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INTRODUCTION

The third meeting of the Emergency Preparedness and Response Standards Committee (EPReSC) was conducted from 29 November to 1 December 2016. It was attended by 44 representatives from 34 Member States (MS) and 5 representatives from International Organizations (IO). Additionally, 8 representatives from MS and IO attended the meeting thru WebEx Service.

EP1: GENERAL

EP1.1: Opening remarks

The meeting was opened by Ms Elena Buglova, Head of the Incident and Emergency Centre (IEC). In her remarks she emphasized the growth of EPReSC activities, with an increased number of safety standards led by EPReSC, acknowledging that this is consistent with the growth of the importance given by MS to EPR related activities. Also these growing activities are a challenge for EPReSC members and require a long term view for its implementation.

EP1.2: Chairperson’s remarks

Ms Heinrich presented her opening remarks. She encouraged the active participation of the Committee members in this meeting as it was in previous meetings. She also provided some information about the joint meeting with WASSC included in the Agenda. Finally, she emphasized the importance of reaching and developing a clear view for the priorities to be faced by EPReSC in the upcoming years.

EP1.3: Logistics and administration

Mr De la Vega presented the logistics and administrative arrangements.

EP1.4: Adoption of the agenda of the third EPReSC meeting

The draft agenda was adopted without changes. The Chair emphasized the flexibility that would be necessary based on the course of the discussions and the availability of some speakers not belonging to the Committee. She thanked the members in advance for their understanding that the agenda may need to be adjusted based on presenters’ availability or other considerations.

EP1.5 Approval of the report of the second EPReSC meeting

The draft minutes of the last EPReSC2 meeting were presented for approval, noting that only comments (from Iran) had been received to the draft submitted for
comments. These comments, which referred to wording of some sentences, had been addressed. The meeting report of EPR2C2 was approved with no objections.

**EP1.6 Update from the 40th meeting of the CSS**

Mr Delattre presented the outcomes of the 40th meeting of the CSS. Australia commented on the publication of safety standards in planned exposure situations, and the need to take into account environmental aspects in the drafting of safety standards related to emergency and existing exposure situations. New Zealand asked about a possible future integration between nuclear safety standards and nuclear security guidance. Mr. Delattre replied that this was an issue with strong political implications and confirmed that there is a strong interface and some overlaps between nuclear safety and security and this aspect will probably be addressed in the future drafting of some common documents for both fields. Japan asked about the action 40.02 agreed by the CSS, including the creation of a Working Group (WG) to consider the impact on the safety standards of one recent UNSCEAR publication. Mr. Delattre clarified that this was regarding a UNSCEAR document about Attributing Health Effects and Inference of Risk, which raised several points with potential impact in safety standards especially regarding defining thresholds for protective actions and dose limits.

**EP1.7 Update from the last Meeting of the Chairs**

Ms Heinrich provided information on the last meeting of the Chairs of Safety Standards Committees. She highlighted the discussion held regarding the issue with Publications Committee and the delays produced by the publication process, which sometimes involves the introduction of changes in the documents approved by the Committees and the CSS. This point was further clarified by Mr. Delattre. There were no questions or comments.

**EP1.8 Update on the NSS-OUI IT Platform**

Mr. Delattre presented the current status, capabilities and use of this platform, which allows among other features: browsing of the different requirements and criteria included in the standard, tracking of the comments posted by different people on the content of the safety standard (SS) and provision of links to other documents (Safety Reports, TECDOC, EPR Series, etc.) that are relevant for the different subsections that may be used in future revisions. To receive access to this platform, SS Committees members should submit a request to the Secretary of the Committee of membership.

Ms. Heinrich asked about the possibility of getting access to the feedback on the comments posted. Mr. Delattre clarified that this was only accessible to the Secretariat. New Zealand asked about who was authorized to provide comments. Mr
Delattre informed that this possibility existed only for members of Safety Standards Committees.

