

**Workshop on "Radiation monitoring and radiation protection culture
for people living in long-term contaminated areas"**

15 March 2005

CNAM, Paris, France

Time: 2:57 p.m.

Members of the Round Table panel:-

Ms. Anne NISBET (Chairperson)

Mr. Jean-Luc GODET

Mr. Gilles HერიARD-DUBREUIL

Mr. Vassily NESTERENKO

Mr. Per STRAND

Ms. Anita VILLERS

MS. NISBET: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for coming back after a lovely lunch. With all that sunshine, we appreciate you coming back to join the round table discussion. It is my pleasure to chair this round table and conclude the SAGE Workshop. I think you would agree that we have had an interesting two days for a variety of reasons, and I don't expect that Jacques, at the beginning of the workshop, made it into the figure of success (?). Anyway, we have benefited from the presentations and we are particularly grateful to those people not directly involved in the SAGE project for broadening our perspectives. I think we have all learned a lot, although I do have a slight regret that time didn't allow us to have our small working group discussions. I think that these would have been particularly useful in framing some of the key issues which could then be brought to the round table for discussion. Nevertheless, we had a very quick brainstorming session over

lunch and a few questions have arisen to start off our discussions. Before we start those discussions, I would just like to say that everything is being recorded here by a typist and that the transcript will be available for us to formulate the recommendations after the workshop. These recommendations will form part of the proceedings of the workshop.

I would like everyone to feel that they have the opportunity to express their concerns, their views, any comments, and also questions at this round table. Unfortunately, time is more limited than we planned, so if people can actually provide a concise input, it would be much appreciated, and we can then hopefully finish the round table by about three forty-five. So I think to start with, it would be a good opportunity to let each panel member express his views and to start off with the discussion. I would like to ask them what are the important aspects or key messages that they are going to take away from the last two days of the workshop; for them personally, maybe not for their organization, but for them personally. We'll just start down at the end and just briefly go through.

MR. GODET: (Speaking in French, interpreted.) In my opinion, two of the most important questions that have been raised during these two days are the following. Well, the first one is the need, not only the interest, but really the need to associate stakeholders in the decision-making process and in the risk management process in the contaminated areas. This first question was widely addressed by the SAGE program and it was addressed several times during the workshop, and it leads to a second question for us at least in France. I am talking particularly to my French colleagues who are here today and whatever organizations that they represent.

For me, who is a member of the French authority for nuclear safety, of course the interest of associating stakeholders is obvious, but my question is how should we proceed about it, what can we do to associate

stakeholders efficiently in our work. Regarding stakeholders, there is something we have not really defined, which is the definition of stakeholders. Who are we talking about? We are used to talking with some famous stakeholders, for example, professional associations in food production or non-governmental organizations which accept to talk with the people who are working in the field of nuclear activities -- "nucleocrats". How can we associate local populations? Because our colleague from Dunkirk said that it is the local population living nearby a nuclear site who must be associated to this work as a priority. I don't have any miracle recipe. At least in the case of France, we have to think about the way to associate those people more. That was the first issue which I had in mind regarding the work we carried out during these two days.

The second one has to do with what we said this morning about the limits of scientific knowledge. Many people, because of the situation in contaminated areas, in particular in Benelux, said that it would be good to have a European research program to get to know better the impact on the health of ionizing radiations, without specifying whether it comes from caesium or other ions, especially at low doses. So these are the two main issues that come to my mind spontaneously. There are probably other ones, but these are the first ones that are coming to my mind. Thank you.

MR. HERIARD-DUBREUIL: (Speaking in French; interpreted.)
First of all, I think that it is the first time that in France there is a public debate on what happens after a nuclear accident. What happened yesterday morning was also important because it shows the tension that such issues are generating and it shows the vulnerability of all the stakeholders who are trying to think about these problems. ACRO expressed their problems this morning, and it is important for public authorities, stakeholders, experts -- well, it is important to understand that these people do not have an easy job, and the

SAGE program seems to be very easy and very obvious, but it is important to understand that, in reality, the participation of local stakeholders is something that is difficult. It is not planned, it requires a lot of stubbornness, it is not something that is implicit. It is the same in France or in Benelux. I think all these stakeholders are vulnerable, and for them, the situations are not stable -- well, sometimes you can improve situations, but suddenly there is a step backwards, the situation is deteriorating again. So it is important to change the culture of stakeholders, but also to change the legislation. Vassily Nesterenko spoke about local measurement centres: in Belarus, there was a legislation which was passed and stated that it was possible to start setting up such centres, and it allocated resources for the creation of those centres. It is the same with regard to the participation of local actors or stakeholders, it should be covered by a legislation.

