

## **STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT FOR POST NUCLEAR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT**

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND QUESTIONS FOR THE BREAK-OUT SESSIONS**

*(Day 2, 13 Oct; duration of sessions: 3 hrs)*

To help workshop participants better understand and prepare for the break-out session discussions, the following background information and initial types of questions for each topic are provided *for information*. The session moderators will use these, or similar, questions, as appropriate, to address the topic of each session, to help identify key issues, good practice, advantages and limitations associated with each topic

#### **Objective of the Break-Out Sessions**

Building on the information presented during Day 1 of the workshop, three topical break-out sessions have been schedule for Day 2, each addressing a different topic as given below:

- Conditions and Means to Engage Stakeholders
- Tools and Sustainability for Stakeholder Involvement
- Stakeholder Involvement in Emergency Exercises

Sessions will be moderated by designated experts to allow participants to discuss their relevant international and national experiences in the context of the topic areas and to identify areas for enhancing stakeholder involvement in post-emergency management. Outcomes will be presented in plenary followed by open discussion, with a view towards elaborating ways forward to achieve more effective stakeholder involvement as part of preparedness at the international and national levels, including possible areas for future national and international work.

#### **Background Material:**

##### **International Guidance Addressing Stakeholder Involvement in Emergency Management**

###### ***ICRP 82: Protection of the Public in Situations of Prolonged Radiation Exposure (1999)***

- The decision making process for the justification of interventions “may involve” relevant stakeholders (§ 59)
- Participation of stakeholders in the decision making process for the discontinuation of interventions after an accident is “essential”

###### ***ICRP 101: The Optimisation of Radiological Protection - Broadening the Process (2006)***

- Publication 101, Part 2, emphasises the role of stakeholder involvement in the optimisation process
- “ *The involvement of stakeholders is a proven means to achieve incorporation of values into the decision-making process, improvement of the substantive quality of decisions, resolution of conflicts among competing interests, building of shared understanding with both workers and the public, and building trust in institutions. Furthermore, involving all concerned parties reinforces the safety culture and introduces the necessary flexibility in the management of the radiological risk that is needed to achieve more effective and sustainable decisions.*” (§ 39)
- “*The involvement of stakeholders does not imply that the operating management and/or authorities relinquish their responsibility to make the final decision, or the accountability for that decision. The question of shared responsibility must not be obscured during the shared steps of the decision framing and implementation of the optimisation process.*” (§ 41)

**ICRP 103: The 2007 Recommendations of the International Commission on Radiological Protection (2007)**

- Evolution from ICRP 60: No longer a distinction between practices and interventions. The two concepts are replaced by three generic exposure situations, which cover all conceivable exposure situations: planned, emergency and existing. The three fundamental RP principles apply similarly to the three exposure situations.
- Optimisation of protection: *“This decision making process may often include the participation of relevant stakeholders rather than radiological specialists alone.”* (§ 224)

**ICRP 109: Application of the Commission’s Recommendations for the Protection of People in Emergency Exposure Situations (2009)**

- *“It is essential that all aspects of the plan are consulted with relevant stakeholders, otherwise it will be more difficult to implement them during the response. To the extent possible, the overall strategy and its constituent individual protective measures should be worked through and agreed with all those potentially exposed or affected. Such an engagement will assist the emergency plans in being focussed, not only on the protection of those most at risk in the early and intermediate phases, but also on the progression to populations resuming ‘normal’ lifestyles.”* (§g)
- ICRP *“recognises that the nature and the extent of stakeholder involvement may vary between countries, but suggests that engagement with stakeholders is an important component in the justification and optimisation of protection strategies in emergency exposure situations... The stakeholder involved in any particular aspects of an emergency response situation will vary with the type of situation/facility being considered, the scale of the emergency ... and the time phase of the emergency ... being addressed.”* (§ 11)
- Detailed developments about stakeholder involvement can be found in sections addressing:
  - The optimisation of protection strategies
  - The preparation of response plans
  - The termination of protective measures
  - The transition to rehabilitation
  - Engagement with stakeholders

**ICRP 111: Application of the Commission’s Recommendations to the Protection of People Living in Long Term Contaminated Areas After a Nuclear Accident or a Radiological Emergency (2010)**

