

TRAINING ENDORSEMENT - DRAFT FOR COMMENT

20 July 2007

Steps involved in RAMTUC endorsement of Training

Summary of element ownership and review

	Syllabus	Material	Trainers	Administration	Monitoring of Training delivery	RAMTUC Annual Review
Level 3	Owned by RAMTUC	Owned by RAMTUC member	Provided by RAMTUC member / DfT	Carried out by contractor.	DfT monitoring and member feedback to committee	S & M (2 years) A (annual)
Level 2	Owned by RAMTUC	Owned by TP	TP	By TP	Initial and on-going witnessing by RAMTUC member. Member feedback to committee	S (2 years)
Level 1	Owned by RAMTUC	Owned by TP	TP	By TP	By TP	S (2 years)

Key

TP Training Provider
S Syllabus
M Material
A Administration

Comments from previous minutes

M36

Phil McNamara sent comments in response to Action M35/4, however more comments are required from Members to progress this issue as DfT require this course to be endorsed by RAMTUC. RAMTUC need to agree the scope of the course, as it is believed that the current course covers too much material. A modular approach was suggested as a solution.

Action M35/4: Members to review course content for appropriateness and highlight areas that are repeated elsewhere on alternative courses. **Ongoing** – Lyn Farrington clarified this action. It was agreed that Members review the current course and comment on materials that ought to be omitted within 3 weeks of this meeting.

A course has been proposed by CAMEON (developed in conjunction with Ellis Collier & DfT). Lyn Farrington requested that Members perform a gap analysis (pre-course material, any omissions etc) in this new material to enable a modular approach to be achieved.

Action M36/1: Members to perform a gap analysis in this new material to enable a modular approach to be achieved within 3 weeks of this meeting. (M36)

M37

It was agreed that RAMTUC should not endorse the content of the 'standard' training as this is dictated by the Regulations. However, RAMTUC will probably need to consider/endorse the higher level modules, as the training providers may not have the technical expertise to do so.

Members agreed that a syllabus needs developing for RAMTUC approval. A rolling programme of RAMTUC agreeing the syllabus for each module was deemed the best way to progress the course. (M37)

M38

1. RAMTUC Training Sub-Committee

Marc Flynn gave a 'Where Have We Been & Where Are We Going' presentation to Members. Cameon's 'Radioactive Material Transport Draft Programme & Syllabi V4' handouts were also circulated. Marc Flynn has been the only witness to the Level 1 & 2 training however; Ian Barlow (DfT) is due to witness the Level 2 training in the near future. John Harvey and Phil McNamara (the

RAMTUC Training sub-committee) attended the Level 3 training course held in March 2005.

The RAMTUC Training sub-committee presented their review paper of the Cameon Level 3 training that they attended. The conclusions were:

Level 1/Foundation Course:

John Harvey explained that this course should identify the elements that this course does not address, in an attempt to highlight when an individual is not competent and should seek further assistance.

- It was suggested that the section 'Identification of RAM' be moved into 'Classification of RAM' as these two sections sit better together. Marc Flynn agreed to change this.
- Within RAM classification, 'excepted' and 'non RAM' need to be included to demonstrate at what levels that legislation covering the transport of RAM start at. Marc Flynn explained that this is covered in some detail but we will revisit the subject and re-iterate the thresholds.
- 'Radiological Protection Plans' need to be added to the 'Assurance Systems' section. Marc Flynn agreed.
- It was felt that RAMRoad 2002 was not the document to be used as a basis for this course, but that TS-R-1 was a better foundation. Marc Flynn explained that Ian Barlow's preference had been to base the course on the UK regulatory text. It was also pointed out that this level 1 course is not reliant on candidate interaction using any regulations. This change was agreed.
- The refresher period for this course was discussed. It was deemed that refresher training should not be mandatory, but left up to individual company requirements.

General Awareness Course:

- Although the Foundation Course gives a good basic understanding to the subject, it was felt that it gives far more information than was required by most of the persons affected. Therefore, the sub committee felt that Companies should write their own training pack specifically for these persons and tailor this for their own particular packages and work processes. The consensus from the other RAMTUC Members was that this was appropriate. Marc Flynn explained that BNG felt that the 3 tier course system would cover most company needs especially those companies that do not have the capability to create and run their own awareness courses. Marc Flynn also noted that the Level 1 course will be available on CD within about a year; it could then be used by companies to ensure consistency in training and tailored/added to, so to meet companies additional requirements yet still comply with the RAMTUC syllabus.

