



Australian Government
Radiation Health Committee

MINUTES

25 June 2014
Miranda, NSW

Chair	Keith Baldry (SA)
Members	Ross Bevan (ACT), Brad Cassells (VIC), Simon Critchley (QLD), Peter Karamoskos (person representing public interests), Carl-Magnus Larsson (ARPANSA), Robert Lyon (NSC representative), Len Potapof (NSW), Russell Robinson (NT), Barbara Shields (TAS)
Secretary	Peter Colgan assisted by Alex Kalaiziovski and Selva Kumar
Apologies	Roslyn Drummond (other member), Andrew Kerans (other member), Hazel Upton (WA)
Observers	Peter Johnston, Stephen Solomon, Ivan Williams, Mary Aerts (WA)

1. STANDING ITEMS

Item 1.1 Welcome & apologies

Chair

The meeting opened at 0930. The Chair welcomed those present and noted the apologies.

The Chair advised the Committee that a call for declarations of conflict of interest from Committee members will be a standing item, and asked if anyone had any conflict of interest to raise and be recorded by the Secretary.

No matters of conflict of interest were brought forward.

During the meeting Dr Larsson intervened to inform the Committee that Ms Judy Evans and Ms Helen Topfer, both of whom had been involved in RHC support activities, and would shortly be leaving ARPANSA. The Committee, through the chair who was asked to convey same, thanked both ARPANSA employees for their hard work and dedication, and wished them well for their futures.

ACTION 1: Letter of thanks be sent from RHC chair to Ms Evans and Ms Topfer [KB]

Item 1.2 Previous minutes

Chair

The minutes from the previous meeting held on 5 March 2014 were confirmed out of session. There were no further comments on the minutes.

Item 1.3 Business arising from previous minutes & Action List

Chair

The Secretary advised the Chair that most of the items in the action list are complete or subject to agenda item papers and discussion.

CONFIRMED

The Secretary advised that outstanding action 22, *Source security update*, is ongoing. Advice from ARPANSA's Security and Community Safety section is that the persons involved have yet to complete the Scheme. Issues surrounding the Scheme that need resolving include the carriage of the Scheme by the appropriate professional body or organisation.

There was no further comment or discussion on item 1.3.

Dr Larsson reminded the Committee of the agreed formal interactions between ARPANSA and its advisory bodies (Council, RHC and NSC) and emphasised the requirements surrounding the granting of a leave of absence from the RHC, and that the Chair may grant such leave.

Item 1.4 Correspondence

Chair

1.4a To University of Adelaide

The Chair informed the Committee that Professor Spooner of the University of Adelaide hoped that the proposed Graduate Certificate in Radiation Management course might commence in 2015.

The Committee welcomed this development and reconfirmed it has a role to play in support of the course.

1.4b To Van Oord

The Secretary advised that Van Oord supplied information in response to the correspondence and that this information was summarised and used to support the drafting of the *Regulatory Expectations for Users of Radiation Sources* paper (Item 2.2b).

1.4c From Radiation Health & Safety Advisory Council – Bonn Call-for-Action

The Committee noted the correspondence from Professor Ray Kemp, Chair, Radiation Health and Safety Advisory Council in which Professor Kemp requests on behalf of Council for the RHC to undertake a review of the Bonn Call-for-Action in relation to the RHC's planned work activities, and provide early feedback to Council.

It was decided that ARPANSA's Medical Radiation Services (MRS) branch should take on the task, initially, of reviewing the Bonn Call-for-Action and make recommendations to support the RHC's response to Council. In the meantime, the RHC should respond to Professor Kemp that the RHC supports Council's request, and also advise of ARPANSA's role, and that further feedback will be provided.

