



NERIS criteria for describing, assessing  
and comparing preparedness or  
management processes in Europe

NERIS TP Dissemination Workshop  
Oslo, January 22nd, 2014

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 EU countries, Belarus and Japan have been followed up
- A need for a tool to facilitate cross-comparison of these initiatives
- The proposed grid of criteria aims at a consistent description and evaluation of the considered national/local processes

# NERIS follow up processes with different purposes :

## **Preparedness** to potential radiological events

- to develop TODAY capacities for off site emergency management and post-event recovery

## **Management** of nuclear emergencies

- to create conditions for emergency off-site decisions of the various concerned actors to ensure radiological protection during the emergency phase

## **Management** of post-accident situations

- to create conditions for the various concerned actors to achieve a sustainable rehabilitation of their living conditions in affected areas

# Four potential contexts to be considered

	<b>Preparedness processes</b>	<b>Management processes</b>
<b>Nuclear or Radiological Emergency</b>	X	X
<b>Post-accident recovery</b>	X	X

# [ The NERIS GRID ]

---

1. Context description
2. Characterisation of the process
3. Description of the process
4. Methods, tools, resources & expertise
5. Outcomes, cooperation, changes
6. Resilience progress, sustainability,
7. Rehabilitation of living conditions, sustainability of the management

## 1- Context description

- Has the considered country been **impacted by past nuclear or radiological events** (in or outside its territory)?
- Is the country hosting **nuclear activities**? Or considering possible future nuclear activities?
- What are the previous **preparedness or management actions undertaken** in your country?
- 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? Or a research activity ?

## 2 - Characterisation of the process

### **What particular stage of a potential radiological event is considered ?**

- Emergency, involving evacuation, decontamination, health protection, water management, compensation, radioactive waste management, agriculture management, food supply and retail...
- Post-accident management involving zoning, compensation, relocation, management of activities such agriculture in the contaminated areas, water supply, rehabilitation of living conditions in the contaminated areas, community revitalisation, etc.

## 3 - Description of the process

- What are the **objectives of the process**?
- Does it 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 activity?
  - Is it a legal or contractual requirement? Is it part of a larger goal entailing other dimensions?
- Do some participants play a **leading role** in the process?



## 4 - Methods, tools, resources & expertise

- Does the process entail the use of particular tools (**such as handbooks, software, etc.**)?
- Does the process ground on **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**

## 5 - Outcomes, cooperation, changes in the framing of 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 or regulatory framework** of emergency or post-accident situations?
- What are the **main lessons** brought by the considered process?

## 6 - Resilience progress, sustainability, extension of the PREPAREDNESS

- Is the country (and local communities) **more resilient** after the process and better prepared?
- Are the progress **sustainable**?
- Have the involved actors developed a **common understanding of what is preparedness**?
- 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 stakeholders or new issues?

## 7 - Rehabilitation of living conditions, sustainability of the MANAGEMENT

- Are the progress **sustainable**?
- Can one expect the process to expand up to a **full coverage of the country**?
- Does the management process open the way to a **long term sustainable rehabilitation of the living conditions** of the affected populations ?