

**MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVES OF
COMPETENT AUTHORITIES IDENTIFIED UNDER THE
CONVENTION ON EARLY NOTIFICATION OF A
NUCLEAR ACCIDENT AND THE CONVENTION ON
ASSISTANCE IN THE CASE OF A NUCLEAR ACCIDENT
OR RADIOLOGICAL EMERGENCY**

REPORT OF THE SECOND MEETING

The Meeting of Competent Authorities is convened as an IAEA Technical Committee to support implementation of General Conference Resolution [GC\(46\)/RES/9.D](#). The representatives considered a report by the Secretariat on actions taken since the June 2001 Meeting, and proposals from a group of like-minded competent authorities relating to long-term sustainability of the international emergency response system and to international assistance and international communication in the event of a nuclear accident or radiological emergency. The representatives agreed on a long-term goal for strengthening the international emergency response system. They agreed on the establishment of a regionally balanced National Competent Authorities Co-ordinating Group (NCACG) that will co-ordinate the execution of tasks assigned to competent authorities by the Meeting, including the establishment of groups to continue the work underway on developing strategies for improving emergency assistance and emergency communication. The Meeting selected the Chairman and regional representatives for the NCACG. The Meeting adopted a proposal for enhancing the existing drill and exercise regime. The Meeting recommended to the IAEA Secretariat that: it convene the Meeting of National Competent Authorities regularly; it convene a Technical Committee to facilitate participation in the Emergency Response Network (ERNET); and that it develop a mechanism for timely communication of lessons identified over the comparatively slow formal publication procedure.

CONTENTS

REPORT OF THE SECOND MEETING..... 1
OPENING.....3
PROGRESS REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT4
**PROGRESS REPORT OF WORK CARRIED OUT BY COMPETENT
AUTHORITIES THROUGH THE OSLO INITIATIVE.....6**
INTERFACES.....7
REPORTS BY COMPETENT AUTHORITIES8
DISCUSSIONS.....8
REVIEW OF DECISIONS9
SELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE NCACG9
CLOSING OF THE MEETING.....10

Appendices

**APPENDIX I: DECISIONS OF THE COMPETENT AUTHORITIES' MEETING,
2 TO 6 JUNE 2003**

Annexes

**ANNEX I: PROPOSED RATIONALE AND SCHEDULE FOR CONVEX DRILLS
AND EXERCISES**

INTRODUCTION

1. The Second Meeting of representatives of competent authorities identified under the Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident (Early Notification Convention) and the Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency (Assistance Convention) took place in Vienna from 2 to 6 June 2003 at the invitation of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

2. The Second Meeting was attended by 81 representatives of competent authorities from 55 Member States. Of these 75 were representatives of competent authorities from 49 Member States that are Party to one or both of the Early Notification Convention and the Assistance Convention: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom, and United States of America. The remaining representatives were from competent authorities of Member States not party to either Convention: Angola, Bolivia, Chile, Georgia, Kazakhstan, and United Republic of Tanzania.

3. Two representatives from international organizations party to the two Conventions also attended, namely from the World Meteorological Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. An observer also attended from the Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA/OECD) and two from the European Commission (EC).

OPENING

4. Mr. Tomihiko Taniguchi, Deputy Director General for the Department of Nuclear Safety and Security of the IAEA, opened the meeting and expressed the Agency's appreciation for the co-operation shown by Member States in providing experts and resources for past emergency responses, and for providing extrabudgetary contributions for improving the Agency's emergency response system. He described the Agency's vision for safety and reflected that, while the Early Notification Convention and the Assistance Convention have served as the foundation for an international system for emergency preparedness and response, additional components were now relevant, such as the Safety Requirements publication issued in 2002 on [Preparedness and Response for a Nuclear or Radiological Emergency \(Safety Standards Series No. GS-R-2\)](#), jointly sponsored by seven international and regional organizations. He recognized that nuclear and radiological emergencies were fortunately very rare. Nonetheless, they represented a challenge not only for preparedness and response, but also for sharing with the community at large the lessons learned from these events. He suggested that regular meetings of the competent authorities might form an important part of an international framework to focus the many initiatives in this field into a coherent programme of concrete, practical steps to strengthen emergency response arrangements worldwide. He concluded by appealing for continued support in the development and implementation of the programme.

