Ms Carr gave a presentation explaining the conclusions drawn from the ITB survey and the referred Guidelines, which provide recommendations on the different protective actions in case of emergency according to the evidence assessment protocol used by WHO methodology (GRADE approach), to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of those protective actions and to give recommendations about its implementation. Afterwards an intense debate followed, mainly regarding the referred Guidelines document.

576 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 current version of the document was mainly focused on the process followed and includes conditional recommendations based on low-quality evidence.

579 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 in her opinion, the GRADE methodology was not applicable to appraise effectiveness of other protective actions in case of emergency, as it may provide misleading results in 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 the main purpose of the guidelines was to provide information on all pro-s and con-s of the decision making when planning for emergency response, so that it could be useful for the development of MS EPR arrangements. She also said that WHO appreciates this kind of feedback as it will give a chance to improve the document. 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
592 acknowledged the need to further elaborate on the text making sure that methodology is explained in a clear way, since there is still misunderstanding related to the GRADE methods which is widely used in clinical medicine and bio-medical research. Ms.

593 Nestoroska-Madjunarova expressed her concerns that in its current state the Guidelines document provided recommendations which would be not useful and could create confusion among member states by including recommendations inconsistent with international safety standards. The presenter replied that the methodology used by the

596 experts in the drafting of the documents is based on the WHO criteria for evidence

597 based guidance and all WHO recommendations now follow the same protocol. Germany suggested that may be this evidence-based methodology could be indeed

adequate for other WHO documents on medical topics but not in this case,

because conclusions which are based on a very limited and insufficient data will not be valid. The

600 presenter confirmed that the document was based on the WHO standard protocol

601 for developing guidance and indeed, according to this protocol, the systematic reviews described in the Guidelines resulted on a very limited evidence, graded as a low- and very-low quality evidence. However, the formal protocol applied by the WHO is not modifiable and all guidelines produced by the WHO must follow the same protocol. Mr. De la Vega supported the opinions raised about the

602 lack of applicability of the WHO’s methodology used for this case and about the misleading

603 results obtained. He also emphasized that the use of GRADE approach could

604 complicate and hinder cooperation and synergies between EPREV and Joint

605 External Evaluation (JEE) if the JEE missions were to apply this document. The

606 presenter replied that there was no mechanism foreseen to implement the

607 conclusions of the document in WHO peer review missions. JEE evaluations are carried out based on the national capacities for preparedness and response to health emergencies, but are not evaluating the detailed content of national response plans. Canada asked about

608 whether WHO would consider the outcome of an EPREV in subsequent JEE missions

609 to the country. The presenter replied saying that if WHO has access to a previous EPREV report

610 they would use it for JEE. United Arab Emirates raised the point that the module of

611 JEE on radiation emergencies was very similar to EPREV and some coordination and

612 cooperation between IAEA and WHO was needed to avoid duplication. The

613 presenter agreed with this point. Ms. Buglova again expressed her view stating that the methodology used
614 in the WHO Guidelines document was not applicable to protective actions in radiation
615 emergencies and the conclusions of the document will not be useful for policy makers.
616 She referred to the case of implementation of EU BSS Directive as an example where
617 this document could be harmful. The presenter replied that she agreed with the
618 need of continuing the discussion and requested the Committee members to provide feedback
about the document.
619 Belgium supported the idea that the approach used in the development of the
620 guidelines is not applicable to radiation emergencies. The presenter replied that
621 WHO had used this methodology in the case of chemical and natural disasters
622 related emergencies. Ms. Nestoroska-Madjunarova highlighted again the importance of the
consistency of
623 the conclusions of the document with GSR Part 7 cosponsored by WHO and other Safety
Standards in the EPR field. The presenter replied that she agreed with this comment,
625 respected those opinions and looked forward to further cooperation. FAO asked
626 about WHO internal regulations addressing other kind of emergencies and how did
627 those documents fit to this one. The presenter replied that the methodology was the
628 same but the information used was different since it was referring to other aspects.