**EP2: REVIEW OF IAEA SAFETY STANDARDS**


Mr Guskov gave a presentation on the content of this draft Safety Standard. Japan asked whether any of the Design Extension Conditions specific cases considered involved failure of the zirconium cladding. The presenter replied that no specific cases were addressed in the draft SS.

There were no other comments or questions to the presentation. The draft SS was APPROVED to proceed to next step of the drafting process (submission to MS for comments).

**EP2.2 DS492 Draft Safety Guide: Human Factors Engineering in Nuclear Power Plants**

Mr Duchac gave a presentation summarizing this draft SS. Ms. Heinrich asked about the comments received to the draft from EPReSC members and how they had been addressed. The presenter informed that comments from EPReSC members had been included in the text, referring the specific case of one comment about Emergency Operations Facilities.

There were no other comments or questions to the presentation. The draft SS was APPROVED to proceed to next step of the drafting process (submission to MS for comments).

**EP3: REVIEW OF IAEA SAFETY STANDARDS (JOINT SESSION WITH WASSC)**

Refer to the specific minutes drafted for this Joint Session

**EP4: REVIEW OF NSGC DOCUMENTS FOR CLEARANCE**


Mr De la Vega presented the new draft NST, modified after a previous draft was not cleared in EPReSC2. This created a situation not specifically addressed in the SPESS guidance, thus and ad hoc process was defined to place the draft on track again.

The presentation had been prepared jointly between the presenter and the Technical Officer for this Implementing Guide. The presenter described the process followed, including internal discussion within the Secretariat (between the Division of Nuclear Security and the IEC) to develop the new draft, the changes included to
adequately address the concerns raised in EPReSC2 about how EPR aspects were
addressed, and the way forward if the new draft were approved in EPReSC3.

USA commended the process followed to improve the draft and address the EPReSC
concerns. France asked for the possibility of having a detailed description of all the
changes included in the new draft. The presenter clarified that, owing the complex
process followed to agree on the changes between Division of Nuclear Security and
the IEC, involving different exchange of intermediate drafts and comments, actually
there wasn’t any file depicting all the numerous changes included. The presenter
confirmed that the most relevant changes were described in the presentation.

No objections were raised and the draft was CLEARED by EPReSC for submission to
DDG for approval.

Transport**

A presentation was given on this draft NST by Mr. Shannon. Mr. de la Vega clarified
the intervention of the IEC at the last stage of the draft (approval by Coordination
Committee) before being sent to this round of SS Committees. This intervention was
related to comments raised by the IEC some time ago and which hadn’t been
addressed in the drafting process. Accordingly, the draft was modified to include
these comments. New Zealand asked for additional clarification about the concept of
Security Level included in the draft NST. The presenter explaining how this concept
was linked to the definition of different thresholds that were meaningful to define
the level of security arrangements needed for a specific shipment.

No objections were raised to the content of this draft and it was CLEARED by
EPReSC for submission to DDG for approval.

Security**

Ms. Rouland gave a presentation on this draft NST. United Arab Emirates asked
whether Critical Digital Assets related to EPR were included. Ms. Rouland confirmed
that this point had been included in the draft.

No objections were raised to the content of this draft and it was CLEARED by
EPReSC for submission to MS for comments.

and Storage and of Associated Facilities**

Ms. George gave a presentation on this draft NST. Ms. Heinrich asked about the
comments received regarding EPR. The presenter explained that some comments
were received from the IEC, which were included before the preliminary approval of
the draft by the Coordination Committee.

No objections were raised to the content of this draft and it was CLEARED by
EPRSc for submission to DDG for approval

**EP4.5 NST051 Draft Implementing Guide: Security during the Lifetime of a
Nuclear Facility**

Ms. Garrett presented this draft NST. Ms. Heinrich asked for the comments received
regarding EPR and how they were addressed. The presenter clarified that 8
comments were received from members of EPRSc, of which 6 were accepted and
two rejected, in this case for consistency with higher level documents.

No objections were raised to the content of this draft and it was CLEARED by
EPRSc for submission to MS for comments.