ACTION 2: ARPANSA to review the Bonn Call-for-Action and report its findings and recommendations to the RHC [MRS]

ACTION 3: Chair RHC to respond to Professor Kemp on behalf of the RHC (in time for RHSAC August 2014) [KB, NURS]

Item 1.5 Public Interest Issues

Peter Karamoskos

Dr Karamoskos informed the Committee that the Northern Land Council had withdrawn its nomination of Muckaty Station as the site for the National low and intermediate level radioactive waste management facility.

Item 1.6 Radiation Health and Safety Advisory Council

Chair

1.6a Summary of Council meeting of April 2014

The Committee noted the summary report and overview of the April 2014 RHSAC meeting.

With the aim of improving the working relationships between the advisory bodies, the Committee was informed that the Chairs of each advisory body will aim to meet prior to each Council meeting.

2. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION & DECISION

Item 2.1 RHC Work Program

2.1.1 Project Progress

2.1.1a Progress Chart

The Committee noted the current status of each RHC Project as charted in the *Priorities and Progress Chart – Current Projects* (Item 2.1a)

Progress on the following projects was discussed:

Radiation Protection in Planned Exposure Situations

Mr Baldry discussed the meeting of the Working Group for the Planned Exposure Code (PEC), which was held on 24 June 2014 at ARPANSA's Miranda office.

The Working Group continued its review of the draft PEC by resolving a number of issues arising from prior meetings.

The Working Group discussed the glossary of the PEC and that RPS F-1 Fundamentals contains a glossary that should cover all codes, and the IAEA has a glossary that is common across its publications

Definition of 'responsible person' used in the PEC was discussed and it was suggested that it might exclude some people that deal with radiation and have responsibilities over the use of radiation sources e.g. service personnel. It was questioned whether responsibilities should apply beyond the person responsible for the source. It was resolved that generally the person owning the source of radiation has responsibility over its use.

Some discussion took place on the need for section 3 of the PEC *Responsibilities of the occupationally exposed person*. It was resolved that section 3 be retained.

There was discussion on how to apply the member of public dose limit to the embryo or foetus when a pregnancy is declared by an occupationally exposed female. The wording in the PEC (which is derived from schedule 1 of the NDRP) was compared to wording from paragraph 186 of ICRP 103. It was decided that the wording of the ICRP should be used in the PEC and the wording in the NDRP should be amended to align with the ICRP.

It was agreed that the incident/accident recovery planning framework from requirement 46 of GSR Part 3 should be addressed in the Radiation Management Plan requirements of the PEC.

Questions were raised about the use of 'planned' and 'existing' in draft ARPANSA codes. However, it was clarified that the wording comes from the ICRP and IAEA and therefore in keeping with international best practice.

It was agreed that the description of this type of RPS publication be changed from 'Code of Practice' to simply 'Code', as the nature of codes of practice are such that they usually apply to a specific use of radiation e.g. for dentistry, which is not the case with the PEC.

ELF Guideline

Mr Colgan informed the Committee of the status of the ELF guideline project, and that a new RHC Project Proposal for the ELF guideline is included as agenda item 2.1.2g.

Mr Colgan explained that, based on the advice from the Office of Best Practice Regulation (OBPR), a combined decision/consultation RIS is required including a completed comments resolution table.

Control of IPLs and Lasers for Cosmetics

Mr Critchley advised the Committee that the project was progressing in its development of a RIS for OBPR review; however progress had slowed somewhat due to the resignation of Dr Claire Lyngå.

Mr Solomon advised the Committee that Mr John Javorniczky from ARPANSA's Radiation Health Services (RHS) branch, who has expertise in UV radiation protection, has picked-up the project from where Dr Lyngå had left it and is now the Technical Support Officer.

Certification of Personal Radiation Monitoring Services (PRMS)

Mr Critchley advised the Committee that the descriptive content of chapter 7 of DS453 *Occupational Radiation Protection*, which is dedicated to the assessment of occupational exposure, is robust but at critical points moves away from mandatory to non-mandatory requirements. Mr Critchley suggested that the non-mandatory content could be clarified by an additional part of the document for its use in Australia. At the moment we don't have an Australian document that specifies the types of monitoring that needs to be provided in the workplace, and chapter 7 of DS435 (with a preface for use in Australia) could provide this.