The second thing is that what is important in our meeting is that we have participants from Benelux, from Norway, from England -- from the U.K. as well, I almost made a mistake, this was a joke made earlier on -- and from various regions in France, and they share the same concerns and the same problems, and it shows once again that working at the territorial level is absolutely necessary if we want to work in the field of recovery of disasters.

To me, there is a difference between the fact that there are strategies to react after accidents and what is going to happen in practice. I don't think that we should have experts designing the solutions and then to have an involvement of stakeholders. I think there should be collaboration between authorities, local stakeholders and NGOs. All these stakeholders are important and they should all be involved, but the conditions of this cooperation is that the systems should have to be designed by everybody in collaboration as well, it is very important in my mind.

MR. NESTERENKO: (Speaking in Russian, interpreted.) Our project is reaching its conclusion, and I am beginning to think that negative effects of radiations on people's health in Belarus are going to continue for several years. I also think that we managed to set up this "Sprout of Life" association following the example of Bragin, within the framework of CORE project -- and "Sprout of Life" is a very good name. And we also help people to learn themselves how to measure food products in order to know their contamination. But I think that education is not enough to reduce internal contamination significantly. Within the European Community, I wish to see new programs emerge, that would make possible to produce clean products, using appropriate agrochemical methods. So far, the measures that have been taken aim at preventing internal contamination, but in spite of these measures, children are contaminated up to 1,000 Bq per kg, so it means that these measures are not sufficient. Now it is necessary to consider devising new prevention methods or products to contribute to decontamination.

Currently, for example, there are additives for fodder to have non-contaminated meat. I think we should promote the production of nutritional additive for people: pectin, for instance, or any other product which absorbs, diminishes or decreases radionuclides. In Belarus, for instance, we have products which are manufactured in Ukraine and which use seaweeds. Russia offered to manufacture pectin also based on seaweeds. I think that in the new program, pectin should be used as a mean of protection against contamination.

We could talk endlessly about the impact of low doses on health, but I encourage you to follow the example of French associations -- and in particular the Chernobyl initiatives, and I am talking about the associations in Caen in Normandy, and in Alsace, which bought two portable machines to make portable cardiograms. So we did cardiograms on children living in the most contaminated areas in Belarus and we saw that over 80 per cent of the

children have heart problems. If we give pectin to these children for one month and we do an electrocardiogram again after one month, we see a 50 per cent improvement in their heart condition. Professor Galina Bandajevskyaia is doing work on this and the results seem to be very good. It is a pity that our French and German colleagues did not participate in this project. Recently, we conducted a survey on the efficiency of pectin, and there are still some uncertainties, because pectin could eliminate radionuclides, but we are wondering whether it could not also destroy essential elements for the organism. The results of this survey are overall positive. Apparently, essential elements for the human body are not destroyed by pectin.

I think we should launch common medical projects to study diabetes, for instance, to also study problems in the digestive system of children or the loss of sight due to radioactivity. I think that common programs would be very useful and that it would be possible to obtain funding to set them up. Thank you.

MS. VILLERS: (Speaking in French, interpreted.) So I will come back on the question about the interest of these two days. First of all, I will highlight the relation and the value of the human relationships we have created. The fact that we have met the return to universal values, we can see that we are all looking for the best health and we are looking about life in a given territory, and side by side with globalisation, which is very often considered as negative. In front of this mutual society taken over by globalisation, we see that here we have met the will for positive globalisation -- to enable us to answer questions and to solve the problems which have been raised by this drift in the civilization. So we are trying to act in such a way that the stakeholders are at the very heart of the decision-making process. Consequently we can regain our hold on the planet and we can give the planet to future generations in the best possible conditions.

MR. STRAND: Thank you. As the last speaker of the panel, it is always easy to say that a lot has been said before, and I must agree with a lot of the issues, especially this concept of involving stakeholders. Again, of course when it is really a problem, that concept is extremely important. The lesson learned from Norway was that we can try to handle problems with a top-down approach only for a few weeks. That was a lesson learned, I think, strongly from all sides, and I think I can only agree what the others have said. However, I think what we really felt in this meeting, and I think it is extremely important also for the future, is that this workshop has managed to get three sides together, and I think that it has initiated a starting of comparing a lesson learned. However, I think there is even a greater potential on this for the future, because you can always have the theoretical approach, but it is at least very important to combine the theoretical approach with some practical experience. My feeling is that comparing these sides, we could even try to synthesize stronger the lessons learned and try to move forward on those issues.