**EP-5: EPR Series PUBLICATIONS UNDER DEVELOPMENT**

**EP5.1 Considerations for Development of a Protection Strategy for a Nuclear or
Radiological Emergency**

Ms Nestoroska Madjunarova gave a presentation informing about the scope and
content of this EPR series, which will provide technical guidance about this new GSR
Part 7 requirement. Some questions were raised afterwards.

Japan asked whether it was intended to address the protection strategy applicable
to emergencies in radioisotope production facilities. The presenter replied that the
document was aimed at being generic, but some specific examples were going to be
included in an Annex, one could be regarding this specific case.

Spain asked whether GSR Part 7 was clear enough regarding planning zones for
nuclear and radiological emergencies. The presenter answered that the differences
in this regard are linked to EP Categories. GSG-2 provides some information on the
point raised.

WHO pointed out the need to provide specific guidance for all protective actions.
The presenter welcomed the comment and invited WHO to provide its contributions
in the drafting process.

France asked about the Consultancy Meeting envisaged to develop the draft and for
the kind of participants foreseen (e.g., radiation specialists, civil defense
representatives). The presenter answered that probably a balanced mix of
representatives of all those sectors, including health specialists, should be pursued.
Germany asked for the kind of scenarios to be considered. The presenter answered that the intent was not to address just a few scenarios, but examples for particular cases will be included.

Finland commended the idea of developing this document and asked for the expected date for publication. The presenter replied that it was expected to have the document and associated the training materials published by 2018.

USA asked about the decision to develop an EPR series document versus a SS to address a specific topic. The presenter replied that in cases where topics required issuance of detailed technical guidance an EPR series document was developed, and later on this could be the basis for drafting a SS. Mr. De la Vega clarified that the main difference between EPR Series documents and SS is that consensus is required for SS and not for EPR series. In addition, EPR series documents are more focused on providing guidance that could be useful for MS. In this last case drafting process was simpler and based on internal processes of the Secretariat.

Japan emphasized that no definition of protection strategy is included in GSR Part 7, and asked about the envisaged approach to face this concept. The presenter replied that the idea was to address this issue in the first consultancies, addressing the implementation of protective actions as a set and developing the concept on this basis.

Ms. Heinrich encouraged the presenter to provide more details at the next EPREsC meeting.

**EP5.2 Information on EPR Series document Operational Intervention Levels for Radiological Emergencies and Methodology for their Derivation**

Mr Vilar-Welter gave a presentation, reporting about the scope and drafting status of this document.

Germany asked about possible contribution of MS to draft this document. The presenter replied that the methodology for drafting would be similar to the one followed for drafting the NPP-OILs EPR series document and that participation in the drafting process of interested MS will be sought.

Australia asked about the content and intended audience of the next regional WS for Asia-Pacific region to be organized regarding OILs. The presenter clarified that the WS will address NPP-OILs and he recommended nominations of attendees involved in the definition or implementation of OILs.

**EP5.2 Information on EPR Series document Preparedness and Response to a Nuclear or Radiological Emergency Occurring in Combination with a Disaster Caused by an Extreme Natural Event**
Mr Vilar-Welter gave a presentation informing about the scope and drafting status of this document. Some questions were raised by the attendees.

Spain pointed out the difficulties to write a document that could be useful for many MS, considering the very different situations existing in MS regarding risk of extreme natural events. The presenter acknowledged that this was certainly a challenge.

The ENIS representative asked for information about plans to develop new EPR series documents and also whether the IAEA was pursuing MS involvement for defining priorities in this field. Australia suggested including in the meetings specific items in the Agenda to get this input from MS. Mr. De la Vega clarified that certainly the Secretariat is seeking input from MS to determine priorities and that EPReSC meetings were an important source for this feedback, but not the only source. On this regard establishing a formal mechanism for this in EPReSC wouldn’t be adequate.

Canada asked about the kind of experts to be involved in drafting this document. The presenter clarified that expertise to be incorporated to Consultancy Meetings (CS) would include both EPR and external events fields.

