

Amendment of ORPAS Guidelines

Clarification in relation to the use of “Good Practices” and “Good Performances” during an ORPAS mission

JUSTIFICATION

The review of the Good Practices through the ORPAS Database highlighted many inconsistencies in the use as per the [ORPAS Guidelines](#) (IAEA Services Series 43, 2020) based on the review of the ORPAS Database. The misunderstanding of the concept of good practices results in the formulation of numerous good practices which does not provide an actual added value to the mission and the host Member State as it was intended.

The approach and way forward related to the identification of Good Practices are subject to this amendment which aims also at describing further the concept of Good Performance to cover in a better manner the “*notable aspects of organization, arrangement, programme or performance that does not fully meet the Good Practice criteria.*”

This amendment will be considered when revising the ORPAS Guidelines.

AMENDMENT

The ORPAS appraisal is based on international safety standards and takes into account the specific conditions in the host Member State. It also identifies specific national strengths, such as good practices in occupational radiation protection, that could be shared with other Member States. The ORPAS Guidelines 2020, para. 8.6.3 states: “*The ORPAS reviewers identify a good practice in recognition of an outstanding arrangement, programme or performance superior to those generally observed elsewhere. It will be worthy of the attention of others as a model in the general drive for excellence. Good practices also reference a basis similar to suggestions, and the basis is clearly documented in the mission report.*”

From this definition, 3 criteria are identified to be met by a practice in order to be identified as a good practice:

- Outstanding arrangement or programme, going beyond to what is required;
- Unique performance, not generally observed elsewhere;
- Replicable by other regulatory bodies, technical service providers or operators, as a model in the general drive for excellence.

Based on the aggregation of this set of criteria (outstanding, uniqueness and replicability), the number of good practices within an ORPAS mission would be therefore limited or not properly addressed. In some missions where the above practice was trialled, the outcomes were 2 Good Practices in Thailand, 1 Good Practice in Jordan, no Good Practice in Dominican Republic, but 8 Good Practices in Kenya.

The ORPAS Guidelines also indicate that “*Notable aspects of organization, arrangement, programme or performance that does not fully meet the Good Practice criteria can be highlighted in the text of the report.*” It was agreed that these notable aspects are identified as Good Performance.

When an ORPAS Team identifies a strong performance that does not fully meet the criteria for a Good Practice, it should still be documented as a Good Performance. Such Good Performances are to be recorded in Part 1 of the ORPAS Mission Report, included in the relevant appendix for the national counterpart (Part 2), and highlighted in the Executive Summary.

From a practical perspective, during the 10–11 days missions, ORPAS Reviewers first identify areas where performance exceeds expectations and categorize these initially as Good Performances. The ORPAS Team then discusses these collectively and agrees which of them merit designation as a Good Performance, based on below paragraph.

SUGGESTION FOR AMENDMENT

8.6.4 Good Performance

The ORPAS reviewers identify a good performance that, while not meeting the definition of a good practice, represents a notable achievement. A good practice is defined as a superior result, practice, technique, or programme that demonstrably contributes—directly or indirectly—to occupational radiation protection, radiation safety, and the continuous improvement of performance within regulatory bodies, technical service providers, and operator facilities or activities.

A good performance is characterized by its effectiveness within a specific context and by the clear value it provides for the radiation protection of workers. However, unlike a good practice, it might not be necessary to recommend its adoption by other Member States, because of financial considerations, differences in design of facility or activity, operational conditions, or other reasons.

Approval

This amendment was approved at the 24th Peer Review and Advisory Service Committee (PRASC) Meeting, convened on 22 June 2026. The PRASC endorsed the immediate implementation of the newly introduced concept for all forthcoming ORPAS missions and recommended that its definition be incorporated in the next revision of the ORPAS Guidelines.