AURPO NEWSLETTER

May 2005

CONTENTS **PAGE NUMBER**

Advertisements in this issue

A note from the Editor

Many apologies for the long delay before the publication of our latest Newsletter. This has arisen for a number of unrelated reasons, but at long last, here it is!

This issue has been collated by Graham Hart, who had hoped to take on the role of Editor of the Newsletter, but who regrettably has had to pull out because of other commitments.

In preparing this issue, Graham has made the following comments:

"My experience in editing Newsletters for other organisations leads me to the view that this is a critical time for the AURPO Newsletter. It has always been accepted by Newsletter Editors that they take on a measure of the responsibility for goading others into producing articles and items for the Newsletter. Nevertheless, some of that responsibility has to rest on all the members of the Association. If they really want a Newsletter, they have to be prepared to regularly submit items for publication. It may be that other sources of information, such as the internet and the web-based listserver discussion forums, have now taken on so much of the role that the Newsletter used to cover that the Newsletter is now no longer needed. It is my belief that this is a decision that the Association now needs to consider."

ANNOUNCEMENTS

44th Annual General Meeting of the AURPO

In accordance with Section 6(a) of the Constitution, notice is hereby given of the above which will be held at 17:00 on Tuesday 6th September 2005 at Manchester Metropolitan University. Any motions, duly proposed and seconded must be received by the Secretary by Monday 8th August 2005. All papers will be available at the meeting.

Christine Edwards
Acting Honorary Secretary

Call for nominations for Membership of the Executive Committee and its Standing Committee(s)

Nominations are invited for membership of the Executive Committee of the AURPO. This Committee consists of President, Secretary, Treasurer and five other members of the Association.

Nominations are also invited for membership of the Technical Co-ordinating Committee.

All nominations, proposed and seconded, must be received by the Secretary by Monday 8th August 2005. If necessary a Returning Officer will be appointed for all elections.

Christine Edwards
Acting Honorary Secretary

President's Report

Hi all,

A bit of a delay but thankfully the Newsletter is out again! Many thanks to Christine for achieving this. Graham Hart had hoped to take over, but since his offer he has been 'enlisted' to several Boards/Committees in RPA2000, SRP and IPEM resulting in him having to withdraw it. He has written some comments about the Newsletter for you to think about. I hope it does continue as I believe our members find it very useful and it is highly regarded by many outside AURPO. However, it does need input from you, the members. We are optimistic that we have a new Editor so please support it!

The AGM looms near again. Accommodation in Manchester has been reserved and the TCC are currently finalising the Scientific Programme. Sponsorship and Exhibitor support are good and the social programme also looks very good once again. Do please attend and also think how you might help us in the running of the Association as this is an aspect causing us some worry. Should we consider having an Administrator for all the routine work, someone with book-keeping knowledge and who would ensure we do things on time, chase subs/reports etc? It would most likely cause a rise in subs. Maybe you know someone e.g. retired or not working but with the relevant skills and willing/able to help in some way? We are a small Association with the AGM our only organised meeting other than those of the two committees. Members do often find getting/making the time vanishes due to work and other commitments. If anyone has any thoughts about this do please contact me or any Executive member. We are pleased to have AGM's lined up until 2008 i.e. Oxford 5th – 7th Sept 2006, Geenwich 4th – 6th Sept 2007 and Liverpool 2nd – 3rd Sept 2008.

We note that IRP is almost definitely soon to merge with SRP. Talks on the merger are over, SRP AGM has agreed to it and IRP awaits the result of its members ballot but expects also to agree. It was asked at the SRP AGM if AURPO had considered merging with SRP - this would help SRP in its quest for Chartered status. The response was a negative and that it wished to remain separate, which I, and I believe most of you, would agree with.

Richard Harrison has worked hard in sorting out many gremlins to do with the website and is hopeful he is nearly there – watch this space!

The HSE Forum last met in October and I thank Andy Hancock for attending for us. This year's Forum will be an Open meeting.

