



**REPORT OF THE RCA THEMATIC SECTOR LEAD  
COUNTRY COORDINATORS MEETING**

4-8 August 2003  
Room IV, C07, IAEA Headquarters,  
Vienna, Austria

## **Report of the Thematic Sector Lead Country Coordinators Meeting**

**Room IV, C07, IAEA Headquarters**

**Vienna, Austria, 4-8 August 2003.**

### **1. Introduction**

The Meeting of the Lead Country Coordinators was held at the IAEA Headquarters, Vienna, 4-8 August 2003 and brought together 15 participants from six RCA Member States (MSs), including Lead Country Coordinators, and Representatives of the RCA Regional Office (Annex 1), to review the thematic sectors of agriculture, electronic networking and outreach (ENO), energy, environment, health, industry, radiation protection, research reactors and waste management. The IAEA was represented by Mr. M. N. Razley, Head, East Asia and Pacific Section, and Mr. M. P. Dias, RCA Coordinator.

The main objectives of the Meeting were:

- (a) to review the project proposals submitted by the Member States for the 2005-06 programme;
- (b) to agree on the thematic sector projects for 2005-06, their prioritisation using the TC criteria and budget allocation;
- (c) to interact with the Technical Officers regarding the technical merits of the proposals;
- (d) to provide inputs to project write-ups.

### **2. Opening:**

Mr. Manase P. Salema, Director, Division for Africa, East Asia and the Pacific (TCPA), Department of Technical Cooperation, IAEA, welcomed the delegates to the Meeting on behalf of Ms. Ana Marie Cetto, DDG-TC and expressed appreciation of the efforts made by the delegates in the preparation of the RCA Programme for 2005-2006. He introduced the incoming RCA Coordinator, Mr. M. P. Dias, to the Meeting and expressed the hope that Mr. Dias would be accorded the same support from the Member States as had been given to his predecessor, Mr. Carlito Aleta.

He stressed that both he and the DDG-TC, Ms Ana Marie Cetto, shared the Member States' vision and view for the RCA Programme to continue to be a successful regional cooperation instrument. He noted the importance of this Lead Country Meeting in this endeavour.

Mr. Salema made the following major points in relation to the RCA programme for 2005-06:

- the RCA programme needed to be aligned with the needs and priorities of the

MSs;

- although there was no Regional Programme Framework to guide the Meeting on needs and priorities, the knowledge of the Lead Country Coordinators concerning the regional situation in their thematic sector should be sufficient to be used instead;
- the TC Strategy could be also used as a guide for the project programming and prioritisation and the four important criteria for projects were that they:
  - addressed the real needs of MSs
  - had a social and economic impact
  - applied essential nuclear technology
  - had strong government commitment
- focus should be given to nuclear technology and to partnerships, since nuclear technology could not be applied in isolation to achieve significant success, especially in the present environment of limited resources;
- a regional programme should be able to produce an added value and, wherever possible, complement the national programme. It should not be structured as a composite of national programmes but rather be concerned with cooperation and transboundary issues. The relationship between regional and national programmes needed to be investigated as part of the future programme design process;
- the concept of fewer and better projects for the 2005-06 RCA programme should be implemented.

In closing, he noted that the RCA Programme operated in an environment of diversity, where there were both opportunities and challenges. The opportunities were in terms of setting up good cooperation and sharing of technologies. The challenges were in terms of the difficulties to establish priorities because of the diverse level of technical and economic development among the MSs. He reminded the Meeting that the envelope for the TC programme in the East Asia and the Pacific region was not divided into separate regional and national compartments and that complementarity was important to optimise the benefits for the region as a whole. He expressed his best wishes for a successful Meeting and renewed his commitment to support the RCA.

### **3. Day 1 – Plenary Session**

#### **3.1 Election of the Chairperson and appointment of Rapporteurs**

Mr. Joon-Keuk Chung, RCARO proposed Dr. John Easey, Australia, to be the Meeting Chairperson. Dr. Byung-Jin Jun, LCC Research Reactor, seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved by the delegates.