5. Mr. Abel González, Director of the Division of Radiation and Waste Safety in the Department of Nuclear Safety and Security of the IAEA, then addressed the meeting. He reflected on the history of the Conventions on Early Notification and on Assistance and remarked that when they were concluded in 1986 and 1987, no formal mechanism was

foreseen that could allow the parties to meet and agree on arrangements for implementing the Conventions. In 2001, the IAEA Secretariat took the initiative to convene a meeting of the competent authorities identified under the Conventions. This First Meeting of representatives of competent authorities, which took place in June 2001, had generated much useful feedback and provided direction. Mr. González paid tribute to the contributions of Norway and the United States of America in support of the Secretariat in following up on the First Meeting. After the approval in March 2002 of [Publication GS-R-2](#) by the IAEA Board of Governors, the General Conference, through resolution [GC\(46\)/RES/9](#), provided the foundation for a meeting to encompass all those Member States for which competent authorities are identified under the Conventions. This resolution encouraged Member States to “develop a consistent, coherent and sustainable joint programme for improved and more efficient international response to nuclear and radiological emergencies”. Mr. González introduced the Facilitator for the Second Meeting, Mr. Jeff Lafortune (Canada).

6. The Meeting adopted the provisional agenda (TM-26050/003). Mr. Malcolm Crick, Head of the Emergency Preparedness and Response Unit of the IAEA and Technical Secretary of the Meeting, recalled the objectives of the meeting and recapitulated the outcome of the First Meeting.

PROGRESS REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT

7. Mr. Crick made a presentation on the actions taken by the Secretariat since June 2001. A progress report had previously been distributed to competent authorities (Ref. J1-TM-26050/SR dated 16 May 2003). The General Conference in [GC\(44\)/RES/16](#) had requested the Director General to improve the capability of the IAEA’s Emergency Response Centre (ERC) if necessary to fulfil its role. Since the last meeting, the IAEA had performed an internal audit and identified several important issues to be addressed. The Secretariat had requested and received extrabudgetary funding from the USA for: enhancing the ENAC protected web site for exchange of information on emergencies; improving the ERC infrastructure; and instituting the Emergency Response Network (ERNET). In addition, a cost-free expert from Germany and a Brazilian expert who was sponsored by the fellowship programme of the Technical Co-operation Fund had assisted in taking actions to improve the Emergency Response System. However, given other demands placed on the Emergency Preparedness and Response Unit (EPRU), in particular since the terrorist attacks on the United States of America in September 2001, sufficient staffing had not been available to develop with competent authorities an enhanced long-term programme for strengthening the international emergency response arrangements.

8. In May 2002, in consultation with the Secretariat, Norway took the initiative to convene a meeting of representatives of interested competent authorities in Oslo with the aim of following up on issues highlighted at the first meeting and outstanding, particularly longer term strategic aspects (‘Oslo initiative’). Norway also made an extrabudgetary contribution through the IAEA Nuclear Security Fund with the aim of assisting the Secretariat to participate in the work subsequent to that meeting.

9. Mr. Crick reported on the development of standards by the Emergency Preparedness and Response Unit, highlighting the relevant paragraphs of [GS-R-2](#), especially the concepts of ‘transnational emergencies’ and their notification, and ‘dangerous sources’. He also outlined the ongoing use of manuals and training material and the extensive training

programmes carried out in many States of the world, and noted that the widespread use of these materials would be useful in harmonizing international response arrangements.

10. Mr. Nogueira de Oliveira, Emergency Assistance Co-ordinator, IAEA, described the Agency's response to requests for assistance under the Assistance Convention that had been received in the last two years, namely in Poland, Georgia, Nigeria, Tanzania, Qatar, Bolivia and Afghanistan. He recognized the assistance provided by Governments, especially France, India, Norway, Russia and the United States of America. He highlighted the lessons identified from the JINEX 1 exercise based on a national exercise at Gravelines in France and provided information on the results of communications tests and drills performed since 2001. He also presented a proposal for modifications to the existing drills and exercises programme for consideration by the meeting (TM-26050/004).

11. Mr. Nogueira de Oliveira presented the [2002 edition of ENATOM](#), highlighting changes from the 2000 edition, in particular changes to incorporate the requirements of [GS-R-2](#). He also presented the changes to the ERNET manual, which included acceptance criteria for teams applying to join the network. Until very recently there had been no applications to join ERNET; however, three States (Slovenia, Brazil and France¹) have now submitted applications, for a total of ten teams to join.

12. Mr. Crick made presentations on the ENAC web site, which had been enhanced functionally with the financial support of the USA. In particular, the site now allows States to submit to the Secretariat — over the Internet — EMERCON forms and other relevant information as attachments. He summarized the work of the Inter-Agency Committee on the Response to Nuclear Accidents (IACRNA) to develop and publish the 2002 Edition of the [Joint Radiation Management Plan of the International Organizations \(Joint Plan\)](#), an activity in which ten international organizations participated.

13. Mr. Nogueira de Oliveira described the initial planning for the JINEX 2 exercise envisaged for May 2005. The representative from Brazil offered a national exercise on which the JINEX 2 could be based. This offer and any other offers that might be received will be reviewed for decision at the September 2003 meeting of IACRNA.

14. Mr. Crick summarized the results of a recent questionnaire aimed at gathering information on the adoption and implementation of [GS-R-2](#) and [ENATOM](#), and on other issues for which the Secretariat and the meeting needed further guidance to direct the future programme. Up to 30 May 2003, 36 States had responded. Mr. Crick encouraged representatives from other States to submit their responses. The results will be made available to competent authorities on the ENAC web site.