- *“The Recommendations in this report ... further develop the role of stakeholders, recognising that those concerned with this type of situation should be involved and given the opportunity to participate directly in the implementation of protective actions to control their exposure”* (§ 4)
- *“Protection strategies have to be prepared by authorities as part of national planning arrangements. These plans should take self-help protective actions into account, including the conditions to allow such actions to be undertaken by the inhabitants...”* (§ 38)
- *“The dissemination of a ‘practical radiological protection culture’ within all segments of the population, and especially within professionals in charge of public health and education, is also an important element of the strategy”.* (§ 62)

**DRAFT Revised BSS: International Basic Safety Standards for Protection against Ionizing Radiation and for the Safety of Radiation Sources (draft v 3.0, 2010)**

- *General Requirements for Protection and Safety Responsibilities of Government :*
  - 2.19: *The government shall establish mechanisms to ensure that, where appropriate:*
    - a) *The activities of the regulatory body are coordinated with those of other governmental agencies, in accordance with para. 2.15 (e), and with national or international organizations with related responsibilities;*
    - b) *Interested parties are involved in decision making or decision aiding processes, as appropriate.*

***NEA Working Party on Nuclear Emergency Matters: Strategy for Developing and Conducting Emergency Exercises (2007)***

- *“Exercises ... provide a forum for exploring and testing new arrangements, for identifying issues that may need to be addressed within overall emergency programmes, and for involving a range of stakeholders who may be involved in various aspects of the response.”*
- *“In defining [exercise] objectives, planners should be aware of the full range of stakeholders that are relevant to a particular objective (e.g. involvement of agriculture representatives to investigate agricultural countermeasures, public information professionals, etc). The exercise planners may limit the scope of involvement, but need an awareness of the full range of relevant stakeholders with regards to a particular issue.”*
- *“Exercises are more successful if the “right” people participate. National exercise programmes can benefit from involving actual decision makers as well as a broad segment of stakeholders both within and external to the emergency preparedness communities.”*
- *“The conduct of exercises based on the models above will advance ... emergency management by involving many of the stakeholder groups that would be part of the response on all levels, for example local first response teams, industry representatives or non-governmental organisations. Planners should expand their planning network to include segments of industry or the private sector that could increase their response knowledge base.”*

***1998 Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice In Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention)***

**Article 5: Collection and Dissemination of Environmental Information**

*1) Each Party shall ensure that ... in the event of any imminent threat to human health or the environment, whether caused by human activities or due to natural causes, all information which could enable the public to take measures to prevent or mitigate harm arising from the threat and is held by a public authority is disseminated immediately and without delay to members of the public who may be affected.*

**Article 6: Public Participation in Decisions on Specific Activities**

*3) The public participation procedures shall include reasonable time-frames for the different phases, allowing sufficient time for informing the public ... and for the public to prepare and participate effectively during the environmental decision-making.*

*4) Each Party shall provide for early public participation, when all options are open and effective public participation can take place.*

*8) Each Party shall ensure that in the decision due account is taken of the outcome of the public participation.*

**Article 7: Public Participation Concerning Plans, Programmes and Policies Relating to the Environment**

*Each Party shall make appropriate practical and/or other provisions for the public to participate during the preparation of plans and programmes relating to the environment, within a transparent and fair framework ...*

**Article 8: Public Participation during the Preparation of Executive Regulations and/or Generally Applicable Legally Binding Normative Instruments**

*Each Party shall strive to promote effective public participation at an appropriate stage, and while options are still open, during the preparation by public authorities of executive regulations and other generally applicable legally binding rules that may have a significant effect on the environment. ...*

*The result of the public participation shall be taken into account as far as possible.*

---

In summary, the basic expectation is that a stakeholder-input process relevant to the goals of emergency management (from preparedness to recovery) should be articulated and implemented as part of preparedness, in order to be effective during emergency response and recovery.

