



## Inspection report

<b>Licence Holder:</b> Australian Federal Police (AFP)	<b>Licence Number:</b> S0056
<b>Location inspected:</b> Brisbane, QLD	<b>Date/s of inspection:</b> 23 August 2017
	<b>Report No:</b> R17/09640

An inspection was conducted as part of ARPANSA's baseline inspection program to assess compliance with the *Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Act 1998* (the Act), the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Regulations 1999 (the Regulations), and conditions of the Source Licence S0056.

The scope of the inspection included an assessment of AFP's performance in the Brisbane region against the Source Performance Objectives and Criteria (PO&C). The inspection consisted of a review of records, interviews, and physical inspection of controlled apparatus.

### Background

AFP uses controlled apparatus as a tool to enforce Commonwealth criminal law, to contribute to combating organised crime and to protect Commonwealth interests from criminal activity in Australia and overseas. This inspection focussed on the industrial X-ray equipment located in the Brisbane region.

### Observations

In general, the management of safety margins by AFP in the Brisbane region was found to be sound.

### Performance Reporting Verification

AFP's quarterly reports have been submitted to ARPANSA in a timely manner in recent years, and contain relevant information, including details of compliance with the Act and the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Regulations 1999 (the Regulations). The Radiation Safety Officer (RSO) coordinates information for quarterly reports from each AFP site and consolidates it into one final report to ARPANSA.

Other documentation required by ARPANSA such as Regulation 51 submissions and Regulation 53 disposal requests are also coordinated through the RSO as needed.

### Training

Each person required to use AFP controlled apparatus undertakes training related to the particular apparatus. Training records for each individual in the Brisbane region who have completed the relevant training were provided to the ARPANSA inspector. The requirements for training at the Brisbane site were such that if an individual did not complete the annual refresher training, that person could not continue as a Bomb Appraisal Officer (BAO).

The AFP had recently appointed a new RSO due to the retirement of the previous RSO. The AFP provided ARPANSA with training records for the new RSO along with the change notification.

### ***Inspection, Testing and Maintenance***

Dot point 1 of Item 12 of the *AFP National Guideline on safe working with radiation*, the AFP's Plans and Arrangements for licensing purposes, requires that all licensed portable and baggage inspection X-ray equipment be maintained and serviced at least every two years. There was no evidence that this had been done for the equipment on site and in fact, for one unit the last maintenance had been carried out in 2012.

Records of all exposures using the portable X-ray equipment detailing items such as the number of shots/pulses used during bomb appraisal/disposal operations were kept in a logbook with the X-ray equipment.

### ***Radiation Protection***

AFP management demonstrates a commitment to radiation protection by establishing a policy to facilitate the safe and effective use of radiation throughout the organisation. This was supported by the National Guideline that:

- outlines the responsibilities of AFP employees involved in the use and handling of X-ray units, and
- provides information on the safe handling and precautions required to eliminate or minimise the risks involved.

There was no information on the printed copy of the National Guideline to indicate the version number or when it was last reviewed however, inspectors were shown these details on computer during a previous inspection of another AFP site. During this inspection, AFP staff were referring to a previous edition. The National Guideline would therefore benefit from document control or version number information identified on the actual document rather than just kept on computer. The two standard operating procedure documents for handling sources and handling TLD monitors both incorporated this type of document control information.

Radiation protection relating to the use of the controlled apparatus was generally seen to follow the requirements of the relevant codes regarding access control, setting up and supervision of boundaries, dose rates, wearing of personal dosimeters and training of operators. A radiation warning sign was affixed to the lid of the X-ray unit case and was used as a warning sign at each site.

### **Findings**

The licence holder was found to be in compliance with the requirements of the Act, the Regulations, and licence conditions.

The inspection revealed the following **areas for improvement**:

- Version control of documentation
- Not following their plans and arrangements in relation to equipment maintenance.

It is expected that improvement actions be taken in a timely manner.