

NEPLG SIGNIFICANT ISSUES/ HORIZON SCANNING PAPER: May 2010

Background

The Nuclear Emergency Planning Liaison Group (NEPLG) is a forum which brings together, under Department of Energy and Climate Change chairmanship, a wide range of organisations with interests in off-site planning for an emergency at a civil nuclear licensed site. The Group identifies, discusses and finds solutions to common problems, and agrees improvements in planning, procedure and organisation which would form a framework of advice to emergency planners.

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to provide a platform for NEPLG to identify, discuss and find possible solutions to significant issues that may affect civil nuclear emergency planning. It is not a risk register: it is aimed at highlighting possible future problems and potential solutions. As solutions are found or issues become less noteworthy outcomes are promulgated via this paper.

DECC
June 2010

| No. | Significant Issue | Timeframe | Background, action and responsibility | Likely Impact on Civil Nuclear Emergency Planning |
|------------|---|--|--|--|
| 1. | Alignment of counter terrorist and accident response arrangements | Ongoing | <p>Threat of terrorist action at a nuclear site has been raised as result of recent terrorist events around the world. The need for better linkages across accident and terrorist response plans has been recognised and work is underway to ensure alignment.</p> <p>SG has agreed at NEPLG in February 2010 to set up a sub group of NEPLG to align these areas of work. In England and Wales DECC has responsibility for the accident response and Home Office for the CT response.</p> | Revised guidance may affect emergency response. |
| 2. | New nuclear build | Planning, policy and preparation ongoing | <p>Although any new build is unlikely to start until 2013/14, emergency arrangements are likely to come under significant scrutiny in any planning process.</p> <p>Policy for new build sits in DECC.</p> | Existing emergency arrangements and planning assumptions could be subject to close scrutiny during the consultation stage. This could impact on resources. |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------|--|---|
| 3. | National Resilience Extranet | Roll out from 2010 | <p>The service will provide a browser-based tool to facilitate multi-agency working during an emergency and enable communication and document access and sharing up to Restricted level.</p> <p>Cabinet Office is leading on this work.</p> | <p>NRE promises to be a helpful tool in emergency response, provided that all agencies are using the same system. Likely take-up is still not known</p> |
| 4. | Emergency Services' Emergency Exposure Levels. | Ongoing | <p>The Blue Light Sub Group met for the first time in December 2009 to address joint work on risk assessments and operational planning, interoperability and resilience across all three emergency services, in case of radiological or nuclear event.</p> <p>NII is leading this sub group.</p> | <p>Improvements in consistency of approach across the emergency services could lead to improvements in response arrangements.</p> |
| 5. | Lack of space in SCCs | Ongoing | <p>The introduction of STACs has increased the number of people attending SCCs and exercise reports are likely to continue to highlight the meeting accommodation/space as an issue. Nevertheless, it is unlikely to be resolved nationally in the short/medium term as STAC is a Civil Contingencies development and the issue is not nuclear specific. Resolution on a local level</p> | <p>Perceived weakness in emergency response arrangements.</p> |

| | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | | could be achieved though co operation between LRF and operator | |
| 6. | Revision of the Consolidated Guidance | Likely to be completed in 2011/12 | <p>A complete review of the Consolidated Guidance is to be carried out by an experienced contractor. The aim is to address any gaps before the guidance comes under intense scrutiny in the new build process.</p> <p>NII is leading on this but Process Review Sub Group will shadow the work closely.</p> | Any changes to the Guidance could impact on arrangements. |
| | | | | |
| No. | HORIZON SCANNING: event or issue | Timeframe | Background | Likely Impact on Civil Nuclear Emergency Planning |
| 1. | CCA Enhancement Programme | Detailed work will continue into 2010-11. | NEPLG would welcome closer alignment between the CCA and REPPIR regimes and has been working hard to bring our guidance in line with CCA for some time. The caveat would be that nuclear has mature and well-tested framework. Any changes should take account of this and ensure that we have sufficient flexibility to meet the requirements of the nuclear | Any alignment proposals should ensure that we get the best outcome with minimum disruption. |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| | | | sector. DECC and NII are involved in the Enhancement Programme. | |
| 2. | IAEA revision of Basic Safety Standards and International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) revisions to IRR | Ongoing | ICRP has published new recommendations for a system of radiological protection. HPA has prepared a project plan for preparing an HPA response to these recommendations. HPA working with key Govt Depts on implementation in the UK framework. IAEA revision of basic safety standards to reflect changes to the ICRP recommendations Also relevant is the move within Europe to have common countermeasures advice on evacuation, sheltering and KI tablets for nuclear facilities close to national borders | Potentially important consequences for response plans. Implications for emergency arrangements are currently not clear but both elements could impact significantly. |
| 3. | Paris and Brussels Convention on nuclear third party liability | Ratification of the amended Conventions likely to take place early 2011 | The Paris and Brussels Conventions were amended in 2004. These amendments upgrade the existing regime and are intended to ensure that, in the event of a nuclear accident, an increased amount of compensation will be available to a larger number of victims in respect of a broader range of | The main changes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ to increase the operators liability limit to a minimum €700m per incident, ○ to increase the total compensation that must be |

| | | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | <p>damage than is currently the case. The UK Government (DECC) has indicated that it aims to go to public consultation on the changes this year with a view to be able to ratify the amended Conventions early 2011.</p> | <p>made available to at least €1.5bn per incident</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ to broaden the range of countries eligible for compensation; and ○ to broaden of the type of damage that is eligible for compensation to include damage related to the environment. |
| 4. | The future of Government Offices | Decision likely to be taken 2010/11 | <p>The Coalition Agreement stated: we will abolish the Government Office for London and consider the case for abolishing the other Government Departments. There is currently no clarity on timescales.</p> | <p>Any changes at the Regional level would have an impact on mature emergency response arrangements for national agencies and Government Departments that currently rely heavily on the GO early response.</p> |
| 5. | Budgetary cuts | Ongoing | <p>The June 2010 emergency Budget Statement trailed severe cuts to government departments. The reality of the cuts will not be known until the autumn statement .</p> | <p>Any budgetary cuts may have an impact on the level of resource we can rely on from Government Departments and agencies.</p> |