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NST004 - OVERVIEW OF CURRENT DRAFT
NST004- Objective

Provide guidance to States on the development, implementation, maintenance and sustainment of a national framework
NST004 - Target Audience

National Policy and Decision-makers, national and local competent authorities, facility operators and support organisations, plus other entities / experts involved in the development of such a framework
NST004 - Scope

• It is intended to provide information and advice to States on the development, implementation, maintenance and sustainment of a national framework for managing the response to a nuclear security event.

• It describes a scheme for grouping types of nuclear security events based on representative scenarios.

• It provides States with guidance on response actions and considerations which can be adapted to meet their specific circumstances, experience and priorities.

• It may assist States in developing an appropriate national response plan and procedures according to their capabilities and needs. However, the details of such a plan are beyond its scope.
NST004 - Structure

– Seven Sections
– References
– Glossary
Sections

1. INTRODUCTION

2. BASIS FOR A NATIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR MANAGING THE RESPONSE TO NUCLEAR SECURITY EVENTS

   • Describes the roles which threat assessment, risk-informed approach, graded approach and detection systems and measures play in developing the national framework

3. TYPES OF NUCLEAR SECURITY EVENTS AND PLANNING OF RESPONSE RESOURCES

   • Describes a scheme to group representative nuclear security events into three categories which can be linked with their likely consequences of various representative scenarios and resourcing requirements
4. DESIGNING A NATIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR MANAGING THE RESPONSE TO NUCLEAR SECURITY EVENTS

• Addresses the design considerations relevant to a State’s national framework, including design methodology, strategic aims, key activities and example response actions.

5. INFRASTRUCTURE FOR A NATIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR MANAGING THE RESPONSE TO NUCLEAR SECURITY EVENTS

• Describes the infrastructure required within a State’s framework which will enable it to manage its response to nuclear security events effectively.

• Discusses multi-agency response and the need for effective plans, procedures, training and exercising to enable these agencies to respond in a coordinated manner.
6. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE

- Describes international cooperation and assistance requirements for responding to nuclear security events.

7. SUSTAINABILITY

- Discusses sustainability of the national framework for managing the response to nuclear security events.
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NST004 - DEVELOPMENT PROCESS
Development process (1)

- **8 Consultancy Meetings** (Jan 2013 – December 2015) with 49 representatives from 14 Member States

- Austria
- Brazil
- Canada
- China
- France
- Finland
- Germany

- Mexico
- Morocco
- Netherlands
- Russia Federation
- Ukraine
- United Kingdom
- United States of America
### Development process (2)

#### 1 Technical Meeting (August 2014)

- 41 representatives from 33 Member States + 1 representative from INTERPOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Left Column</th>
<th>Right Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Niger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Russia Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 2014

- 142 comments were received from MS representatives of:
  - Armenia (4)
  - China (8)
  - France (45)
  - UK (44)
  - USA (41)
All comments received were carefully assessed and majority incorporated into the draft.

March 2015

- The draft publication was posted in NSGC and relevant group(s) web-site.
Development Process (3)

• **June 2015**
  – Draft was reviewed and approved by relevant groups for submission to MS

• **August 2015**
  – Draft submitted soliciting MS comments

• **Dec 2015 – Jan 2016**
  – Addressing comments received from MS
After 120 day MS revision

- Total of 65 comments were received:
  - Germany (9)
  - India (1)
  - Jordan (4)
  - Russian Federation (22)
  - UAE (6)
  - UK (23)

- Letters specifying that there were *no comments on the draft* were received from:
  - China
  - Czech Republic
  - Finland
  - Sweden
After 120 day MS revision

• All comments received were carefully assessed and majority incorporated into the draft
  – The resolution tables before you give details of comments made

• April 2016
  – The draft publication was posted in NSGC and relevant group(s) web-site
Development Process (4)

- May 2016
  - A total of 17 comments / proposals were received from NSGC members:
    - France (7)
    - Russia Federation (6)
    - USA (4)

- All NSGC comments / proposals received were carefully assessed and the majority accepted
  - The resolution tables before you give details of comments received and assessed

- May 2016
  - TRANSSC and RASSC
    - Have no comments
Development Process (4) - continue

RECENTLY ESTABLISHED

• Emergency Preparedness and Response Standards Committee (EPReSC)
  – A total of 100 comments/proposals were received from:
    – Australia (10)
    – Belarus (7)
    – Canada (16)
    – Czech Republic (22)
    – Ireland (12)
    – USA (33)
  – All comments / proposals received were carefully assessed and the majority accepted
    – The resolution tables before you give details of comments received and assessed
Development Process (5)

• NST004 current status

  – It was APPROVED by NSGC for submission to DDG-NS on 21 June 2016

  – It was CLEARED by TRANSSC for submission to DDG-NS on 16 June 2016
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NST004 – PLANNED PATH TO PUBLICATION
**Planned path to publication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>EXPECTED PERIOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Approval by the NSGC for submission to the DDG-NS and clearance by other relevant group where appropriate</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Endorsement by the CSS</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Review and approval by IAEA Publication Committee</td>
<td>August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Target publication date</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you!