Dr. Easey thanked the delegates for the honour of being elected Chair. He said that there was challenging times ahead for the RCA MSs with the task of producing a well-focussed future programme for the RCA. He noted that the RCA had had a distinguished record of achievement in the past and that had been achieved in an environment where decision-making had been through a consensus process.

Dr. G. Singh and Dr. Ainul H. Daud were nominated as rapporteurs for the Meeting

and this was unanimously approved by the Meeting.

### 3.2 Adoption of Agenda

The Chair inquired whether there were changes to the proposed Agenda for the Meeting (Annex 2). Dr. Byung-Jin Jun, LCC Research Reactor, proposed that an item be included on the roles of Lead Country Coordinators. The Meeting agreed that the item would be discussed on Thursday: 9:00 – 9:30 hrs. The Agenda was adopted with this change.

### 3.3 Presentation on the Relevance of the IAEA TC Policy to the RCA

Mr. M. N. Razley gave a brief overview of the TC Strategy and its relevance to both the national and the regional programmes in East Asia and the Pacific. The presentation was also important for the preparation of the projects for the TC 2005-06 Programme Cycle (Annex 3).

The highlights / emphasis of the presentation were:

- MSs and the Agency secretariat had to cooperate to implement TC Strategy;
- Model Project Criteria were now applicable to the entire IAEA TC Programme;
- there were a large number of projects competing for the limited East Asia and the Pacific Region budget
- 45% of the Region's future year budget for 2005-06 had already been committed. In terms of the various project categories, the fund allocations were C0 (US\$ 3.7 million), CI (US\$ 3.5 million) and CII (US\$ 3.8 million).
- an overview of the roles and responsibilities of the thematic sector LCCs in the preparation of 2005-06 TCP in relation to communications with the National RCA Representatives on project selection, consultation with MSs, and submission of the project proposals;
- project funding would be dependent on the submission of quality projects;
- the need to reduce the number of both hardcore and footnote a/ RCA projects.

In the ensuing discussions, the following major issues were covered:

- the review by the LCCs of projects scheduled for extension in 2005-06 was a difficult process for projects that had only just commenced as part of the 2003-04 programme. Implementation had only been in progress for a maximum of 6 months of the 2-year cycle project. Some projects had had no implementation due to the problems with SARS in the region. In this situation, it was suggested that the project objectives need to be reviewed/evaluated to determine whether 2 years would be sufficient to achieve the objectives.
- the Meeting requested the secretariat to provide data on the budget and the performance of the other regions to enable comparisons to be made with the RCA programme. It was agreed that such data could be made available to

the RCA MSs. However the Meeting was cautioned about the analysis of this data since each region was different and that funding had been allocated according to the needs of the MSs. In some cases other regions had used a group approach to advantage in pursuing Agency support for their projects. It was suggested that the RCA MSs should be encouraged to cooperate together in any efforts to try to secure a greater budgetary support for the RCA. Nevertheless, it had to be borne in mind that greater project support might not provide additional benefits if the RCA MSs' absorptive capacity had been reached.

#### 3.4 Presentation on Implementation Issues Related to the TC Policy

Mr. Dias made a brief outline presentation on implementation issues related to the TC Policy. He explained that the emphasis was on model project criteria, fewer but better planned projects, results based long-term planning and the necessity to attract other donors. (Annex 4)

In the subsequent discussions, it was observed that there was a significant mismatch between the proposed project budgets and the activities planned. It was also suggested that the Agency had an overoptimistic expectation for 'success stories' from projects on low budgets. It was noted that in some cases there were MSs participating in projects that were not relevant to their needs and priorities. There were also cases where even though, the nuclear technology component was small, the contribution to the overall solution to the problem was important and significant.

#### 3.5 Presentation on the Structure of the RRU Database

Mr. M. Kempainen presented an outline of the structure of the RRU database, which had been developed in the Agency (Annex 5). The RRU database development was part of the ENO project and there were more than 38 RRU in the RCA region. Finalisation of testing and implementation of the database were expected by the end of September 2003. An agreement within the RCA MSs needed to be sought on the use of the system. The RRU database would be hosted by the Agency and it could be linked to any Internet System. The LCCs needed to be aware of the RRUs in their thematic sectors and they should use the information provided in the database. They were also requested to provide new input for the Database as it became available to keep the Database up to date.