I must say it is extremely strange -- I mean we have had Chernobyl for almost 20 years now, and at least in what I know, we don't really have had this putting people together with the practical experience and trying to compare, and trying even also to synthesize some of the experience, and that is something I think is of extreme importance, and which I am sitting backward and I am feeling for the future; if we are going to do something, this is something we should look into. Because I think all of us is driven by the force that we want to do this better next time, and to do it better next time is to learn from the past. I think I should not now make it too difficult for the chairperson, but at least the emergency preparedness is coming in my mind, I think that is a word we should think about. I mean we should learn as much as possible from Chernobyl and we should try to do it better, but we should also

do it better next time something happens.

MS. NISBET: Before we move on to the second question, I don't know if anybody in the audience would like to add anything to what they have got out of the last two days. In a concise way, if anyone has got anything extra that the other panel members have already mentioned. Does anybody else here like to add anything to what the panel has already said about what they have learned from the last two days?

MR. HUGON: Just a problem which crossed my mind this morning, it was about the financing of the stakeholders, because if you want to have the stakeholders involved in the decision-making process, maybe, I don't know, the government or local government or local authority should find some means to finance them.

MR. MURITH: (Speaking in French, interpreted.) Christophe Murith from the Swiss Public Health. We don't have the problem of involving stakeholders in Switzerland because we have the structure of local laboratories, at the very local level, which are acknowledged by the local population. They speak the same language, they have the same culture and they do measurements in the foodstuff regarding radioactivity and chemicals since 1957. That is the first point.

The second point is that, as has been mentioned, we cannot wait for the proven results coming from the scientific community. I mean we are talking about immunity (?) to act in territories like Russia. I wonder whether it would be relevant to switch to the problem of public health, rather than remain in the problem of radioactive protection. It is a problem of public health. We have identified troubles, we have to do something. There are organizations like the World Health Organization who can be contacted, and they can do something.

MS. NISBET: Does anyone want to respond to that?

MS. DURONOVA: I would like to stress the importance coming from here (inaudible) -- the top-down approach. In Switzerland, you are happy, you have this already working. It is working also with this process, where the power is going to the local authorities, and this conference is showing me that it is very important. Having in mind the presentations, it seems to me that it is very important to prepare people who work at the local level.

MS. NISBET: Are there any further questions before we move on? No, okay.

If we come to the second question and then just ask whichever panel member feels inclined to answer. From this morning, I think we can agree that the non-government organizations are very useful for solving problems at the local level. Does any member of the panel think therefore that some sort of political framework is necessary to facilitate this on a local, national and international basis, and if they do think that, then how might it be achieved? Does any member of the panel wish to answer that question? The French maybe, I don't know.

MR. GODET: No, I am giving my turn for -- I am trying to think.

MR. HERIARD-DUBREUIL: (Speaking in French, interpreted.) If we are looking at the future, what are the questions that we have to answer? First of all, there is a whole set of problems concerning the territories which have been contaminated. This is the rehabilitation of the life conditions in these territories. These are questions which are raised in Belarus, in Norway, also in the U.K., since there are still places in the U.K. which are contaminated. So this is one category of problems. There is also another

question which is raised for the European countries as a whole and which doesn't concern the countries having nuclear activities only. It is to know how we should prepare ourselves to such a situation, how should we consider it, how should we act, so that if a territory is contaminated by an accident which is in Europe or outside Europe, how should we act to create the conditions which are going to be favourable, in spite of the accident, to seek some help of rehabilitation. What can we do? Is there anything to do? Is there nothing to do? Can we do things? This is a second type of problem. And the third avenue is the question which remains, the sanitary question. I am not going to come back upon that, but I think what Jean-Luc has identified is an important question. It is true that this happened 18 years ago and we may wonder why and how we could really address this problem of public health. So there are questions regarding what has to be done in the contaminated territory.

Now regarding rehabilitation, we are reducing the doses. There are people who are still living there, so we try and see that they can have new ways of life. But it raises a fundamental problem, namely, what kind of society are we living in. We are manufacturing territories which are obliging us to raise these questions. What kind of a society is that? I think that even if we are first orientated to acting to improve what exists, we still have these questions which are remaining and remnant.