15. Ms. JoAnne Ford, of the IAEA Division of Public Information, addressed the meeting and explained that there was a need for Member States to recognize the critical importance of public information and to make plans for managing the media interactions during an emergency, as required in [GS-R-2](#). In particular, the Secretariat requested that — in the event of a nuclear or radiological emergency — States supply the relevant contact details of the staff they have assigned to liaise with the IAEA on public information matters. These details are to be provided on the EMERCON forms.

¹ A representative from France announced an application for membership as an aerial survey team.

16. A discussion session was held in plenary to consider several issues: the need for performance criteria for notification times; the proposed exercise programme; the objectives of the next JINEX exercise planned for 2005; the participation in exercises of competent authorities not identified according to [ENATOM](#); the duplication of fax messages during drills; confusion over the use of Co-ordinated Universal Time (UTC); the need for the Agency to disseminate lessons learned from its emergency responses in a timely manner; and the need to move towards electronic communication mechanisms and away from facsimile as the primary means of communication. These various issues were recorded in a log for consideration by the Secretariat and for development of the meeting's final decisions.

PROGRESS REPORT OF WORK CARRIED OUT BY COMPETENT AUTHORITIES THROUGH THE OSLO INITIATIVE

17. Mr. Finn Ugletveit (Norway) introduced the work carried out under the Oslo initiative. The Norwegian competent authority, recognizing that the Secretariat had insufficient resources to follow up on all actions recommended by the last meeting, in particular insufficient human resources to address longer term strategic issues, convened in co-ordination with the Secretariat a meeting of representatives of interested competent authorities in Oslo in May 2002 with the aim of following up on actions outstanding from the First Meeting of Competent Authorities. The meeting developed a presumed long-term vision for the international emergency response system and an action plan for the work to be done in preparation for the Second Meeting of Competent Authorities. The Oslo meeting recommended forming three *ad hoc* working groups of volunteers, on long-term sustainability, assistance and communication, respectively. These were subsequently established, and Mr. Ugletveit provided co-ordination among them and with the IAEA Secretariat. A final report of 'like-minded' competent authorities for following up on the recommendations of the first meeting of representatives of competent authorities was developed and circulated in advance of this meeting (TM-26050/002).

18. Mr. Raul dos Santos (Brazil), who led Working Group 1 on long-term sustainability, presented its report. He described the requirements of a sustainable long-term mechanism for the continuous improvement of the international response system, and identified what was currently missing from the present arrangements. The group recommended institutionalizing the meetings of competent authorities and the creation of an 'office' comprising regional representatives to provide liaison and co-ordination between meetings of the competent authorities.

19. Mr. Stephen Solomon (Australia), who led Working Group 2 on international assistance, presented its work and recommendations. The group had identified different types of assistance (cross-border physical assistance and home-based advice/assistance provision). However, the group proposed that the work needed to be extended in order to analyse in more detail what needed to be established to facilitate different types of assistance in response to an emergency and the roles and responsibilities of Member States and international organizations. It proposed that one or several working groups be established to further elaborate on this. It recognized that the ERNET concept had not been widely espoused by Member States and proposed that the IAEA convene a Technical Committee Meeting to undertake a review of ERNET with a view to facilitating its implementation. It also proposed that the criteria for acceptance to ERNET be reviewed with the aim of clarifying that non-deployable, home-based teams may be acceptable for certain functions. The group proposed

that Member States review their national emergency response arrangements to work towards harmonization with ERNET and with the procedures in [IAEA-TECDOC-1092](#) and [IAEA-TECDOC-1162](#).

20. Mr. Wim Molhoek (Netherlands), who had co-chaired Working Group 3 on international communication, presented its work and main conclusions. The working group had not been able to complete its work because of the complexity of the problem and the limited resources available to it. It proposed that a new working group be established to continue the work on international communication with a two year review cycle for new options to be considered. It proposed that the information and data sets for transfer in an emergency be considered with respect to harmonization and standardization and that standards are established. It proposed that meteorological products be standardized in an electronic format and reviewed together with WMO. It recommended that the meeting choose the Internet as a primary communication tool and that national web sites be established. It further recommended that a standard web site be developed and made available for all Member States to copy and that all States establishing web sites make them consistent with the standard site. It also recommended that security and confidentiality issues be considered and adequate technical solutions to this problem be found.

21. A discussion session in plenary raised concerns about: the level of financial resources needed to support the future work of any working groups; and the details of the provision of human resources, equipment, training, legal issues and oversight for the implementation of ERNET. It was agreed to proceed conceptually with parallel actions: (1) the work on assistance started by the working group should continue; a survey of assets should be carried out with Member States to ascertain what they can offer in assistance, an analysis of the gaps should be carried out and long-term plans should be made to deal with the gaps²; (2) the Secretariat should convene as a matter of urgency a Technical Committee Meeting with representatives from States most likely to provide assistance resources and to address systematically the issues that were hindering the participation in ERNET. It was also agreed in principle to continue the work of the group on international communication.