Christine and I had a very constructive meeting with our colleagues in Strathclyde about the Radiation Protection course. Trevor has taken over as the course co-ordinator and a paper of his follows later. I do thank Kevin for all his hard work in getting it going, his enormous input over the years and for his never ending enthusiasm.

To this end I re-iterate my request for people to offer to help in some way - see you in Manchester.

Tony Richards
25th April 2005

AURPO Certificate in Radiation Protection

The third AURPO/ University of Strathclyde Course - AURPO Certificate in Radiation Protection - officially ended for Part 1 on April 1st and the deadline for Part 2 is May 1st 2005. This has been a successful web-based course designed to enable prospective RPAs to demonstrate knowledge and core competencies and make a significant contribution to an RPA Portfolio and hence accreditation.

The course was initially intended to assist existing RPAs through the accreditation process. That time has now passed and future students will probably be aspiring RPAs or existing RPOs looking to improve their knowledge base. As it is not feasible to produce a portfolio of evidence and demonstrate RPA competencies from scratch within the 6 months time frame of the course the Part 2 certificate will not be offered in future but tutors will obviously still assist students with portfolio development.

Applications are now being considered for the next course which will start on September 5th 2005. For application form and further information contact Claire Hill at: c.f.hill@strath.ac.uk

Plans are also in hand to use WebCT and develop existing course material into a multi- module certificated course for RPSs. It is intended that there will be a range of core and optional modules so that the course can be tailored to the individual needs of RPSs whilst reflecting the requirements of HSE IRP6. There will be on-line testing of the course material studied and the certificate issued will reflect the areas that have been satisfactorily covered. This new course is being developed by Trevor Moseley (t.j.moseley@shef.ac.uk) who would welcome members opinions on the value of such a course to their institution.

Trevor Moseley
Course Coordinator

Report from RPA2000

During 2004, 196 new Certificates were awarded bringing the total of IRR99 certificate holders to 374. RPA2000 achieved its aim of processing all applications received by the end of March 2004. The number of Assessors rose again but there were a few resignations with a net number of 31.

At the AGM in February Ian Keyes stood down as Secretary to the Assessment Panel and was replaced by Graham Hart. Graham also chairs IPEM's Accreditation Working Party which, like SRP's Qualifications and Professional Standards Committee, offers advice to the RPA2000 Board in the running of and proposed changes to the scheme.

The Re-Certification Scheme was finalised and is now available to applicants. Much effort by several people has gone into setting up schemes for Certification and re-Certification of Laser Protection Advisers. Development of other Specialist Certificates is in hand and all the documentation associated with the scheme has, or is, being revised to reflect any changes and to provide better clarity. There have been several meetings with HSE and the proposed consultation paper on modifications to the HSE statement is still awaited.

Tony Richards
25 April 2005

AURPO Annual Meeting, Belfast, September 2004 - Session Reports
(Reports of the three sessions by John Scott, Peter Marsden & Graham Hart)

Practical Update Session – Waste Disposal (Tuesday 7 September - pm)

Storage and Decay
Peter Marsden, UCL Hospitals, NHS Trust

The presentation reviewed the Environment Agency report P3-073/TR, Agency Practice and Future Policy in Decay Storage of Radioactive Wastes, with practical guidance and some additional thoughts.
(http://publications.environment-agency.gov.uk/PDF/SP3-073-TR-E-P.pdf)
One example given by Peter was of aqueous delay tanks being installed to reduce the radiation exposure at the sewerage works that were then not used because the predicted exposure to maintenance workers was greater. A point raised was that in future we may all have to justify why we are not using decay storage to reduce discharges when the half-life are less than 90 days.