I would like to talk about the experience of CORE in Belarus. CORE is a program which has been set up after the ETHOS program. What Jacques has said yesterday is that the people who had been working on this program had voluntarily stopped it. They didn't want to continue it; not because they are not obtaining any result, but because they didn't want anybody to think that they were actually answering to all the problems raised by a post-accidental situation. The public health question in particular was not answered, and also they were not answering to the economic questions which are necessary to be solved, if we want to rehabilitate life in these territories. I

think in the CORE program, we have identified vulnerability because we have been the target of multiple attacks, and in some way we have come to exhaustion, and the CORE program has required a political commitment. Before the CORE program could start, we have implemented what we called the declaration of principles. Local stakeholders of the Belarus territories, national and international actors have accepted to sign this declaration of principles: it was a commitment to sign, to act together to rehabilitate the contaminated territories. It is not a humanitarian action, it is a commitment which is based on the idea that not only the Belarus stakeholders are involved, but that also it concerns the international stakeholders. I would add that there has been an acknowledgment of the complexity of the question because it cannot be addressed with the normal modes of coordination; a common effort has to be triggered to design new approaches.

So this answers the first problem that I have identified, namely, the rehabilitation. But in a broader way, I think that when we are addressing the second question which is to be prepared for a post-accidental situation, I think we need a political agreement, which means that we need states, national authorities, local governments, NGOs in Europe, and maybe in association with countries which are outside the European Union, to sign a common declaration, to say that these questions are important for them. This will enable to create a framework which will secure the interventions of all the stakeholders which are likely to work on the program. So since we started yesterday at 9 o'clock, we have seen various comments in the public and very interesting suggestions. We have seen the press today, and we see that it is necessary to state that the question has to be acknowledged, that we recognize the essential position of the local stakeholders and territories in the post-accidental actions, that this is not promoting nuclear activities, that we are talking about something which is fundamental. So in my view, for the future, we should think about the way we can create the involvement of the various

European countries, and when I mean the involvement of the countries, I am not talking about the territories, I am talking about the territories and also the associations.

MR. GODET: (Speaking in French, interpreted.) To answer what has been said, what Gilles has proposed is not something which is straightforward. To be pragmatic, to set up a process which would lead authorities from the member states, from the European Union, and even from countries outside the Union, to be associated to NGOs in order to sign a document which would be a political document, the said document being favourable to this joint approach of actions in contaminated territories, I must say that, as an authority, it is a process upon which I have never worked with and it doesn't appear to be very simple. This being said, it is not because it has never been done and because it is not simple that we shouldn't try.

Now from the French point of view, for this year and the next year -- now maybe it goes along the same line, but we are more modestly trying to develop bilateral cooperation with several European countries, some of them are represented in this distinguished audience. We made contacts with our Norwegian friends a few minutes ago, and I think that the development of bilateral relations would be able to favour what Gilles has suggested. In addition to that, I would like to say that we shouldn't fall into this top-down approach that we have been condemning here. I think that the people who are here are also favourable to the bottom-up approach, which means that the truth has to come from the field and from local experiments. I think that the public authorities in France at least could favour the emergence of what I would call micro projects, mini or local projects, that could be initiated by stakeholders, and most particularly by the populations who live around the sites. I have a great confidence in NGOs and professional organizations. I think that the floor should be given to the people who are living near the sites,

and I believe that there is a European program which is addressing this type of project. This is something that would push the national authorities to evolve along the line that Gilles has suggested.

MS. VILLERS: (Speaking in French, interpreted.) Let me try and complement what was said as to the role and the means. I think everybody understood the uniqueness of this meeting and its efficiency and also the hope of using this process to set up a prevention system. All these happened because a serious disaster occurred. Now there are other places which are highly contaminated by other products, chemical products, for instance, and maybe this uniqueness could be transformed into a method. I may be disappointed because we see that it is a cross-cutting contamination involving air, soil, water, etc. I am disappointed to hear somebody from Europe saying: We should find financial resources in our communities or in our regions. I have placed great hopes in Europe and I think that we demonstrated here that the weight of Europe was extremely important, and I hope that he would say that the role of NGOs would be taken into account to work in the field, because they work in the field and they make a link between public authorities and local people. I think European decision makers are working too much in isolation. The idea of sustainable development and of this cross-cutting nature of things is something that is not understood very well yet, and there is still a long way to go to make people understand that.