Professor Johnston suggested that if there is content in DS453 that the Committee does not agree to then it should provide such feedback to the IAEA.

On the certification of PRMS providers, Mr Critchley posed the question as to whether it was necessary for Australian regulators to certify PRMS providers and if so, could there be a mechanism within NATA for this to take place?

Mr Baldry spoke of the need to accredit PRMS providers so as to ensure that they are providing an adequately compliant service. It was also recognized that OHS legislation plays a role in ensuring accurate monitoring of workers health.

ACTION 4: Members to provide comment on chapter 7 of DS453 [RHC]

ACTION 5: Apply Chapter 7 of DS453 as interim guidance on assessment of occupational exposure (for PRMS services) [NURS, Radiation Regulators]

National Incident Reporting

Mr Critchley expressed his disappointment in the progress of the incident reporting framework project and suggested that it would benefit from tapping into existing incident reporting systems implemented by public hospitals.

Mr Solomon offered the services of RHS in support of the project.

ACTION 6: ARPANSA RHS to support Mr Critchley in the work of the National Incident Reporting project [RHS]

2.1.1b Status of the Proposed Safety Guide on Radiological Clearance/Closure Criteria and Management of Sites Contaminated as a result of Past and Present Activities

The Committee noted the current status of the project and the changes in the Working Group membership.

Mr Baldry discussed how the project might interact with National Environment Protection (Assessment of Site Contamination) Measures (NEPM). Although it is recognised that the NEPM does not address radiological protection, it was suggested that this national system of auditors could be tapped into as a useful resource.

The Committee noted the work of the Working Group, which has developed a draft schematic based on IAEA publications (including DS459 and DS473). The schematic describes the process for releasing practices or existing exposure situations from regulatory control.

The Committee discussed the proposed draft 'unrestricted release' criteria cutoff of 0.3 mSv (above background) for practices (planned exposure situations), and the proposed public dose limit of 1 mSv for existing situations, with 'restricted release' applying between these two points.

Dr Larsson supported a 1 mSv criteria for application to planned exposure situations and a different criteria should be applied for clearance and closure, otherwise the site would remain a managed site - walk away criteria could be aligned with clearance and exemption levels.

ACTION 7: Work on building IAEA guidance into the first draft Safety Guide [WG]

ACTION 8: Provide the next RHC meeting with the first draft Safety Guide for decisions to be made on clearance/closure criteria [WG]

2.1.1c Code of Practice for the Safe Transport of Radioactive Material

Dr Samir Sarkar informed the Committee that the OBPR has advised that a RIS is not required.

Stakeholder comment was sought on the final draft of RPS2. Three comments were received (one later withdrawn). A comments resolution table was prepared and referred to OBPR for confirmation that their previous advice that no RIS is required still holds, which was subsequently confirmed by the OBPR.

The Committee discussed Annex 1 of RPS2 *Health effects of ionizing radiation and standards for control of exposure* and whether the information contained in the annex accurately reflects the current position and knowledge of low doses of radiation to which the annex applies a clear cut off of 100 mSv.

Dr Larsson questioned the need for the annex as the now published Fundamentals (RPS F-1) covers the topic. It was agreed that Annex 1 was no longer required.

Dr Cassels raised the matter of the wording surrounding ARPANSA's jurisdiction over transport of radioactive material, in that where the draft RPS2 advises the reader that ARPANSA has no jurisdiction over such transport it should be changed to reflect that ARPANSA has jurisdiction over transport of Commonwealth sources.

DECISION: Approval of draft RPS2, contingent on deletion of Annex 1. Project completed.

