

Unclassified

NEA/CRPPH/INEX(2009)9

Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Économiques
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

28-Jul-2017

English - Or. English

NUCLEAR ENERGY AGENCY
COMMITTEE ON RADIOLOGICAL PROTECTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH

Working Party on Nuclear Emergency Matters

INEX 4 EXERCISE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

INEX 4 Exercise on Consequence Management and the Transition to Recovery

*INITIAL DISTRIBUTION: RESTRICTED TO INEX 4 NATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEES
(including Exercise Organisers, Moderators, Evaluators-Recorders)*

JT03417721

Complete document available on OLIS in its original format



NEA/CRPPH/INEX(2009)19
Unclassified

English - Or. English

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....3
 Purpose of this Document.....3
 INEX 4 Objectives and Topical Areas.....3
 Questionnaire Contents, Instructions and Date for Submission.....6
 1 INFORMATION ON THE PARTICIPATING COUNTRY7
 1.1 Detailed information on INEX 4 exercise organisation.....7
 1.2 Description of the Emergency Management Structure7
 2 INFORMATION ON THE SCENARIO AND EXERCISE FORMAT8
 2.1 Information on the scenario: Variable Scenario Information8
 2.2 Other information on the scenario not included above9
 2.3 Information provided to exercise players.....9
 2.4 Involvement of neighbouring countries in the exercise9
 2.5 Additional national objectives10
 3 INFORMATION ON NATIONAL PRACTICES FOR CONSEQUENCE MANAGEMENT AND THE
 TRANSITION TO RECOVERY11
 A) DECISION MAKING11
 A.1 Decision-making authority11
 A.2 Decision-making processes12
 A.3 Optimisation of protection strategies12
 A.4 Termination of Countermeasures13
 A.5 International assistance.....14
 A.6 Communication and coordination with other countries and the international community14
 B) PUBLIC HEALTH15
 B.1 Public health (near and long-term):15
 B.2 Information and communications16
 C) MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT.....16
 C.1 Capability assessment.....17
 D) SAFETY AND SECURITY OF POPULATIONS AND INFRASTRUCTURE.....18
 D.1 Population Control (Police Command & Control) and Management18
 E) PLANNING FOR RECOVERY19
 E.1 Decontamination and waste management.....19
 E.2 Recovery management procedures and stakeholder involvement20
 4 OTHER INFORMATION22
 REFERENCES23

**INEX 4 EXERCISE ON CONSEQUENCE MANAGEMENT
AND THE TRANSITION TO RECOVERY:
EXERCISE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of this Document

In order to provide a basis for improvements, it is important that the experience and outcomes of each INEX 4 exercise be documented and shared, as appropriate. To this end, this document provides a set of common INEX 4 evaluation questions to facilitate:

- the work of the National Exercise Organisers in the planning of their INEX 4 exercise;
- the evaluation and recording by the evaluator/recorders of the INEX 4 outcomes in relation to the exercise scenario and MSELs; and
- the comparison of outcomes from all INEX 4 exercises, the identification of commonalities and differences in approaches, and the elaboration of common issues for further discussion at the INEX 4 International Evaluation Workshop.

The *INEX 4 Exercise Evaluation Questionnaire* has been developed based on the INEX 4 topical areas, scenario and MSELs. The questionnaires and overall evaluation focus on identifying good practices, common issues and areas for further investigation. National Exercise Organisers are asked to co-ordinate the completion and submission of this questionnaire within approximately 6 weeks of holding their national INEX 4 exercise.

Evaluators/Recorders should note that INEX 4 is an issues-driven table-top exercise focussing on consequence management and the transition to recovery. As such, the early crisis phase of the event will not be exercised, and all early phase notifications and actions will be assumed to be completed prior to the exercise start. INEX 4 is not intended nor designed to test any of the relevant international conventions for notification or assistance, and should not be used as such. Additional guidance on the INEX 4 scope, objectives and design is provided in the INEX 4: Guide for National Planning Committees (NEA/CRPPH/INEX(2009)7), which forms part of the INEX 4 Technical Materials (see References).

INEX 4 is a "no fault" exercise. Neither participating countries nor individuals will have their performance assessed, and outcomes will not be used as such.