Mexico asked if the document would include emergencies that are a combination of radiation emergencies with conventional human intervention caused emergencies. Mexico also asked if nuclear security related events were considered. The presenter informed that inclusion of security events was not envisaged and regarding other conventional emergencies, the CS discussions will determine to what extent they would be considered, however the main aim of the document is about natural disasters.

Norway asked about the exact name of the document under development. The presenter clarified that the drafting process is not starting from scratch, but from one existing draft with the title included in the Agenda.

Germany asked about possible involvement of experts from other International Organizations such as OECD, EU, etc. The presenter agreed on the convenience of having strong support for the document but also it was needed to keep a practical approach to make feasible having the document ready in a reasonable amount of time.

FAO asked about the purpose of the document regarding other emergencies. The presenter replied that the aim was at analyzing potential impact of conventional emergencies regarding nuclear or radiological emergencies.

New Zealand highlighted the difficulties to assess the different scenarios to be included in the document. The presenter agreed with this remark.
EP 6 STRATEGIC ISSUES

EP 6.1a Proposed priorities for development of safety guides in EPR in mid-term and proposed structure (for discussion)

EP 6.1.b DPP for GS-G-2.1 Revision (for information)

Since both points of the Agenda had important links between them, it was decided to hold the discussion on them simultaneously. Ms. Nestroska Madjunarova gave two presentations, one on the proposed priorities for Committee’s work in the mid-term and another on the proposed content of the DPP for revision of GS-G-2.1.

New Zealand commented on the timeline included (2017-2022) for priorities and whether this timeline it should go beyond considering the work involved. The presenter replied that the road map presented may be reviewed and updated as steps are fulfilled. Ms. Heinrich supported this perspective.

Finland inquired whether it would be better to develop an EPR series document on medical topics instead of developing a SS. The presenter agreed initially with this point, but considering that the aim should ultimately be at developing SS to provide higher level guidance on GSR Part 7 requirements for medical aspects, a SS document is appropriate for medical topics.

WHO asked about possibilities for cosponsoring of different SS included in the road map. The presenter replied that this cosponsoring may be developed in the frame of DS474/475. Mr. De la Vega supported the idea of cosponsoring, with interested IACRNE organizations defined on a case by case basis.

Japan asked if requirement 5 (Protection Strategy) of GSR Part 7 would be addressed in next revision of GSG-2or in the upcoming GS-G 2.1. Japan also stated that having an Appendix on this aspect in this SS would be very useful. The presenter clarified that the aim was to include this aspect in the revision of GSG-2, not in GS-G 2.1. It’s expected that the EPR Series document on Protection Strategy, currently being developed, will be helpful in this regard. Japan agreed about the usefulness of this EPR series. The presenter agreed and pointed out that EPR series are not SS.

ILO reminded that in order to cosponsor a document an invitation letter would be needed. The presenter agreed, informing that this point will be fulfilled for every cosponsoring.

USA remarked that they would appreciate having a clearer view on the schedule for developing guidance for all GSR Part 7 requirements. The presenter acknowledged this point, but also recalled the difficulty of developing a commonly shared view on that, referring to the discrepancies raised in the debate in EPreSC2 regarding the discussion paper on GS-G 2.1 revision. In the future also platforms like NSS-OUI could be useful to take steps to further clarify the road map. Mr. De la Vega pointed out that the development of additional guidance for GSR Part 7 requirements should be a gradual process combining the development of EPR series document (provided detailed technical guidance) and new or revised SS (providing higher level guidance, but requiring longer term for their development). The presenter reminded also that development of EPR series documents is
an internal Secretariat process and not ruled by EPReSC, EPR Series are not SS but rather
should be considered as useful complements of SS, providing more operational guidance.

Germany raised the point of the problems faced by EU MS, which should implement shortly
the new BSS Directive. They would appreciate the existence of guidance that could help in
this process. The presenter remarked that the IAEA is working together with the EC on this
regard, and certainly the IAEA is willing to provide support to EU MS. Mr. De la Vega
informed that the IEC was willing to work with the EC in the organization of a WS to provide
information on how GSR Part 7 may support the implementation of the EC BSS Directive.