22. The Facilitator expressed on behalf of the meeting and the Secretariat appreciation to all those who had participated in the Oslo initiative and in the *ad hoc* working groups.

INTERFACES

23. Mr. Ray Powles (invited speaker, UK), from the European Bone Marrow Transplant Group, made a short presentation on the work of its Nuclear Accident Sub-committee. The group co-ordinates a large network of medical centres across Europe, whose expertise relates to regular treatment of people who receive whole body radiation doses above the threshold for bone marrow deterministic effects. He offered this expertise to be associated in some way with the international arrangements for provision of assistance in the case of a nuclear or radiological emergency.

24. Mr. Gerhard de Vries (EC-JRC-ISPRA) presented the work of the European Commission in the area of communications and technical products for international response

² In order to facilitate the consideration of the whole area of assistance, the IAEA Secretariat was asked to make available an analysis of the events for which requests for assistance had been received by the IAEA, the nature of the requests for assistance and of the assistance actually provided.

to nuclear emergencies. This included primarily (1) the formal and operational ECURIE system for notification and information exchange; (2) the EURDEP system to compile and make available real time monitoring data across Europe, which has been extensively tested on a voluntary basis and will become an official means to report such data shortly; and (3) the ENSEMBLE project, which is exploring how best to collect, analyse and present the results of predictions from different long-range transport and atmospheric dispersion models to aid decision making. He offered to make available these various systems to the competent authorities and support for implementation. In particular, Mr. de Vries presented a concept developed jointly by the EC-JRC and the IAEA ERC to establish as a short term solution an operational interface between the ECURIE system and the ENAC web site, in which a message sent to one system would be transmitted to the other, thereby avoiding the need for duplicate entry by the competent authorities of EC States.

25. The meeting raised an issue with regard to legal aspects. It was envisaged that letters would need to be written from the EU States to both the IAEA and the EC declaring that a notification to one could be recognized as serving as a notification to the other, and an agreement would need to be concluded between the EC and the IAEA on the performance objectives of their respective systems. This had yet to be worked out in detail. The meeting agreed to the proposal in concept, recognizing the amount of work to be done, and requested the IAEA Secretariat and the EC to proceed with the detailed planning and implementation.

26. Mr. Morrison Mlaki (WMO) made a presentation on the work of the WMO in relation to serving the meteorological community in responding to environmental disasters, including nuclear and radiological emergencies. In the discussion, the meeting concurred with the need to review the requirements for meteorological products, the mechanism for exchanging meteorological products, and the input data needed — considered as an aspect of the provision of assistance — in time for presenting to the next meeting of the Regional Specialized Meteorological Centres, scheduled for November 2003.

REPORTS BY COMPETENT AUTHORITIES

27. Competent authority representatives made short reports to each other in regional groupings on how various aspects of international communication and assistance were implemented at present in their States. At a subsequent plenary session, presentations by the Rapporteurs for each group allowed the meeting to draw the following conclusions that, with some exceptions: most countries had or were working towards implementation of national emergency response plans for nuclear or radiological emergencies; the time needed to notify an emergency varied considerably depending on the type of emergency, but that emergencies at nuclear installations would probably be reported to the competent authority within 2 hours; most countries would provide information in English and on EMERCON forms; and for most countries the national competent authority would issue a notification or further information without further clearance by their governments.

DISCUSSIONS

28. Groups were formed with random membership to discuss and debate in parallel some general issues, including the arrangements for institutionalizing the meetings of competent authorities, the establishment of an 'office' and 'working groups' and the mechanisms for co-ordinating work between them and the Secretariat; the proposed drill and exercise programme; contact points for public information and the need for performance objectives.

Each group's Rapporteur presented to the plenary a summary of the conclusions reached by the group.

29. While there were some differences among the groups, the following conclusions could be drawn: there was a need to establish an NCA co-ordinating group (NCACG) comprising regional representatives to co-ordinate the execution of tasks assigned to NCAs by the meeting and to co-ordinate actions with the Secretariat; the NCA meeting should be held on a regular basis, initially every two years or when deemed necessary by NCACG in consultation with the Secretariat; the scope of work for the TCM on ERNET should not include non-physical advice/assistance at this stage but focus on establishing a basic capability; another group should work on longer term assistance issues, including the provision of non-physical advice/assistance; one or more groups should continue the work on communications; however, working groups should be established to perform tasks and be result-oriented rather than permanent standing groups on subjects; guideline values for notification times would be useful to help States in making appropriate advanced arrangements; the proposed exercise schedule (TM-26050/004) was accepted along with a recommendation for a mechanism to increase the frequency of drills in countries with low success rates and a request was made for inclusion of the post-release phase; there was a need to consider the terminology of 'nuclear accident and radiological emergency' in the context of the meeting and its work; and a need to review public information arrangements.

