives, how those competences should be demonstrated and who is to make the assessment of competence. The inspector undertakes some on the job training and then makes the demonstration of the competence he or she has obtained, for example, by writing a report on the training or through the normal process of reporting on visits, inspections etc. Mr Britten reported that the process is not working adequately as line managers are usually allocated to make the assessment of competence and some feel they are not able to make the judgement. Inspectors are requesting more opportunities for training than are available and inspectors are feeding back that the competency outcomes are often not needed to the depth tested.

7. Report on relevant developments in IAEA

Mr Caruso NSNI, IAEA, gave a useful description of relevant developments in NSNI, particularly in IRRS, the programme for Embarking Countries and the training programme for regulators. IRRS was now a major service for regulators with about ten missions in two years, including to France, UK and (last week) to Russia. Training of regulators staff was an element looked at by IRRS missions. In answer to a question from Mr Britten, Mr Caruso said that sharing good practice between regulators is a challenge because of the differences between them, IAEA's role was to advise on improvement by seeking and sharing good practice and it would recruit people if needed to facilitate this. Mr Mignon asked about Embarking Countries and Mr Caruso's reply was that IAEA was producing a road map on how to use the Safety Standards, which includes advice on which SSs to give priority to at each stage of a country's development and what organisation should be responsible for its implementation. This guide (DS424) was in drafting (planned to be approved in Q3/4 of 2010) at the moment and NSNI would welcome comments from members of the SC.

8. Formulation of a new draft of the Plan of work

An earlier Breakout session had discussed the proposed Plan of Work and during the meeting various comments had arisen. Mr Britten had redrafted the PW overnight before the third day and presented his proposal to the meeting for discussion. Appendix 8 shows this proposal, which is marked to show changes from the draft PW.

Ms Moracho proposed that, in addition to the discussion in the meeting, members of the SC were invited to send comments within the next two weeks and the Bureau should finalise it. She also called for SC members to volunteer to contribute to resolving some of the actions. Mr Britten suggested that, in commenting, members should ask the questions: Is it balanced and is it properly strategic in view?

In discussion it was noted that the divisions of actions into aims had resulted in several actions being almost duplicates.

Detailed comments were:

- 1.4 refers to development of training manuals - can examples be presented to the SC?
- 2.1 and 1.3 are related (see comment above)
- 2.5 refers to IAEA documents which have been translated into another language – is it possible to feed them back to IAEA for inclusion in the web-page, or to hyperlink them?
- 2.2 and 3.1 are closely related
- Perhaps 3.1 and 3.2 should be merged
- 3.3 - the SC to advise IAEA on how to ensure that Safety Standards being developed which have training as an element, give consideration to the outputs of the SC
- Expand 2.4 - SC needs to consider how better to capture MS experiences and how to incentivise MSs to provide them
- Each action should have a leader

9. Summary of Conclusions and Actions

Conclusions and actions are presented below in note form; they divide up into a small number of themes:

Consolidated document

- Rationalising into one document: Tec Doc 1254, the self assessment guidelines, IRRS reports and existing standards that refer to training.
- Decide on form (Tec Doc, S. Report, possibly a safety guide), update and revise
- Tec Doc - Quadrant2 - identification of training –additional disciplines (decommissioning, human factors, security, transport etc.) – (unresolved issue)
- Review where/ what key parts of IAEA quadrants are supported by what training material in meeting the requirements of new starters in the RB.
- Intelligent customer – Competence requirements of RBs using external sources of advice and TSO's
- Embarking Countries – how to ensure that guidance is applicable to them
- Preamble to overarching document to report on MSs experience of using Tec Doc or self assessment guide, methodology

Self assessment guide

- What is the experience of the countries which have used it- (feedback to inform drafting, not to refer to this within document)
- Is it realistic to use as a part of the planning system for staffing and resource needs – if so, minor changes to the tables to incorporate future as well as present needs
- Consider the use of the self assessment guide for current and future needs as an integral part of the RBs planning process
- Possible use in self assessment in preparation for IRRS
- Implementation of the guidelines could be discussed in each country during IRRS missions
- Prioritisation of gaps – experience on how to do this in needed
- Resource intensity – tailoring the model for the needs of individual RBs
- Discipline needs to be transferred from annex III and put into the table
- How to evaluate training effectiveness (is this a new competence?) – needs to be designed into the TNA system

Sharing and gathering of information

- The Process for gathering of information is for IAEA to produce and operate
- A process is needed to facilitate the sharing of information (Aim 2) and aim 2 has to be amended to reflect the fact that this process is an agency process but has to involve the MSs in providing information
- IAEA will include a digest of information with periodic updates on training material
- IAEA to organise a database of good practice (not "Best" practice)
- How to make information from regional groups more widely available
- How to capture information about training available from other bodies or agencies (e.g. NEA).
- Pakistan offered to share their training material, in English
- Think about how to identify good practice
- Better engagement with IAEA internal training strategy
- IAEA process for aligning SC work with parts of other developing SSs which relate to training and competence in RBs.

Barriers to sharing

- Some MS's don't have training information on their websites
- Methodology for IAEA to capture information – policies, help, methodology
- The need to make the website more accessible for training material

- Consider whether language barriers mitigate against good sharing – e.g. if a MS translates IAEA guidance can IAEA link to this guidance in MSs language
- Translate MS's training materials into English for IAEA sharing?

