



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

	Preparedness processes	Management processes
Nuclear or Radiological Emergency	X	X
Post-accident recovery	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?¹⁰

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 ?