30. The Meeting participants recognized the increasing international attention to the response to radiological emergencies, including those involving malevolent acts, as reflected in, for example, General Conference Resolution [GC\(46\)/RES/9](#), the recent G8 Statement (TM-26050/022), the findings of the [2003 International Conference on Security of Radioactive Sources](#), the recent experience of the IAEA in providing assistance following radiological events and IAEA Member States' concerns. It also recognized that the actions needed to improve international emergency preparedness and response will contribute to improving the response to radiological emergencies, including those involving malevolent acts. It also noted the continuing lack of resources available to the IAEA's Emergency Response Programme to perform its tasks.

REVIEW OF DECISIONS

31. The Facilitator and Secretariat prepared a set of principal decisions for detailed consideration by the Meeting. These were reviewed, modified and agreed in plenary. The decisions are recorded in Appendix I.

SELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE NCACG

32. It was agreed that pending formalization of the National Competent Authority Co-ordinating Group (NCACG) decided in Decision 2003/03, it was necessary to select a Chairman and regional representatives to carry forward the work of the meeting. The NCACG should decide whether to continue the existing Oslo-initiative working groups or to change them. The Oslo-initiative working groups would continue to work in the interim. The NCACG would need to manage any transition from the existing working groups in co-ordination with the Secretariat.

33. The meeting overwhelmingly selected by show of hands Mr. Finn Ugletveit (Norway) for Chairman of the NCACG.

34. Six regional groupings were formed by the participants representing competent authorities in Africa; East and West Asia; eastern Europe, western Europe, North America; and Latin America respectively. Each group proposed a regional representative to the NCACG, and alternates in the event their nomination were not supported by their authorities.

REGION	PRIMARY	<i>1ST ALTERNATE</i>	<i>2ND ALTERNATE</i>
Africa	Nigeria	<i>S. Africa</i>	<i>Egypt</i>
Asia	China	<i>Australia</i>	<i>Japan</i>
eastern Europe	Slovenia	<i>Hungary</i>	<i>Slovakia</i>
western Europe	Netherlands	<i>France</i>	<i>Germany</i>
North America	Canada	<i>USA</i>	<i>Mexico</i>
Latin America	Brazil	<i>Cuba</i>	<i>Argentina</i>

CLOSING OF THE MEETING

35. The Facilitator thanked the participants for their contributions to the meeting and expressed his view that an important step had been made in starting a major strategic upgrade for the international response system and achieving its long-term sustainability. He wished the NCACG and Mr. Ugletveit every success. The meeting closed at 13:00.

APPENDIX I: DECISIONS OF THE COMPETENT AUTHORITIES' MEETING, 2 TO 6 JUNE 2003

Decision 2003/01

The meeting agreed on the following long term vision statement, based on the TM-26050/002 report¹, as the goal for strengthening the international preparedness and response system for nuclear and radiological emergencies:

The goal for the international community should be a self-sustaining and continuously improving system of co-operation between States for preparedness and response for nuclear and radiological emergencies. Therefore, recognizing that they are individual States undertaking actions for populations under their own jurisdictions, they can through co-operation, communication and the sharing of information, resources and experience achieve a coherent and optimized handling of the event taking all available resources into consideration.

Decision 2003/02

The meeting recommended that the Secretariat identify resource needs, optimize the use of the Secretariat's present resources and, where necessary, request additional funding needed to implement these recommendations, taking into account its own experience and the expected impacts of these recommendations; and recommended that the competent authorities encourage the provision of extra-budgetary funding to meet the new demands.

Decision 2003/03

The meeting agreed to establish a National Competent Authorities' Co-ordinating Group (NCACG) to manage the tasks assigned to the competent authorities by the Meeting. Its terms of reference will be developed based on the proposal contained in TM-26050/002. It will be composed of a Chair designated by the meeting of competent authorities and regional representatives designated by the regional delegates. Its functions will be to develop an action plan in co-ordination with the Secretariat, produce deliverables within the next two years, and produce terms of reference for, review the project plans of, monitor the progress of and co-ordinate the work of working groups. In addition, it will maintain liaison with the NCAs, periodically report on progress to them, and co-ordinate actions with the Secretariat. The NCACG will be accountable to the NCAs for the implementation of the relevant recommendations. The NCACG will submit modifications and additions to the work plan to NCAs, and will obtain their concurrence before work takes place. Its work will be cost-free to the Agency.

Expected outcome

- The establishment of a mechanism for managing NCA contributions to the development and enhancement of international arrangements for preparedness and response for nuclear and radiological emergencies.

¹ Report of like-minded competent authorities for following up on the recommendations of the First Meeting of representatives of competent authorities.