#### 3.6 Presentation on the roles of ENO in programming and implementation by ENO

Mr. M. Safuan Sulaiman gave a brief presentation on ENO in programming and implementation, with emphases on the contribution of ENO in the process of project preparation (Annex 6).

The Meeting noted that the RCA had taken the lead in the development of ENO at the regional level and that ENO could be of assistance in project management. However, it was recognised that there were still problem areas that needed to be addressed, such as the use of English as a second language for some training materials and the confidentiality and security of information. It was suggested that the RCA MSs should review how the ENO had been used for a range of communications tasks and especially how it might be used to assist in the reduction of the need for face-to-face meetings during the preparation of the RCA programme. It was also suggested that consideration should also be given to how national programmes might be able to benefit from the RCA's experience in utilising ENO.

### 3.7 Presentation on the Activities of the RCA Regional Office (RCARO)

Mr. J-K Chung made a presentation detailing the activities of the RCARO and its contribution to the RCA programme in term of dissemination of information (Annex 7). He outlined the RCARO's efforts in information exchange and networking in particularly with Mission briefings for the RCA MSs Embassies in Seoul, as well as interaction with local nuclear-related industries. MSs were encouraged to undertake similar actions in their respective capitals to enhance the visibility of RCA in the Region. The RCARO would be willing to assist MSs where appropriate. Efforts were also being made in support of nuclear knowledge enhancement and preservation within RCA. In response to a question on the role of the RCARO with fellowships, it was noted that the main activities related to the circulation of information and coordination.

### 3.8 Introduction to Project Design (Project Design Elements and Project Formulation Matrix)

Dr. Ainul Daud outlined briefly the Project Design Elements and Project Formulation Matrix and their importance in the process of project planning, formulation, approval and prioritisation, implementation and evaluation (Annex 8).

## **4. Day 2 – Plenary Session (continued)**

### 4.1 Presentation on Live-Link and TC-Pride

Mr. Kempainen presented an outline of the structure of Live-Link and its use (Annex 9). He detailed the features of Live-Link and how it could be used at three levels for a Virtual Team, Communities of Practice or Expert Team with variable access depending on the status as a Coordinator, Member or Guest. A pilot study on the Live-Link would be run for the MSs. Licensing of Live-Link to MSs would take place by 2004 and the software licence would cost US\$250/user.

In the presentation on TCPRIDE Mr. Kempainen informed the Meeting that country level features were being added. Concerning questions on the security of the system, it was noted that this was largely via the login and it was not currently designed to deal with highly confidential matters.

### 4.2 Presentation on Elements of Project Design

Mr. Razley made a presentation on project design (Annex 10). In the subsequent discussions the following major points were made:

- National RCA Representatives should provide direction on the future RCA Programme.
- Nuclear science and technology components in the projects needed to appropriate and should not be forced in as an application.
- Where the end user application or the project technology cut across the responsibilities of Ministries outside of the National Nuclear Institute, there was a need to ensure that efforts were made to get those Ministries involved.

- Regional projects could be used to reduce constraints that might arise in national projects.

## 5. Collective Review of the Thematic Sector Project Proposals

Respective LCCs for the thematic sectors of Industry, Health, Agriculture, Safety, Energy, Environment and Research Reactors made their presentations on the progress of the current projects and the reviewed project proposals for 2005-2006. The preliminary list of proposals for 2005-06 for all the thematic sectors is given in Annex 11.