Questionnaires

- Future questionnaires: - Think about analysis first - Quantify answers - Identify what works best - Identify difficulties
- Include a question for those who indicate IAEA tools not used to find out why they do not use them
- The results from questionnaires need analysis (Task group? – unresolved)
- Seek more questionnaire responses (aim for 20)

SC work programme

- Dividing up into steps and formulating target dates - Programme schedules required
- Analyse questionnaires with special attention to analysis of Q4 (quality of IAEA website) and summarise in a report (to include additional SC work, good practices, items for IAEA/NSNI website) cleared through SC and issued as 'deliverable'

10. Conclusion

The Chairman, Mr Britten proposed three general objectives at the commencement of the first meeting of the Steering committee: "*Provide assurance that the Bureau has been moving things in the right direction; Confirm that the work programme is good enough (and to change it, if necessary); and to identify task groups for new work*".

The meeting successfully met the bulk of these objectives. It considered the Terms of Reference for the SC and reviewed the Plan of Work proposed by the Bureau. Changes have been proposed to the Plan of Work and members have been asked for detailed comments by email in preparation for the PW to go forward to the Bureau for consideration and adoption. It reviewed the IAEA self-assessment model and recommended its amalgamation with Tec Doc 1254 into a consolidated document. It also recommended that further MSs are urged to complete the questionnaire and that an analysis is carried out on the results.

No specific task groups have yet been identified.

Note that the next Bureau meeting is provisionally scheduled for the 1st Quarter of 2010.

Appendix 1 – Final Agenda for the SC Meeting, 3 – 5 December 2009

WEDNESDAY, 2 DECEMBER 2009, 9.30 A.M.		
09:30	Opening of the Meeting	*Mr Ph. Jamet DIR-NSNI* *Mr. Fernández Moreno, Commissioner of CSN of Spain*
09:50	Introduction of participants	
10:10	Presentation and Adoption of the Agenda	*Mr. J. Britten (UK) Chairman*
10:20	Presentation of the Minutes of the last Technical Meeting in December 2008	*Mr. J. Britten (UK) Chairman*
10:40	Coffee Break	
11:00	Reports from the Bureau Meeting including ToR and proposed Work Programme for the Steering Committee • Discussion of the Work Programme • Set up of Working Groups (WG)	*Ms. M. Moracho,RAS* *All*
12:30	Lunch Break	
14:00	Discussion of the Work Programme – Continuation	*All*
15:15	Presentation of conclusions by the WG and discussion	
16:00	Coffee Break	
16:20	Presentation of conclusions by the WG and discussion– Continuation	
17:00	Adoption of the Work Programme and Close of the day	
17:30	Reception	

THURSDAY, 3 DECEMBER 2009		
09:00	Reports from the IAEA: • New web design, new web links • Revisions of BPTC text book Presentation of the IAEA "Guidelines for self assessment of Competence need for the Regulatory Bodies"	*Ms M. Moracho, RAS*
10:00	Working Groups	
11:30	Presentations and conclusions of Working Groups	
12:40	Lunch Break	
14:00	Presentation and discussion of results from the questionnaires	
15:30	Coffee Break	
16:00	Discussion on future work related to questionnaires	
17:00	Close of the day	

FRIDAY, 4 DECEMBER 2009		
09:00	Report on relevant development of IAEA (relevant safety Standards, IRRS guidelines)	*Mr. Caruso, SH-RAS*
09:30	Presentations on recent developments, volunteers by the Member States and others	
10:25	Coffee Break	
10:40	Outline and agreement to actions for 2010	*Mr. L. Summers*
12:40	Lunch Break	
14:00	Conclusions and dates for next meeting	
15:30	Closing of the Meeting	

Appendix 2 Participants of the SC Meeting

COUNTRY / ORGANIZATION	PARTICIPANT		OFFICIAL MAILING ADDRESS
	Title	**Last Name** **First Name, Middle Name Initials**	
Belgium	Mr	Mignot Pierre	Bel V Rue Walcourt 148 1070 BRUXELLES BELGIUM Tel: 0032 2 5280234 Fax: 0032 2 5280102 Email: pierre.mignot@belv.be
Brazil	Ms	Wieland Particia	Email: pwieland@cnen.gov.br
Bulgaria	Mr	Kosturkov Lyubomir	Nuclear Regulatory Agency 69, Shipchenski Prokhod Boulevard 1574 SOFIA BULGARIA Tel: 00359 2 9406817 Fax: 00359 2 9406919 Email: l.kosturkov@bnra.bg
China	Mr	Yu Weicai	Longhua District 570125 Haikou City, Hainan Pronivce CHINA Email: yuwc@hnpc.cc
Finland	Ms	Koskinen Kaisa	Finnish Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority (STUK) P.O. Box 14, FI00881 Helsinki, Finland Tel: +358 9 75988322 Fax: + 358 9 75988382 Email: Kaisa.Koskinen@stuk.fi
France	Mr	Lachaume Jean-Luc	Autorité de Sûrete Nucléaire (ASN) Autorité de Sûrete Nucléaire (ASN) 6 place du Colonel Bourgoin 75572 Paris Cedex 12 France Tel: +33 (1) 4019-8613 Fax: +33 (1) 4019-8836 Email: jean-luc.lachaume@asn.fr

