

Minutes of the 6th Meeting of the European Radiation Protection Authorities Network (ERPAN)

Date: 23rd of Mai 2011

Venue: ASN, Paris

Participants:

1. Ekström Briggitta, Swedish Radiation Authority, Sweden
2. Faermann Uwe, Bavarian Environment Agency, Germany
3. Fennell Stephen, Radiological Protection Institute of Ireland, Ireland
4. Guzman Olvido, French Directorate General for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection, France
5. Isambert Aurelie, French Directorate General for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection, France
6. Janzekovic Helena, Slovenian Nuclear Safety Administration, Slovenia
7. Marchal Carole, French Directorate General for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection, France
8. Perez Mulas Arturo, Nuclear Safety Council, Spain
9. Saxebol Gunnar, Norwegian Radiation Protection Authority, Norway
10. Stritt Nicolas, Swiss Federal Office of Public Health, Radiation Protection Division, Switzerland
11. Thomas Gareth, Health and Safety Executive, UK
12. Watson Isabelle, Scottish Environment Protection Agency, UK

Apologies for absence:

1. Alvarez Carmen, Nuclear Safety Council, Spain
2. Dejan Zontar, Slovenian Nuclear Safety Administration, Slovenia
3. Kropacek Jan, State Office for Nuclear Safety, Czech Republic
4. Coenen Simon, Federal Agency for Nuclear Control, Belgium
5. Economides Sotiris, Greek Atomic Energy Commission, Greece

1. Introductions

Gareth Thomas (Deputy chairperson) welcomed all the participants and thanked Olvido Guzmán and ASN for organising the venue in their headquarters in Paris.

2. Approval of minutes from previous ERPAN meeting in June 2010

The minutes were approved without any comment.

All the presentations listed below are posted on the restricted area of the ERPAN website at the following address:

http://www.eu-alara.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=85&Itemid=48

3. Recent incident (feedback, lesson learned)

By Gareth Thomas

Presentation on an incident in the UK that occurred on an oil rig.

By Uwe Faermann

Presentation of the department radiation Protection within the Bavarian Environment Agency and its activities in case of events like Fukushima.

4. Involvement of medical physicists in imaging departments in France

By Aurelie Isambert (France)

The control of the dose increase in medicine (imaging) is one of the concern of ASN in France. Medical physicists can play a key role in optimisation of the dose for the radiation protection of patients. For nuclear medicine (diagnostic and treatment), interventional radiology, and conventional radiology, there is a need to identify the tasks of MP and to give guidelines on staffing levels employers (or employees).

5. Dose to extremity in nuclear medicine

By Nicolas Stritt (Switzerland)

An increase in the extremity doses of nuclear medicine staff within Switzerland has been observed. The Swiss Federal Office of Public Health (SFOPH), acting as the surveillance authority, conducted a series of audits to raise awareness of the high extremity doses, especially when handling beta emitters and PET nuclides. The aim was to prevent extremity doses from increasing even further. These audits revealed that avoidable errors could also occur with experienced specialist staff. Considerable reductions in doses could often be achieved with simple measures, such as the consistent use of syringe and vial shielding. Moreover, these investigations confirmed the fear that the effective fingertip doses are much higher than the dose registered by the official ring dosimeter.

6. Result of ERPAN survey

By Stephen Fennel (Ireland)

A resume of the different survey made by the ERPAN network was presented. A discussion about the publication of the different survey on the website was made. These surveys should be published on the ERPAN website under the EAN website.

- Iodine ablation monitoring of sewer discharges
- ERPAN/EGOE survey of dose constraints

7. ICRP consultation on effective dose per unit radon exposure – regulatory implication

By Gareth Thomas (UK)

The practical implication for the regulatory body of the new ICRP dose coefficient for radon was presented. Most of European countries have national reference levels at 400 Bq/m³. The following implications and questions were raised:

- Conflict with ICRP entry level of 1000 Bq/m³
- Worker concerns in relation to non-radiation risks
- Most workers (in workplaces > 400 Bq/m³) currently < 3/10ths dose limit (6 mSv)
- Doubling will mean many persons dose > 6 mSv (= Cat A)
- What if age < 18yrs
- Dosimetry implications
- Implications for classification of areas
- Consideration of historical and life-time doses

8. Merger of regulatory bodies SKI (nuclear security) and the SSI (Radiation protection) in Sweden

By Briggitta Ekström (Sweden)

A presentation about the merger of two units in radiation protection SKI and SSI in Sweden was made. The issues to be solved as well as the gain of such a merger were discussed.

9. ICRP consultation on the effects of radiation on the eye – new dose limit

By Gareth Thomas (UK)

The new dose limit proposed by the ICRP for lens of the eye was presented. Authorities will need to raise awareness amongst duty holders of the scale of the likely dose limit reduction for the eye so that they can discuss their dosimetry needs with their dosimetry services. Authorities will need to commence discussions with dosimetry services since few services offer Hp(3) dosimeters to their clients. This is fine for photon fields because a Hp(0.07) only leads to a 5-7% overestimate of dose. But for beta fields, Hp(0.07) is inappropriate for eye dose assessment under the proposed new limit and will lead to very large overestimates. Some other issues will also have to be considered with this new limit, such as a categorization of workers, applicability of the science behind new limit, sectors most affected by the 20 mSv dose limit, dosimetry, dosimeters and geometry.

10. Inspection philosophy, unannounced inspection

By Stephen Fennel (Ireland)

The purpose of inspection was presented as well as the advantages and disadvantages of announced and unannounced inspections. A survey was also made within ERPAN and most of the countries who responded answered that most inspections by the regulatory bodies are announced. Unannounced inspections are inefficient for inspectors, are disruptive to staff and patients in medicine. Announced inspections provide an extra “incentive” to licensee. There is also unannounced aspect of an announced inspection.

11. BSS Draft 2010 and its implications

By Helena Janzekovic

The EU BSS Draft 2010 was presented as well as its implication for the regulatory bodies. The EU BSS Draft 2010 is a step forward towards a harmonised and comprehensive legislation related to radiation safety within EU countries. The development of a science as well as applications of scientific results requires continuous update of the regulatory regimes. However, the implementation of safety standards is based on the strong commitment of the national regulatory authorities.

12. Collaboration/coordination with HERCA

By Olvido Guzmán (France)

A meeting is planned between HERCA (Head European Radiation Protection Authorities Network) and ERPAN in order to discuss further collaboration and use of synergies between the two authorities networks.

13. Date and venue for the next meeting

The date of the next meeting will coincide with the summer meeting of the EAN. Therefore the next meeting of the ERPAN will be held at the ASN headquarters, 6 Place Colonel Bourgouin, Paris, on Friday 1st of June 2012 from 9h30 until 16h30.

14. AOB

Nothing in particular.

For the Minutes: Nicolas. Stritt, SFOPH, secretary