



# IRRS POLICY

## Clarification in relation to the use of Good Practices and Good Performances during an IRRS mission

---

Vienna, 30 September 2019

### BACKGROUND

The review of the Good Practices highlighted during past IRRS missions shows many inconsistencies in the use of the definition provided by the IRRS Guidelines. 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 international community as it was intended.

The approach and way forward related to the identification of Good Practices are subject to this policy paper 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 policy will be considered when revising the IRRS Guidelines to further clarify the definition of Good Practice and Good Performance.

## POLICY

The IRRS Guidelines 2018 states: “*Good Practice is identified in recognition of an outstanding organization, arrangement, programme or performance superior to those generally observed elsewhere. It will be worthy of the attention of other regulatory bodies 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 actually met by a practice in order to be identified as a good practice:

- Outstanding performance, going beyond to what is required;
- Unique performance, not generally observed elsewhere;
- Replicable by other regulatory bodies, 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 a mission would be therefore limited. In the recent missions where the above practice was trialled, the outcomes were 2 Good Practices in Norway, 1 Good Practice in Spain and 1 Good Practice in Germany.

The IRRS 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 a Team wants to highlight a good performance which is not a good practice, this is to be indicated in the core text of the relevant sub-chapter (E.g., Norway report: “*The IRRS Team considers the communication with the public as a good performance of DSA.*”) and also highlighted in the executive summary (E.g., “The IRRS Team also identified areas of good performance, as evidenced by the policies and the regulatory framework and activities implemented in Norway. These included strengthened justification in the substitution of blood irradiators based on...”).

From a practical point of view within the process of a two-week mission, the IRRS Reviewers initially identify areas that exceed expectations as Good Performances, then the IRRS Team collectively discuss and agree which Good Performance(s) merit being categorised as a Good Practice.