Holding and Disposal of Sealed Sources
Bob Russ, Environment Agency

The three parts to the presentation were High Activity Sealed Sources, International Initiatives on Radioactive Sources and the Surplus Source Disposal Programme.
Prior to a review of the Council Directive 2003/122/Euratom on High Activity Sealed Sources the lessons learnt from recent incidents were discussed. These lessons were that sources in use are well managed, but poorly managed when not in use and there was a lack of financial provision made for disposal.
(http://europa.eu.int/eurex/pri/en/oj/dat/2003/l_346/l_34620031231en00570064.pdf)
The international initiatives covered were from the European Community, IAEA and the G8.
Of particular interest was the proposed Surplus Source Disposal Programme, which would be along the lines of the work done in Scotland and Northern Ireland to dispose, using government funding, of the surplus radioactive sources.

Disposal Routes for Sealed Sources
Brian Heaton, University of Aberdeen

The experiences and summary of the various ways of disposing of radioactive sources were discussed. This covered the Waste Closed Sources Exemption Order, the Testing Instruments Exemption Order and the Surplus Source Disposal Programme in Scotland. Brian's conclusions were to get rid of all sealed sources unless needed, when buying make sure the University authorities know the cost of disposal, and to negotiate over the disposal price.

AURPO Training Package
Ian Haslam, University of Leeds

As far back as Exeter Ian had raised the idea of an AURPO training package. The package is to be Web based and be a resource of material that could be used for training. Currently it is dominated by material generated by Ian for the University of Leeds, Ian therefore made a request for extra material from other members of AURPO.
(http://www.leeds.ac.uk/safety/aurpo/Training GN start-up.doc)

Scientific Session
Background Radiation and Environmental Legislation
(Wednesday 8 September – am)

Following the opening address by Prof. McCormac, Pro-vice Chancellor of Queen's University, Mike Thorne presented the session's keynote lecture on Background Radiation. Mike gave an absorbing summary of both natural and man-made background, covering cosmic rays and cosmogenic radionuclides, primordial radionuclides and their progeny, and man's environmental assault from weapons testing. In each case he indicated the contribution made to the average background dose. Examples of doses around the Slovakian uranium mines and the monazite beaches of Brazil were sobering enough, but his haunting quotes from the weapons tests era burnt away all traces of Guinness from the previous evening.

Martyn Green (NRPB) picked up the theme with a presentation describing the current status of the Radon Monitoring Programme in the UK. In describing the complexity of the task it was interesting to note that Radon levels in some homes are of the same order of magnitude as the epidemiological data from which risk factors are derived. These latter indicate that Radon exposure accounts for some 2000 deaths per year in the UK. The programme encompasses 30 district councils in England, a pilot in Flintshire and ongoing mapping in Northern Ireland and Scotland. Martyn concluded with description of the remediation methods employed and their respective costs and problems.

Environment Activity Levels on the UK mainland was covered by **John Titley** (Environment Agency). The multi-agency monitoring programme tends to concentrate on activity around nuclear sites, but has incorporated non-nuclear industry, UKAEA at Culham, and 30 landfill sites. Their results are reported in RIFE reports and the next edition is due out in October. It was reassuring to see that doses are generally low and decreasing, the high spots being the West Cumbria coast weighing in at 620μSv/year (combined effects of Sellafield and Rhodia, a fertiliser plant) followed by 110μSv/year (Dungeness) and 79μSv/year (Ribble estuary).

Crossing the Irish Seas, as so many AURPO members did, **Robert Larmour** (IPRI) described the environmental monitoring programme in Northern Ireland. In addition to Radon monitoring, Robert's department monitors activity levels along the coastline, assessing the impact of GB discharges in to the Irish Sea. This has included a large habits survey in collaboration with the Republic of Ireland. Their results indicate environmental levels which, whilst measurable, are generally much less than 1% of Generalised Derived Levels for most radionuclides. These provided a valuable reassurance to the population in the Province.

The morning session closed with an entertaining and informative talk by **David Hornsey** on radiation from antiques and museum pieces. Looking every inch a Cotswold dealer, David took us into another world, populated by vaseline glass collectors, Fiesta dinner-ware, optical lens manufacturers and clock makers, where doses of 30-50 μSv per year appear to be not uncommon. It was interesting to hear of the use of uranium to colour porcelains and of thorium to improve the refractive index of optical glass. And as sales of non-radioactive tritium for luminising continue to plummet, let us all secure David's future as a radium paint supplier by offering him the raw material at bargain prices.