Ms. Heinrich closed the debate, by summarizing:
- The document with the road map for future work was adopted by EPReSC as a
  reference identifying mid-term priorities and their development. It could be revised
  and refined in future meetings.
- Regarding the DPP, the document is at an early stage and hasn’t yet met the
  necessary steps in the SPESS process to allow it to move forward. It was presented
  for information and discussion. After this meeting, it will be entered into the SPESS
  process and will be submitted to SS Committees (including EPReSC) meetings to be
  held next June. At that time the Committees will evaluate the DPP, for approval for
  submission to CSS.

**EP6.2 Communication related topics**

**EP 6.2.a Update on EPReSC WG on “How to communicate What’s safe”**

Mr. Meschenmoser gave a presentation summarizing the status of this activity. He
informed that the discussion paper (DP) will be streamlined in the next Consultancy
Meeting. Since the text compiling the discussion held by the WG on this topic will be
then basically complete, the next point would be the integration of the text in an
adequate publication. He proposed having the paper included in the upcoming
revision of the EPR Series document on Public Communication.

Ms. Heinrich opened the floor for comments, clarifying that is up to EPReSC to
decide on the future use of this DP.

Finland asked about possible usefulness of the DP in DS475. The presenter endorsed
that idea. Portugal, after stating his agreement with the proposal, suggested also
taking advantage of the paper for the upcoming revision of INES Manual. This
proposal also supported by the presenter.

Ms. Heinrich closed this point by concluding the acceptance of the proposal about
including the DP as an Annex of the revised EPR Series Document and also consider
specific points of its content in DS475 and revision of INES Manual.

**EP 6.2.b Update on drafting status of DS475**
Mr. Meschenmoser gave a presentation summarizing the situation of the draft and upcoming steps in its development. After the TM held last September to get direct feedback from MS on the draft, the text was subsequently revised and it’s expected to be sent to SS Committees June meetings for approval prior for submission to MS for comments. There were no comments on this topic.

**EP 6.2.c Briefing on INES Scale Manual Revision**

Mr. Meschenmoser presented the plans and expectations for the revision of this manual. Some points were raised afterwards by the attendees.

Canada suggested considering a change of approach in INES Scale to make it more open-ended. The presenter agreed that the scale needed some kind of reform, but at this stage it was difficult to define a clear scope of the revision.

Slovenia recalled some challenges in the use of INES. Germany asked about the considerations of uncertainties in the rating process. The presenter agreed with the need of reviewing the tool, but he emphasized that the scale shouldn’t be used to compare events. In his opinion one relevant aspect for the revision was streamlining the interaction with the media in the use of the scale. Spain asked about the use of INES scale during emergencies, highlighting that it’s very difficult owing to lack of precise and fully contrasted information. The presenter agreed with this issue, which had been also raised in the recent biannual meeting of INES National Coordinators. United Arab Emirates asked about the possible link between INES scale and the Assessment & Prognosis process during and emergency being developed by the IAEA. The presenter replied that in his opinion such links in this regard are unlikely to exist.

**6.3 Updates on activities to support the implementation of GSR Part 7**

Mr. De la Vega gave a presentation on this subject, informing about upcoming training events and WS. There were no comments.

**6.4 Update on EPRIMS status and related activities**

Mr. Breitinger gave a presentation on this point, informing about the status of the platform and plans for improvement of some of its features.

France raised the point about the possible need of more than one National Coordinator, as it is their case. He also asked about the information that had been populated by the IAEA when the system was launched and how it was expected to be validated. The presenter clarified that the referred information came out of RASIMS-TSA5 and information provided by the country in the last Competent Authorities Meetings. Validation should be done by the affected country, with the exemption of the Performance Indicators that required agreement between the IAEA and the MS.
7 PRESENTATIONS BY MS ON NATIONAL EPR ARRANGEMENTS

7.1. Presentation by Belarus

Ms Nikolayenks gave a presentation describing the EPR arrangements in Belarus. Her presentation can be found in the EPreSC web site. Some questions were asked by the attendees.

