

**STRATEGIES AND GUIDANCE FOR ESTABLISHING A PRACTICAL
RADIOLOGICAL PROTECTION CULTURE IN EUROPE IN CASE OF LONG TERM
RADIOACTIVE CONTAMINATION AFTER A NUCLEAR ACCIDENT**

**MINUTES OR THE FOURTH "SAGE" COORDINATION MEETING
7-9 JULY 2004, MINSK (Belarus) - 10 JULY 2004, PINSK (Belarus)**

Participants

SAGE Partners:

- BB-RIR (Brest Branch of Research Institute of Radiology, Belarus):
Alexandre SUDAS, Ludmilla ZHUKOVSKAYA, Alexandre ZAITSAU, Alexandre MORHOL
- BELRAD (Radiation Safety Institute, Belarus):
Vassili NESTERENKO, Alexander DEVOYNO, Vladimir BABENKO
- CEPN (Nuclear Protection Evaluation Centre, France):
Jacques LOCHARD, Pascal CROÛAIL
- GSF (Radiological Protection Institute, Germany):
Irene FIEDLER
- NRPB (National Radiological Protection Board, United Kingdom):
Anne NISBET

Guests:

- Gaby VOIGT (IAEA, Vienne, Autriche)
- Jean-Claude AUTRET, Mylène JOSSET (ACRO, France)

Intepret:

Nina FILIPONENKO

Summary:: *The first half day of the meeting was mainly devoted to the state of advancement of Work Packages 2 and 5. During the second day, SAGE partners mainly discussed the content and the format of the handbook (Work Package 4). The third day (morning only) they prepared the programme of the final SAGE Workshop (Work Package 1) that will be organised in Paris on 14 and 15 March 2005.*

1. Introduction and agenda of the meeting

A. Devoyno (BELRAD deputy director) welcomed the participants in BELRAD facilities at Minsk. He apologised for the absences of Vassili. Nesterenko and Alexei Nesterenko due to the fact that the latter was operated in emergency the day before the meeting. All SAGE members expressed their wishes for a prompt recovery of Alexei Nesterenko. Vassili Nesterenko joined the meeting later on.

J. LOCHARD presented the agenda of the meeting.

7 July pm:

- WP2: Approval of the final WP2 report (written by I. Fiedler, G. Voigt); Plan for future works.
- WP3: Discussion of state of advancement of WP3. Plan for finalisation.
- WP5: Feedback from stakeholders panels in the UK (A. Nisbet), Germany (I. Fiedler) and France (J. Lochard) and preparation of the WP5 synthesis report on stakeholders panels.

8 July am:

- WP4: Presentation of the electronic version of the handbook by CEPN (P. Crouail).

8 July pm:

- WP4: Corrections on the paper version of the handbook (All partners).

9 July am:

- WP1: Preparation, organisation and sponsoring of the final SAGE workshop (All partners).

10 July am+pm:

- WP4 - WP5: Belarussian Stakeholders panel in Stolyn. Comments on the handbook. (This part of the co-ordination meeting to be attended only by CEPN and BB-RIR members)

All participants agreed on the agenda.

2. Working Packages: advancement of the SAGE project

2.1. *WP2: Review of Infrastructures in France, Germany and the United Kingdom*

The final version of the WP2 report (Deliverable N°1) was edited by GSF on 14 April 2004 and sent by CEPN to the EC on 15 June 2004. It is co-signed by I. Fiedler and G. Voigt. The .pdf version will be put on the SAGE website as soon as possible (**Action: CEPN**).

A synthesis paper will be prepared by G. Voigt and I. Fiedler and a PowerPoint presentation will be prepared for the the final SAGE workshop in March 2005. Before that, both other SAGE partners who are involved in WP2 (respectively NRPB and CEPN) will sent as soon as possible to GSF what they consider to be the key points as far as "strenghts and weaknesses" of the national organisations in a long-term post-accidental situation (respectively in the UK and France) are concerned. (**Action: NRPB, CEPN**).

From this material, concrete recommendations (especially to national authorities) must clearly appear in the paper written by GSF (**Action: GSF**).