The following comments and recommendations were brought out during the discussions following the presentations:

### Project design and selection:

- Most project proposals lacked any linkage to recent international declarations such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), Johannesburg Declaration, Poverty reduction strategy papers, etc.
- National RCA Representatives should provide guidance to the National Project Counterpart (NPC) on the requirements of the MDG, etc.
- It is proposed that future project proposals should use the revised Project Information Sheet prepared at the Regional Workshop on planning, selection and design of TC Projects, held in Daejeon in July 2003 (Annex 12).
- A clear Road Map is required for the Thematic Sector Industry.
- RCA projects should reflect regional problems and each participating MS should be able to provide their national work plan.
- RCA projects need to be matched to the IAEA requirements, if Agency funding is being sought.
- The respective National RCA Representative must screen all RCA project proposals being suggested from proponents in their country before these are submitted to the appropriate thematic sector LCC.
- The planning, formulation and selection of the projects submitted for the RCA programme need to be integrated in parallel with the national process. Project screening by the National RCA Representative should be undertaken as part of the National TC project selection processes and involve the National TC Liaison Officer.
- As stated in the RCA Guidelines and Operating Rules, all project proposals that have less than three RCA MSs as project proponents should be rejected automatically.
- Refinement of the project proposals should take into consideration comments from Technical Officers with respect to the advantages of using nuclear techniques. TOs are to advise on the refinement of the proposal's objectives and proposed activities to meet the objectives but not its redesign.

### Project management

- RCA Guidelines and Operating Rules should be reviewed and updated to include issues raised at this LCC Meeting.
- RCA Guidelines and Operating Rules should include definitions of project continuation and project extension.
- There was concern about the rollover of some funding from the 2003/2004 biennium to 2005/2006. It was suggested that where there needs to be significant rephrasing of the 2003-2004 programme activities into 2005, the 2005 could be better used for more thorough project preparation for 2007-2008 programme. Some projects could be designed to receive funding starting in 2006.
- Where there was competition between similar priority projects for funding, consideration should be given to those that would make the best impact for a given budget.
- Thematic sector LCCs should advise, where appropriate amalgamation of activities or projects might secure additional contributions and/or donors.
- The function of thematic sector LCC should include:
  - mentoring the project LCCs in that sector
  - providing guidance on the correct design for a project in that thematic sector which could meet the RCA and IAEA requirements.

### Project promotion

- The RCA should encourage the seeking of partnerships and project LCCs were requested to utilise the RCARO to explore ways of increase visibility and viability before submission to the thematic sector LCC.
- Definition of 'Success Stories' needed to be revisited.

## **6. Day 3 - Break-up sessions and consultation period**

During the break-up/consultation sessions, the Lead Country Coordinators had discussions with the Technical Officers and other officials regarding the details of each of the on-going projects, the new project proposals and the workplan. The different projects were re-examined especially with respect to the TC criteria and resource availability. The programmes were revised and both the projects and the activities in each project were prioritised as necessary.

## **7. Day 4 - Presentations**

### **7.1 Presentation on Overview of a Self-Evaluation Tool for Member State Counterparts**

Mr. Rick Williams OIOS gave a presentation on a self-evaluation tool (Annex 13). He reviewed the Agency's move to results-based programming, the key terminology and the logical structure for project design. He then dealt with the rationale for and the elements involved in self-evaluation. He also made available additional documentation for the participants on these subjects.

### **7.2 Responsibilities of Lead Country Coordinators**

Dr. Easey informed the Meeting that the National RCA Representatives Meeting held in Colombo, Sri Lanka in late May 2003 had had concerns about a range of roles and responsibilities across the RCA, including those of the Lead Countries. He reviewed the additional agenda item that had been included for the NRM (Annex 14) and the terms of reference that had been agreed by the NRM for the Ad Hoc Committee to carry out the review of the RCA management structure (Annex 15).

The Meeting noted these actions. They supported previous suggestions made earlier in the Meeting that the Lead Country Concept paper and the RCA Guidelines and Operating Rules needed to be updated to take account of the lack of definition about the roles and responsibilities of the thematic sector Lead Countries as well as the problems that arose in assigning responsibilities when project proposals were merged. Concern was also expressed about the timing schedule for the preparation of proposals to meet the Agency's timetable. The Chair reminded the participants that the revised PIS also included details of the timing for the preparations for the 2007-08 cycle (Annex 12).