INEX 4 Objectives and Topical Areas

The main goals of INEX 4 are to allow participating countries to *i)* test or identify elements for improving their arrangements for consequence management and transition to recovery in response to a

malicious event involving dispersion of radioactive materials in an urban area (affecting people, critical infrastructure, environment, economics, etc), and *ii*) exchange experiences with other countries that have conducted an INEX 4 exercise. To meet these goals, the following common **key objectives** have been set:

- Test and investigate the adequacy of national arrangements (including national coordination and communication), and where appropriate international arrangements, for consequence management and the transition to recovery;
- Review and share information on approaches to consequence management and the transition to recovery, in order to identify good practice and to allow review and improvement of national and international arrangements; and
- Identify key areas and approaches to international coordination and communication in order to provide a basis for improvements in international emergency management systems.

While the scope of response to an urban-based malicious event may be broad, in order to present a manageable exercise from the perspective of planning, conduct and evaluation, the following specific **topical areas** have been elaborated:

1. Decision-making on protection strategies for consequence management and the transition to recovery;
2. Public health, including issues in information and communication;
3. Monitoring and assessment, including capability assessment;
4. Safety and security of populations and infrastructure;
5. Planning for recovery.

Based on the key objectives and topic areas, the following additional elements, which form the basis of the questionnaire, have been elaborated:

- Roles, responsibilities and requirements of responding organisations for delivering consequence management;
- Approaches to developing a co-ordinated consequence management response, including communication and coordination between responding organisations during the consequence management period through, for example:
 - integration of resources;
 - implementation strategies;
 - laboratory analysis provision and capabilities;
 - data collection and collation processes;
 - transition to recovery;
- Approaches to decision-making on protection strategies for consequence management and the transition to recovery, including issues in:
 - optimisation of protection strategies (including technical, economic and social factors);
 - development of a strategy for:
 - for implementation of protective actions;
 - identification and management of newly affected areas;
 - termination of protective measures
 - communication and coordination between countries and international organisations, including:

- communication arrangements;
- understanding of the consequence management period;
- recommendations for protective actions;
- communication of recommendations for protective actions;
- Approaches to management of public health, including issues in information and communication;
- Effectiveness and appropriateness of the monitoring, modelling and assessment process, including capability assessment;
- Requirements and approaches to safety and security of populations and infrastructure, including
 - population control (police command and control);
 - identification and management of affected populations;
- Requirements of public information and public affairs during the consequence management period through development of strategies for;
 - dealing with the public;
 - dealing with the media;
 - dealing with international bodies;
- Development of a national recovery plan to manage the return to normalcy, including
 - requirements for changing roles and responsibilities during the transition to recovery;
 - organisations responsible for long-term recovery;
 - strategy for clean-up and management of contaminated wastes;
 - involvement of stakeholders in the decision-framing process.

Other National Objectives

This questionnaire, in the form distributed by OECD/NEA, is based on the set of common objectives and topic areas elaborated above.

To meet specific national needs, National Planning Committees may add additional objectives to their exercises. However, to ensure that these can be adequately investigated while maintaining the common scope of the INEX 4 exercises, it is strongly recommended that any additional objectives be established in a manner consistent with the common INEX 4 framework. In cases where National Planning Committees have developed additional objectives, they should also develop corresponding evaluation questions to ensure that the outcomes related to these objectives are adequately recorded. While there is no requirement to submit this additional information to the NEA following the exercise, the National Planning Committee may do so if they so desire, in the interests of experience exchange.

Specifically, in the case of the INEX 4 scenario, it is noted that while there will be an interface in many countries between criminal justice and emergency management for malicious events, the common exercise elements focus on the consequence management aspects presented by such scenarios. Topics and questions addressing security and criminal justice have been excluded from the common framework; *however, this does not preclude countries, if they so desire, from more closely examining these aspects under their own initiative and in a manner consistent with the framework.* In such cases, countries may add additional topics and questions as deemed appropriate to their own national exercise planning, conduct and evaluation, as discussed above.

Questionnaire Contents, Instructions and Date for Submission

This questionnaire has been organised according to the INEX 4 topic areas and common Master Series Events List contained in the INEX 4: Guide for National Planning Committees (NEA/CRPPH/ INEX(2009)7), and includes the following parts:

- Information on the participating country;
- Information on the scenario and exercise format;
- Information on national practices for consequence management and the transition to recovery, including:
 - Decision-making;
 - Public health;
 - Monitoring and assessment;
 - Safety and security of populations and infrastructure
 - Planning for recovery

When planning their national INEX 4 exercise, organisers should use the questionnaire in conjunction with the aforementioned planning guide to ensure that the exercise is suitably structured to facilitate the completion of the questionnaire after the exercise.