Before to be presented, the paper accompanying the WP2 report will be circulated through Western European representatives of radiation safety authorities in France, Germany and UK. (**Actions: CEPN, NRPB, GSF**).

2.2. *WP3: Feedback Experience in Belarus, including ETHOS*

In spring 2004, A. Nesterenko sent to P. Croüail and S. Lepicard a revised version of the report entitled "*Belarussian experience in the field of radiation monitoring and radiation protection of population and role of governmental and non governmental structures in solving these problems*" based on the reports prepared by BB-RIR and BELRAD. CEPN members made a thorough reading of both reports in order to try to extract from them the paragraphs/chapters which could be included into a final common report (Deliverable N°2).

J. Lochard mentioned that in comparison from what was expected, the BB-RIR contribution is too much focussed on the early phase after the accident with a broad view of the Belarusian monitoring system and, that BELRAD contribution is mainly focussed on its own activities since two decades and does not reflect fully the Belarusian experience in general. Mixing both contributions will not give a complete description of how the whole monitoring system has evolved in Belarus since the catastrophe and how it is operating today, which is the main goal of the WP3 deliverable. In order to achieve this objective, J. Lochard proposed that BELRAD, with the help of CEPN, will prepare a

complementary paper developing what is "*the Chernobyl radiation monitoring system in Belarus today*". Furthermore, J. Lochard proposed that Alexei Nesterenko will prepare a Power Point presentation of this paper to be presented at the final SAGE workshop. BELRAD will take this in charge when Alexei will return from convalescence (**Action: BELRAD, CEPN**).

Moreover, a short paper written by CEPN based on Mrs L. Zhukovskaia's slides (excerpt from her presentation made during the first coordination meeting) will be added to BELRAD and BB-RIR reports as part of the WP3 contribution because it will constitute a good synthesis of the feedback from the ETHOS experience in Belarus. The compilation of the three contributions will constitute deliverable N°2 (**Actions: BELRAD (finalisation of the report), CEPN (short paper from Mrs L.Zhukovskaia's slides), BB-RIR (validation)**)

As far as the finalisation of the WP3 report is concerned it was not possible, due to the hospitalisation of Alexei Nesterenko, to make decisions on the way to proceed. As a consequence this task has been postponed to the end of 2004.

2.3. WP5: Running of Western Europe Stakeholder Panels

Stakeholders

In France, the first part of the third stakeholder panel meeting (held on 26 January 2004 in Paris, at the Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers) was devoted to a practical case study for the interpretation of whole body measurements (WBC) and their analysis with data on foodstuffs contamination. The case study was based on measurements related to French embassy's employees in Minsk (for both body and foodstuffs measurements). The analysis was conducted using the different interpretation tools developed in the handbook. On the second part of the meeting, the French regulation (general principles, organisation, major regulatory texts) was presented to the participants by the representative from the French authority (DGSNR). During the third part of the meeting, the French non-governmental organisation CLCV presented a project aiming at developing a strip cartoon dealing with radioactivity and related problems tackled within SAGE, easier to be read by the general population and particularly young people. The last part of the meeting (in sub-groups) was devoted to comments on the second version of the practical handbook on radiation monitoring and protection.

The fourth French stakeholder panel meeting (held on 3 May 2004 in Paris, at the Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers) was particularly focussed on a detailed review of the handbook (hard copy + html version) and the related computer tool for helping the health and measurement professionals in analysing the results from body and foodstuffs measurements. This work led to a

4th draft version of the Handbook. Part of the meeting was also devoted to the design and preparation of the final SAGE workshop. The participation of the French stakeholder panel members was discussed and it was decided that all members will be invited. Regarding the proposal of the French NGO to develop a strip cartoon dealing with radioactivity and related problems tackled within SAGE, it was decided that a project will be prepared in autumn 2004 and presented during the final workshop with the objective of being possibly sponsored later on. The participants decided to organise an additional meeting of the stakeholder panel on the 1st of December 2004.