ACTION 9: Amend wording in the WG responses to public comment received on RPS2 to reflect that ARPANSA has jurisdiction over transport of Commonwealth sources (or similar) [WG]

ACTION 10: Progress approved RPS2 through the 21 Step Workplan, including submission to RHSAC for their endorsement [WG]

2.1.1d Radiation Health Series 31 Mapping and Adoption of IAEA Publications

Mr Kalaiziovski advised the Committee of the work underway in mapping the mandatory requirements of RHS31 *Code of practice for the use of industrial radiography equipment* (1989) against the draft PEC; IAEA Specific Safety Guide SSG-11 *Radiation safety in industrial radiography*; and specific ISO standards on industrial radiography equipment and sealed source classification.

Using the example of replacing RHS31 with a combination of the PEC and SSG-11, the following options were proposed for adopting IAEA publications:

Option 1 - Apply the PEC and direct users of industrial radiography equipment to the existence of SSG-11 via a link from ARPANSA's website.

Option 2 – Apply the PEC and formally adopt SSG-11 as the appropriate non-mandatory guidance.

Option 3 – Re-badge SSG-11 as a RPS Code & Safety Guide with a preamble that identifies the selected paragraphs that are to be regarded as mandatory requirements.

Option 4 – Develop a new RPS Code and Safety Guide based on SSG-11.

DECISION: The Committee indicated their preference for Option 2, but provided in principle support for Options 2 or 3 at this stage to allow further consideration of the issues

ACTION 11: Complete RHS31 mapping and report back to RHC for further discussion [NURS]**2.1.2 RHC Project Proposals**

The Committee noted the RHC Project Proposals (agenda items 2.1.2a – 2.1.2i).

2.1.2a Fundamentals for Protection Against Non-Ionising Radiation

Dr Solomon informed the Committee that the objective of the project is to produce a new document (similar to RPS F-1) titled *Fundamentals for protection against non-ionising radiation*, which will provide underpinning science and protection principles that are closely aligned with international best practice.

The Committee was advised that WHO has commenced work on an IAEA basic safety standard style document. Overall, a lot of work is required philosophically.

The Committee generally agreed with Mr Critchley's suggestion that the RHC should consider providing input into the WHO publication.

The Committee approved the Project Proposal

Mr Baldry volunteered to be Project Manager and Dr Rick Tinker is to be the Technical Support Officer

ACTION 12: TSO and PM to formulate WG membership and workplan for RHC endorsement [KB, RT]**2.1.2b Code for Government, Legal and Regulatory Framework for Safety**

The objective of the project is to produce a RPS Code that establishes requirements in respect of the governmental, legal and regulatory frameworks for safety. The framework for safety is to be established for the entire range of facilities and activities.

The Committee approved the Project Proposal

Mr Baldry volunteered to be Project Manager and Mr Selva Kumar is to be the Technical Support Officer

ACTION 13: TSO and PM to formulate WG membership and workplan for RHC endorsement [KB, SK]**2.1.2c Code for Management and Safety Culture**

The objective of the project is to develop a RPS Code *Management Systems* to define the requirements for establishing a management system that ensures, by considering the implications of all actions not within separate management systems but with regard to safety as a whole, that safety is not compromised.

The Committee approved the Project Proposal

Mr Lyon volunteered to be Project Manager and Mr Jordan Lock is to be the Technical Support Officer

ACTION 14: TSO and PM to formulate WG membership and workplan for RHC endorsement [BL, JL]**2.1.2d Code for Radiation Protection in Existing Exposures**

The object of this project is to produce a RPS Code *Protection of the public and workers from ionizing radiation in existing exposure situations*.

Dr Solomon informed the Committee that the code will be a top-level publication in line with approach taken with the PEC. The code is required as there have been major changes in radiation protection philosophy and standards, in particular the ICRP have revised recommendations and subsequent guidance, and the IAEA has published its new BSS (GSR Part 3).

The Committee approved the Project Proposal

Ms Sarsha Collet is the nominated Technical Support Officer. A Project Manager has yet to be assigned.