Lithuania asked about planning zones and their possible impact in Lithuanian territory. He also emphasized the need for bilateral agreement and harmonization of reference levels between both countries to ensure consistency. The presenter agreed on the importance of this aspect, and remarked that a bilateral agreement is being developed. Israel asked about the distance considered for implementation of Iodine Thyroid Blocking (ITB). The presenter replied that there is a pre-distribution made within a 10 Km. radius and that ITB are available for distribution in 1 day. There is a national stockpile for this purpose. Germany asked about the use of the same Generic Criteria (100 mSv) for Sheltering and Evacuation. The presenter replied that the use of these criteria was in line with GSR Par 7 and that they were developing specific Operational Intervention Levels for the different protective actions. South Africa asked about the expiry date of the ITB pills. The presenter replied that the typical expiry period is 10 years. They don’t have yet a specific schedule for replacing the stockpiles. France asked information about the Operational Intervention Levels (OIL), Emergency Action Levels and Other conditions, as shown in one of the slides of the presentation. The presenter replied that those aspects were developed in detail in the Emergency Plans and those values and conditions served for the decision making process for defining protective actions. New Zealand asked about the process to estimate the dose received by the public in the areas contaminated by Chernobyl accident, and specifically if only external exposure was considered or were there other exposure pathways considered. The presenter clarified that these areas were considered as being in an existing exposure situation and all the pathways were monitored. She also clarified that the level of contamination in food and milk was quite low, thus the exposure due to ingestion was low. New Zealand asked who is responsible for radiation monitoring in case of accident in nuclear or radioactive transport. The presenter replied that they have a special brigade with specific training and resources for that purpose.

7.2: Presentation by New Zealand

Mr. Ardouin addressed the Committee on the EPR arrangements in New Zealand. A discussion followed.

Ms Heinrich requested some additional technical details about the Co-60 teletherapy source information that was provided by the presenter. Egypt asked about the control of scrap metal to detect orphan sources. The presenter explained the
controls in place in that regard. Mr. Florian Baciu, from the IEC, asked about existing
arrangements in the country for requesting and providing assistance at the
international level. The presenter explained that they haven't had any need on that
aspect to date, and they were engaging with neighboring small island countries to
develop an agreement on this subject. Ms. Heinrich asked about capacity building
activities taking place in the country on EPR. The presenter provided information
about some activities implemented in the area of IAEA Transport Safety Standards.
Some of those activities take place through a regional network created in the Pacific
Ocean Islands community.

Japan and Mexico volunteered for presentation to be given by MS in EPreSC-4 on
national EPR arrangements.

**EP-8: REPORTS FROM INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**


Ms Carr gave a presentation explaining the conclusions drawn from the ITB survey
and the referred Guidelines, which made an appraisal of the different protective
actions in case of emergency using the WHO methodology to draw conclusions
about effectiveness of those protective actions. Afterwards an intense debate
followed, mainly regarding the referred Guidelines document.