Following the exercise, participating countries are requested to fill out this questionnaire as completely as possible, and submit it to the NEA Secretariat, in order to assist with the international post-exercise evaluation. The questionnaire has been provided in MS Word format so that information can be added directly into the document following each question. You are also requested to indicate in the questionnaire any area where particular emphasis was placed during the exercise.

Please return the questionnaire to the NEA Secretariat (edward.lazo@oecd.org) within 6 weeks of completing your exercise, and by 15 May 2011 at the latest.

1 INFORMATION ON THE PARTICIPATING COUNTRY

1.1 Detailed information on INEX 4 exercise organisation

Country:	
Date of the exercise:	
Contact Person for further information on this questionnaire	
Name :	
Organisation:	
Tel :	
Email :	
Organisations involved in the preparation of INEX 4	
Lead Organisation (Exercise Coordinator):	
Other Organisations:	
Information on organisations that participated in INEX 4 (see table below)	
Organisation	
Function	
Number of players / level of responsibility	
<i>repeat as necessary</i>	

1.2 Description of the Emergency Management Structure

- Please provide a description of the emergency management / national response structure.

A:

2 INFORMATION ON THE SCENARIO AND EXERCISE FORMAT

The basic INEX 4 exercise scenario has been provided in the INEX 4 Guide for National Planning Committees. According to national need, exercise planners could alter certain elements of the scenario, with the exception of the section on “*Ground Truth / Defined Information*”. This part of the evaluation should be used to provide all relevant information on the scenario exercised.

2.1 Information on the scenario: Variable Scenario Information

Description	Details
Location (city) of the detonation	
Season and general weather conditions for the follow-on response and transition to recovery	
Type of area affected (residential, industrial, touristic, etc)	
Size of area affected	
Number of individuals injured in the initial explosion	
Number of individuals in the downtown area at the time of the explosion	
Number of hospitals in the area	
Number of individuals reporting to each hospital in the area	
Number of people in the evacuation zone at the beginning of the “follow-on response”	
Number of businesses in the evacuation zone at the beginning of the “follow-on response”	
Number and location of shelters set up at the beginning of the “follow-on response”	
Number of people each shelter is housing	
Number of hotels closed	
Number of guests relocated	
Products affected	

2.2 Other information on the scenario not included above

- Did you use multiple devices? If so, please provide details and the rationale.

A:

- Did the event cause any contamination in a foreign country?

A:

- If a decision-aiding tool was used to further develop the scenario, please specify which tools were used and how the outputs were used.

A:

- Did you make any other modifications to the scenario not included above? Please specify.

A:

- At the start of the exercise, what countermeasures were assumed to have been taken (implemented, continuing, terminated)? What was the basis for this?

A:

- At the start of the exercise, what information was assumed to have been provided to the public? to the international community? What was the basis for this?

A:

2.3 Information provided to exercise players

- What material did you prepare for players?

A:

- When was this provided to players?

A:

- Did you encounter problems providing this information? If yes, please explain.

A:

2.4 Involvement of neighbouring countries in the exercise

- Did you involve neighbouring countries in your exercise? If yes, which countries and how were they involved?

A:

- Did you play in the same location? If not, how did you communicate?

A:

- What cross-border / trans-boundary issues were exercised?

A:

2.5 Additional national objectives

- Did you introduce additional national objectives? If yes, please specify?

A:

Other observations:

3 INFORMATION ON NATIONAL PRACTICES FOR CONSEQUENCE MANAGEMENT AND THE TRANSITION TO RECOVERY

A) DECISION MAKING

Overview: This topic addresses the decision making processes that are followed in responding to the exercise scenario. The focus is on decision-making for protection strategies addressing consequence management and the transition to recovery, in particular with respect to approaches to countermeasures (optimisation, implementation and termination) and international communications. Relevant issues include how decisions may be made, what and how various factors may be taken into consideration during optimisation (e.g., technical, economic, social and international considerations; changing priorities) and how this is communicated to various stakeholders, implementing and terminating protection strategies, and the role of and approaches to international communications (capability and practical ability to exchange information; understanding the situation; communicating decisions).