ACTION 15: PM to be sought, then TSO and PM to formulate WG membership and workplan for RHC endorsement [RHS, SC]**2.1.2e Code for Emergency Exposures to Ionising Radiation**

The object of the project is to produce a RPS Code covering *Emergency exposures to ionising radiation* to protect the public and first responders in the case of a radiological or nuclear incident resulting in emergency release to the environment.

The Committee approved the Project Proposal

Dr Cassels volunteered to be Project Manager and Dr Marcus Grzechnik is to be Technical Support Officer

ACTION 16: TSO and PM to formulate WG membership and workplan for RHC endorsement [BC, MG]

2.1.2f Safety Guide for Emergency Preparedness and Response

The object of the project is to produce a RPS Safety Guide *Emergency preparedness and response for ionizing radiation releases* as guidance in support of the proposed RPS Code *Emergency exposures to ionising radiation*.

The Committee approved the Project Proposal

Dr Cassels volunteered to be Project Manager and Dr Marcus Grzechnik is to be Technical Support Officer.

ACTION 17: TSO and PM to formulate WG membership and workplan for RHC endorsement [BC, MG]

2.1.2g Guidelines on Limits of Exposure to Electric and Magnetic Fields – 0 to 3 kHz (ELF fields)

The objective of the project is to produce a guide on managing exposure to ELF fields.

The new guide will replace the NHMRC Interim Guidelines (1989), and it is intended to align it with current scientific research and guidance from ICNIRP (2010).

Dr Solomon informed the Committee that the current draft ELF guidance will become two documents. Chapters 1, 2 and 3 will form the guide itself, and chapter 4 of the draft guide will form separate advice on precautionary measures for ELF exposure. The advice on precautionary measures (an ARPANSA document or RHC statement), will be a separate project, which will be released at the same time as the guide.

The Committee approved the Project Proposal

Dr Shields volunteered to be Project Manager and Dr Ken Karipidis is to be Technical Support Officer

ACTION 18: TSO and PM to formulate WG membership and workplan for RHC endorsement [BS, KK]

2.1.2h Revision of RPS3 – Maximum Exposure Levels to radiofrequency Fields – 3 kHz to 300 GHz

The objective of the project is to review and update RPS3 *Maximum exposure levels to radiofrequency fields – 3 kHz to 300 GHz*. The revision will take into account the ARPANSA expert panel review of RF literature as well as updated guidance from ICNIRP and WHO. The result may be that a code will be prepared based on ICNIRP, supported by a Guide.

The Committee approved the Project Proposal

Dr Ken Karipidis is the nominated Technical Support Officer. A Project Manager has yet to be assigned.

ACTION 19: PM to be sought, then TSO and PM to formulate WG membership and workplan for RHC endorsement [RHS, KK]

2.1.2i Revision of RPS14 (GSR Part 3 alignment)

The objective of the project is to revise RPS14 *Code of practice for radiation protection in the medical applications of ionising radiation*.

Professor Johnston informed the Committee that the alignment of RPS14 with the requirements of GSR Part 3, in reality, could produce a new code of practice for radiation protection of the patient with a subset of safety guides to cover dentistry, chiropractic, research purposes, and discharge of patients.

The Committee approved the Project Proposal

Mr Critchley volunteered to be Project Manager and Mr Paul Marks is to be Technical Support Officer

ACTION 20: TSO and PM to formulate WG membership and workplan for RHC endorsement [SC,PM]

2.1.3 Prioritising the Work Program

2.1.3a RHC Workplan – Priority of RPS Publications

Item 2.1.3a was carried over for discussion at the next RHC meeting.

Item 2.2 National Uniformity

Carl-Magnus Larsson

2.2a National Uniformity & the NDRP

The Committee noted the discussion paper on National Uniformity and the NDRP, which represents the views of the RHC working group members and does not represent official policy views of the Commonwealth or state and territory jurisdictions.