Ms. Heinrich asked about the status of development of the document and how was
the document expected to be useful regarding supporting GSR Part 7
implementation. The presenter replied that the document was mainly focused on
the process followed and very little about recommendations. Ms. Buglova
highlighted that the IAEA participated as an observer in different meetings about
the ITB topic. However regarding the Guidelines document she emphasized that the
methodology used was not applicable to appraise effectiveness of other protective
actions in case of emergency and provided misleading results on this regard. Finland
raised the point that during emergency decisions should be made rapidly based on
existing information and not on the considerations included in the Guidelines. Also
she raised the problems that these Guidelines may involve regarding lack of
consistency with the instructions to be given by the Public Health Authority. The
presenter replied by saying that WHO was open to this kind of feedback. Mr.
Martincic, from the IEC, emphasized the point that the methodology used in the
Guidelines was not applicable to protective actions in case of radiation emergencies,
leading to misleading results that do more harm than good. The presenter
acknowledged the need to further contrast the data included in the Guidelines. Ms.
Nestoroska-Madjunarova highlighted the existence of many aspects of the
recommendations provided that didn’t provide any useful guidance, but rather confusing conclusions. The presenter replied that the methodology used by the experts in the drafting of the documents is based on the WHO criteria for evidence based guidance. Germany suggested that may be this evidence based methodology is adequate for other WHO documents on medical related topics but not in this case, emphasizing the fact that with so few valid data the conclusions are useless. The presenter confirmed that the document was based on the WHO standard protocol for developing guidance. Mr. De la Vega subscribed the opinions raised about the lack of applicability of the methodology used for this case and about the misleading results obtained. He also emphasized that the use of this methodology could complicate and hinder cooperation and synergies between EPREV and Joint External Evaluation (JEE) if the JEE missions were to apply this document. The presenter replied that there was no mechanism foreseen to implement the conclusions of the document in WHO peer review missions. Canada asked about whether WHO would consider the outcome of an EPREV in subsequent JEE missions to the country. The presenter replied saying that if WHO has access to EPREV report they would use it for JEE. United Arab Emirates raised the point that the module of JEE on radiation emergencies was very similar to EPREV and some coordination and cooperation between IAEA and WHO was needed to avoid duplication. The presenter agreed with this point. Ms. Buglova explained that the methodology used in the WHO Guidelines document was applicable to protective actions in radiation emergencies and the conclusions of the document were not useful for policy makers. She referred to the case of implementation of EU BSS Directive as an example where this document could be harmful. The presenter replied that she agreed with the need of continuing the discussion and provide feedback about the document. Belgium subscribed the idea that the approach used in the development of the guidelines is not applicable to radiation emergencies. The presenter replied that WHO had used this methodology in the case of chemical and natural disasters related emergencies. Ms. Nestoroska-Madjunarova asked about the consistency of the conclusions of the document with the fact that WHO had cosponsored GSR Part 7 and other Safety Standards in the EPR field. The presenter replied that she respected those opinions and looked forward to further cooperation. FAO asked about WHO internal regulations addressing other kind of emergencies and how did those documents fit to this one. The presenter replied that the methodology was the same but the information used was different since it was referring to other aspects.

**EP 8.2 REPORTS FROM OTHER IO BEING OBSERVERS TO EPRESC**

**EP 8.2.a Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)**

Mr. Blackburn summarized the statement submitted by FAO to EPReSC highlighting the main activities of FAO regarding radiation emergencies, which were mainly focused on agricultural countermeasures and long-term food control. He also referred to the WS jointly organized by the IAEA and the FAO last October regarding Chernobyl accident effects on the food chain. There were no questions.
**EP 8.2b International Labor Organization (ILO)**

Mr. Niu gave a presentation on ILO activities to support UN Sustainable Development Goals. There were no questions.

**EP 8.2.c World Nuclear Transport Institute (WNTI)**

Ms. Presta presented the main activities of WNTI, in particular regarding the feedback provided by the Nuclear Transport Operators to international Safety Standards.

Germany asked about specific recommendations issued by WNTI regarding Emergency Exposure Situations during transport activities. The presenter mentioned some specific developments made by WNTI to Operational Intervention Level related to transport emergencies.

**EP 8.2.c European Nuclear Installations Safety Standards (ENISS)**

Mr. C. Hall presented a statement from ENISS regarding its activities in the field of safety standards and communications.

Australia referred to a document on non-radiological impact referred to in the statement, asking about the information gathered for its development. The presenter clarified that the document was based on information collected from actual emergencies.

**EP-9: CLOSING OF THE MEETING**

Before summarizing the conclusions of the meeting, Ms. Heinrich addressed two specific aspects:

- Regarding DS478 discussed during the joint meeting with WASSC, she mentioned an aspect observed after the discussion held in that meeting. This aspect involved a change in paragraph 9.124 of the draft between the version posted in the EPReSC area (September 2016) and the version effectively presented to the meeting. The changed text introduced some confusing wording. She requested and obtained the permission from the Committee to directly approach the DS478’s Technical Officer to fix this issue.