A.1 Decision-making authority

- Who was the lead national organisation for the scenario exercised, and if appropriate, with which post (e.g. minister, deputy minister, head of regulatory authority, etc.) did the decision-making authority rest for the decisions taken during this exercise?
 - If authority rests with more than one organisation / post depending on the decision to be taken, please specify.
 - Was the lead organisation different from what it would have been for a nuclear and/or radiological accident?

A:

- Was there more than one decision maker? If so what were the roles of the various decision making groups? Is there a “Unified Coordinating Group”? How were decisions reached (full agreement before moving ahead, multiple options provided, etc)?

A:

- As the emergency passed from consequence management to the transition to recovery to long-term recovery, was there a “hand-off” of decision-making authority from one organisation / post to another? If yes, please specify the organisations involved, and the basis for the shift of authority.

A:

Other observations:

A.2 Decision-making processes

- Which intermediate and longer term aspects/consequences needed to be dealt with, and at which level?

A:

- How were response priorities (e.g. monitoring resources) established?

A:

- What decision-making processes exist as part of the emergency arrangements? Did/would evaluations of decisions taken occur afterwards?

A:

Other observations:

A.3 Optimisation of protection strategies

- How was the optimisation process developed/used, what factors were considered (technical – dose, risk, national and/or international guidance levels (pre-defined, ad-hoc), measurements, etc; economic; social-political) and how were they accounted for in the development and implementation of
 - protective strategies/actions?
 - clean-up guidance and actions?

A:

- Were individual actions within the protective strategies optimised collectively or individually?

A:

- How were the impact of decisions accounted for?

A:

- Who initiated the optimisation process and when? Who was responsible for its management?

A:

- How was the optimisation process explained to various stakeholders, including:
 - Leadership for the Consequence Management period? Transition to Recovery period?
 - The public? The media?
 - Other stakeholders (other government, non-government organisations, affected industry, etc)?

A:

- Did you consider the implementation of protective actions (restrictions, advice, etc) addressing:

- materials, goods and/or products used, consumed, stored, produced, processed, etc, in the potentially contaminated area, including their movement in/out of the area? Please explain;
- the current and future movement of people in and out of the potentially contaminated area (residents, business, visitors, tourists, etc) ? Were actions, approaches or criteria for travel and tourism implemented in the same manner or time period as for local residents, businesses, etc? Please explain.

A:

- If any of the above protective actions were considered, did you decide to implement them? Which ones? When? How?

A:

- Did you consider long-term aspects in the decision? If yes, please specify how.

A:

Other observations:

A.4 Termination of Countermeasures

- Which organisations(s) were responsible for the withdrawal of protective actions? Did this vary according to the protective action being withdrawn? Were they the same organisations responsible for implementing the protective actions?

A:

- What approaches and/or criteria were taken for the termination and withdrawal of the various protective actions?

A:

- How was the termination and withdrawal of protective actions implemented and communicated to affected stakeholders?

A:

- What types of costs associated with the protective actions were considered compensable and how were these tracked?

A:

- What types of incident response documentation was kept and archived?

A:

Other observations:

A.5 International assistance

NOTE: During the exercise, it is assumed that any “requests” or “offers” of assistance are simulated. Requests for assistance should NOT be sent to the International Atomic Energy Agency or to other countries or international organisations if this has not been explicitly agreed upon beforehand between the playing country and the IAEA or other countries or organisations.

- During the consequence management and/or transition to recovery period, did you consider the general offers of assistance received from other countries?

A:

- If it was considered, did you decide to accept assistance? If so, are plans in place for accepting such assistance or would this be dealt with ad-hoc? Who decides?

A:

- In addition to any offers received, did you consider requesting international assistance?

A:

- If it was considered, did you decide to request assistance? If yes:
 - what was the basis for this decision (e.g., through bilateral, multilateral agreements; under the Convention on Assistance in case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency, etc)?
 - which assistance was requested and when was it requested (consequence management, transition to recovery)?

A:

Other observations:

A.6 Communication and coordination with other countries and the international community

NOTE: INEX 4 is not designed to test/implement international conventions nor notification of the international community. However, the decision-making process may include the need to communicate and coordinate with other countries and/or the international community about the event and the decisions taken to implement protective actions, particularly those that may impact other countries or their citizens in the affected country. It is expected that these aspects will be simulated and discussed during the exercise.