MR. NESTERENKO: (Speaking in Russian, interpreted.) Dear colleagues, I would like to share with you an experience that I have been involved in for 10 years now in Minsk. In Dortmund in Germany, there is an international training centre. One month ago, I was participating in a meeting where there were 250 German organizations working on the Chernobyl

accident and the problems deriving from that. Representatives from 200 Belarusian organizations as well as the ambassador of Belarus in Germany participated in that meeting. There were representatives of the government and of the parliament as well. The German government allocates approximately €2 million each year for the development of these programs. Cooperation between associations of Belarus and Germany really significantly helps people who are living in the contaminated territories. It is necessary to find funds, to organize similar meetings in order to provoke collaboration between Belarus and French associations. There are very interesting projects which exist, one of these projects involves the creation of a centre called "Hope", to decontaminate children. It involves an association which is located in Frankfurt and an association working on Chernobyl, which has initiated this project. They built a sanatorium to cure children in Belarus. This represents true assistance to Belarus children and to the future generations as well. Cooperation between Germany and Belarus is working well, so we could extend this collaboration and create similar relations between Belarus and France.

MS. NISBET: Does anybody else have anything to add to these comments? Before you add them, can you say your name please?

MR. HUGON: (Speaking in French, interpreted.) Michel Hugon from the European Commission. I would like to answer Ms. Villers's comment. It is true that I was not used to such meetings because I am beginning to work in crisis management, and what I realize, during these two days, is that the stakeholders' associations are independent and free associations and their basic idea is to rehabilitate the territories and to inform local populations around nuclear sites or potentially dangerous industrial sites. Of course these initiatives are local and, in the case of Chernobyl, we saw that some associations started to work together around Chernobyl and also in Norway,

because of the impact of Chernobyl in this country. Maybe I think that these associations need local financing to survive, it cannot be assistance at the European level. We cannot decide at the European level to allow associations of stakeholders to be involved in crisis management after an accident, because if you look at where all these industrial or nuclear sites are located, they are not homogeneously distributed throughout Europe. So it is really a local problem and I understood that. There is a specific problem in Nord Cotentin in the north of France and in Wales, and situations are different from one place to another. Of course people can work together afterwards, they can associate their effort, and we could use programs such as SAGE to try and establish links between them. But it is going to be very difficult, politically speaking, to do more than that, and to fund associations of stakeholders. We see that all the time, as soon as Europe is trying to do something, for example, regarding the directive on safety or on radioactive waste, some member states are not happy at all.

MR. HÉRIARD-DUBREUIL: (Speaking in French, interpreted.) I would like to illustrate the point I made earlier on in a practical way. First, I would like to tell our friends from Belarus who are here that I am a member of a French committee which is a partner in the CORE program. So we have been trying to find ways of developing collaboration with our friends from Belarus for a long time now. It is not a humanitarian cooperation because the disaster occurred 20 years ago; it is not a recent event, it is a collaboration based on the idea that it is a problem we have in common. If we want to develop cooperation with our Belarus friends, the assumption is that, in Europe, local groups are going to emerge and also share this idea that it is an important problem. In Belarus, associations are confronted directly to the problem and they are trying to find new ways of managing situations like that. What we want is to really have an exchange of ideas and to promote common

work. We also understood that chemical and nuclear products are leading to similar problems, they are commonalities. The problem of nuclear contamination is that, hypothetically in Europe, we have various cases of problems. We are thinking about the possibility of a disaster, but we have real cases of chemical contamination, and it is not an issue which is totally different from what we are doing for radioactivity.

I would like to say a few words of the experience we have since April 2004 within the framework of the Euranos program. It is going to be almost a year. Euranos is a huge European project about the management of accidents, and there is a small part dedicated to post-accidental management. A small group of French stakeholders was requested to try and launch a kind of pioneer project in France. Why France? Because in France there are many nuclear power plants, because we already have people working with Belarus, because in France the authorities are completely changing their doctrine, their tools, they are really starting a new process of reflection. Maybe they have understood that they did not have much expertise in the field of post-accidental management. We understood that of course this could not be centralized, so we tried to establish a partnership. We got in touch with several territories in France to ask whether they would like to participate, and three accepted: the urban community of Dunkirk, the urban community of Montbéliard. Dunkirk is in the north of France and Montbéliard is in the east, and Rouillac which is, for foreigners to France, the place where Cognac brandy is manufactured. These three regions or territories expressed their interest. Of course in Dunkirk there is the largest nuclear power plant in Europe. There is none in Montbéliard. In Rouillac, there is one, but farther away, near Bordeaux, it is not like a nuclear community. These communities expressed an interest because they are in the process of setting up a regulatory in France which is something called the "community rescue plan" for the short, medium and long term. So they wanted to develop their