In the UK, the core group of the UK stakeholder panel met in London for a second time on 11 May 2004. The main focus for discussion was the advanced third draft version of the handbook providing guidance for those living in the contaminated territories. The stakeholders provided their initial feedback on its structure and content as well as its general applicability to the UK (see Power Point presentation in annex 1). Several members of the panel agreed to convene satellite stakeholder groups (comprising members of the public, public health professionals etc.) in different areas of England and Wales to further extend the consultation process. A questionnaire designed by NRPB (see Annex 3) will be used to record feedback on specific aspects of the handbook in a standardised format, i.e.

- General applicability of the handbook to the UK
- Practicability and appropriateness of information/guidance provided
- Adapting the handbook for use in the UK
- Format of the handbook

A third meeting of the core group will take place on 6 October 2004 to consolidate feedback and to draw up recommendations. Overall, the UK stakeholder panel supports the aims and objectives of the handbook and would like to subsequently adapt it for use in the UK. Consideration is being given to broadening the scope of the handbook to include chemical contaminants.

In Germany, the second meeting of the German stakeholder Group was held on 2 March 2004 in Neuherberg. A short summary about the third SAGE coordination meeting in Paris was given to inform the panel about the progress of the different work packages of the project. The second draft version of the handbook on a radiation monitoring and protection system in case of contamination of the environment was discussed in detail. One main objection was the role of the medical doctors. According to German stakeholders, even after a training and education in radiation protection the family doctors in Germany will not be able to solve the problems in case of a long term contamination. Another concern was the measurement of ambient dose rates done by the “families” themselves, participants to the meeting feared that anxiety and problems of the concerned population can be increased by unsteady measurements with insufficient devices. This was an

experience made after the Chernobyl accident, when many people tried to do their own measurements. A further general problem may arise because of “data security”, if measurement results of persons and households are published. Moreover some proposals were made for the handbook: the involvement of psychologists to support concerned population groups, dissemination of actual information by internet, preparation of interactive CDs for schools and kindergartens and of a glossary in the national language for the most important terms in radiation protection. The next meeting is planned for the discussion of the next version of the handbook.

The Belarus stakeholder panel met for the second time on 10 July 2004. During the meeting the Belarus participants gave advices on the format, structure and contents of the draft version of the handbook which was translated into Russian by CEPN. The participants welcomed the work done so far, particularly as far as the style was concerned. They proposed to include complementary material available in Belarus on how to behave in recreational areas and on recipes to reduce the contamination of foodstuff during cooking. They expressed the wish to see in the future a Belarus version of the handbook taking into account more specifically the specificity of the Belarus situation. It was decided to finalise first the European version and then to look for opportunities after the Paris workshop for possible supports to develop a Belarus version.

WP5 Final Report

A. Nisbet proposed (see PowerPoint® presentation in Annex 1) a first structure for the final WP5 report (Deliverable N° 4). CEPN and GSF will provide her with interim reports dealing with the following items:

- Why stakeholders engagement is important?
- Which stakeholders participated and why?
- Method of consultation (description of the process/dynamics of involvement)
- Initial feedback on the handbook (stakeholders commitment / selected extracts of discussions)
- Final feedback (evaluation through a specific questionnaire: see in Annex 1 and the questionnaire in annex 3)
- Future collaboration (if any)

(Action: CEPN, GSF, NRPB)

2.4. WP4: Handbook on Practical Radiation Protection Culture

P. Crouail presented the fourth draft version of the Handbook which exists now in an electronic

format and a paper version (see Annex 2). The electronic version is a tree-structured Doc-to-Help® document which separates the handbook into different levels of difficulty, and allows users to read it in more or less details according to their scientific knowledge and/or interest.

The structure, objectives, title, contents, and misses as well, have been largely discussed during the meeting (also including the German, French and British stakeholder panels feedbacks) as well as during the Belarusian stakeholder panel, organised in Stolyn (Brest Region) the day after the coordination meeting held in Minsk.. As a consequence, a fifth draft version of the Handbook - now entitled "*Strategies and Guidance for those living in a long-term contaminated territory: Handbook on practical radiation protection culture*" - will be provided by the end of the Summer 2004 (at least, before the last Western European stakeholders panels). (**Action: CEPN**)