Scientific Session - Best Practicable Means
(Wednesday 8 September – pm)

Non-Ionising Radiation Sources – 3 Steps to Aid Legislative Compliance
(from Graham Hart – YourRPA)

The Health & Safety Executive are showing increased interest in non-ionising radiation sources in hospitals and Universities. We are all very familiar with the requirements of IRR99 for ionising radiations sources, and a similar approach works well for other non-ionising radiations.

Step 1 – The Register

You need a register of all non-ionising radiation sources, including lasers, UV and EMF sources, as well as non-lasing visible source such as spotlights and high power projectors.

This raises some issues you will need to think about:

What level are you going down to? – For example, CD players and CD-ROM units need to be exempt from your concerns with laser sources, and similarly there needs to be a level 'below regulatory concern' for other non-ionising radiation sources, such as those with EMFs. Motors in small devices should certainly be in that category, as will many other devices that produce small amounts of EMF radiation in the course of their normal function. The only caution I would place here is to ensure that large old motors or other devices that may not have been well maintained might need to at least be considered.

This is straightforward as long as the register is indeed complete. My experience is that you often need multiple sweeps via email, visits & letters to really dig out all the potential risk items, especially to get to the 'oh you mean that thing in the basement' level of responses!

The register also needs to have sufficient technical and usage details so that it is possible to perform a risk assessment of the usage of the sources (both for the primary users and any secondary exposed groups).

This is easy enough so long as you really can get all the information you need. Some old lasers pre-date the requirement for labelling, for example, and what about the RF heat sealer made by the firm that went out of business 20 years ago?! In some cases the information is not easy to obtain, and this is when the internet or listserver become useful tools.

Step 2 – Risk Assessment

You need to go and visit the locations of the sources to make a formal written risk assessment.

The process of risk assessment has already been fully described elsewhere and so it won't be repeated here, but there are a number of issues to consider here as well.

Having found these unlabelled lasers, or long-defunct RF heat sealers, do they need to be kept at all, or can they be disposed of?

If they are unlabelled, and are intended to be kept for possible future use, then its going to need to be someone's responsibility to find out what they are, how much radiation they give out and

of what type, so that a proper label can be made for the equipment and a sensible assessment made of the risk the equipment poses.
For lasers, UV and RF equipment, characterizing the nature of the output is not necessarily a simple exercise. Field measurements may well need to be made, using the appropriate equipment. This is often specialised – and hence expensive! In some cases the way the measurement is made can affect the result obtained, so the measurements not only need to be made using the correct equipment, but also needs to be in the hands of someone who really knows how to operate it.

Before making output measurements, however, you have to be reasonably certain that the equipment is in a safe enough state to operate. Is there a maintenance history, or at least some guarantee that the equipment will function in a state close to normal operating conditions? This is a particular concern with RF equipment, since it is possible for the RF to leak to potentially distant locations from the equipment.

Step 3 – Safe Systems of Work

You need to ensure safe systems of work are developed which meet current and forthcoming legislation

Many old items of equipment are operated under instructions gained by 'sitting next to Nellie', in the vernacular of the mills – often passed down from person to person, but not necessarily written down or with a view to minimising exposure where action levels might be reached or exceeded.

Following these simple steps – know your sources, the risks they may possess and following safe systems of work, will ensure risk (and improvement notice) minimisation!

Addendum

The HSE have produced some guidance about safety in the use of whiteboards.

This has arisen because "Computer projectors, which are used to show presentations or to illuminate interactive whiteboards, can expose the eye to levels above one of the exposure limits which HSE uses as a guide for compliance with applicable legislation. Therefore, although such exposure limits are not statutory, the HSE considers the following advice to be good practice in respect of the use of these projectors by employers in the education sector."