- ❑ An improved ability to meet the needs of Member States for better co-ordination and a more effective implementation of solutions to international challenges in nuclear and radiological emergency response.

Time frame

- ❑ Confirmation of nominations by Member States: August 2003;
- ❑ Terms of reference and level of effort: October 2003;
- ❑ Resourcing: December 2003.

Decision 2003/04

The meeting requested the NCACG to establish two Working Groups as soon as possible, namely:

- a. Working Group on the provision of assistance, with emphasis on needs and ways to harmonize assistance procedures, including those of the ERNET system; and
- b. Working Group on international communication of emergency information and data, focusing on ways to harmonize and optimize the exchange of key emergency information and data in an emergency, including reliability, redundancy and security issues².

Until these working groups can be established to continue and expand on the work carried out by the existing working groups under the Oslo initiative (TM-26050/002), the existing working groups will be maintained and a transition will be arranged.

Expected outcome

- ❑ Concrete recommendations and options for the enhancement of international assistance and communication arrangements;
- ❑ Creation of Task Teams to develop technical solutions.

Time frame

- ❑ Working Group nominations: September 2003;
- ❑ First meeting of Working Groups: fourth quarter 2003.

Decision 2003/05

The meeting requested the NCACG to establish a consultative mechanism with NCAs and the Secretariat to ensure close co-ordination with the NCAs between meetings of the National Competent Authorities. The meeting has requested support from the Secretariat for the use of its existing communications and information exchange infrastructure to facilitate the liaison and co-ordinating function of the NCACG.

Expected outcome

- ❑ More effective programme control.

Time frame

Within one month of confirmation of nominations.

² The meeting also noted that the Working Group should consider liaising with other international organizations, including the EC, to evaluate the application and/or implementation of EC projects such as EURDEP and ENSEMBLE.

Decision 2003/06

The meeting recommended that the Secretariat convene as soon as possible a Technical Committee Meeting of representatives from the State Parties to the Assistance Convention that are most likely to be able to provide assistance in a nuclear or radiological emergency and of selected representatives from the Working Group on assistance. The purpose of the TCM would be to formulate recommendations to the Secretariat on steps to be taken to overcome problems in ERNET participation.

Expected outcome

- ❑ Enhanced effectiveness of the ERNET protocols;
- ❑ Increased participation in the ERNET system.

Time frame

Fourth quarter 2003.

Decision 2003/07

The meeting requested the NCACG, through some mechanism involving consultation with NCAs, to make recommendations on:

1. the expected time from the recognition of various emergency conditions to the notification of the IAEA;
2. the expected time from receipt of the notification of various emergency types by the IAEA to receipt of the notification by NCAs of potentially affected States and of other States;

Expected outcome

Better defined planning targets and measurement tools for the evaluation of drills and exercises.

Time frame

- ❑ Discussion paper: March 2004;
- ❑ Draft guidelines in ENATOM and the Joint Plan: June 2004.

Decision 2003/08

The meeting agreed with the draft proposal for drills and exercises as outlined in TM-26050/004, taking into account comments of the meeting regarding the requirements and objectives of drills and exercises³, and recommended that the frequency of drills be increased for contact points with lower success rates and that the Secretariat implement follow-up actions to improve that success rate. In addition, the meeting requested the Secretariat to make available to all competent authorities the results of such drill and exercises.

Expected outcome

Increased confidence in the effectiveness of the procedures and methods for notification and exchange of information.

Time frame

Implementation of the drills and exercise schedule: January 2004.

³ The Secretariat has since updated TM-26050/004 and a new draft is attached as Annex I to this meeting report.

Decision 2003/9

The meeting agreed with the proposed programme of large scale international exercises conducted by the IAEA in co-operation with IACRNA every four years (as outlined in TM-26050/04). The meeting recommended that the Secretariat, in consultation with the NCA Co-ordinating Group, clarify the objectives of the exercises, while maintaining the key goal of verifying the adequacy of international arrangements for notification and the exchange of important information and data on nuclear and radiological emergencies. The meeting also recommended that the Secretariat extend the scope of these exercises to include the post-release phase as well as radiological emergencies. The meeting also recommended that the Secretariat propose to the IACRNA that the name 'JINEX' is changed to avoid confusion with the INEX exercises sponsored by the NEA.

Expected outcome

Better co-ordination of international exercises on nuclear and radiological emergencies. Clearer understanding of the purpose of large scale exercises sponsored by the IAEA and of the relationship with other large scale international exercises sponsored by other organizations.

Time frame

- ❑ Name change before next large scale exercise in 2005.
- ❑ Implementation of enlarged scope before subsequent exercise in 2009.

Decision 2003/10

The meeting recommended that the IAEA, at no cost to non-EU Member States in the short term, continue co-operation with the EC for the development and implementation of an interface between the ECURIE system and ENAC for the automatic exchange of relevant emergency information and data. In addition, the meeting recommended that the IAEA investigate the legal and technical aspects of a process to reduce duplication and improve overall coherence with respect to information provided by member states of the European Union.