## **8. Days 4 & 5 – Review of Thematic Sector Proposals for the 2005-2006 RCA Programme**

The revised programmes for each thematic sector for the 2005 – 2006 RCA Programme were presented to the Meeting:

- Agriculture – Annex 16
- Electronic Networking and Outreach – Annex 17
- Energy – Annex 18
- Environment – Annex 19
- Health – Annex 20
- Industry – Annex 21
- Radioactive Waste Management – Annex 22
- Radiation Protection – Annex 23
- Research Reactor – Annex 24

Following each of the presentations, there was a critical discussion of the materials presented and suggestions were made on how specific aspects might be improved. The proposals will be revised in the light of these comments.

A summary of the programme for all the thematic sectors is given in Annex 25.

## 9. Day 5 - Plenary

### 9.1 Preparation of the Meeting Report

The participants agreed that the important outcomes from the Meeting would be the detailed proposals for each of the thematic sectors and the following conclusions and recommendations, which were agreed during this session.

### 9.2 Conclusions

- LCCs noted that there were no formal and little informal mechanism for cooperation and coordination with the national projects/programmes in the development and submission of the RCA project proposals by individuals in RCA MSs.
- The role of the thematic sector LCCs had not been defined in the RCA reference documents – Operating Rules and Guidelines and the Lead Country Concept paper.

### 9.3 Recommendations

#### 9.3.1 Programme For 2005-2006

The National RCA Representatives were requested to review the proposals for the 2005-06 prepared by the LCCs for the thematic sectors, and endorse the provisional programme set out below.

Further details of the proposed programmes are set out in Annexes 16 to 24.

#### 9.3.1.1 Thematic Sector - Agriculture

Priority	Project Title	Budget for 2005 (US\$)	Budget for 2006 (US\$)	Total (US\$)
1	Development of sustainable land use and management strategies for controlling soil erosion and improving soil quality	140,000	150,000	290,000
2	Integrated Approach for Improving Livestock Production Utilizing Indigenous Resources and Conserving the Environment	140,000	140,000	280,000
3	Development of effective monitoring and practices for improving food safety	135,000	140,000	275,000

4	Use of Nuclear and Related Techniques for Better Management of Water and Nutrients in rain-fed Cropping System	140,000	135,000	275,000
5	Enhancement of genetic diversity in food, pulses and oil crops and Establishment of mutant germplasm network (MGN	145,000	135,000	280,000
6	Bioremediation of toxic metals, radionuclides and organic pollutants	100,000	100,000	200,000
	TOTAL	800,000	800,000	1,600,000

#### 9.3.1.2 Thematic Sector - Energy

Priority	Project Title	Budget for 2005 (US\$)	Budget for 2006 (US\$)	Total (US\$)
1	Tracing Future Sustainable Paths through Nuclear and Other Energy Options"			300,000

#### 9.3.1.3 Thematic Sector - Environment

Priority	Project Title	Budget for 2005 (US\$)	Budget for 2006 (US\$)	Total (US\$)
1	Improved information of urban air quality management in the RCA region (extension)	120,000	170,000	290,000
2	Isotope techniques for GW contamination studies in urbanised and industrial areas (extension)	50,000	100,000	150,000
3	Enhancing the marine coastal environment (extension)	150,000	150,000	300,000

4	Improving reg. Cap. for ass. and managing risks associated with contaminated sediments in urban coastal environments. (New)	100,000	100,000	200,000
5	Environment conservation by using radiation processing (New)	75,000	100,000	175,000
	Improving regional capacity for responds to aquatic emergencies (Continuation)	With support from Australia (AusAID)	With support from Australia (AusAID)	
	TOTAL*	495,000	620,000	1,115,000