Level 2/Consignor Module:

- Billed as an 'Operational Skills' course by Cameon, the sub committee questioned if it would be better titled as a 'Consignors Course'. However, while it was felt that this had some merit it might lay the path open to a multitude of different user courses. The sub committee agreed that the section on 'Waste' needed to come out. During the meeting it was concluded that in hindsight the subject ought to stay but ought not to be a special section in its own right. Marc Flynn clarified that the intent was to cover the transport implications of waste only; BNG will re-visit this text and revise, or remove it to address this.
- Concerning pre- course requirements, some members felt that delegates needed to have passed the Level 1 Foundation Course, to be numerate and be able to use 'power' functions easily. It was confirmed that it was the decision of RAMTUC to stipulate course entry requirements. After discussion RAMTUC Members agreed that the precursor to the Level 2 course ought to be a pass on the Level 1 course '*or equivalent*'.
- In the numeracy discussion it was identified that 'Mixed Isotope' considerations would be separated out into a separate course. It would practice both the mixtures calculation and the manipulation of numbers using scientific notation (10^3 , 10^9 , Mega, Tera etc). The possibility of supplying pre-coursework to prepare students was also discussed. Single isotopes will be covered in the Level 1 course. John Harvey suggested that the training course descriptions need to clearly state that to consign mixed isotopes, the 'Mixed Isotope' course needs to be sat in addition to the Level 2 course.
- Roger Norman suggested that the documented course structure be clarified further i.e. 2 Day RAM by Road + 1 Day RAM by Rail etc.
- Members decided that refresher training was to be either by re-sitting this course within 2 years, by passing the appropriate modal course(s), or as recommended by the DGSA.

Level 3 / Specialist Course:

- The syllabus as presented covers most aspects in depth but requires amending as follows:
 - Supporting Systems – the TCSC Codes of Practice need to be included, before the 'Pink Book' entry. BNG will include these CoP's in the session.
 - Fissile Materials – Criticality Assessment needed to be included. Marc Flynn stated that M Peers has revised his criticality presentation to cover designing criticality safety into package designs and will satisfy this request.
 - Transport of RAM Waste – should be removed for the same reasons as detailed in the Level 2 course comments. Marc Flynn explained that this is now a 30 minute presentation on the revised L3 course focussing on transport implications of waste, i.e. fissile limits, disposable packages, local council restrictions etc. RAMTUC Members felt that this was acceptable.
 - Radionuclide decay – again, should be removed, as people at this level would be aware of radionuclide decay. Also, the

Packaging Selection needs to include shielding and consideration of half-life decay in selecting a package. Marc Flynn stated that Mike Peers has amended his activity decay presentation to re-enforce the relationship of this issue to package selection and address this concern.

–Radiological Protection Programmes – needs adding as a new subject. Marc Flynn explained that an overview of RPP's is included in the final compliance support session, presented by Ellis Collier. The Chairman also noted that for RPP's in the UK, written compliance with the IRR's is accepted by the DfT.

–Pre – course requirements would be a pass on the Level 2 course '*or equivalent*'. Table 1 needs amending to reflect this. There would be no specified requirement for refresher training.

RAMTUC endorsed the training course subject to the above amendments. However, feedback from future courses is to be delivered at RAMTUC Meetings periodically.

It was clarified that RAMTUC owned the syllabus for the Level 1, 2 and 3 courses and the material for the Level 3 course. (M38)

M40

Ownership of the training material was discussed as DfT had expressed an interest in understanding where this lies, again possibly over concerns of commercial equality and Cameon being viewed as a preferred supplier. It was agreed that RAMTUC own the rights and will make it freely available. (M40)

M41

MF advised that DfT confirmation that the RAMTUC training course was appropriate had been received and circulated to the committee. He also advised that the training was going well and that the exam had been modified but the syllabus remained.

A general discussion was held to determine a suitable revalidation period for the training; the consensus was 2 years for the level 1 and 2 qualifications, unless attending a company based regulatory update/refresher and 5 years for the level 3 certificate. (M41)