The text of the guidance can be found at:
(http://www.gse.gov.uk/radiation/nonionsing/whiteboards.htm)

NRPB Reports, Publications and Website
(Phil Tattersall - NRPB)

NRPB-W63 Radiological Assessments for Small Users

This report replaces an earlier report NRPB-M744 that described methods for preparing radiological assessments relating to the accumulation and disposal of radioactive wastes by Small Users, ie undertakings such as universities, hospitals, and medical and industrial research establishments. For this report the models in NRPB-M744 have been reviewed and some significant modifications have been made to take into account more recent work by NRPB and others in this area. As in the previous report, the assessment methodology is illustrated by worked examples using some realistic source terms. The results of these calculations suggest that most Small Users should be able to demonstrate that doses associated with their disposal practices are well below relevant dose limits and constraints.

NRPB-W62 Exposure of the General Public to Radio Waves near Microcell and Picocell Base Stations for Mobile Telecommunications

Exposures of the general public to radio waves transmitted by microcell and picocell base stations for mobile telecommunications have been assessed through theoretical and experimental means. More generally, exposures to radio waves transmitted over a range of frequencies in the VHF and UHF bands by a variety of sources have also been investigated experimentally.

Twenty GSM base stations were selected at random from a group of 3000 that had low antenna height and radiated low power, in accordance with the accepted characteristics of microcell and picocell base stations. A compliance distance in terms of the reference level advised by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) for exposure of the general public was determined for the antenna of each of the selected base stations, based on technical information provided by the network operators. Under conservative assumptions, the minimum height at which the reference level could potentially be exceeded at any of the sites is 2.4 m above ground level.

The power density of the Broadcast Control Channel (BCCH) carrier transmitted by the microcell base station of interest was measured at 610 locations distributed over ten of the twenty base station sites. Most of the measurement locations were outdoors, at heights in the range 0.9–1.7 m above ground level, and were accessible to the general public. Exposure quotients derived from the measured data were generally in the range 0.002–2% and the greatest exposure at any of the sites was 8.6% of the ICNIRP public reference level. The percentage of total exposure contributed by the base station of interest was investigated through spectral measurements at all twenty sites, at a total of sixty measurement locations. The percentage contribution was found to be highly variable and ranged from less than 1% to almost 100% depending on the site and the measurement location.

On the basis of the results of the measurements and calculations carried out for the twenty selected microcell base stations, members of the public would not be exposed in excess of the ICNIRP guidelines whilst standing on the ground at any of the sites. Exposures that comply with the guidelines are not considered hazardous.

The results of some of the radio wave surveys carried out by NRPB are also available on the web site at: *http://www.nrpb.org/radiation_topics/emf/radio_surveys/index.cfm*

NRPB-W61 Solar Radiation Measurements at a Network of Seven Sites in the UK, January – December 2003

A summary of the results from January to December 2003 of a survey of solar radiation levels at the UK network of seven solar radiation measurement sites is presented. The network consists of three NRPB sites at Chilton, Leeds and Glasgow (monitoring since 1988), three Meteorological Office stations at Camborne, Kinloss and Lerwick (monitoring since 1993-95) and a new site, supported by a Welsh Assembly grant, operating for part of the year on the summit of Mount Snowdon. Visible (400–770 nm), ultraviolet UVA radiation (320–400 nm) and erythemally weighted ultraviolet radiation UVR_{eff} (280–400 nm) have been measured simultaneously using a three-detector measurement system. Results are compared with calculated irradiances of ultraviolet radiation and published illuminance data, and with data for the measurement period from 1989 to 2002.