Dr Larsson expressed his view that an agreement needs to be reached on what national uniformity is, and that there is a need to arrive at a definition or statement on national uniformity and how to achieve it.

On the NDRP, Dr Larsson suggested that its use, significance and purpose in achieving national uniformity needs to be decided, therefore discussion on that is also required to formulate a view. He also enquired that if the NDRP is found to be useful, how do we speed up the process of its preparation and adoption?

Mr Baldry advised the Committee that the purpose of the paper is to articulate the issues on the effectiveness of national uniformity and the NDRP and discuss a way forward. One of the problems about national uniformity is the differences in commitment amongst regulators due to jurisdictional issues. It is a question of reconciling the Committee's and ARPANSA's desired outcomes with those of the jurisdictions' executive. Overall, what is desired is to provide radiation protection with less resource burden on jurisdictions and less burden on users and stakeholders.

It was observed that the Committee often talks about national uniformity, but it may not be adequately addressing the concerns of the regulated entities. There may be differing expectations between the professions, for example dentists may not be so concerned about national uniformity, whereas borehole loggers would be. The level of concern across different users of radiation needs to be identified. Further, if the jurisdictions don't ask stakeholders what is of interest to them the RHC might be concentrating on what is not important. One Committee member emphasized that the drivers for national uniformity should be based on risk, and that industry is more comfortable when resulting regulations are risk informed. Also discussed was the fact that the NDRP has become more than a repository of RHC agreed issues that assist national uniformity.

There was discussion on the usefulness of having a linked reference to the license application process under the relevant Mutual Recognition Act (1992) in each jurisdiction, based on the NSW example provided in the Agenda paper.

Dr Larsson summarized the discussion by proposing that while we had agreement as to what national uniformity is, the fact remains that it is not being implemented. He cited two examples where Advisory Councils seem oblivious to the existence or purpose of the NDRP. The shortcomings of relying on the NDRP process as the primary method of achieving national uniformity was then raised by the Committee, and the possibility of advising COAG/AHMAC/SCoH of this fact was canvassed.

It was suggested that a reminder be sent to all Jurisdictions of the requirements of the Mutual Recognition Act, and that an on-line repository or register should be established where stakeholders

could make regulators aware of national uniformity issues, both ‘wins’, and non-uniformity challenges. RHC could then consider this as the need arises.

ACTION 21: Jurisdictions to investigate the steps they need to take to fully apply the requirements of the MRA and report at the next meeting [RHC Members representing Jurisdictions]

ACTION 22: Prepare a draft stakeholder feedback webpage template or model (mock-up only), for use by state & territory regulators, which provides information on the NDRP & national uniformity, and which allows stakeholders to make regulators aware of any national uniformity issues that adversely affect them [ARPANSA]

ACTION 23: National Uniformity WG to consider the issue further, and come back to RHC with a Discussion Paper exploring options to improve national uniformity [NUWG]

2.2b Regulatory Expectations for Users of Radiation Sources Seeking to Obtain Authorisations in More than One State or Territory – Administrative Protocol)

As was noted in the discussion under 2.2a above, the original NCP Review Recommendation (17) was to ‘incorporate an administrative protocol in the National Directory...for the application of mutual recognition principles’. The Committee noted that the attachment to Agenda Item 2.2B, ‘regulatory expectations’ is essentially such an administrative protocol in that it aims to provide a mechanism for reducing unnecessary regulatory and additional costs for business within the existing agreed national policy of mutual recognition.

