Submission form for revised C2 2024

### Your details

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| This submission was completed by: *(name)* |  |
| Address: *(street/box number)* |  |
| *(town/city and postcode)* |  |
| Email: |  |
| Organisation (if applicable): |  |
| Position (if applicable): |  |

### Additional information

I am, or I represent an organisation that is, based in:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | New Zealand | |
|  | Australia | |
|  | Other (please specify): |  |

I am or I represent:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | a health practitioner | |
|  | a servicing engineer | |
|  | a medical radiation technologist | |
|  | a medical physics expert | |
|  | a qualified expert other than a servicing engineer, medical radiation technologist or a medical physics expert | |
|  | a supplier of radiological equipment | |
|  | an organisation involved with nuclear medicine | |
|  | other (please specify): |  |

### Privacy statement

The Ministry of Health – Manatū Hauora (the Ministry) may publish submissions on the Ministry’s website. If you are submitting as an individual, the Ministry will remove your personal details and any identifiable information.

If you do not want your submission published on the Ministry’s website, please tick this box:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Do not publish this submission. |

Your submission will be subject to requests made under the [Official Information Act 1982](https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1982/0156/latest/DLM64785.html). If you want your personal details removed from your submission, please tick this box:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Remove my personal details from responses to Official Information Act 1982 requests. |

**Please return this form:**

By email to: [ors.codes@health.govt.nz](mailto:ors.codes@health.govt.nz)

By post to: Office of Radiation Safety C2  
Ministry of Health  
PO Box 5013  
Wellington 6140

### Consultation questions

**The Director for Radiation Safety (the Director) is specifically seeking feedback and comments on the following:**

1. Is restricting the scope of the revised C2 to unsealed radioactive material appropriate?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

2. Is describing nuclear medicine as ‘the use of unsealed radionuclides in medicine for diagnosis, staging of disease, therapy and monitoring the response of a disease process. This includes but is not limited to the use of unsealed radioactive material in imaging, in vivo diagnostics, and as tracers’ accurate?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

3. Is the proposed interpretation of ‘medical physics expert’ appropriate?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

4. Is the proposed interpretation of an ‘overexposure of a person’ appropriate and complete?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

5. Is interpretation of ‘radioactive waste’ appropriate?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

6. In the proposed interpretation of ‘referring practitioner’, ‘health professional’ has replaced ‘health practitioner’. Is this an appropriate change?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

7. Is the proposed interpretation of an ‘underexposure of a person’ appropriate and complete, and is the requirement to notify the Director appropriate?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

8. Is the proposed interpretation of a ‘user of unsealed radioactive material’ appropriate and comprehensive?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

9. Is the replacement of the requirement in clause 5(c)(ii) for an ‘emergency shower’ by a requirement for ‘where appropriate, a shower for the decontamination of a person contaminated with radioactive material’ appropriate?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

10. Is the requirement in clause 5(e) for radiation shielding to be approved by a medical physics expert or another qualified expert appropriate?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

11. Are the requirements in clause 6(j) and 6(k) of the revised C2 for the disposal of radioactive waste, such as potentially limits being added to source licences, appropriate and adequate?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ☐ | Yes |
| ☐ | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

12. ‘3 Bq/cm2‘ is referenced in clause 10(f) of the current C2. Is the removal of the reference from clause 11(f) of revised C2 appropriate?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

13. Is the proposed requirement in clause 12(b) of the revised C2 that the holder of a source licence must use an accredited provider to provide a dose monitor to be used by an individual who is likely to exceed three-tenths of a dose limit justified to ensure protection and safety?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

14. Is it appropriate for baselines and suspension and remedial levels to be approved by a medical physics expert and for such values to be based on the values provided in standards and in guidance produced by professional bodies?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

15. In clause 21 of the revised C2, is the title ‘Discharge of a patient who has undergone therapy’ appropriate and are the requirements, including use of the description ‘not discharged to be an outpatient’, adequate and appropriate?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

16. Is it appropriate to delete clause 24 (‘Referring practitioner’) of the current C2?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

17. Would the inclusion in a revised C2 of a completed ‘Appendix 1: Cross-reference to Radiation Safety Act 2016’ be useful?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

18. Is it appropriate to replace ‘Appendix 2: Training requirements’ (as in the current C2) with ‘Appendix 2: Training requirements for radiation safety officers’?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

19. Are the training requirements in Appendix 2 of the revised C2 appropriate and comprehensive for training a radiation safety officer?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

20. Do the training requirements in Appendix 2 of the revised C2 provide an adequate core of knowledge for those who have roles for protection and safety that are specified by the holder of a source licence?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

21. Are there any other changes you would like to suggest to the revised C2 or comments that you would like to make?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
|  |