



Procedure for determining the ‘IRPA view of the profession’

Being the “Voice of the profession”, IRPA is expected and must be able to formulate positions and opinions.

PRESENT SITUATION

Without a defined process, positions formulated by IRPA officials must always be looked at as personal views.

A transparent procedure is needed to give IRPA officials a mandate. This procedure must be simple, adequately fast, communicated.

Obstacles:

- there is no mandate for IRPA to speak for each member society
- even most, if not all, societies are not be able to formulate a harmonized position of their memberships
- there is no practical possibility to install a voting process in order to identify a majority among members
- Just asking AS to formulate their views will not necessarily enable any author to formulate a harmonized view.

Even in cases where there is no chance for THE harmonized position it may be helpful e.g. for a regulatory body to see the spectrum of positions, making clear where there are agreements and where not.

It is recognized that there are many different situations where an ‘IRPA view’ may be required. This could range from a view on a major RP policy issue, to a detailed practitioner perspective on a technical issue. Also, there are different timescale requirements for responding: where we are developing an IRPA internal view the timescale is in our hands, but where we are requested to comment on another organisation’s document (e.g. an IAEA draft Standard) or make a contribution to a workshop/conference then the timescales are defined externally – we either meet the required timescale or have no input!

Our procedure for formulating an IRPA View must therefore be flexible to accommodate these differing requirements.

In all cases of formulating an ‘IRPA View’ the existing base of IRPA positions and perspectives will be taken into considerations, including:

- IRPA Guidance Documents
- Ongoing Committee and Task Group considerations
- IRPA Congress (International and Regional) outputs

PROPOSAL

Our method of formulating an 'IRPA View' will be tiered according to the circumstances. The President will be involved in all considerations, and will have the decision on which option to follow, where possible taking EC views into account.

Tier 1: Major Issues (e.g. the System of Protection Consultation)

An EC member is charged to formulate a first position paper for the "question" to be answered, which is endorsed by the EC. Consultation invitation sent to all AS by the Exec Officer; within a pre-defined time period the AS are requested to give their opinion about the position paper (agree, disagree, comment, proposal for improvement). The nominated EC member amends the original paper as appropriate, and the EC gives final endorsement. *Notes: A second round of consultation may be appropriate in some key situations. The nominated EC lead may work in association with a 'lead' AS.*

Tier 2: Defined timescale for a key document (e.g. IAEA draft Standard - 120 day consultation)

An EC member is charged to lead the consultation, and may decide to prepare a 'key issues' summary. Consultation invitation sent to the EC and to all AS by the Exec Officer; within a pre-defined time period the AS are requested to give their comment. The nominated EC member prepares the IRPA response, which may be an overall consensus or a range of perspectives. Ideally the draft response is issued to the EC for final review, but as a minimum the President must approve the output.

Tier 3: IRPA view on a significant issue for an external conference/workshop/meeting

A nominated EC member formulates a view, where timescales permit seeking input from the EC and if appropriate from any other relevant RP expert (not a full AS consultation!). The final position is agreed by the President. On occasion it may be necessary for the President to respond on behalf of IRPA at relatively short notice: in such situations the President should use 'best endeavours' to seek input from relevant EC colleagues.

Tier 4: Ad-hoc 'working level' issues

Reliance on the judgement of the nominated EC lead, ideally after discussion with the President (if time allows). On occasions IRPA may be represented at a lower-level meeting by an expert from outside the EC. In this case the line to be taken must be endorsed by a nominated EC member.

Endorsed by the IRPA Executive Council, June 2018