During a short visit of the Public Information Centre of the Radiology Institute in Pinsk (BB-RIR facilities) on 9 July 2004, it was decided that several technical sheets which are presented at this place will be translated and included in the "*Improvement options*" section of the Handbook. (**Action: BB-RIR, CEPN**)

2.5. SAGE website (<http://www.ec-sage.net/>)

The website was not updated since October 2003. This will be done rapidly. (**Action: CEPN**)

2.6. Preparation of the SAGE dissemination workshop

The title of the workshop will be "*Inclusive radiation monitoring and radiation protection culture for those living in a long-term contaminated territory*". It will take place in Paris on 14-15 March 2005 at the Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers, and will focus on the management of long-term contamination in Western Europe and Belarus. It will also include presentations dealing with chemical contaminants. It will last 2 days (see the provisional programme hereafter) mixing plenary presentations and discussions with small working groups. Topics and questions that will be addressed during the small groups discussions (see the programme hereafter) may still change before March 2005 but the "moderators" of the groups will benefit from the UK stakeholders panel which has proposed a complete questionnaire on the general applicability of the handbook, its adaptation to each Member States and the appropriateness of the guidance provided (see Power Point Presentation in Annex 1).

The attendance will be restricted to a maximum of 80 persons (Radiation protection authorities, European health professionals, representatives of international organisations, public stakeholders from the WP5 panels, NGOs, ...).

A specific session of the workshop will be devoted to the presentation of concrete Western European experiences of the long-term post accidental management: A. Liland from Norway will be invited to present the experience of the management of the post-Chernobyl consequences in Norway. M Temple from UK will be invited by A. Nisbet to present the management of a chemical contamination due to the Phurnacite factory in Wales. (**Action: NRPB**)

In April 2004, J. Lochard sent letters to GSF (Dr H. Paretzke) and NRPB (Pr R. Cox) to point out that sponsoring would be necessary to organise the workshop under acceptable conditions. J. Lochard asks them to help CEPN in searching for financial supports from national organisations in their respective countries. Along the same line, CEPN wrote to DGSNR (A.-C. Lacoste) and IRSN (J. Repussard) to know if a direct sponsorship of the workshop might be envisaged from these French regulatory bodies. A demand of sponsoring was also made to the EC when sending the mid-term report.

Whilst NRPB will encourage healthcare participants to come to the workshop, Mrs Mary Morrey answered that it will not be possible for NRPB to act as a direct sponsor. No answer was given on the possibility for NRPB to seek for funding from other British organisations. EC answered on 18 May that the workshop would represent an excellent opportunity to disseminate the results of the SAGE project to an extended international community of stakeholders. However, with respect to a specific EC support, Mr A. Zurita confirmed that the Commission has not the possibility to increase the financial contribution provided to the SAGE project. No answer was received from Germany. IRSN and DGSNR answered positively to CEPN's demand and will provide a financial support for the workshop. Moreover, Mrs C. Luccioni (Professor at *Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers* - CNAM) who is a member of the French stakeholder panel has recently informed CEPN her institution will provide the conference rooms for free. If necessary, it was decided that fees will be also asked to institutional participants. The amount of the fees will be fixed after the realisation of a provisional workshop budget. (**Action: CEPN**)

Under the above conditions, J. Lochard declared that the workshop could be organised without a high financial risk.

The first announcement of the workshop will be prepared by CEPN, and sent during Summer 2004. (A provisional version of the announcement will be sent to SAGE-Partners as soon as possible, then it will be put on the SAGE web site with the possibility to register automatically). (**Action: CEPN**)

The provisional programme of the workshop is as follows:

FIRST DAY

Introduction

- Welcome address (Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers)
- Presentation of the SAGE Project (Jacques Lochard, CEPN, France)

The rehabilitation of living conditions in contaminated territories :
the ETHOS Project in Belarus

Film by Sylvaine Dampierre (32 mn)

Session 1 (Chair person to be selected)

- Paper n° 1 –The Chernobyl radiation monitoring system in Belarus today (Alexei Nesterenko, BELRAD, Belarus)
- Paper n° 2 – Radiation monitoring and countermeasures in Norway since the Chernobyl accident (Astrid Liland, NRPA, Norway)
- Paper n° 3 – Post accident radiation monitoring management in France, Germany and UK : strengths and weaknesses (Irene Fiedler - GSF, Germany)
- Paper n° 4 – The dynamics of stakeholder involvement in the development of the SAGE Project (Anne Nisbet, NRPB, UK)

Session 2 (Chair person to be selected)

- Paper n° 5 – Presentation of the SAGE Handbook: "*Practical radiation monitoring and radiation protection culture for those living in a long-term contaminated area*" with the participation of Members of the European and Belarussian SAGE stakeholder panels.