Germany	Ms	Jelinski Marianne	Gesellschaft fuer Anlagen und Reaktorshicherheit mbH Schwertnergasse 1 D-50667 Cologne Germany Email: Marianne.Jelinski@grs.de
Hungary	Ms	Petofi-Toth Katalin	Hungarian Atomic Energy Authority (HAEA); Nuclear Safety Directorate Fényes Adolf u. 4 1036 BUDAPEST HUNGARY Tel: 0036 1 4364913 Fax: 0036 1 4364909 Email: tothkati@haea.gov.hu
India	Mr	Singh Om Pal	Department of Atomic Energy (DAE); Atomic Energy Commission (AEC); Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research (IGCAR) KALPAKKAM, Tamil Nadu 603 102 INDIA
Lithuania	Ms	Adomaityte Ugne	State Nuclear Power Safety Inspectorate (VATESI) A. Gostauto Street 12 01108 VILNIUS LITHUANIA Tel: 00370 5 2661585 Fax: 00370 5 261 44 87 Email: u.adomaityte@vatesi.lt
Pakistan	Mr	Sadiq Mohammad	Pakistan Nuclear Regulatory Authority Pakistan Nuclear Regulatory Authority Mauve Area G-8/1, Peshawar More, Islamabad P.O. Box: 1912 Islamabad 44000 Pakistan Tel: +92 51 9263029 Fax: +92 51 9263007 Email: dr.sadiq@pnra.org

Romania	Mr	Biro Lucian	National Commission for Nuclear Activities Control (CNCAN) Director General National Commission for Nuclear Activities Control (CNCAN) Nuclear Reactors Division 14 Liberatatii Blvd. Bucharest 5 Romania Tel: +403160572 Fax: +403173887 Email: lucian.biro@cncan.ro
Russian Federation	Ms	Kapralov Evgeny	FSUE VO "Safety" FSUE VO "Safety" Taganskaya St. 34a 109147 Moscow Russian Federation Tel: 0074959116484 Fax: 0074959110886 Email: kapralov@vosafety.ru
Russian Federation	Ms	Sokolova Elena	Federal Service for Environment, Technological and Nuclear Supervision (Rostechnadzor); Scientific and Engineering Centre for Nuclear and Radiation Safety (SEC NRS) Malaya Krasnoselskaya ulitsa 2/8, dom 5 107140 MOSCOW RUSSIAN FEDERATION Tel: 007 495 2640352 Fax: 007 495 2642859 Email: sokolova@secnrs.ru
Slovakia	Mr	Szabo Viktor	Nuclear Regulatory Authority of the Slovak Republic (UJD SR) Bajkalska 27 P.O. Box 24 820 07 BRATISLAVA SLOVAKIA Tel: 00421 2 5822120 Fax: 00421 2 58221166 Email: viktor.szabo@ujd.gov.sk
Spain	Mr	Moreno Francisco, Fernandez	Consejo de Seguridad Nuclear (CSN) Calle Justo Dorado Dellmans, 11 28040 MADRID SPAIN Email: ffmr@csn.es

Spain	Ms	Villanueva Delgado Isabel	Consejo de Seguridad Nuclear (CSN) Calle Justo Dorado Dellmans, 11 28040 Madrid Spain Tel: 0034913460320 Fax: +34 91 346 01 03 Email: ivd@csn.es
United Kingdom	Mr	Britten Ian	Health Safety Executive NII Health Safety Executive NII Email: Ian.Britten@hse.gsi.gov.uk
United Kingdom	Mr	Summers John, Lyndon	3 Roosevelt Avenue LANCASTER, Lancashire LA1 5EJ UNITED KINGDOM Tel: +44 152 460 410 Email: lyn_summers@hotmail.com
Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development	Ms	Dunnlee Janice	Deputy Director General OECD Nuclear Energy Agency Le Seine St. Germain 12, boulevard des Iles 92130 Issy-les-Moulineaux France Fax: +33 (0) 1 45 24 11 15 Email: Janice.DUNNLEE@oecd.org

Appendix 3 – Breakout Group Members

Group 1	**Group 2**	**Group 3**
K Koskinen	P Wieland	P Mignon
M Sadiq	M Jelinski	J Lachaume
E Sokolova	A Ugne	O P Singh
U Adomaityte	E Kapralov	R Lucian
F Moreno*	K Petofi-Toth	L Kosturkov
I Villanueva Delgado	L Biro	V Szabo
		J Dunnlee

Appendix 4 – Draft Plan of Work developed in the Bureau for discussion

Proposed Plan of Work for the

STEERING COMMITTEE ON COMPETENCE OF HUMAN RESOURCES FOR REGULATORY BODIES IN MEMBER STATES WITH NPPS

22 SEPTEMBER 2009

Vision:

- *"Adequate policies and strategies for providing sufficient and competent human resources are in place in Member States to ensure effective nuclear safety regulation* at NPPs consistent with the IAEA Safety Standards."*

* *"Nuclear Safety Regulation" involves both the regulatory body as well as TSO activities.*

Mission:

- *To advise the IAEA on how it could best assist Member States to develop suitable competence management systems for their Regulatory Bodies.*

Aim I:

Adequate tools are available for helping the RB to establish and implement an adequate competence management system.