knowledge to better understand the problems and to increase their expertise and so on and so forth. Three territories have accepted to really take their own destiny into their hands and to take their responsibilities; they have accepted to work with experts, with associations such as ACRO and Anita Villers's association as well. So it is really a meeting between several stakeholders. And the authorities I think are in the process of understanding that they cannot succeed alone. So there is a kind of collaboration which is emerging and there is a kind of political agreement between regions, national authorities and associations, which is emerging. We started to work and we realized that there are limits to a national debate. For the moment, in this group, there are only three territories, but there are limits to a national debate, because in case of an accident, in case of a contamination, the problems in Dunkirk will not be the same problems as in Montbéliard or as in Rouillac. This approach will come to an end in 2005, it is the first stage of the project, and we are realizing that there are limits even at the national level. So these communities will have to build their own approaches locally, taking specificities into account with their own stakeholders.

Of course everybody understands that if a national legislation is passed, it will be imposed on all the territories. So the territories have to collaborate and exchange views and also exchange with the national level, because if some day there is a legislation, it will then maybe comply with regional requirements, and it would be important also for this national legislation not to destroy the capacity to renovate all these stakeholders. So you see that you cannot work in your own corner. [The Euranos project has started in France to try to develop an original approach and we will see whether we can convince other countries to do the same.](#)

Our idea was that if we start preparing tools for post-accidental situations, they cannot be ready-made tools. Local stakeholders have to develop their own tools, which means that this approach that we developed in

France - and I am going to cut it short - could apply to England, to Norway, maybe to Belgium, maybe to Germany, and maybe all these other countries are going to wish to develop similar approaches. And then we need to have harmonization in Europe, because if Europe has a number of legislations which contradict national regulations, it is not going to work either; it is going from the region to the nation, to Europe. Progressively, I think we are creating the conditions for an agreement, between these three levels - local, national and European - for post-accidental rehabilitation.

MS. DURONOVA: I totally support Mr. Dubreuil and also support Anita Villers who was talking a little bit about the common language between decision makers and stakeholders. I would like to point to your attention that there was a recent work program of the European Community, the project EVATECH, which was dealing with questions regarding the late phase countermeasures in inhabited areas. In six countries there were introduced new methods for communication and stakeholders' involvement, facilitated workshop. It was done in Poland, Slovakia, the United Kingdom, Belgium, Germany and Denmark. I would like to invite you to the dissemination seminar which will take place in Brussels on 20th April. I will manage it technically. I will send the invitation letter which was also distributed at IAAE , and the participating different countries, to Jacques, and Jacques will distribute to the participants here. Those who are willing to participate in such a meeting and would like to also listen to some aspects as Mr. Dubreuil touched here regarding the Euranos project, that means concerns of stakeholders' involvement in this area, are welcome.

MR. HUGON: The information is already available on the Cordis website. We have put it on the Cordis website some time ago.

MS. HOCQUET-DUVAL: (Speaking in French, interpreted.) I would like to share a piece of information with you, to rebound rather on this idea that people have about funding should be local or European. I think we need both. I would like to take the region I know best, which is the region of Dunkirk. If unfortunately some day we have a nuclear or chemical accident, first there may be casualties, there may be death, and then there may be survivors who would also need help. Locally we would not be able to solve the problem. Neighbouring communities would have to help us, but also communities farther away would have to help us, communities which are lucky enough not to have any similar site on their territories. I think we did have similar examples after Chernobyl, and it probably happened -- the communities helping Chernobyl, I mean. So it is not only the local level which can fund programs for rehabilitation after an accident, because if it is too much of a burden for the local territory, then solidarity should exist at least within the nation, within regions which don't have industrial sites but which benefit from what we are producing in those regions which have industries.

In France, you know we have regionalization, and we should not regionalize according to the smallest common denominator. Solidarity should remain, and we should share, because otherwise we produce wealth and we suffer all the damage. So it is not fair. There is the need for more equilibrium than that.

MS. NISBET: I would like to ask the organiser of the workshop whether there is time for one more question before we finish. Are people able to stay for another ten or fifteen minutes, because I would like to ask a final question? I mean I have got several questions here, but the final question, to be more precise, is about where we are going in the SAGE Project and the SAGE Handbook. Is there time for that? Okay. After I have asked the

question, if it is possible for some of the panel members and members of the audience that already have spoken to give their views, that would be helpful.