- Did you decide to consult/inform other countries and/or international organisations about the decision to implement protective actions? If yes, what was the basis for this decision, what information did you provide and when? Do you have bilateral, multilateral agreements which require such information exchange?

A:

- Did you make decisions which, in your view, could have implications on neighbouring countries or on the international community? If so, please describe.

A:

Other observations:

B) PUBLIC HEALTH

Topic Overview: This topic addresses the approaches to and issues in managing longer-term public health issues arising from the exercise scenario. Relevant issues include mechanisms for and approaches to the tracking and identification of possibly affected individuals (including emergency responders, local populations, individuals who were passing through the area at the time of the event, etc), how to deal with the “worried-well” and concerned individuals outside identified affected areas, appropriate information and communications, etc.

B.1 Public health (near and long-term):

- Is there a national response plan or guidance covering health issues, and if yes, is long-term follow-up of affected individuals included? Who was responsible for this follow up and how was it done?

A:

- Who was responsible for a “Registry” of affected and potentially affected individuals, including first responders, emergency workers, members of the public, international visitors, etc?

A:

- How would the “Registry” of affected and potentially affected individuals be implemented? What types of information would be collected and by whom? Was there an obligation for potentially affected populations to undergo long-term health surveillance?

A:

- Who was responsible for dose reconstruction, and how were doses assessed?

A:

- Who was assigned responsibility for overall mental health for first responders, emergency workers, members of the public, international visitors, etc, and how was this implemented?

A:

- Were medical expenses, treatments, hospitalisation of affected individuals financially covered? What was the role of health insurances in the near and long-term?

A:

Other observations:

B.2 Information and communications

- People living in, working in or travelling through the affected area: Information about the emergency response, including implementation of protective measures, advice, etc.
 - Which organisations(e) were responsible for ongoing communications?
 - What information was provided and how was it provided (e.g. which media, methods were used)?

A:

- General public, including concerned individuals outside the affected areas, in other countries, etc: Information on the response, changes in restrictions in the area, etc.
 - Which organisations(e) were responsible for ongoing communications?
 - What information was provided and how was it provided (e.g. which media, methods were used)?
 - Which methods were used to reassure the public (giving positive messages)?
 - Were political aspects considered when formulating messages?

A:

- What systems were available to inform the public as to the status of displaced persons?

A:

Other observations:

NOTE: *Please attach to this evaluation questionnaire any press releases that were developed during this exercise (in their original language and, if available, in English).*

C) MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT

Topic Overview: This topic addresses approaches to monitoring and assessment to support consequence management and the transition to recovery. Relevant issues include how monitoring and assessment is used to support decision-making, how to coordinate exchange of relevant data and information at the national and international levels, the impact of changing priorities on monitoring and assessment needs and how it can be maintained over an extended response.

C.1 Capability assessment

- How was the radiation contamination characterised? What products were produced to explain this? Were these made available to organisations external to the emergency management structure, and if yes, who and how?

A:

- How were these products used in the decision-making process? Could these products be improved with respect to the needs of decision-makers? If so, please specify

A:

- How was ongoing monitoring and assessment supporting the move to recovery maintained? How were monitoring and assessment resources managed and prioritised?

A:

- How was the potential spread of contamination out of the area managed. Was information related to this communicated at the international level, and if yes, how?

A:

- How were the initial response/monitoring teams managed, and were they integrated back into the later response?

A:

- How were issues relating to claims from private industry for the use of rented equipment, etc, managed.

A:

- Was any critical infrastructure in the affected area given special priority during any phase of the follow-on response or recovery?

A:

- How were issues relating to the crowded shelter in the affected city managed?
 - What agency was responsible for managing the shelters in the affected city and neighbouring cities?
 - Was any attempt made to transfer evacuees from one shelter to another? If so, please describe briefly.

A:

- Was any specific solution implemented to decontaminate the HVAC systems and other contaminated areas in local office buildings?

A:

- What solution was implemented to deal with the issue of the contaminated water pumping station?

A:

- Was any action taken with regards to guests that had been relocated to surrounding hotels? Were there any international implications that arose due to foreign travellers attempting to leave the country?