Actions:

1.1 The IAEA to publish the proposed "Guidelines for Competence Needs Self Assessment for the Regulatory Body" by the first quarter 2010.

At plenary meeting on 2-4 December 2009, the Steering Committee Members to endorse the use of the document.

IAEA to send the document to publications Committee by March 2010.

1.2 Complete and balance the list of competencies of the four quadrants of TECDOC 1254

Scientific Secretary to circulate the updated list of competencies before the 2-4 December

1.3 To develop a package for training of the Training Coordinator in the Regulatory Bodies as identified in the "Guidelines for Competence Needs Self Assessment for the Regulatory Body". (To be initiated by the IAEA by the second quarter of 2010)

1.4 Outline a document gathering the best practices for establishing an adequate competence management system,

1.4.1 The Steering Committee members to fill in the questionnaire on their competence management system as prepared by the Chairman and discussed with the Bureau.

1.4.2 Analyse the results, produce a report on good practices and possibly a new TECDOC, or one combined with the current TECDOC 1254.

(Bureau, by tentatively second quarter of 2010)

Aim II:

A system is in place for sharing knowledge, training materials and exchanging information on training events.

Actions:

2.1 Periodic report by the IAEA and feedback by SC members on continuous upgrading of the IAEA web site on Nuclear Installations Safety training, including uploads of new materials, information on training events and interesting links.

2.2 Identify which parts of quadrant 2 do not have enough training materials available for the Member States´ needs.

(To be discussed at next meeting of the SC, 2-4 December 2009)

2.3 Develop and design appropriate training to correct gaps identified in 2.2.

(Not before finalising 2.2)

2.4 Give feedback on the updated chapters of the BPTC.

(To be discussed at SC meeting December 2009. Steering Committee)

2.5 SC members to respond to the questionnaire prepared by P. Mignot and discussed in the Bureau in order to identify web links and information related to networks, owners groups, or other resources.

2.6 To suggest specific presentations from delegates to inform SC members about recent developments that may be useful to Member States.

(Continuous: The Bureau)

Aim III:

To incorporate the outcome of the Steering Committee's work into the development of IAEA safety standards which deal with competence of the regulatory body.

Actions:

3.1 To be informed and discuss the status of development of all safety standards which deal with the competence of the regulatory body.

(Annual report by the IAEA)

3.2 To contribute to the development of the existing IAEA safety standards which refer to the competence of the regulatory body by:

- Examining their adequacy and identifying the need for additions and changes.
- Following up and giving feedback on their content through the current Safety Standards committee's coordinators.

(Steering Committee when appropriate)

Appendix 5 – Notes on the Breakout session to discuss the "Aims" listed in the Plan of Work

Discussion thread

Three "Aims" are identified in the proposed PW; these are:

"***Aim I****: Adequate tools are available for helping the RB to establish and implement an adequate competence management system.*

Aim II: *A system is in place for sharing knowledge, training materials and exchanging information on training events.*

Aim III: *To incorporate the outcome of the Steering Committee's work into the development of IAEA safety standards which deal with competence of the regulatory body*".

The framework for the discussion was:

Is the aim sensible? – timing; realistic; and relevant to all MS

The "Actions" identified in the Draft Work Programme for each Aim - will they deliver the aim?; Are there enough / too many?

How to deliver the Aims? - volunteers / task groups; how to monitor progress?

Group1 - Aim I: *Adequate tools are available for helping the RB to establish and implement an adequate competence management system*

- It is realistic (possible to reach)
- It is relevant to all member states
- Timing - MSs need material as soon as possible, but IAEA needs some time to produce and validate all the material
- Aim 1 - To assess the tools needed we should agree what we mean by an adequate competence management system. In IAEA documentation there are both requirements and examples, but there might be a need for a safety standard on training - Perhaps all countries do not need similar tools - The number of actions is sufficient but should be reconsidered in the next meeting (The Agency should be open to take any suggestions
- Action 1.1 - IAEA should consider to develop this further and publish it as a safety guide (helps also aim 3)
- Action 1.2 - This is included in draft guidelines for competence needs self assessment for the regulatory body (posted to some participants in October and available on IAEA web-site)
- Action 1.3 - This will help MSs to establish a competence management system. Because the training coordinator has very important role, the training package should be developed as soon as possible (start with the syllabus)
- Action 1.4 – Tec Docs are very useful, but this should be upgraded to safety standard level - It can be very challenging to find the best practices from the answers of the questionnaires (IRRS missions reports could be useful)
- Suggestions and observations
    - Pakistan is willing to share its training material (syllabus) with other countries
    - IAEA should organize a database on best practices (Aim 2) (but who can arbitrate on what is good practice) and also on training material from MS
    - IAEA could produce training manuals (to harmonize training)

Group 2 Aim II: *A system is in place for sharing knowledge, training materials and exchanging information on training events.*

- Timing: A more detailed schedule of the system implementation should be worked out. The deadline should be established to identify that the system "is in place".
- Realistic: The aim is realistic because it reflects interest of MS in a tool for sharing best practice.
- Relevant to all Member States: The aim is relevant to all MS because regulatory practices of the MS have much in common, although some MS with well developed processes may experience lack of motivation in sharing their information.