Topical working Groups

The participants will be divided into four working groups. Each of them will be invited to contribute to one of the following topics. Results of the working groups will be then presented in plenary session on Tuesday.

Topic 1. Contents of the handbook

Topic 2. Role of local stakeholders

Topic 3. Tools for informing stakeholders

Topic 4. Diffusion of the "SAGE approach" in Western Europe

SECOND DAY

Session 3 (Chair person to be selected)

- Paper n° 6 – A non-governmental organisation's perspective on citizen vigilance (Jean-Claude Autret, ACRO, France)

Working Groups debriefing

- Paper n° 7 : The management of long-term chemical contamination of the environment : a case study from Wales (Mark Temple - National Public Health Service, Wales).
- Paper n° 8 : Implementation of an inclusive radiation monitoring system in the Bragin District in Belarus (Alexander Morhal, Pinsk Institute of radiology or Tatiana Kotlabai, "Sprout of Life" NGO, Belarus).
- Paper n° 9 : Toward an integrated approach on rehabilitation strategies for long-term contaminated territories : the EURANOS Project (Gilles Hériard-Dubreuil, Mutadis, France).

Session 4 (Chair person to be selected)

- Round table: the way forward
- Adoption of workshop's recommendations

The table below presents the main tasks to be accomplished during the preparation phase of the SAGE workshop.

Table 1. Planning for the preparation of the SAGE Workshop

| Work | Deadline | Action by | deadline / performed (date) |
|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Letters to GSF, NRPB (seeking for sponsoring) | End of December 2003 | CEPN | April 2004 |
| Confirm location & date | End of January 2004 | CEPN | June 2004 |
| Letters to potential sponsors (presentation) | Beginning 2004 | GSF, NRPB, CEPN | April 2004 |
| Provisional Programme and confirmation of speakers | on the way | All | |
| 1st Announcement (website,...) | Summer 2004 | CEPN | |
| Finalisation of the Programme | Summer 2004 | CEPN | |
| Seeking for chair persons | ASAP | Programme Committee | |
| Letters to invite journalists | Autumn 2004 | Programme Committee | |
| Registration forms (sent and receipt) | end Summer 2004 - Winter 2005 | Organisation Committee | |
| Book of abstracts | February 2005 | Programme Committee | |
| Workshop | 14-15 March 2005 | | |
| Proceedings | End of March 2005 | CEPN | |

2.7. 6-months report, Progress report, cost statements

P. Croüail sent the 6-months progress report to the EC two weeks before the coordination meeting. He reminded SAGE partners that the costs statements and quotations have to be prepared and transmitted to CEPN during Autumn 2004: the deadline is October for the 2nd Periodic Cost Statement. (**Action: All**)

The annual progress report must be sent before 1st of December.

