



What criteria for describing, assessing
and comparing post-accident
preparedness processes in Europe?

NERIS-TP WP3 workshop
Bordeaux, 13th September 2013
Stéphane Baudé, Gilles Hériard Dubreuil, Mutadis

Origins and objectives of the proposed criteria

- In the framework of NERIS-TP WP3, initiatives for post-accident preparedness or management in different European countries and Belarus are reviewed
- A need emerged for a tool to facilitate cross-comparison of these initiatives
- The proposed criteria aim to facilitate a consistent description and evaluation of national/local processes aiming at:
 - Developing preparedness to potential radiological events or
 - Managing actual emergency or post-accident radiological situations
- They are notably based on the EURANOS CAT 3 Framework



1. Criteria for process description

Context

- Has the considered country been **impacted by past nuclear or radiological events** (originated in or outside its territory)?
- Is the country hosting **nuclear activities**? Or considering possible future nuclear activities?
- What are the **preparedness actions undertaken** in your country? (or management actions, if your country has been previously impacted by a radiological event)
- What is the **origin of the present process**? Who initiated it and why?
- Does the process ground on a **legal or regulatory framework** or is it an informal initiative of one or several actors? Or a research activity (undertaken as part of a research project)?

Characterisation of the process

- **What particular stage of a potential radiological event is considered** in the preparedness process (emergency, post-accident management)?
- What are the **specific issues/dimensions considered** in the process:
 - Issues regarding **emergency management** (evacuation, decontamination, health protection, water management, compensation, radioactive waste management, agriculture management, food supply and retail...)
 - Issues regarding **post-accident management** (zoning, compensation, relocation, management of activities such as agriculture in the contaminated areas, water supply, rehabilitation of living conditions in the contaminated areas, etc.)

Description of the process

- What are its **objectives**?
- Does the process take place at **local level**? In several local communities? At **national level**? **Or both**? Does it involve trans-boundary or **international cooperation**?
- Is the process **temporary or permanent**?
- **Who** are the actors involved in the process?
- What are the specific **motivation** of each category of actors to participate in this preparedness activity?
 - Is it a legal or contractual requirement? Is it part of a larger goal entailing other dimensions (e.g. as a part of a multi-risk preparedness policy)?
- Do some participants play a **leading role** in the process?

Methods, tools, resources & expertise

- Does the process entail the use of **particular tools** (such as handbooks, software, etc.)?
- Does the process ground on **specific methodologies** in order to produce a co-expertise of the different categories of actors involved?
- Does the process involve **mediation or facilitation** capacities?
- What are (human and financial) **resources** involved? How is it funded?
- Have the involved actors **access to a relevant expertise**?
 - Do they have the capacity to develop their own expertise on the situation? To what extent is the available expertise reliable in the eyes of the population & CSOs (when involved)?



2. Criteria for process evaluation

Outcomes, cooperation, changes in the framing of P-A issues, regulatory changes

- What are the **outcomes** of the process?
- Was the process subject to some **evaluation**? By whom? How?
- Do the different stakeholders have a **better understanding of their role and duties** in the context of a post-accident situation?
- To what extent does the process contribute **to change the patterns of relation** between the involved stakeholders?
- What are the **synergies between national & local** dimensions?
- **Has the framing of the emergency or post-accident issues changed** along the course of the process?
 - To what extent **is the radiation protection goal embedded into a larger perspective** involving the several aspects of life quality that would be potentially affected?
- Has the process provoked some **change of the legal, regulatory or institutional framework** of emergency or post-accident?
- What are the **main lessons** brought by the considered process?⁹

Resilience progress, sustainability, extension of the process

- Is the country (and local communities) **more resilient** after the process and better prepared?
- To what extent is the progress **sustainable**?
- To what extent have the involved actors developed a **common understanding of** what would be a **sustainable level of national-local preparedness**?
- To what extent and how can one expect the preparedness process to expand up to a **full coverage of the country**?
- To what extent does the **involved actors foresee future activities** involving new categories of stakeholders? Or new relevant issues?
- To what extent are the involved **stakeholders willing to go further**? Will they initiate preparedness activities of their own?
- Possible **further steps** of the development of preparedness in the country?



Composition des groupes de travail
Working groups composition

Groupe 1 – Salle 2-051

Gilles Hériard Dubreuil (Mutadis) – Animateur

Eric Bérat (ARS Aquitaine)

Sandra Biguenet (CEPN)

Henri Benazech (CLIN du Blayais)

Michel Cartier (ANCCLI)

Jean-Pierre Charre (Maire d'Orsan, CLI Marcoule, GPPA ANCCLI)

Julie Hazemann (EnerWebWatch)

Vincent Leuregans (CLI de Gravelines)

Patrick Maupin (CLIN du Blayais)

Thomas Mimiague (CLIN du Blayais)

Emmanuel Moulin (CLIN du Blayais)

Xavier Paulmaz (CLIN du Blayais)

Michaël Petitfrère (ASN nationale)

Coralie Pineau (CLI de Gravelines)

François Rollinger (IRSN)

Groupe 2 – Amphitheatre Badinter

Thierry Schneider (CEPN) – animateur

Jean-Claude Autret (CLI de Flamanville, GPPA ANCCLI)

Valérie Demet (ANCCLI)

Julien Dewoghelaere (Mutadis)

Daniel Geniez (CLI de la Drôme, ANCLI)

Jean-Clément Hernandez (CLIN du Blayais)

Jacques Maugein (Président de la CLIN du Blayais)

Philippe Moretto (Université de Bordeaux I)

Ohtsura Niwa (CIPR)

H. Peltier (Conseil Général de Gironde)

Jacqueline Rabic (CLIN du Blayais)

Wolfgang Raskob (KIT, coordinateur de NERIS-TP)

Philippe Renaud (IRSN)

Jean-Pierre Rombeaux (CLI de Gravelines)

Patrick Vieille (CLIN du Blayais)

Groupe 3 – Salle 3-091

Stéphane Baudé (Mutadis) – Animateur
Dominique Boutin (CLI de Chinon, ANCCLI)
Sylvie Charron (IRSN)
Michel Demet (ANCCLI)
Hervé Guégan (CLIN du Blayais)
Catherine Guénon (Ministère de l'Intérieur, DGSCGC)
Florion Guillaud (CLIN du Blayais, GPPA de l'ANCCLI)
Sylvie Hamon (CLIN du Blayais)
Françoise Hubert (CLIN du Blayais)
Véronique Leroyer (IRSN)
Yves Lheureux (ANCCLI)
Philippe Moretto (CLIN du Blayais)
Anne-Cécile Rigail (ASN division de Bordeaux)
Guy Stebens (HCPN, Luxembourg)
Marie-Pierre Thamie (EDF)

Questions

- Ces critères vous paraissent-ils pertinents pour décrire et mettre en regard les différents processus de préparation post-accidentelle?
- A la lumière de la deuxième série de critères. En quoi les différents processus Français, Européens et japonais présentés ont-ils permis
 - Une évolution durable du jeu d'acteurs, de la façon de poser les problèmes, du cadre institutionnel et juridique ?
 - Le démarrage ou le renforcement d'une dynamique propre des territoires susceptibles de se maintenir au cours du temps ? Le renforcement de la résilience de territoires ?
- Quelles sont les principales leçons que vous tirez des différentes présentations ?