- General comment - Clear procedure should be developed for the information exchange between the IAEA and MS (ex. Liason Officers in TC).
- Action 2.1generally is relevant to deliver the aim
  - Comment: IAEA should prepare a periodical information digest about updates of the training and methodological materials on their web-site and correspond it to the MS (SC members).
- Actions 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - the actions are relevant to deliver the aim
  - Comments:
  - Necessary attention should be paid also to the other quadrants (1, 3, 4)
  - Actions 2.2 – 2.4 should be rescheduled.
- How to Deliver
  - Suggestions:
  - A workgroup should be formed to analyze the answers to the questionnaire. The results of the analyses should be provided to MS (SC members).
  - A task group should be formed to develop the schedule (see "Timing") and detailed description of the actions.
  - A task group should be formed to analyze quadrant 2 and identify gaps taking into consideration updates of the BPTC.
- Generalized question for SC: Language barrier - MS develop training materials in their mother tongue. This is a barrier for the information sharing.

Group 3 Aim III: *To incorporate the outcome of the Steering Committee's work into the development of IAEA safety standards which deal with competence of the regulatory body*".

- 3.1 Okay but 2 actions:
- 3.1.1 Report by IAEA about status during yearly SC meeting
- 3.1.2 Information by IAEA directly to SC nominated person when standard is approved
- 3.2 Delete in second bullet: « through the current Safety Standards committee's coordinator »
- Action by Working Group or Bureau, then SC
- 3.3 To contribute to the development of new IAEA Safety Standards (Item 3.2)
- 3.4 Improve the searching function for Safety Standards on website finding documents is difficult if you don't know the navigation system
- 3.5 Use information from IRRT and IRRS reports to identify gaps in Safety Standards
- IAEA Produce periodical digests and updates on what is available

Appendix 6 – Notes on the Breakout session to discuss the IAEA Guidelines for Self Assessment

The SC broke into the same breakout groups as previously to discuss the self assessment model.

Discussion threads

General questions for all groups:

What more has to be done to bring the document to the point where it can be published?
Whether its effectiveness needs to be evaluated?

Group 1 - Examine the application of the guide to technical competence (quadrant 2) and address the following:

Is it sufficiently comprehensive?
Can it be applied to a TSO?

Group 2 - Consider how to use the document to predict future staffing and competence needs, in particular:

is its use in this way practicable?
what may be the particular difficulties?

Group 3 - Consider the routine application of the tool for assessment of current staff, in particular:

resources required to operate the system
potential difficulties relating to performance management

Group 1 : *Examine the application of the guide to technical competence (quadrant 2)*

Is quadrant 2 sufficiently comprehensive? - The list is not yet comprehensive has to be checked against BPTC and the Basic Knowledge Framework.

- Technologies that should be added
  - security and physical protection
  - management system
  - transportation safety
  - QA (including int. codes ASME, IEEE, IEC etc)
  - decommissioning techniques
  - NPP operation (if RB grants certificates to operators)

Can it be applied to a TSO? - You have to know which competences are available at RB and which at TSO

- RB should be able to be an 'intelligent customer' on all technical disciplines
- RB must assess the technical proposals at TSO
- TSO can use this framework, at least quadrant 2

What more has to be done to bring the document to the point where it can be published

- Would be a user friendly solution to have only one document on this area:
  - update TECDOC 1254 and include all this information into updated document and publish it as a safety report / next year before next steering committee meeting

Whether its effectiveness needs to be evaluated?

- IAEA should gather information on how widely this guideline is used in MSs and if MS do not use it what are the main reasons and if there are some proposals how to improve it

Other proposals

- Include into Quadrant 1: Competencies Related to Legal Basis and Regulatory Processes (1.3. Regulatory Guidance Documents Competency)
- The ability to consider existing Regulatory System of Documents as a whole and to suggest the ways of its improvement
- It is important on High Level not only to analyze the information regarding individual Regulatory Documents, but also synthesize it for the System development as a whole.

Group 2: *Consider how to use the document to predict future staffing and competence needs*

Difficulties:
- To make correct and reliable prediction of future competence needs a systematic approach to planning of RA functions and tasks in future should be implemented
- In plenary session it was noted that TNA can be an integral part of RBs planning system
- The guidelines and tool can be used more to assess future competence needs, than to assess future staffing because there are different options to feel competence gaps

Practical use for future staffing and competence needs:
- The guidelines and Excel tool should be integrated into the RA planning process
- Another KSA column could be added to the Excel tool to assess future needs (to see also differences between current and future needs).