NRPB-W60 Optimisation of Monitoring for Internal Exposure (OMINEX)

The aim of the OMINEX project is to provide advice on the design and implementation of internal dose monitoring programmes in the workplace that enables best use to be made of available resources, while minimising costs. Topics addressed include choice of monitoring method(s), (for example, excretion monitoring versus *in vivo* monitoring), choice of measurement technique (for example, alpha spectrometry versus mass spectrometry), monitoring intervals, measurement frequency, required measurement sensitivity and accuracy, measurement parameters needed to achieve this performance, the resulting uncertainty in assessed intakes and doses, and minimum detectable doses. The underlying approach to optimisation was to consider costs versus 'benefits', the latter being quantified primarily by assessing the sensitivity or accuracy with which intakes and doses are determined from the results of particular monitoring methods. The main results of surveys of current internal dose monitoring practice and the costs of monitoring programmes are presented. Recommendations on the optimisation of bioassay and *in vivo* measurement parameters are discussed. A novel method for the assessment of uncertainty in assessed intakes and doses is described, and the use of information on uncertainties in designing a monitoring programme is discussed. Recommendations are described for the monitoring of exposures to compounds of tritium, cobalt, iodine, caesium, uranium, plutonium and thorium encountered in the nuclear industries.

NRPB-W59 Proposals for Limiting Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields (0 to 300 GHz) Summary of comments received on the May 2003 Consultation Document and responses from NRPB

The National Radiological Protection Board (NRPB) has recently published '*Advice on Limiting Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields (0–300 GHz)'*. This was accompanied by publication of '*Review of the Scientific Evidence for Limiting Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields (0–300 GHz)'*. The review supports the recommendation by ICNIRP that exposure guidelines for members of the public should be more restrictive than exposure guidelines for people occupationally exposed. As part of the development of the advice, a consultation document was published on the NRPB website in May 2003. The consultation document detailed the scientific evidence providing the basis for exposure guidelines and made proposals for revising previous advice. NRPB-W59 provides a summary of the issues raised in the consultation comments and how these were addressed by NRPB in its science review and in developing its advice.

NRPB's Annual Report for 2003-2004 is now available on the web site at *http://www.nrpb.org/publications/corporate_documents/annual/annual_report_2004.pdf*. There is also a new animated version of the 'at-a-glance' leaflet dealing with the transport of radioactive materials at *http://www.nrpb.org/understand/transport/transport.htm*

ICRP

The consultation period on the next fundamental ICRP recommendations ends on 31 December 2004. All comments are being posted on the ICRP web site as they are received and can be viewed at http://www.icrp.org/remissvar/listcomments.asp

Miscellaneous

The following question and answer were recently reported in Hansard for 8 December 2004 (and I think the BBC web site) and may be of interest to readers.
(http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm200405/cmhansrd/cm041208/text/41208w25.htm#41208w25.html_sbhd1)

Radioactive Chocolate

Norman Baker: To ask the Secretary of State for Trade and Industry if she will make a statement on the storage of chocolate radioactively contaminated following the fire at Windscale in 1957. [200708]

Mr. Mike O'Brien: A fire broke out in Pile 1 on 10 October 1957, and was extinguished on 11 October. Radioactivity was released to the environment. The main public health concern was the contamination of locally produced milk by the short-lived isotope iodine 131. Milk produced within 80 square miles of the site was banned from 12 October, and the ban was extended to 200 square miles on 15 October.

At that time, the chocolate manufacturer Rowntree ran a factory in Egremont, close to the Windscale site. Records in one UKAEA file show that on 8 November 1957 Rowntree wrote to seek compensation for 90 tons of chocolate milk crumb manufactured between 11 and 15 October, which they believed to have been contaminated as a result of the Windscale fire. UKAEA contested this claim on the grounds that "the crumb is completely safe for consumption owing to the short half-life of the radioactive iodine which was the sole source of contamination".

The correspondence continued for some months, culminating in an exchange of letters between the Chairman of Rowntree and Sir Donald Perrott of UKAEA. Rowntree acknowledged, "we fully accept your advice that, as a matter of scientific fact, the 90 tons of crumb do not represent a radioactive hazard", but stated that in the interest of customer relations and commercial prudence, they wished to have the crumb destroyed or disposed of. They sought the UKAEA's help to do so, and offered to meet the costs incurred. UKAEA agreed "to accept responsibility for destroying this material" on Rowntree's behalf.