**Topic 1: Conditions and Means to Engage Stakeholders**

*(Moderator: Jonathan Edwards, US EPA)*

*How to create and maintain a stakeholder involvement process that is relevant to the overall emergency management programme (planning to recovery) and to the identified stakeholders?*

- (a) *Cross-cutting question addressed in all sessions:* What is the role of stakeholder input in the development of optimised protection strategies for post-nuclear emergency management? What conditions and means will facilitate this, both within emergency management organisations and amongst other stakeholders?
- (b) What conditions (policies, guiding principles, structures, approaches, partnerships, types of stakeholders, etc) will favour effective/meaningful stakeholder involvement, in a manner consistent with the objectives of the emergency management programme? What conditions may hinder this?
- (c) Who is responsible for creating and maintaining these conditions, and what is the extent of their responsibilities? Do these depend on the type of emergency/lead organisation, or on a specific area of responsibility?
- (d) What benefits to emergency management organisations are/can be expected? What are the limitations or potential pitfalls?
- (e) What opportunities are offered by current existing structures to create conditions and means to engage stakeholders? How are stakeholders identified and informed of these processes?
- (f) Do the current structures favour particular types of stakeholders (e.g., through privileged communication channels or mechanisms for interaction), and if so, what is the rationale?
- (g) Are/should all stakeholders be involved in the same manner, or does/should their manner of involvement reflect their role or responsibility? How can stakeholder expectations be identified, managed and utilised (what are they, are they realistic, how are they taken into consideration, how to deal with conflict...)
- (h) What mechanisms at the national level are either currently used or foreseen for identifying and involving stakeholders from other countries, including other authorities or professional organisations? How are goals and objectives defined, communicated, agreed

=====

**Topic 2: Tools and Sustainability for Stakeholder Involvement**

*(Moderator: C. McMahon, RPII, Ireland)*

*What type of tools and resources are needed to sustain effective stakeholder involvement processes and meaningful stakeholder involvement, from the points of view of all stakeholders (including authorities)?*

- (a) *Cross-cutting question addressed in all sessions:* What is the role of stakeholder input in the development of optimised protection strategies for post-nuclear emergency management? How can this be undertaken in an effective and sustainable manner, both within emergency management organisations and amongst other stakeholders?
- (b) What processes, tools or resources can be used for identifying and deciding the type, scale and nature of stakeholder involvement for a particular situation. Do such tools to promote sustainable involvement as part of preparedness depend on the type of emergency / lead organisation?
- (c) What expertise and technical tools/resources can authorities make available to support stakeholders in their own preparedness and post-emergency management (e.g. models, indicators, handbooks, etc)? What are the main characteristics of such tools, and what should be the role of the authorities in developing, delivering, supporting, using these?
- (d) How can the various tools available to stakeholders support the development of optimised protection strategies?
- (e) How can the tools/resources be used in the larger context of coordinated emergency preparedness, and how might this change for different aspects of the emergency management (preparedness, consequence/recovery, long-term rehabilitation)?
- (f) How can authorities contribute to capacity building amongst stakeholders? Would this change for different stakeholders, and in what sense?
- (g) How might projects or processes initiated by stakeholders be utilised (opportunities, challenges, limitations, risks)
- (h) What criteria/indicators can be used by authorities to judge the success of such tools from the point of view of the goals and objectives of emergency management

=====

**Topic 3: Stakeholder Involvement in Emergency Exercises**

*(Moderator: M. Griffiths, DECC, UK)*

*How can the participation in emergency management exercises be extended to include a broader range of stakeholders (ie, those outside the formal emergency management structure), with the goal of improving emergency management arrangements?*

- (a) *Cross-cutting question addressed in all sessions:* What is the role of stakeholder input in the development of optimised protection strategies for post-nuclear emergency management? How can stakeholder involvement in emergency exercises facilitate this goal?
- (b) What is the link between stakeholder involvement during preparedness and stakeholder involvement in exercises (how to ensure a coherent approach)?
- (c) How can exercises be used to build ongoing collaboration with a range of stakeholders?
- (d) What types of stakeholders (jurisdiction, level, responsibility) should be involved in emergency management exercises, and how can this be accommodated in an effective and appropriate manner? How will this vary depending on the type of exercise/type of stakeholder?
- (e) How can the objectives/goals of stakeholders with respect to exercising be accommodated in a meaningful manner?
- (f) How can the different roles and responsibilities of stakeholders external to the formal emergency management structure (eg, other governments, industry reps, public reps, civil society) be accounted for in the exercise planning, conduct, evaluation and follow-up?
- (g) What experience exists at the national level for involving stakeholders in emergency exercises: who was involved, what was done, how did it work, what were the lessons?