POLICY ISSUE
NOTATION VOTE

May 31, 2006 SECY-06-0127

FOR: The Commissioners

FROM: Luis A. Reyes
Executive Director for Operations

SUBJECT: REVISED SELF-EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE MEDICAL USES OF ISOTOPES

PURPOSE:

To request Commission approval to revise the criteria used by the Advisory Committee on the Medical Uses of Isotopes (ACMUI) to evaluate its performance. This paper does not address any new commitments or resource implications.

BACKGROUND:

In Staff Requirements Memorandum (SRM) COMSECY-96-028, dated August 21, 1996, the Commission directed the ACMUI to develop criteria for evaluating its performance and submit these self-evaluation criteria to the Commission for approval. The ACMUI developed and submitted these criteria. Furthermore, SRM-COMSECY-96-028 required that the ACMUI periodically evaluate itself using this Commission-approved criteria and provide the results to the Commission.

Since the issuance of SRM-COMSECY-96-028, the ACMUI has performed self-evaluations annually. In SECY-01-0160, the staff requested approval for the ACMUI to submit biennial self-evaluations, and in SRM-SECY-01-0160, dated August 23, 2001, the Commission approved biennial submissions of ACMUI self-evaluations. The staff last submitted the ACMUI's biennial self-evaluation in 2005 (see SECY-05-0167.)

CONTACT: Angela R. McIntosh, NMSS/IMNS
(301) 415-5030

DISCUSSION:

In both the 2003 and 2005 response to its self evaluation, the ACMUI stated that it believed the self-evaluation criteria should be updated. Specifically, some members of the ACMUI indicated that at least one question was inappropriately directed and/or should be rephrased. While these criteria have been sufficient to help the ACMUI evaluate itself from 1996 until the present and the ACMUI's comments were not substantial, the criteria should be updated to be more relevant for evaluating ACMUI's current performance. Therefore, the staff has updated the criteria, with the ACMUI's input, to be more pertinent, relevant, specific, and applicable, and also to consolidate self-evaluation questions that are similar in nature.

Enclosure 1 provides the self-evaluation criteria currently used by the ACMUI. Enclosure 2 provides the proposed ACMUI self-evaluation criteria. Enclosure 3 explains which self-evaluation criteria were revised and which were rescinded, and also provides an overall rationale for proposed changes.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Commission approve Enclosure 2, the revised ACMUI self-evaluation criteria.

COORDINATION:

The Office of the General Counsel has reviewed this Commission Paper and has no legal objection.

/RA Martin J. Virgilio Acting For/

Luis A. Reyes
Executive Director
for Operations

Enclosures:
1. ACMUI Self-Evaluation Criteria
2. ACMUI Revised Self-Evaluation Criteria
3. ACMUI Revised Self-Evaluation Criteria - Rationale

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE MEDICAL USES OF ISOTOPES (ACMUI)
CURRENT SELF-EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Does the staff and the ACMUI interact in such a manner as to satisfactorily address issues before the committee?

2. Do the committee members clearly define issues for the staff and provide timely, useful, objective information to the staff when requested?

3. Does the committee provide critical review and oversight of issues?

4. Does the committee provide expertise/advice that is not available from within the Agency?

5. Does the committee meet frequently enough to address issues in a timely manner?

6. Do committee members bring issues from all elements of the medical community to the attention of NRC staff?

7. Does the committee facilitate/foster communication between the public/medical community and NRC?

8. Does the committee consider NRC's resource constraints when recommending new or enhanced regulatory programs?

9. Does the committee make effective use of subcommittees to assist the staff on specific tasks or projects?

10. Does the size and scope of the committee meet NRC's current needs?

Enclosure 1

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE MEDICAL USES OF ISOTOPES
REVISED SELF-EVALUATION CRITERIA

Following is the required Advisory Committee on the Medical Uses of Isotopes (ACMUI) self-evaluation. The purpose of this evaluation is to provide feedback to the Commission on your perception of the ACMUI's performance. This feedback will help the Commission monitor the ACMUI's ability to perform its required function, and will also be useful in helping the staff work with the ACMUI to enhance the Committee's ability to effectively advise the staff.

To maximize the usefulness of this evaluation, you are encouraged to keep the following points in mind: 1) When possible, provide specific examples to help support your responses; and 2) Suggest specific actions the staff and/or the ACMUI may consider to address your perception of issues of concern.

1. Regarding ACMUI timeliness and function: a) Does the committee routinely meet deadlines? b) Does the committee meet frequently enough to address issues in a timely manner? c) Is communication and coordination between the staff and the ACMUI effective, such that interactions are timely and the ACMUI understands its mission, function, and assignments?

2. The ACMUI's charter and the ACMUI Handbook "Serving on the ACMUI: A Member's Guide" (NUREG/BR-0309) state the need for the ACMUI to provide fair, objective advice on policy and technical issues that arise in regulating the medical use of byproduct material for diagnosis and therapy.

   Does the ACMUI effectively advise the staff and develop resolutions to issues in a fair, objective, balanced manner, in keeping with the intent of NUREG/BR-0309? Are the various stakeholder groups' interests (such as the public, the medical community, and the Agreement States) fairly and appropriately reflected in the ACMUI's advice?

3. Do the committee members interact collegially to address issues?

4. Is the committee effective at providing advice that is not unduly burdensome on stakeholders while maintaining and/or improving safety?

5. Is the committee effective at recommending new or enhanced regulatory programs and/or providing advice/recommendations within NRC's stated resource constraints?