General considerations:
- Before publishing the document a pilot project on competence needs self-assessment with the developed Excel tool could be done in some MS (In plenary session later it was noted that a number of MSs had already used the process (see the presentations of Pakistan, Hungary etc.)
- The document/tool could be used as a part of self-assessment questionnaire during IRRS preparation

Group 3: *Consider the routine application of the tool for assessment of current staff*

General opinion :
- Very useful tool
- Very heavy to use, requires a lot of human resources, therefore to be adapted to each specific situation
- Guidelines to be published as a TECDOC or a safety guide?
- Kind of synthesis of TECDOC 1254
- Added values: gap analysis + Training Coordinator + balanced competencies between quadrants

Before publication :
- Include Appendix III disciplines in table
- Revise Appendix III according to SC comments

Note Bulgaria experience:
- self assessment + evaluation by manager
- Priorities to be established on basis of short term activities
- Largest gap is in practical training (quadrant 3) on site
- Job descriptions had to be adapted after application of the guidelines, because some competencies were missing in the organisation

Effectiveness :
- MS should inform IAEA on the effectiveness after use of the guidelines
- Implementation of the guidelines could be discussed in each country during IRRS missions

Appendix 7 – Notes on the Breakout session to discuss the use of questionnaires by the SC

Discussion thread
Rather than discuss the answers provided by MSs, which have not yet been analysed, the SC concerned itself with whether the use of questionnaires is likely to be a valuable and useful working method for the future work of the SC.

General question for all the groups: *is the use of questionnaires likely to be a valuable and useful working method for the future work of the steering committee? (NB TOR require the Bureau to keep working methods under review)*

Group 1: Question specific to the "Training Syatems" questionnaire
Identify any omissions/concerns over the current question set (training systems and practices).
How can the results of the training systems questionnaire be used to identify and develop good practice for MS's?

Group 2: Qestion specific to the "Web Links" questionnaire
Identify any omissions/concerns over the current question set (web-links).
How can the results of the web-link questionnaire feedback be used to stimulate moves toward a more strategic approach to the development of better networking?

Group 3: Question specific to working practice with respect to using questionnaires
What is the best way forward with regard to analysis and use of the questionnaire feedback?
Are there other more efficient ways to generate the information provided by the questionnaires?
How should the SC/Bureau identify other areas where use of questionnaires (or alternative techniques) may be applicable?

Group 1: Question specific to the "Training Syatems" questionnaire
Identify any omissions/concerns over the current question set (training systems and practices).
How can the results of the training systems questionnaire be used to identify and develop good practice for MS's?

Overall concern:
- Method itself is good, but it should be clear (in advance) how the results will be used.
- For a single MS answering can be very useful because it gives an overall view on this area
- Assessing effectiveness of training should be based on PIs
- 'good but not sufficient/enough'

Identify any omissions / concerns:
- The answers of questions depending on the situation in MS,
- The questions should be raised in such manner that the answers are quantifiable and easily comparable (scale 1-5, or 1-10) . Then these results could be used in performance assessment within the MS
- Questions dealing with costs seems to be irrelevant (Q7) - answers might be misleading, depending of the very current situation. There might be other indicators such as the proportion of training compared to total working hours
- Suggestions for additional questions
    - What is the practise that is implemented at Your RB that most contribute to successful results
    - Does Your organisation has training facility for practical training? If yes, describe.

- Questions arising problems/difficulties MS are facing in capacity building should be included. (What are the difficulties?)

How can the results of the training systems questionnaire be used to identify and develop good practice for MS's:

- Yes, to some extent, but this will be a very challenging task
- Who is assessing the good practices and on what basis; what is good for one MS might not be suitable for another
- Perhaps it is up to a MS to pick up the practices which they consider useful

Other concerns discussed

- How to train the top management (in some MS top managers are nominated by politicians)
- authorisation, decision making etc.
- It would be helpful for steering committee members to get WG tasks before meetings
- Design the evaluation of training into the training system

Group 2: Question specific to the "Web Links" questionnaire
Identify any omissions/concerns over the current question set (web-links).
How can the results of the web-link questionnaire feedback be used to stimulate moves toward a more strategic approach to the development of better networking?

Omissions/concerns:

- No question addresses the issue of what assistance (methodological, resource etc.) do MS need to provide their training materials and share information
- Q No.2. If the answer is negative it is difficult to understand why
- Q No.3 requires details only if the answer is positive.

Ways of using the results of the web link questionnaire to stimulate moves toward a more strategic approach to the development of better networking:

- A special web page should be created in the IAEA web site training block where all the web links to the websites containing information on training materials, tools etc., mentioned by MS in their answers should be listed. Each link should have a description what training materials, tools it contains
- Answers to question 4 should be specially and deeply analyzed to improve the IAEA website quality and capabilities
- If MS use the IAEA training materials, such materials might be translated into these MS mother tongues. If so, these translated materials should be copied back to the IAEA to increase its multilingual training material database.

Group 3: Question specific to working practice with respect to using questionnaires
What is the best way forward with regard to analysis and use of the questionnaire feedback?
Are there other more efficient ways to generate the information provided by the questionnaires?