I think that we can agree that the work carried out under the SAGE contract has been extremely valuable and the production of the generic handbook has been an important first step with regard to providing Western European authorities with some strategies and guidance for rehabilitation. So how do the panel members or members of the audience see that the concepts being taken forward from here? And, as an add on that, we saw the idea of specific handbooks for pregnant mothers, do we see that perhaps we have individual handbooks, what is the best approach that we can do from here? Maybe I could ask Per, if you wish to state something.

MR. STRAND: Thank you. May I make a comment and refer back to what was said earlier on? I do feel that there are a lot of lessons learned, but there is still a potential for the future. I think especially with this handbook here and the idea forward that could be very beneficial. I think we have been talking several times about the concept, the system, the rehabilitation strategy. Gilles has also introduced what you call the political document. I think if we translate it to a little bit more neutral language, I think we are trying to establish a sort of platform for the development of a framework. We don't need to call it political, but at least I see that from the experience we have had from Chernobyl, we see the need for a framework and that we can do it better next time. That is why I mention this emergency preparedness. There is also this handbook coming in. By having this generic handbook, of course there is always a potential of further development of that generic handbook, and that should also be done. I think to take that even a step forward and trying to put it to, for example, case studies for this. For example, these sites that we have been discussing, even trying to put it into practical use; it may be a practical use for those sites.

The different countries and the European Commission have all put a lot of money into trying to deal with the Chernobyl accident, but it is trying to take some synthesis out of that. I think it has been very good in this meeting that we really try to compare, try to look on the way forward and try to make a framework which should be more than Chernobyl, but which should be more linked to emergency preparedness. I think we could easily use, for example, the handbook. But we shouldn't be prepared for the past, we should prepare for the future things also. So it is a combination. There I see a need for a platform, a need for a platform which has a good dialogue between authorities, between NGOs, between populations, all of this. That platform, which is the platform for developing a framework, which would be of importance for, for example, emergency preparedness.

I mean at the moment there I may be going too far, but at the moment you have a lot of accidents which never happened, but one good preparedness is maybe to go into the problem, to try to deal with it and look what could be dealt with it, and that is the lesson learned from this project, trying to involve a lot of stakeholders. That could also be done before it was a problem. So that is my feeling, partly because I have a responsibility for emergency preparedness. But I feel you can add more value to what you are doing, add more into it, emergency preparedness and framework, which is generic, by, for example, using handbooks or case studies, for example. That is my input.

MR. HÉRIARD-DUBREUIL: (Speaking in French, interpreted.) A short clarification. The regions and the territories involved in Euranos so far have stated immediately that they were interested in an approach that would be wider for them, in order to prepare to address crisis situations. Working on the nuclear problem helps them prepare themselves to address other aspects: chemical accidents, natural disasters, whatever. So they understand the level

of complexity of issues. This is what Marie-Paule was saying earlier on in Dunkirk. They are not only addressing nuclear, but also other dangerous or hazardous sites. There are seven of them in Dunkirk.

MS. NISBET: Would anyone else like to add anything?

MS. ZHUKOVSKAYA: (Speaking in Russian, interpreted.)

In spite of the fact that we are representing the country which has been the most deeply affected by the consequences of Chernobyl, we are trying to do our best and overcome the consequences of the accident. I would like to express here our appreciation to all the countries that are helping us in our efforts. I would also like to thank for the humanitarian aid, for the work, the research we are doing in collaboration with other countries. So I want to thank upon the participation of the human quality. It is the memories, the duty of memory that we are safeguarding all together. We have a lot of experience that we have gathered during the years which have elapsed after the accident and we are always open to the sharing of our experience with our partners of the other countries. It is with appreciation that we are accepting the experience lying in the other countries. We are also trying to become familiar with the problems which are confronting our colleagues in other countries of the world, and we have finally been able to understand that these problems are not only our problems. They are global problems, they include the chemical and the radiological aspects, and our common goal is to gather our strength and our efforts to try and overcome our problems and to solve them.

We are extremely grateful and we are extremely pleased that the ETHOS project has been set up in our territories, in Belarus. Thanks to this project, we have been able to benefit from the very precious experience, helping us to manage the consequences of the accident. I am talking about the participation approach, the cooperation with what we call the stakeholders, namely, the populations involved. So this was within the framework of the

ETHOS 1 project. Afterwards, we have participated in ETHOS 2. And now we are still working and cooperating within the framework of a new project, which is called CORE.