6. Is the size and composition of the committee adequate to address current issues? For example: a) Should any specialty currently represented be considered for elimination? If so, why? b) Should any specialty not currently represented be added to the committee? If so, why?

7. Does the committee facilitate/foster communication between the public/medical community and NRC?

8. Is the committee effective at making the daily responsibilities of the regulated community understood by the NRC?

9. Does the committee make effective use of subcommittees to assist the staff with specific tasks or projects? For example: a) Are subcommittees formed when appropriate and are members' roles defined? b) Are deadlines met? c) How effectively does the ACMUI address these and other challenges to subcommittee effectiveness?

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE MEDICAL USES OF ISOTOPES
SELF-EVALUATION

Following is a list of the Advisory Committee on the Medical Uses of Isotopes (ACMUI) self-evaluation questions. The list also contains the proposed new questions, revised questions, rescinded questions, and a rationale for the new/revised questions.

Current Question 1: Does the staff and the ACMUI interact in such a manner as to satisfactorily address issues before the committee?

Revised Question 1: Regarding ACMUI timeliness and function: a) Does the committee routinely meet deadlines? b) Does the committee meet frequently enough to address issues in a timely manner? c) Is communication and coordination between the staff and the ACMUI effective, such that interactions are timely and the ACMUI understands its mission, function, and assignments?

Reason for Revision: The current question is vague. The revised question requests the ACMUI to more specifically address effective and timely communication and interaction between the ACMUI and the staff.

Current Question 2: Do the committee members clearly define issues for the staff and provide timely, useful, objective information to the staff when requested?

Revised Question 2: The ACMUI's charter and the ACMUI Handbook "Serving on the ACMUI: A Member's Guide" (NUREG/BR-0309) state the need for the ACMUI to provide fair, objective advice on policy and technical issues that arise in regulating the medical use of byproduct material for diagnosis and therapy.

Does the ACMUI effectively advise the staff and develop resolutions to issues in a fair, objective, balanced manner, in keeping with the intent of NUREG/BR-0309? Are the various stakeholder groups' interests (such as the public, the medical community, and the Agreement States) fairly and appropriately reflected in the ACMUI's advice?

Reason for Revision: While the ACMUI is a medical advisory body that advises the staff, the advice provided should be fair and objective, and not solely advance the views of the medical community. The revised question underscores the ACMUI's responsibility to provide balanced advice that benefits all stakeholders.

Current Question 3: Does the committee provide critical review and oversight of issues?

New Question 3: Do the committee members interact collegially to address issues?

Reason: Current Question 3 has been replaced because a more important consideration would be whether committee members interact collegially to address issues. Also, the question, as currently written, has been consolidated into revised Question 2.

Current Question 4: Does the committee provide expertise/advice that is not available from within the Agency?

Revised Question 4: Is the committee effective at providing advice that is not unduly burdensome on stakeholders while maintaining and/or improving safety?

Reason for Revision: The staff routinely engages the ACMUI for expertise and advice not within the Agency. The staff, therefore, recognizes that the expertise/ advice on the ACMUI is not available within the Agency. The revised question is more relevant and useful for evaluating the ACMUI's performance.

Current Question 5: Does the committee meet frequently enough to address issues in a timely manner?

New Question 5: Is the committee effective at recommending new or enhanced regulatory programs and/or providing advice and recommendations within NRC's stated resource constraints?

Reason: Current Question 5 has been replaced, because it is important that the ACMUI provide its advice while considering the NRC's resource constraints. Therefore, the committee should evaluate itself in this regard. Also, the question as currently written has been consolidated into revised Question 1.

Current Question 6: Do committee members bring issues from all elements of the medical community to the attention of NRC staff?

New Question 6: Is the size and composition of the committee adequate to address current issues? For example: a) Should any specialty currently represented be considered for elimination? If so, why? b) Should any specialty not currently represented be added to the committee? If so, why?

Reason: The size and composition of the ACMUI help determine whether issues from all elements of the medical community are adequately represented. Therefore, current Question 6 has been replaced so that the committee

	can evaluate the ACMUI's size, composition, and the need to adjust these elements. Furthermore, the essence of the current question is addressed in revised Question 2.
Current Question 7:	Does the committee facilitate/foster communication between the public/medical community and NRC?
Question Retained:	No change.
Current Question 8:	Does the committee consider NRC's resource constraints when recommending new or enhanced regulatory programs?
New Question 8:	Is the committee effective at making the daily responsibilities of the regulated community understood by the NRC?
Reason:	Current Question 8 has been consolidated into new Question 5, and replaced. Question 8 has been replaced, because the ACMUI believes it is important that the Commission understand the daily responsibilities of medical professionals, and how the regulations impact medical professionals. The new question allows the ACMUI to address this issue.
Current Question 9:	Does the committee make effective use of subcommittees to assist the staff on specific tasks or projects?
Revised Question 9:	Does the committee make effective use of subcommittees to assist the staff on specific tasks or projects? For example: a) Are subcommittees formed when appropriate and are members' roles defined? b) Are deadlines met? c) How effectively does the ACMUI address these and other challenges to subcommittee effectiveness?
Reason for Revision:	The enhancement to Question 9 is useful for enabling the ACMUI to more thorough and specificly determine its ability to successfully use subcommittees to address issues. Therefore, the staff believes the revised question is more relevant to evaluating the ACMUI's performance.
Current Question 10:	Does the size and scope of the committee meet NRC's current needs?
Rescinded:	Consolidated into new question 6.