- Ask for more contributions (target: 20 countries)
- Summarise (5 pages maximum) the responses in a report with all the responses in Annexes
- identify additional areas for SC work
- identify good practices, if any
- identify items to be updated in IAEA/NSNI website
- Send the report to SC members for comments/additional inputs
- Issue the report as a deliverable of the SC

Appendix 8 - Proposal for a new Draft of the Plan of Work

Draft 3 of Proposed Plan of Work for the

STEERING COMMITTEE ON COMPETENCE OF HUMAN RESOURCES FOR REGULATORY BODIES IN MEMBER STATES WITH NPPS

4 DECEMBER 2009

Vision:

- *"Adequate policies and strategies for providing sufficient and competent human resources are in place in Member States to ensure effective nuclear safety regulation* at NPPs consistent with the IAEA Safety Standards."*

* *"Nuclear Safety Regulation" involves both the regulatory body as well as TSO activities.*

Mission:

- *To advise the IAEA on how it could best assist Member States to develop suitable competence management systems for their Regulatory Bodies.*

Aim I:

Adequate tools are available for helping the RB to establish and implement an adequate competence management system.

Actions:

1.1 Determine the best way in which to document existing and potential future IAEA material on expectations relating to training competence management, to include "Guidelines for Competence Needs Self Assessment for the Regulatory Body", TECDOC 1254 and/or successor (including any outstanding rebalancing of quadrants, addition of disciplines to quadrant 2, development of quadrant 1 in relation to regulatory body development self-improvement, inclusion of intelligent customer capability), linkage to other relevant IAEA standards, outcome of questionnaire analysis etc.

~~**1.2** Complete and balance the list of competencies of the four quadrants of TECDOC 1254 (NB the development of the self-assessment at 1.1 has partially completed this but further work is required to ensure that, in particular, quadrant 2 is developed in a way that allows training and development provisions to be identified as fully as for the other quadrants). **Change.**~~

1.2 To develop a package for training of the Training Coordinator in the Regulatory Bodies as identified in the "Guidelines for Competence Needs Self Assessment for the Regulatory Body". (To be initiated by the IAEA by the second quarter of 2010)

~~**1.4** Develop a single IAEA document that maps out competence expectations (to cover update of TECDOC 1254, inclusion of self-assessment tool, inclusion of relevant sections of other standards and guidance, abstraction of IRRS reports, outcome of analysis of questionnaires). **New.**~~

1.3 Develop a methodology for identifying good practice and an IAEA system to maintain a data-base of good practice, to include materials offered by Pakistan **New.**

1.4 IAEA to evaluate success of training manuals developed for BPTC and develop for other key competence areas as appropriate. **New.**

1.5 IAEA to evaluate reported difficulties with training website accessibility and propose improvements, in particular the search facility. **New.**

1.6 Complete questionnaire activity on training systems (20 MS) and analysis to identify good practice for competency management (to include lessons learned from first use that will be useful for future use – eg, think about analysis first, quantify answers, identify what works best, identify difficulties). Analysis to lead to a report (to include additional SC work, good practices, items for IAEA/NSNI website) cleared through SC and issued as 'deliverable'. **New.**

1.7 Refine IAEA self assessment guide, to include:

- experience of the countries who have used it
- use as a part of the planning system for staffing and resource needs, changes to the tables to incorporate future as well as present needs
- Possible use in self assessment for IRRS
- Prioritisation of gaps – experience on how to do this
- Resource intensity – tailoring the model for the needs of individual RBs
- Discipline needs to be transferred from annex III etc. and put into the table
- **Evaluation of training effectiveness (new competence?)**

Aim II:

A system is in place **within the IAEA** for sharing knowledge, training materials and exchanging information on training events. **Change.**

Actions:

2.1 Establish an IAEA process and practice for sharing relevant training information (to include obtaining, 'capturing' and making available information from regional centres and other agencies eg NEA, in particular to embarking countries). **New.**

2.2 Establish a periodic report by the IAEA and feedback to SC members on continuous upgrading of the IAEA web site on Nuclear Installations Safety training, including uploads of new materials, information on training events and interesting links, and a digest of explanatory information. **Change.**

~~**2.3** Identify which parts of quadrant 2 do not have enough training materials available for the Member States´ needs.~~

~~(To be discussed at next meeting of the SC, 2-4 December 2009)~~

~~**2.3** Develop and design appropriate training to correct gaps identified in 2.2.~~

~~(Not before finalising 2.2)~~

(now covered by 1.2)

~~**2.3** Give feedback on the updated chapters of the BPTC.~~

~~(To be discussed at SC meeting December 2009. Steering Committee)~~

2.3 Complete questionnaire activity on weblinks (20MS) and analysis to establish further improvements to IAEA information sharing process. Analysis to pay particular attention to Q4 (quality of IAEA weblinks) and lead to a report (to include additional SC work, good practices, items for IAEA/NSNI website) cleared through SC and issued as 'deliverable'. **New.**

2.4 ~~To suggest specific presentations from delegates to inform SC members about recent developments that may be useful to Member States.~~ Develop a web location for preserving examples of good MS practice (see also 1.3) **Change.**

2.6 ~~IAEA to establish process that includes an explanatory digest with information that is included with periodic updates on training developments.~~ **New.**

2.7 ~~Analyse feedback from questionnaires and propose new actions to the Bureau.~~ **New.**

2.5 IAEA to develop system that identifies MS's training material that is translated into IAEA official language for MS use, and places it on web for use by others with similar language needs. **New.**

2.6 Identify and take steps to eliminate any barriers to the exchange of training information. **New.**

2.7 Establish an IAEA page for useful web-links.

Aim III:

To incorporate the outcome of the Steering Committee's work into the development of IAEA safety standards which deal with competence of the regulatory body.

