

Emergency Preparedness & Response (EP&R): The Report/Study

Aarhus Round Table on Emergency Preparedness and Response
of NPP Cattenom
May 17th 2014
Schengen, Luxemburg

Andrej Klemenc, REC Slovenia, Secretary of NTW Working
Group on EP&R

Checking results of EU study on EP&R

DG ENER commissioned in 2013 a study: “**Review of current off-site nuclear emergency preparedness and response arrangements in EU member states and neighbouring countries**”.

The objective of the investigation was:

- **Assess the status of the existing arrangements and capabilities** for off-site emergency preparedness and response (EP&R) within and between the EU Member States (MS) and neighbouring countries in respect of their coherence and completeness;
- **Identify best practices, gaps and inconsistencies**, in particular related with cross border arrangements;
- **Assess how current arrangements and capabilities could be made more effective** (in particular optimized to make better use of available resources and avoid duplication, both nationally and across borders); and
- **Make recommendations on potential areas for improvement.**



Checking results of ENCO study on EP&R

- **The study is based on the top level desk office work** complying, analysing and comparing governance structures, and legal, technical and organisational procedures regarding EP&R, however not how - if at all - are those provisions and procedures actually implemented in practice.
- **Key findings of the ENCO Study:**
 - Current arrangements and capabilities for off site nuclear emergency management are **broadly compliant with European legislative requirements** and (non-binding) international requirements
 - A number of gaps or inconsistencies exists: The most significant is **a general lack of strategies and arrangements for long term protective measures and return to normality following an emergency**; and coherence in cross border arrangements
 - MS are taken different approaches to technical implementation – that might be technically adequate and justified however **undermines public confidence**
 - There are opportunities for greater **sharring of resources and capacities** on EU&R among MS, however greater benefits can results from **integrating arrangements for nuclear emergency with those for other type of emergency**, at all levels, including within the EC itself.

Questionnaire on EP&R provisions from a (practical) perspective of civil society

NTW WG on EP&R will check the relevance of the results of the study by comparing actual state of the art of the off-site EP&R based on the questionnaire targeting also implementations of EP&R provisions with the findings of the ENCO study

1. Which **stakeholders** should be **included in off-site nuclear EP&R activities** in your country?
2. What are the provisions regarding **inclusion of civil society** (local initiatives, NGOs) and/or local communities in EP&R activities?
3. At what stage - if at all - are the **initiatives of local communities and/or NGOs included** in EP&R activities?
4. Are the local communities and/or civil society engaged in **cross-border EP&R activities**?
5. How do you assess provision of **sheltering** in off-site EP&R plans in your country?
6. How (and by whom) are the stocks of **stable iodine pills** planned in your country?

Questionnaire on EP&R provisions from a (practical) perspective of civil society

8. How do you assess provisions for evacuation plans in case of nuclear accidents in your country?
9. there a clear strategy regarding **decontamination** in your country?
9. How are EP&R plans in your country addressing the issue of **relocation**?
10. Have those plans been **updated after the accident in Fukushima** or are they at least planned to be updated?
11. What **major changes** have been made or are planned to be undertaken?
12. How are **food and drinking water restrictions** managed under EP&R plans at national level?
13. Are there in EP&R plans clear criteria under what circumstances people will be allowed to **return** (to their homes) **from evacuation or relocation**?
14. How people in emergency protection zone are to be **informed on EP&R activities**?

Questionnaire on EP&R provisions from a (practical) perspective of civil society

15. How (by which media) and by whom the people in the emergency planning zone **will be informed of a nuclear accident** in the nearby NPP? How and by **whom the general public will be informed** of a nuclear accident?
16. Would the **information** on the level of exposure to radiation, sheltering measures and evacuation activities **provided by authorities be considered as reliable, sufficient and trusted** by the people?
17. Are there in your country enough calibrated measurement devices to assure an adequate **measurement of levels of radiation** in case of severe nuclear accident?
18. Which **civil society organization(s) and/or independent experts and/or institute(s)** have a potential to provide **trustworthy, credible and effective information** on EP&R in the case of a severe accident in a NPP in your country?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION!

Andrej Klemenc

The Regional Environmental Centre for Central & Eastern Europe
– Ljubljana Office



REGIONALNI CENTER ZA OKOLJE
Slovenija

andrej.klemenc@rec-lj.si