2.8. Summary of actions and reporting schedule

Table 2. Summary of actions

| no | Actions | By | Deadline | Status |
|----|---|--------------------------|--|--------|
| 1 | Finalize deliverable N°2 (WP3) | BELRAD CEPN BB-RIR | ASAP (will depend on when A.N. will recover) | |
| 2 | Update SAGE website (WP1) | CEPN | ASAP | |
| 3 | Post the .pdf version of deliverable N°1 (WP2 report) on the SAGE website (WP2) | CEPN | August 2004 | |
| 4 | Check the availability of speakers for the SAGE workshop (WP1) | SWPCM | August 2004 | |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| 5 | Prepare a first budget of the SAGE workshop (WP1) | CEPN | Summer 2004 | |
| 6 | Finalise the programme and announcement (website) of the SAGE workshop (WP1) | CEPN | Summer 2004 | |
| 7 | 5th draft version of the handbook (WP4) | CEPN | End Summer 2004 | |
| 8 | Prepare cost statements | All | September 2004 | |
| 9 | Provide material for the annual report | All | September 2004 | |
| 10 | Select some "strengths and weaknesses" of the national organisations in a long-term post-accidental situation (collected by GSF) (WP2) | CEPN NRPB GSF | September 2004 | |
| 11 | Find chair persons for the SAGE workshop (WP1) | SWPCM | Summer-Autumn 2004 | |
| 12 | Write a paper for the SAGE workshop (WP2) | GSF | Autumn 2004 | |
| 13 | Write a paper for the SAGE workshop (WP3) | BELRAD CEPN | Autumn 2004 | |
| 14 | Complete the section " <i>Improvement options</i> " of the handbook (WP4) | CEPN BB-RIR | Autumn 2004 | |
| 15 | Prepare interim reports on the running of stakeholder panels (collected by NRPB) (WP5) | NRPB GSF CEPN | Autumn 2004 | |
| 16 | Discuss/modify the handbook with stakeholders (WP4-WP5) | CEPN | Autumn 2004 - Winter 2004-2005 | |
| 17 | Write a final version of the handbook (WP5) | CEPN | Autumn 2004 - Winter 2004-2005 | |
| 18 | Write a draft version of the report on stakeholder panels (WP5) | NRPB | Winter 2005 | |
| 19 | Circulate GSF paper before the workshop (WP2) | CEPN NRPB GSF | Winter 2005 | |
| 20 | Issue proceedings of the workshop (WP1) | CEPN | Spring 2005 | |
| 21 | Write a final version of the report on stakeholder panels (WP5) | NRPB | Spring 2005 | |

ASAP= As soon as possible; SWPCM = Members of the SAGE Programme Committee (J. Lochard, A. Nisbet, G. Voigt, A. Nesterenko, A? Soudas)

Table 3. Reporting schedule (updated July 2004)