Actions:

3.1 IAEA to report to SC annually on development of all safety standards which deal with the competence of the regulatory body. **Change.**

(Annual report by the IAEA)

3.2 IAEA to advise SC member when new standards are issued that have implications for training in NP competence. **Change.**

3.3 Develop and establish process for aligning SC work with IAEA work, including the way in which the SC contributes to development of new standards that include training requirements. (could be combined with 3.1?) **New.**

3.4 Identify information in IRRS reports that may help to benchmark MS in the area of competence management . **New.**

Appendix 9 Terms of Reference of the Steering Committee

CONTENT

1. Introduction

Some countries envisage a renaissance of nuclear power. Many of these have operated NPPs for a long time. A number of regulators face problems in the recruitment of new staff and in defining training programmes to provide and maintain the necessary competence to perform their regulatory functions.

The Convention on Nuclear Safety requires in Article 8 each of the signatory Member States (MSs) to "establish or designate a regulatory body entrusted with the implementation of the legislative and regulatory framework referred to in Article 7, and provided with adequate authority, competence and financial and human resources to fulfil its assigned responsibilities."

IAEA has published a number of documents to assist MSs on the essential elements of a training framework for staff working on nuclear activities, and this includes the regulatory bodies. These documents include:

GS-R-1	Legal and Governmental Infrastructure for Nuclear, Radiation, Radioactive Waste and Transport Safety
GS-R-3	Management System for Facilities and Activities
GS-G-3.1	Application of the Management System for Facilities and Activities ;
GS-G-1.1	Organisation and Staffing of the Regulatory Body for Nuclear Facilities; and
TECDOC-1254 A	Training and staff of the regulatory body for nuclear facilities: competency framework.

The IAEA convened a Technical Meeting (TM) in December 2007 to advise the IAEA on how it can best assist MSs to meet their training needs and comply with the above mentioned documents. Some 17 Member States were represented, with a very broad geographical spread, and a wide variety of NPP designs.

In December 2008, a second Technical Meeting was held. The meeting reached a broad consensus supporting the setting up of a Steering Committee (SC), as well as a smaller Bureau which could meet to help plan and steer the work between the main meetings of the Steering Committee.

2. Terms of Reference

Vision

- *"Adequate policies and strategies for providing sufficient and competent human resources are in place in Member States to ensure effective nuclear safety regulation* at NPPs consistent with the IAEA Safety Standards."*

  * *"Nuclear Safety Regulation" involves both the regulatory body as well as TSO activities.*

Mission

- *To advise the IAEA on how it could best assist Member States to develop suitable competence management systems for their Regulatory Bodies.*

Aims

- Adequate tools are available for helping the RB to establish and implement an adequate competence management system.
- A system is in place for sharing knowledge on best practices, training materials and exchanging information on training events.

- To incorporate the outcome of the Steering Committee's work into the development of IAEA safety standards which deal with competence of the regulatory body.

Structure & Functions

Chairman

The chairman of the group will be responsible for:

- Leading the plenary meetings
- Programme and planning of the meetings, ensuring the implementation of actions between meetings, assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of the working methods and results.

- She/He will be assisted by a Bureau and the IAEA secretariat

IAEA Secretariat

- NSNI will provide a Technical Officer as scientific secretary (SS).
- SS will inform of any IAEA development of interest for the group, including events, conclusions from technical meetings, new material useful for training. The SS will co-ordinate activities internally e.g. with other IAEA divisions/departments.
- SS will also support the Chairman and the Bureau with the work programme and planning of meetings, follow-up the implementation of actions, and assessment of the working methods and results.

The Bureau

The Bureau shall consist of limited group (around five) of representatives including a chairman and the IAEA scientific secretary. They shall meet at least once between plenary meetings in order to follow up the implementation of actions of the work programme, assess the working methods and results and define the lines to take for next plenary meeting.

Member Profile

- Candidates for individual membership of the Steering Committee should have a good grasp of training methodologies, be able to provide broad views of their own organizational or national perspectives and commit to participate and contribute to the working plan.
- They provide information of interest for the group and updates on their regulatory training issues as well as implement actions and work in task forces as agreed in the plenary meetings

Working Methods

Plenary Meeting: it will take place once a year. The meetings will have duration of 3 days and the venue and date will be decided by the group.

Between plenary meetings, there will be communication and follow-up by e-mail, and the main results and work programme of the group shall be published on the web.

Outputs of the Meeting

At the end of each plenary meeting the following shall be produced:

- Conclusions of the meeting (they will be published at IAEA web on NSNI training)
- Proposal for specific training projects, if appropriate
- Actions and deadlines
- Work programme for next year including a follow-up of implementation of actions from last meeting
- If needed, Task Forces (TF) dealing with specific issues may be set up as a result of the plenary meeting. The TF will have a leader who will report to the Bureau on the progress of the work.

Self-Assessment

In order to accomplish the objectives of the group, an evaluation of the effectiveness and efficiency of the working methods shall be conducted periodically under the responsibility of the Bureau, who might propose changes on the working methods as a result of such evaluations. The evaluation of results and implementation of the work programme will be conducted by the Bureau.