Mr Baldry undertook that he would circulate the protocol to the Committee with the view of placing it on ARPANSA’s website as an RHC Statement

ACTION 24: Finalise the ‘regulatory expectations protocol’ and circulate it to the Committee for out-of-session comment and approval (allowing 8 weeks for comment) [KB, RHC]

ACTION 25: Approved Regulatory Expectations protocol to be posted on ARPANSA’s and other jurisdictions’ websites [NURS, state/territory regulators]

Item 2.3 Adoption of IAEA Publications

Diane Harrison
Peter Colgan

2.3a Proposed Radiation Guide: Near Surface Disposal Facilities for Radioactive Waste

In recognition of the ‘in principle’ support by the RHC in its March 2014 meeting to adopt IAEA publications as RPS documents, Mr Colgan briefed the Committee on a proposed method of adopting, via clarification, IAEA Specific Safety Guide No SSG-29 *Near surface disposal facilities for radioactive waste (2014)* as a RPS publication to assist users in Australia (item 2.3a).

Mr Colgan informed the Committee that only minor clarification is required to adopt the IAEA guide in Australia, but some difficulties were highlighted, such as copyright restrictions in using IAEA publications and maintenance of currency due to the periodic updating by the IAEA of its publications.

An alternative was discussed, in that ARPANSA could establish an ‘International Best Practice’ webpage which would provide direct links to international documents, thus avoiding copyright issues and the need to produce ARPANSA publications (item 2.3b).

ACTION 26: Work on SSG-29 to be completed as draft RPS document (in line with Option 2 in 2.1.1d above) and considered at next meeting [RS (GW), NURS]

2.3b Proposed International Best practice (IBP) Page

Mr Colgan tabled hand-out copies of a mock-up concept of the proposed IBP page and advised that the page could be structured to follow the 20 subject areas of the IAEA and ICNIRP guidance, with interpretive text to assist readers, and linked accordingly.

A discussion took place on whether there is a need to clearly list documents that can be referred to directly as IBP as opposed to IAEA documents that are subject to clarification as per the discussion on the RHS31 mapping exercise (item 2.1.1d). It was agreed that no IBP documents would be listed as RPS documents without RHC endorsement. For each RPS document, similar review work to that provided in 2.1.1d, would need to be undertaken in each instance.

ACTION 27: Copyright Issues Paper on Adopting IAEA Guides be prepared for RHC consideration [NURS]

3. INFORMATION ITEMS

Item 3.1 Nuclear Safety Committee

Mr Lyon presented a summary of the NSC meeting held on 20 June 2014.

Item 3.2 International Liaison

3.2a Commission on Safety Standards (April 2014)

The Committee noted the ARPANSA overseas travel report of the meeting of the *Safety Standards Committees Chairs* (7 April 2014) and the meeting of the *35th Meeting of the Commission on Safety Standards* (8-10 April) – IAEA, Vienna, Austria.

Item 3.3 National Response to DS453 Occupational Radiation Protection

3.3a Comments on DS453

The Committee endorsed the Australian comments on DS453 *Occupational Radiation Protection*, plus late comments from Frank Harris, and asked that a consolidated comments table be forwarded to IAEA.

ACTION 28: Forward DS453 comments to IAEA [NURS]

Item 3.4 Proposed National Ban on Solaria

3.4a ARPANSA's response to the ACCC

The Committee noted ARPANSA's response to the ACCC.

Item 3.5 Public Interest in RPS Publications

3.5a Download statistics (Nov 2013 – June 2014)

The Committee noted the download statistics.

Item 3.6 Meeting dates for 2014

The Committee noted the RHSAC, RHC and national and international meeting dates for 2014.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

Item 4.1 Any other business

Mr Critchley raised with the Committee a request from Professor Paul Monsour of the School of Dentistry, University of Queensland for information from each jurisdiction relating to the use of extra-oral cone beam radiography equipment.

The information will be used for academic purposes, and Professor Monsour would be interested in receiving information on equipment registration, make, model, kV, mA etc.

Professor Johnston informed the Committee that ARPANSA has corresponded with the Australian Dental Association on the use of such radiography, and that ARPANSA has done some work in this area.

ACTION 29: Mr Critchley to write to each jurisdiction seeking information on behalf of Professor Monsour.

Item 4.2 Next meeting

To be advised.

Close	1600
Next meeting	19 November 2014, QLD Health, Brisbane (to be confirmed)