RADIATION SAFETY WEB SITES
(John Scott – Leicester)

Draft ICRP report - Protecting people against radiation exposure in the aftermath of a radiological attack:
http://www.icrp.org/draft_protect.asp

Radiation Protection News – Issue 25 May 2004:
http://www.hse.gov.uk/radiation/ionising/rpa/rpa25.htm

In Terms Of Risk – NRPB Volume 15, No.4 2004:
http://www.nrpb.org/publications/documents_of_nrpb/pdfs/doc_15_4.pdf

Environment Agency publication catalogue:
http://publications.environment-agency.gov.uk/epages/eapublications.storefront

BOOKS AND PUBLICATIONS
(John Scott – Leicester)

Ken Kasper
Time, Distance, Shielding, and Radioprotectants
Health Physics, Vol. 87, No. 1, July 2004

J. Hilton, M. Harvey, J. Simmonds
The Combined Impact On Doses To Man Of Multiple, Authorized, Radionuclide Discharges For The Year 1999 Reaching The Upper River Thames, UK.
Health Physics, Vol. 87, No. 1, July 2004

Catherine Organ et al
High radon concentrations in a house near Castleisland, County Kerry (Ireland)-identification, remediation and post-remediation
Journal of Radiological Protection, Vol. 24, No. 2, June 2004
It is interesting to speculate what the media response would have been if this very high exposure was from a man made source and not natural.

Charles B. Meinhold
Lauriston S. Taylor Lecture: The Evolution Of Radiation Protection-From Erythema To Genetic Risks To Risks Of Cancer To…?
Health Physics, Vol. 87, No. 3, September 2004

NRPB merges with HPA

On 1 April 2005 the National Radiological Protection Board merged with the Health Protection Agency forming its new Radiation Protection Division. The Division consists of its headquarters at Chilton in Oxfordshire, its Occupational Services Department at Leeds, and Radiation and Environmental Monitoring Scotland at Glasgow. Together with the Chemical Hazards and Poisons Division of HPA it forms the Agency's Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazards. The Director of the Centre is Dr Roger Cox, the former Director of NRPB. The Division carries out the Health Protection Agency's work on ionising and non-ionising radiations. It undertakes research to advance knowledge about protection from the risks of these radiations; provides laboratory and technical services; runs training courses; provides expert information and has a significant advisory role in the UK.

The Ionising Radiations Health & Safety Forum

The Forum held its second meeting on 13 October 2004. Items considered included the ICRP's draft recommendations, radon in the workplace, compliance with health and safety legislation, and the publication of HSE guidance documents. The opportunity was also provided for all members to provide updates on recent and future developments.

The Forum also considered the future basis of its membership in the light of requests for other bodies to be represented. It acknowledged that there could be benefits from holding its future meetings on a more open basis, whilst retaining its core membership as presently constituted. Those with an interest in attending the next meeting of the Forum (likely to be in October 2005) are invited to inform the Secretariat – ionising.radiation.hd@hse.gsi.gov.uk. Dependent upon the numbers, a decision will then be made on how the next meeting will operate.

Review of the HSE statement on Radiation Protection Advisers

The review of the HSE Statement on Radiation Protection Advisers is still awaited. The main objectives of the review will be to:

- identify and rectify any inconsistencies;
- identify areas that require further clarification and guidance, e.g. core competence versus suitability; and;
- consider whether there are deregulation issues to be addressed.

The result should be a revised, and simplified Statement that takes due account of Stakeholder input.

High activity sealed sources and orphan sources (the HASS Directive) - consultation on draft regulations

This consultation seeks views on draft regulations intended to implement Council Directive 2003/122/Euratom on the control of high activity sealed radioactive sources and orphan sources (the HASS Directive). The UK is obliged to implement this Directive by 31 December 2005, and this is to be done by means of regulations made under the European Communities Act 1972. The deadline for responses is **17 June 2005.** Further information and a copy of the consultative document can be found at:

http://www.defra.gov.uk/corporate/consult/hass-directive/

Training & Education

ETRAP 2005 3rd International Conference on Education and Training in Radiological Protection, Brussels, Belgium, 23-25 November 2005

The conference is jointly organised by the Belgian Nuclear Research Centre (SCK-CEN) and the Belgian Federal Agency for Nuclear Control (FANC), in cooperation with the European Nuclear Society (ENS).