In my view, the SAGE project, together with the handbook which has been created within the framework of SAGE, is something that I consider as the creative report which gathers all the work which has been conducted during all the years following the accident. So it is this work which is the basis of the guide, and I think that it is something which is going to be improved over the years. In fact we are going to take into account the specificities of each country and we are going to take into consideration all the problems which have been existing in the various countries, and I think that it is the very effective and fruitful cooperation which deserves to be continued, which I want to acknowledge. I thank you for your attention.

MS. NISBET: I am under strict orders to close the round table. One more question, okay.

MR. AGEYETS: (Speaking in Russian, interpreted.) I am Vladimir Ageyets from Belarus. I am the director in charge of the National Institute of Radiology. I am very happy to have come and to have participated in this meeting, in which we see lots of organizations being represented. I want to express my gratitude to Jacques Lochard, who has provided this possibility to meet, to come and attend the meeting. In fact, I have been led to ask myself a question. I am under the impression that the European Commission considers that it is only the NGOs which are providing information. I think that the inconvenient of all the projects is they are short-term projects. To have objective information which is reliable, the monitoring has to be in place for several years. In the situation such as it is now, such as it exists, we can derive the statistics, which are not always objective.

Today, Belarus is a field of international exploration. We have many territories which are contaminated by radionuclides, and there is still people who are living there, a new generation which has replaced the previous one. In my view, it is necessary to gather the data from the government organizations and from the NGOs in order to succeed. I do hope that we have succeeded in pushing things around, all the more as I have been invited to participate in the meeting. All the scientific data that have been gathered during these last years, the results of the research which has been made, are extremely important, and I would like us to have an exchange of results, an exchange of experiments. So I am all in favour of cooperation. Thank you.

MR. LOCHARD (?): (Speaking in French, interpreted.) Anne, if I am authorized to say two words. Following this intervention, I would just like to add that, to solve a problem as complex as the rehabilitation of contaminated territories, it can only be done together, the public authorities, the association, the civil society. One of the strong ideas that has come out from ETHOS and which has continued to live in the territories of Belarus, but which we have shared is this idea of pluralism, this idea that there are several approaches which are looking at the same reality, and from that we can see some kind of a tool emerging, from which we can all agree and which could become the basis of an common action to improve things.

MS. NISBET: Thank you. I think that concludes the round table discussion I would like to thank all the panel members for their contributions and also the contributions from the audience. We have gone about forty-five minutes over from what we originally expected, and I thank people very much for staying. I'll just hand over to Jacques now to close the workshop.

MR. LOCHARD: (Speaking in French, interpreted.) I am going to

be extremely brief. We are at the end of the workshop. I would like to thank you all. First of all, I would like to thank the organizations which have enabled us to support the workshop and to organize it: the DGSNR, the French Embassy in Belarus, the CNAM, and I would like to thank also CNAM most particularly, because confronted with such an unexpected event, they have been able to find the necessary spirit so that our meeting has been finally very pleasant and very fruitful.

I would like to thank all those who have enabled the meeting to be harmonious. I would like to thank the interpreters, they did a lot of work. I would like to thank the technicians, most particularly this gentleman over there who has been able to be dedicated and has done his best for us to work in the best conditions. I would like to thank the police, because the police have protected us morally, they have brought their moral support and they have protected us also effectively. I would like to thank the typist, thanks to her we are going to have a verbatim which is going to be very accurate regarding the round table, which has been very rich.

Last but not least, I would like to thank you all. We have lived together very strong emotions. I have appreciated the dignity of your reactions, I have appreciated your support. We have been able to confront a difficult situation together. I would like to thank you very much.

I would just like to make a little technical aside. Some of you are going to have expenses which are linked to the cleaning of their clothes and of their personal objects which have been marked and destroyed. In the case where they couldn't be refunded by their respective countries or organizations, I would like them to send their invoices to us. CEPN, as organizers of the project, we are going to try and act in such a way that nobody keeps a bad memory of our seminar.

To conclude, I would like to say that beyond the stress and the tension, at least for me, I have had enough time to see spring coming to Paris.

We are exiting a long cold, an unusual period for this time of the year. The sun has decided to appear during these last two days and has been more and more intense, I do hope. I think it is a very good sign for the future of our common work. As soon as tomorrow, the partners of the SAGE program are going to meet in order to work together and to conclude the project, to prepare the final publication of the project in order to keep the trace of what has been said and done during the two years, the two and a half years of the program. Once again, thanks to all of you and have a safe return back home. Bye.

(End of the Round Table - 4:16 p.m.)