Expected outcome

Simplification and optimization of the processes for notification and exchange of information with regard to member states of the European Union.

Time frame

- ❑ Interface developed and tested: September 2004;
- ❑ Recommendations for the rationalization of the two systems: December 2004.

Decision 2003/11

The meeting agreed that the NCA Co-ordinating Group be charged with developing proposals for enhancing the co-ordination of media relations between the IAEA and Member States in the event of a nuclear or radiological emergency. The co-ordination mechanisms should cover aspects relating to both the Notification Convention and the Assistance Convention.

Expected outcome

Improved consistency of information provided to the public in a nuclear or radiological emergency.

Time frame

Proposed solutions delivered by the NCA Co-ordinating Group: September 2004.

Decision 2003/12

The meeting recommended that the Secretariat carry out a systematic analysis of any problems perceived by NCAs regarding the relation between the INES/NEWS and ENATOM information systems, and that the Secretariat liaise with the INES Technical Committee, the NEA and WANO to make a joint proposal for resolving the problems identified.

Expected outcome

- ❑ Better co-ordination of information available from the IAEA and other international organizations in an emergency;
- ❑ Reduction of the risk associated with discrepancies in information.

Time frame

Joint proposal for resolving issues: June 2004.

Decision 2003/13

The meeting recommended that the Secretariat develop and implement a simple mechanism for communicating in a timely manner to competent authorities the lessons identified from events for which the IAEA had to co-ordinate or provide assistance. This system should provide for a faster turn-around time over the current procedure for the formal publication of accident reports.

Expected outcome

- ❑ Faster and more effective dissemination of lessons identified;
- ❑ Greater likelihood of addressing lessons identified before interest in the event is lost;
- ❑ Earlier tangible improvements in the arrangements for receiving or providing assistance.

Time frame

Implementation of the mechanism: July 2004.

Decision 2003/14

Taking into consideration the General Conference resolution [GC\(46\)/RES/9](#), the meeting recommended that the Secretariat convene on a regular basis the Meeting of National Competent Authorities identified under the two Conventions, currently envisaged every two years and/or as recommended by the NCACG. The venue of such meetings would normally be Vienna.

Expected outcome

A reliable consultative mechanism to ensure the participation of the competent authorities in the key operational decisions affecting emergency notification, emergency exchange of information and the provision of assistance in the event of a nuclear or radiological emergency.

Time frame

- ❑ Draft agenda for the next meeting: January 2005;
- ❑ Next meeting: June 2005.

Decision 2003/15

The meeting took note of the possible benefits of establishing a link with the European Bone Marrow Transplant Group's network of relevant medical resources and recommended that the IAEA, in consultation with WHO, consider whether and how it might potentially be used in the framework of the Assistance Convention.

Expected outcome

Decision on the possibility of enhancing the network of emergency medical resources for the provision of assistance.

Time frame

Contact with WHO: third quarter 2003.

Decision 2003/16

The meeting recommended that the Secretariat, in co-ordination with the NCACG, involving relevant technical experts and consulting with competent authorities, pursue with WMO an update of the requirements for meteorological products, including their format, content and mechanisms for their delivery.

Expected outcome

Functional requirements for timely delivery of appropriate meteorological products that meet higher expectations of competent authorities;
Plan for development and implementation of changes.

Time frame

Meeting with RSMCs: November 2003.

Decision 2003/17

The meeting recommended that the IAEA urge its Member States to adopt the two Conventions.

Expected outcome

Non-party Member States adopt the Conventions.

Time frame

Fourth quarter 2003.

ANNEX I: PROPOSED RATIONALE AND SCHEDULE FOR CONVEX DRILLS AND EXERCISES

The following draft rationale and schedule for CONVEX drills and exercises is based on the proposal (TM-26050/004) presented to the Second Meeting of competent authorities. It has been modified to take account of recommendations from the Meeting and expected resource availability at the Secretariat. It is intended as a basis for reflection in the new 2004 version of ENATOM. The Agency intends to issue an amendment to [EPR-ENATOM\(2002\)](#) in the third quarter of 2003 and begin operating the new regime from 1 January 2004. Further minor modifications may be expected before final issue following consultations with the NCACG.

Emergency drills and exercises (CONVEX)

Standard drills and exercises will be prepared, performed and evaluated to test key response objectives within the scheme described below. The results and appropriate evaluations will be published on ENAC.

All drill and exercise messages in this framework **must** be clearly marked with the words 'EXERCISE' in English.

CONVEX 1

General objective: to test whether fax contacts are accurate, that contact points can access ENAC properly and that NWP's are continuously available.