\*Excluding the project funding by Australia

#### 9.3.1.4 Thematic Sector - Human Health

Priority	Project Title	Budget for 2005 (US\$)	Budget for 2006 (US\$)	Total (US\$)
	Distant assisted training for NM technicians (continuation)	24,900	0.0	24,900
	Distance education in Radiation oncology (continuation)	90,000	60,000	150,000
1	Strengthening Medical Physics through Education and Training (extension)	100,000	100,000	200,000
2	Improvement of. QA of brachytherapy for frequent cancers in the region (new)	180,000	180,000	360,000
3	Radioconjugate therapy for liver cancer	80,000	80,000	160,000
4	Diagnosis of osteoporosis (extension)	80,000	80,000	160,000
5	Tumor imaging by Nuclear Medicine (new)	50,000	50,000	100,000
	TOTAL	604,900	550,000	1,154,900

## 9.3.1.5 Thematic Sector - Industry

Priority	Project Title	Budget for 2005-6 (US\$)	Budget for 2007 (US\$)	Total (US\$)
1	Safe and Clean Industries	405,000	0.0	405,000
2	Quality System Enhancement	450,000	100,000	550,000
	TOTAL	855,000	100,000	955,000

## 9.3.1.6 Thematic Sector – Research Reactor Utilization

Priority	Project Title	Budget for 2005 (US\$)	Budget for 2006 (US\$)	Total (US\$)
1	RI Production and NB application with assured safety			300,000

## 9.3.1.7 Thematic Sector – Radiation Protection

The Meeting recommended that a Consultants Meeting be held in October 2003:

- to define the needs of the Member States using the available information set out in country profiles, peer reviews, expert reports, etc. and
- to elucidate a “big picture view” for management both with in the Agency and between the RCA and the Model Projects

## 9.3.1.8 Thematic Sector – Waste Management

The Meeting decided to request the Agency to support upstream work to facilitate the scoping of a project proposal possibly to commence in 2006.

## 9.3.2 Operational Matters

- It is recommended that the role of the thematic sector LCC be precisely defined in the RCA reference documents such as the Operating Rules and Guidelines and the Lead Country Concept paper.
- It is recommended that a LC meeting be hosted in Vienna in June 2004.
- Because of the disappointing quality of some proposals being submitted by the RCA MSs, it is recommended that additional guidance be provided through the provision of additional training materials, assistance and guidelines. It is recommended that the PIS developed in the RW in Taejon in July 2003 be the basis for the RCA project proposals submissions for the 2007-08 biennium.

- Improved lines of communication should be established, encouraged and enforced.
- Project LCCs and the thematic sector LCC should ensure that their communications are also copied to the relevant National RCA Representative to facilitate the process of project formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.
- The nomination procedure for a Lead Country from the project formulation stage to the election of the Lead Country needed to be rigorously defined.
- LCCs recommend that there should be a formal cooperation and coordination process with the national projects/programmes during the development of the RCA project proposals by individual RCA MSs.
- LCC recommend that a strategic plan be developed for each regional thematic sector in order to provide transparency in the development of the future RCA programme and act as the basis of securing future donor support.
- It was recommended that the thematic sector LCCs, through the National RCA Representative, request the Lead Countries, including those Member States proposing projects in an acting LC role, to obtain any additionally required information or evidence by 31 October 2003 to ensure that the full requirements of the Agency could be complied with.

#### 9.4 Closing Session

Mr Salema congratulated the participants on the work they had carried out during the five days to refine and upgrade the project proposals for each of the thematic sectors to meet the TC criteria. He also thanked the Technical Officers for their contributions and noted their valuable role in this process of project selection and refinement. He also acknowledged the support given by staff of the East Asia Pacific Section and especially the RCA Office.

Mr Dias also added his congratulations to those of Mr Salema for the hard work and achievements of all involved in the Meeting.

Dr Easey noted that it had been agreed that the draft report would be circulated by him to the Agency and the participants on 15 August and he requested them to have all comments and corrections circulated back to him by 22 August so that the report could be finalised and distributed to the National RCA Representatives in good time for their preparations for the General Conference Meeting. Before formally closing the Meeting, he expressed his appreciation for the strong cooperation provided by all parties which had greatly assisted him in the task of chairing the Meeting and for helping him to achieve a timely implementation of the Meeting schedule. He thanked Dr. Ainul H Daud and Dr G Singh for performing the rapporteur tasks.

The Meeting was closed at 12:40h.