| Date | At | Product (to be provided by) | Status - Comments |
|------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| 2002.10.01 | T_0 | Official launching date of SAGE | OK |
| 2002.11.15 | $T_0 + 1$ | 1 st Coordination Meeting, in Paris | OK (held in Paris on November 14-15, 2002) |
| 2002.12.15 | $T_0 + 2$ | 1 st Meeting Minutes (CEPN as coordinator) | OK (sent to the EC on December 13, 2002) |
| 2003.04.01 | $T_0 + 6$ | 1 st six-months Management Report (CEPN as coordinator) | OK (sent to the EC on July 23, 2003) |
| 2003.06.26 | $T_0 + 9$ To be confirmed | 2 nd Coordination Meeting, in Pinsk | OK (held in Pinsk on June 26-27, 2003) + 1st BY Stakeholders panel (27 June 2003) |
| 2003.07.31 | $T_0 + 10$ To be confirmed | 2 nd Meeting Minutes (CEPN as coordinator) | OK (sent to the EC on August 1, 2003) |
| 2003.10.01 | $T_0 + 12$ | 1 st Periodic Cost Statement (CEPN as coordinator) | OK (sent to the EC on December 2, 2003) |
| 2003.10.01 | $T_0 + 12$ | 2 nd six-months Management Report (CEPN as coordinator) | OK (sent to the EC on December 2, 2003) |
| 2003.10.01 | $T_0 + 12$ | 1 st Annual Technical Report (CEPN as coordinator) | OK (sent to the EC on December 9, 2003) |
| 2003 | between $T_0 + 9$ & $T_0 + 14$ | Organisation of stakeholders Panels in the UK, France, Germany and Belarus – Year 1 | June 19, 2003: 1 st F Stakeholders panel June 27, 2003: 1 st BLR Stakeholders panel July 1, 2003: 1 st UK Stakeholders panel October 20, 2003: 2 nd F Stakeholders panel November 10, 2003: 1 st G Stakeholders panel |
| 2003.11.27 | $T_0 + 14$ | 3 rd Coordination Meeting, in Paris | OK (held in Paris on November 27-28, 2003) |
| 2003.11.28 | $T_0 + 14$ | Milestone 1 (BB RIR, BELRAD as WP3 partners): “Evaluation of the Lessons Learnt from the Belarus Experience” | Draft Report (BELRAD contribution) available in July 2003, revised in December 2003. Draft Report (BB-RIR contribution) available in December 2003. |
| 2004.01? | $T_0 + 15$ | 3 rd Meeting Minutes (CEPN as coordinator) | OK |
| 2004.01.01 | $T_0 + 15$ | Mid-Term Report (CEPN as coordinator) | OK sent to the EC month 16: 27 February 2004 |
| 2004.01.01 | $T_0 + 15$ | Deliverable 1 (prepared by GSF as WPL of WP2, co-edited by CEPN as WPL of WP1): “Review of Infrastructures in Western Europe” (End of WP2) | Draft Report (CEPN contribution) available on June 26, 2003. English contribution sent to GSF during Summer 2003. Deliverable edited by GSF month 18 (14 April 2004), sent by CEPN to the Commission M20 (15 June 2004). |
| 2004.01.01 | $T_0 + 15$ | Deliverable 2 (prepared by BB RIR as WPL of WP3, co-edited by CEPN as WPL of WP1): “Feedback Experience in Belarus” (End of WP3) | Corrections sent to BELRAD by CEPN month 19. New draft report submitted by BELRAD month 21. Issuing of the report postponed to M24 |
| 2004.01.01 | $T_0 + 15$ | Announcement of the Dissemination Workshop, one year before | Search for sponsoring began month 18. Answer that no extra funding will be received from the EC, received at M19. Draft programme available at M21. |
| 2004 | between $T_0 + 15$ & $T_0 + 27$ | Organisation of stakeholders Panels in the UK, France, Germany and Belarus – Year 2 and 3 | January 26, 2004: 3 rd F Stakeholders panel March 4, 2004: 2 nd G Stakeholders panel May 3, 2004: 4 th F Stakeholders panel May 11, 2004: 2 nd UK Stakeholders panel July 9, 2004 2 nd BY Stakeholders panel (December 1, 2004 5 th F Stakeholders panel) |
| 2004.01.01 | $T_0 + 18$ | Milestone 2 (all as WP4 partners): Draft Version of the Handbook, giving Guidelines for an Operational System of Measurements | OK: 1 st draft version available month 11, 2 nd version available month 14, 3 rd version available month 16, 4 th version available month 20. |
| 2004.04.01 | $T_0 + 18$ | 3 rd six-months Management Report (CEPN as coordinator) | OK: sent to the Commission month 20 (15 June 2004). |
| 2004.07.07 | $T_0 + 21$ | 4 th Coordination Meeting, in Minsk (instead of Pinsk) | OK (held in Minsk on July 7-8, 2004) |
| 2004.08.01 | $T_0 + 22$ | 4 th Meeting Minutes (CEPN as coordinator) | OK |
| 2004.10.01 | $T_0 + 24$ | 2 nd Periodic Cost Statement (CEPN as coordinator) | |
| 2004.10.01 | $T_0 + 24$ | 4 th six-months Management Report (CEPN as coordinator) | |
| 2004.10.01 | $T_0 + 24$ | 2 nd Annual Technical Report (CEPN as coordinator) | |

SAGE Reporting schedule (Part 2)