CONVEX 1a Specific objectives: to test whether NWP and NCA(A) fax contacts are accurate, that NCA(A)s can access ENAC properly and that NWP's are continuously available¹

The IAEA's ERC will send a drill message by fax to all NWP's and NCA(A)s twice per year. It is expected that:

- NWP's send an acknowledgement of receipt within 30 minutes to the IAEA's ERC; and
- NCA(A)s, on the next working day, access ENAC and send to the IAEA's ERC a simple acknowledgement of receipt of test message and a confirmation of their ability to access ENAC.

CONVEX 1b Specific objective: for any NWP or NCA to test whether its fax contacts for the IAEA's ERC are accurate

Any contact point may send a drill message by fax to the ERC not more frequently than once per quarter without prior arrangement, and the IAEA will return a simple acknowledgement of receipt on or before the next working day. No other States will be involved.

¹ The Second Meeting of Competent Authorities in Decision 2003/08 recommended that the frequency of drills be increased for contact points with lower success rates and that the Secretariat implement follow-up actions to improve that success rate.

CONVEX 2

General objective: to test whether response times to a notification are adequate, and to confirm the appropriate use of ENATOM report forms on ENAC.

CONVEX 2a **Specific objective: to test whether NWP's are continuously available, whether the NWP's can alert the relevant NCA(A)s in an adequate time and that the NCA(A)s can access ENAC properly**

The IAEA's ERC will send a drill message to all NWP's twice per year by fax. It is expected that:

1. NWP's send an acknowledgement of receipt within 30 minutes to the IAEA's ERC;
2. NWP's promptly contact the NCA(A)s, as appropriate; and
3. as soon as possible, the NCA(A)s access ENAC and send to the IAEA's ERC by fax a confirmation that they were able to access ENAC, including the time they were contacted by the NWP's. This should be performed within 2 hours of receipt of the drill message by the NWP.

The NCA(A)s of States will be warned in advance that this test will take place in the coming month, but otherwise the time and date will be unannounced.

CONVEX 2b **Specific objective: to test the ability of NCAs to complete ENATOM forms on ENAC and submit them to the IAEA²**

The NCAs of States will be invited to participate in advance in this drill which will be conducted annually, and last no more than 4 hours (elapsed time). The nature of the scenario and date of the exercise will be communicated in advance to allow appropriate NCAs³ to register their participation.

During the exercise the IAEA's ERC will make available to participating NCAs descriptions of a developing scenario. The participating NCAs complete ENATOM forms appropriately and submit them via ENAC to the IAEA's ERC within 1 hour of receipt of each description.

² Note this objective is different from the one provided as CONVEX 2b in EPR-ENATOM (2002)

³ This could be NCA(D)s or NCA(A)s depending on the nature of the scenario.

CONVEX 2c Specific objective: to test the use of ENAC for exchanging information about a developing situation.

The NCA(A)s of States will be invited to register their participation in this exercise, which will be conducted annually, last no more than 6 hours (elapsed time), and be held on a specific announced date.

The IAEA's ERC will simulate a hypothetical emergency and forward a notification to participating NCA(A)s and issue information on ENAC. The IAEA's ERC will issue further simulated information on ENAC. Other participating NCA(A)s access the information on ENAC and confirm they have read and understood the information posted.

CONVEX 3

General objective: to test the full operation of the information exchange mechanisms

A large scale exercise will be conducted once every four years. Details will be announced to States in advance. All States Party to the Early Notification Convention are strongly encouraged to participate. Such an exercise will usually be based on a national exercise being conducted in a State (thereby allowing simulation of the information flows between operator and competent authority, and of public information management), and will be co-ordinated with exercise plans of other international organizations through the IACRINA⁴.

⁴ The Second Meeting of Competent Authorities in Decision 2003/9 recommended that the Secretariat, in consultation with the NCA Co-ordinating Group, clarify the objectives of the exercises, while maintaining the key goal of verifying the adequacy of international arrangements for notification and the exchange of important information and data on nuclear and radiological emergencies. The meeting also recommended that the Secretariat extend the scope of these exercises to include the post-release phase as well as radiological emergencies. The meeting recommended that the Secretariat propose to the IACRINA (see '[Joint Radiation Emergency Management Plan of the International Organizations](#)', EPR-JPLAN) that the name 'JINEX' is changed to avoid confusion with the INEX exercises sponsored by the NEA.

Indicative schedule

Month	2003	2004	2005
January		CONVEX 1a	CONVEX 1a
February		CONVEX 2c	CONVEX 2c
March			
April		CONVEX 2a	CONVEX 2a
May			CONVEX 3
June			
July	CONVEX 1a	CONVEX 1a	CONVEX 1a
August		CONVEX 2b	CONVEX 2b
September			
October	CONVEX 2a	CONVEX 2a	CONVEX 2a
November			
December			

Those drills and exercises shaded in the above table will be unannounced and conducted with contact points of all Member States. All other exercises will be announced and Member States will be invited in advance to register their participation.