ETRAP 2005 aims to reinforce the contacts between organisations and individuals dealing with education and training in radiological protection on national and international level. In addition to experience sharing and mutual learning, the conference intends to contribute to a better harmonisation of training practice and of skills recognition. Special attention will be paid to networks currently emerging at the European and global level. Both ETRAP 2005 and subsequent ETRAP conferences will provide the necessary platform for a comprehensive and trans-disciplinary approach to education and training in radiological protection.

Conference Secretariat: etrap2005@euronuclear.org
Website: http://www.etrap.net
ENS - European Nuclear Society - http://www.euronuclear.org/

Other ENS conferences in 2005:
- Nuclear communicators: PIME, http://www.pime2005.org/
- Research reactors: RRFM, http://www.rrfm2005.org/

IRPA News

The Main Commission of the ICRP met in Paris last March. Focus was given to the consultation exercise on the proposed 2005 recommendations. It resulted in nearly 200 responses and amounted to some 600 pages of written text. Many of the comments arise because the Foundation Documents have not yet been put out for consultation. The consultation on Foundation Documents will take place this summer and they should be revised, if necessary, to be approved if all goes well at the Geneva meeting of the Commission in September 2005.

The Commission has approved 5 foundation documents for web consultation with the intention that they be posted for a period starting in April until mid-July. The documents are:

- Biological and Epidemiological Information on Health Risks Attributable to Ionizing Radiation: A Summary of Judgements for the Purposes of Radiological Protection.
- The Basis for Dosimetric Quantities Used in Radiological Protection.
- Assessing Doses to the Representative Individual for the Purpose of Radiation Protection of the Individual.
- The Optimization of Protection: Broadening the Process.
- Environmental Protection: the Concept and Use of Reference Animals and Plants.

These documents are seen as essential to underpin the Commission's recommendations. In addition, two new Foundation documents are thought to be necessary as a result of the consultation exercise.

Non-Ionising Radiation News

European Directives - Physical Agents (Electromagnetic Fields) Directive

A proposal for a Council Directive on physical agents, that included specific provisions in separate Annexes on noise, vibration, optical radiation and electromagnetic fields, was first published in 1993. In 1999 the Council agreed to take the four agents forward in individual Directives. The Physical Agents (Vibration) Directive came into force in July 2002, the Physical Agents (Noise) Directive in February 2003 and the Physical Agents (Electromagnetic Fields) Directive in April 2004. The EMF Directive was published in the Official Journal of the European Communities on 30 April 2004 (Ref: L159) under the title of "Directive 2004/40/EC on the minimum health and safety requirements regarding the exposure of workers to the risks arising from physical agents (electromagnetic fields)" [124kb] but, because of errors, it was reprinted on 24 May (Ref: L184).

The Directive has to be implemented by 30 April 2008 and as a start to that process, we held a consultation meeting with industry on 27 July 2004. The HSE agreed to set up a Working Group to identify EMF applications that might have difficulty complying with the Directive and to recommend simple control measures which could be undertaken. The HSE also commissioned the National Radiological Protection Board to identify the industrial sectors likely to be affected by any legislation resulting from the implementation of the EMF Directive. The report is entitled:

'Occupational Exposure to Electric and Magnetic Fields in the Context of the ICNIRP guidelines'

Physical Agents (Optical Radiation) Directive

On 19 July 2004, the Dutch Presidency introduced a proposal on optical radiation that had been developed by the Irish Presidency for the fourth and last Physical Agent Directive. The HSE commissioned the National Radiological Protection Board to identify the industrial sectors likely to be affected by any legislation resulting from the implementation of the optical radiation Directive. The report is entitled:

'*Occupational exposure to optical radiation in the context of a possible EU proposal for a Directive on optical radiation*'