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• A peer review conducted by an international team of experts
• A review based on international safety standards and guidance in the area of emergency preparedness and response, taking into account local conditions
• A review and technical exchange of experiences and practices at all levels
An EPREV is NOT:

• An audit against a rigid set of codes and standards
• A review based standards from experts’ own country
• A way to compare or rank Member States in terms of emergency preparedness
• An inspection of the national regulatory requirements
Practical objectives of an EPREV

- The purpose of the EPREV service is to review the practical implementation of emergency preparedness arrangements for responding to a radiation emergency.

- An EPREV peer review is performance-based, i.e. the review tries to answer the question “are the arrangements adequate and will they work?” given the national context in which they are applied.

- An EPREV service also aims at identifying specific strengths and best practices that can be shared with other Member States.

- An EPREV provides a basis for determining where improvements may be required and for measuring progress made in those areas.
EPREVs to date

• 42 EPREV missions conducted since 1999
• Most recent:
  – 2016: Hungary
  – 2015: United Arab Emirates, Kenya, Ghana, Nigeria, Jamaica
• Planning for 3 missions underway:
  – 2016: Indonesia
  – 2017: Belarus, Slovenia
EPREV Scope

• EPREV scope can be limited to one or more Emergency Preparedness Categories
  – By default, scope is limited to the applicable EP Categories in the national self-assessment
  – Scope can also be limited through the planning process to meet specific mission objectives

• Scope cannot be limited to certain organizations, facilities, or activities

• Missions are 5-10 days, depending on scope
EPREV Process

- Request by Member State
  - Self-Assessment
    - Preparatory Mission
      - EPREV Mission
        - EPREV Report and Findings
          - National Action Plan
Outputs: EPREV Report

• Findings are agreed with the counterparts before the team leaves the host country
  – Recommendations (GSR Part 7)
  – Suggestions (All relevant IAEA safety standards)
  – Good Practices

• Final report sent as Restricted ~30 days after the mission

• Report derestricted 90 days after receipt by host country, unless requested otherwise
Basis for the review

• The review is based on the IAEA safety standards for EPR
• Recommendations must be based on GSR Part 7
• Suggestions and Good Practices can be based on GSR Part 7 or applicable Safety Guides, GSG-2 and GS-G-2.1, and eventually others (DS474, DS475, DS469)
Recommendations

- Recommendations address aspects of the EPR arrangements that are not fully consistent with the IAEA Safety Requirements contained in GSR Part 7
  - They are specific, realistic and designed to result in tangible improvements
  - They state “what” needs to be achieved, not “how”
  - It is up to the Host State to determine the best method for achieving the desired outcome
  - They are succinct and self-explanatory
  - They are practicable and implementable

- The basis for the recommendation will be clearly documented
Suggestions

• Suggestions address two types of observations:
  – The requirement is met but the arrangement are not entirely consistent with the guidance contained in the other two safety standards on EPR, namely GSG-2 and GS-G-2.1
  – The requirement is met but it is deemed that tangible improvements could be made to the manner in which the arrangements are consistent with the requirements

• Suggestions are primarily intended to make the arrangements more effective or efficient

• A suggestion may be proposed in conjunction with a recommendation or may stand on its own

• The basis for the suggestion must be clearly documented
Good practices

• A good practice reflects an organization, arrangement, programme or performance that has a uniquely efficient or effective way to meet the IAEA safety standards

• A good practice goes beyond the fulfilment of current requirements or expectations

• It should be worthy of the attention to other Member States

• The basis for good practices should be any of the requirements or guidance contained in the IAEA safety standards on EPR.

• A good practice need not be exclusive or unique to the Host State, but it should not be common to many
Conclusions

• EPREVs can be a useful tool for reviewing the practical implementation of revised safety requirements

• MS are encouraged to update their national self-assessment in EPRIMS and consider requesting an EPREV mission
Thank you!