

**BACKGROUND NOTE ON THE APPLICATION
OF THE CONVENTION
TO NUCLEAR RELATED ACTIVITIES
ECE/MP.EIA/2011/5**

Screening

- NPPs, Nuclear waste storages listed in Appendix I
- Major changes (no thresholds) covered by Convention
- Renewal of NPP license
- Extensions of designated operation period without license renewal
- Decommissioning of the facility
- Substantial increase of production (NPP, storage of radioactive waste)

Screening

- Scope of Screening
- Based on normal operation, severe accidents including beyond design based accidents
- Severe accidents with the risk of a very low probability but severe effects

Screening Good Practice

- Consideration of severe accidents beyond the design base should inform the permitting procedure and perhaps the screening and the subsequent EIA

Notification

- Which Parties are notified
- Neighboring States or more wide notification
- Notification upon request

Notification Good Practice

- At least all neighboring countries should be notified
- Other potentially affected Parties could be identified by using certain dispersion models and subsequent radiation exposure calculation, based as appropriate on severe accident scenarios

EIA Procedure

- Convention requires to give information on the EIA procedure
- Lack of information and understanding
- Difficulties to fulfill the obligations

EIA Procedure – Good practice

- Complexity of decision-making processes
- More Information on EIA and licensing system, inter-linkages and final decision is necessary
- Equal possibilities for the public – EIA system of the Party of Origin could be applied
- It may be appropriate to provide opportunities for the public and authorities of the affected Parties to participate repeatedly throughout the process – challenge: approach may be incompatible with existing legislation
- Alternatives need to be simultaneously examined
- The no-action alternative must be addressed
- Linkages between possible SEA and ongoing EIA and vice versa
 - If no SEA, the EIA might bear both policy and project level implications

EIA documentation

- Likelihood of radionuclide releases low but in case of severe accidents high damages
- Opinions differ as to whether EIA should address severe accidents
- When are severe accidents best addressed
- If they are addressed in an EIA what should they cover
- Communication of large (technical) volumes
- Translation issues

EIA documentation – Good practice

- When severe accidents are subject of an EIA certain information has to be given, e.g. probabilistic safety analyses, environmental radiation programme
- Documentation should cover those external events that could pose a threat, e.g. effects on the supply of cooling water and on electric power grid connections
- Translation: key information needs to be available in languages of the affected Party

Public Participation

- Right to make comments to the proposed activity, EIA report
- Equivalent opportunities for the public of the affected Party

Public Participation – Good practice

- Information should be shared on how public participation is being arranged
- Public hearing in the Party of origin/affected Party
- Informing the public on the possibility of severe accidents

Consultations

- Information regarding security - confidential versus transparency
- Certain degree on information regarding safety and security measures are necessary

Consultations – Good practice

- Security information acc. to art 2 para 8 – bilateral consultations
- affected Parties might request maximum info on safety and security measures
- Participation in consultations – all relevant authorities
- Questions in advance are helpful

Final decision

- Difficult to get sufficient information on the final decision
- What is the final decision
- Project proponent to proceed with the project

Final decision – Good practice

- Due account is taken of the EIA, the comments from the Affected Party and outcome of consultations

Post-project analysis

- Little experience
- Long time lag between a final decision and project commissioning