- Regarding point 6.1.b of the Agenda, she emphasized that the DPP presented was not for approval but just for information, because it hadn’t been submitted into the SPESS process. After entering in the SPESS process it will be submitted to EPReSC4 for approval.

At this stage, USA raised some comments on the WHO presentation. She emphasized that, sharing the views expressed by EPReSC members during the discussion, she
thanked the presenter for the information provided and acknowledged that, even if the approach of the document could be controversial, it provided a different perspective regarding protective actions that could be useful from a different perspective to the one adopted in Safety Standards.

**EP9.1 Review of conclusions arising from the third meeting of EPReSC**

Ms Heinrich provided a summary of the meeting's main points and conclusions:

- In the mid term it will be important to take into account the perspective provided by the CSS mid-term priorities
- Approval of 5 draft Safety Standards at step 7 and one at step 11, as indicated in the Agenda
- Clearance of 5 NSGC draft Implementing Guides: 3 for submission to DDG for approval, 2 for submission to MS for comments.
- Joint session with WASSC where a good discussion and exchange took place.
- Discussion on EPReSC strategic issues. Adopted a document with a road map and priorities for future developments, which will be revised in the future as deemed necessary.
- Briefing and discussion on communication related topics, ongoing EPR series documents and IEC activities.
- Briefing and interesting debate on two MS presentations about national EPR arrangements. Japan and Mexico have volunteered to give similar presentations in EPReSC4.

**EP 9.2: Any Other Business**

No additional point was raised

**EP9.3 Dates for future Meetings**

Mr de la Vega provided information on dates for future meetings:

- 4th EPReSC meeting from June 6 to 9, 2017
- 4th EPReSC meeting: tentative dates: 6 – 9 November 2017

**EP10.4 Closing Remarks**

Ms Heinrich thanked the participants for their time, efforts and attention, and also expressed appreciation for the excellent spirit of active participation demonstrated during the meeting.
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<td>Nikalayenka</td>
<td>Alena</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonck</td>
<td>Michel</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juacaba Belem</td>
<td>Lilia Maria</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahier</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigouin</td>
<td>Luc</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakr</td>
<td>Wafaa</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaltonen</td>
<td>Hannele</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodeman</td>
<td>Jean-François</td>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyen</td>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuhlen</td>
<td>Johannes</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapitany</td>
<td>Sandor</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasim</td>
<td>Kadhim Ayyl</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organo</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tshuva</td>
<td>Avraham</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizzi</td>
<td>Roberto</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homma</td>
<td>Toshimitsu</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurusumi</td>
<td>Masato</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motomitsu</td>
<td>Kunihiko</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomizawa</td>
<td>Yumi</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Youngmin</td>
<td>Korea, Republic of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidiskiene</td>
<td>Danute</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortés Carmona</td>
<td>Alejandro</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klomberg</td>
<td>Theo</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardouin</td>
<td>Cris</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solberg</td>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadeem Hussain</td>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliveira Martins</td>
<td>Joao</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarmichuk</td>
<td>Sergey</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tall</td>
<td>Moustapha</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makovnik Michal</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramerane Mothusi</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Jose</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johansson Jan</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rauber Dominique</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusch Ronald</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Bloushi Fahed</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhensa Surinderjit</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fielding Nasrine</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen David</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffin Stephanie</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinrich Ann</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siwila Boster Dearson</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**International Organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presta Anne</td>
<td>WNTI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr Zhanat</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn Carl Michael</td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall Chris</td>
<td>ENISS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niu Shengli</td>
<td>ILO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Webex Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starostova Vera</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizamska Marina</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awudu Abdel Razak</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soufi Itimad</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vuletic Vedrana</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guzman Olvido</td>
<td>NEA/OCDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimenez Pablo</td>
<td>PAHO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charalambous Fiona</td>
<td>ARPANSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>