| | | | |
|------------|------------|--|---|
| 2005.01.?? | $T_0 + 27$ | Milestone 3 (NRPB , GSF , CEPN as WP5 partners): “Evaluation of the outcomes of the European Stakeholders Panels” | |
| 2005.03.11 | $T_0 + 30$ | 5 th Coordination Meeting, in Paris | |
| 2005.03.14 | $T_0 + 30$ | DISSEMINATION WORKSHOP , in Paris | Paris (Conservatoire des Arts & Métiers) 14-15 March 2005 |
| 2005.03.31 | $T_0 + 30$ | Deliverable 3 (prepared and edited by CEPN as WPL of WP4): “Handbook on Practical Radiation Protection Culture” | |
| 2005.03.31 | $T_0 + 30$ | Deliverable 4 (prepared by NRPB as WPL of WP5, co-edited by CEPN as WPL of WP1): “Feedback Report on Stakeholders Panels” | |
| 2005.03.31 | $T_0 + 30$ | Deliverable 5 (CEPN as WPL of WP1): “Proceedings of the Dissemination Workshop” | |
| 2005.03.31 | $T_0 + 30$ | 5 th Meeting Minutes (CEPN as coordinator) | |
| 2005.03.31 | $T_0 + 30$ | 3 rd Periodic Cost Statement (CEPN as coordinator) | |
| 2005.03.31 | $T_0 + 30$ | 5 th six-months Management Report (CEPN as coordinator) | |
| 2005.03.31 | $T_0 + 30$ | eTIP: Final Technical Report (all , edited by CEPN as coordinator) | |
| 2005.03.31 | $T_0 + 30$ | Technological Implementation Plan | |
| 2005.03.31 | $T_0 + 30$ | Official end of the contract | |

2.9. Next meeting

The next (and last) coordination meeting will be held in Paris the day after the workshop (16 March 2005).

ANNEX 1 - SAGE WP5

STAKEHOLDER PANELS: UK APPROACH

ANNEX 2 - SAGE WP4

HANDBOOK

(revised 4th Draft version)

ANNEX 3 - SAGE WP5

Questionnaire used by UK Stakeholder Panel

| | |
|---|--|
| Occupation: _____ Postcode: _____ | |
| A. General applicability of the Handbook to the UK | |
| 1. Do you agree with the idea that the <u>key</u> to dealing with long term contamination in an area is to provide local people with the tools and knowledge to be able to measure their own radiation exposures? | |
| 2. Does the proposed system of 'radiation monitoring and protection' fit in with current ways of working in the UK? | |
| 3. Do you foresee any difficulties implementing this type of system, in terms of infrastructure etc? | |
| 4. The Handbook is focussed on contamination with caesium-137 and the consequences of a nuclear accident. Do you think this will limit the use of the Handbook? | |
| 5. Do you feel that this Handbook could usefully be adapted for the UK to consider a range of contaminants? | |
| B. Practicability and appropriateness of information/guidance provided | |
| 1. Do you agree with the Handbook being aimed at four groups of people – the household, the health professionals, the measuring professionals and the stakeholder advisory board? Are there other groups that should be addressed specifically in the UK - for example, local authorities, the emergency services, relevant government agencies such as the Environment Agency and the Food Standards Agency? | |
| 2. Is the level of information and the topics covered under each of the four sections, relevant to the types of audience? | |
| 3. Is more help needed on how to interpret measurements, estimate radiation doses and get a feel for what they mean? | |
| 4. Is sufficient guidance given on what people can do to reduce their radiation exposures and how effective different actions might be? | |
| 5. Will it be possible to provide enough instruments to measure external radiation and to train people to use them? | |
| 6. Will it be possible to provide a very localised service to measure radioactivity in foods? Will there be enough equipment available, people available to provide training and people who are prepared to be trained? | |
| 7. Is it practicable to provide training for the health professionals to enable them to provide the appropriate help and guidance for the local population? Do health professionals feel that with appropriate training they would be able to provide the necessary support for the local population? | |
| 8. Is it possible to provide a localised service to measure radioactivity in people? Will suitable equipment be available, are people available to provide training and people who are prepared to be trained? | |
| 9. Is a diagram and explanation on the relationship between different units used for radioactivity necessary and is the one given under radioactivity in the technical sheets helpful? | |
| C. Adapting the Handbook for use in the UK | |
| 1. Are there any other topics/issues that you think should be addressed in this Handbook with regards to the UK situation? | |
| 2. Is there any information/guidance given in the handbook that you think would be unsuitable for dealing with long term contamination in the UK? | |
| 3. Is there any extra information/guidance that should be included for dealing with long term contamination in the UK? | |
| D. Format of the Handbook | |
| 1. Is the current structure of the handbook helpful or is there an alternative structure that you would prefer? | |
| 2. Does the main body of the handbook contain language that is too technical, not sufficiently technical or is it generally clear? | |
| 3. Are the technical sheets helpful and again is the language too technical, not sufficiently technical or generally clear? | |