A:

Other observations:

D) SAFETY AND SECURITY OF POPULATIONS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Topic Overview: This topic addresses approaches to maintaining the safety and security of populations and property, and the withdrawal of restrictions on movement, access, etc. Issues include the types of reasons and relevant criteria or considerations for withdrawing restrictions, approaches to maintaining critical services affecting public safety/security, how the security of property will be managed, how individuals displaced or impacted by countermeasures will be managed, etc.

D.1 Population Control (Police Command & Control) and Management

- What information were you willing to share internationally? Which organisation was responsible for this decision, and what was the process and criteria for the decision?

A:

- What information was given to, or withheld from, the public? Was the information to the public provided at the local, regional and/or national levels? Who decided, prepared and coordinated this?

A:

- Where there any crime scene issues identified that could have impacted/impered a timely transition to recovery?

A:

- How were disruptions to local government functions and services in the affected area managed? Were exceptions granted for access to restricted areas/buildings, and if so, what processes were used to guide decision-makers on such exceptions?

A:

- Were any citizens allowed into the evacuation/restricted access area, and if so, under what circumstances? Were exceptions granted, and if so, by what authority?

A:

- How was abandoned and contaminated personnel property managed?

A:

- How were issues around security of property and goods handled?

A:

Other observations:

E) PLANNING FOR RECOVERY

Topic Overview: This topic addresses approaches to moving from consequence management towards the transition to post-emergency recovery. Issues include what long-term priorities will need to be managed, which organisations may be implicated, approaches to decontamination and waste management, impact of public reaction, how the increasing role of stakeholders in the decision-framing process will be handled, identifying affected businesses/sectors/etc, dealing with economic impacts, moving towards long-term recovery, types of criteria or considerations for terminating the emergency situation, etc.

E.1 Decontamination and waste management

- What type of decontamination and clean-up was required before allowing people back into the area? What residual dose rates or other criteria/indicators were considered acceptable for return of evacuees?

A:

- What was the basis for the clean-up levels established during the transition and what factors were considered (risk, dose, background levels, cost, social factors, logistics and waste storage, etc)? How were these factors weighed in the final decision, and who made the final decision?

A:

- Was consideration given to an acceptable clean-up cost, and if so, how much?

A:

- Did the implementation of countermeasures and decontamination result in large quantities of contaminated material to be managed? Which kind and what quantities of contaminated material? How did you estimate this?

A:

- Which organisations are responsible for securing, handling and disposing of contaminated material resulting from an emergency? Are there identified facilities for this? If so, please describe.

A:

- Do arrangements for handling and disposing of contaminated material resulting from an emergency differ from given procedures in “normal operation”? If so, please describe.

A:

- What plans or arrangements were adopted or developed for decontamination of public buildings and property? Private buildings and property? Who is responsible for clean-up of private property? Who pays for the clean-up?

A:

- How was contaminated runoff water managed?

A:

Other observations:

E.2 Recovery management procedures and stakeholder involvement

- What type of criteria were used for terminating the emergency situation? Who made the decision and what was it based on: Existing Requirements / Current status / Process / All the above? What issues were identified for long-term recovery and which organisations will be responsible for managing these aspects?

A:

- Where any Advisory Groups established to support the transition to recovery, such as: Technical Work Groups? Stakeholder Work Groups? Both? Who made the decision to establish these? How were their members selected/identified?

A:

- What was the relationship between the Technical and Stakeholder Work Groups? What were their roles and were these covered in response plans? How were differences between the two groups resolved? Did you have procedures (pre-established, ad-hoc) for the involvement of stakeholders in decisions taken with regard to contaminated areas/material? If so, please describe.

A:

- Were Stakeholder Groups utilised to assist in outreach activities during the transition to Recovery period? If so how were their questions/concerns addressed? If any disagreements resulted, how would these be resolved? Who was responsible for adjudicating any problems?

A:

- Was a plan developed to address long-term housing requirements or relocation? Did the plan include the economic and social impact to way of life? people? animals? livestock? How? What response was given to those citizens that did not want to move back into their homes?

A:

- Is a process established if the affected community wants to demolish structurally sound buildings even though they have been decontaminated? Were there differences, if any, in the treatment of public vs. private property?

A:

- What was the process for the public to dispose of contaminated belongings? How was the items collected?

A:

- What assistance was available to affected businesses, etc within the contaminated area? Was assistance available to other impacted businesses, etc outside the contaminated area? How were damages/losses handled? What was the role of property insurances? What efforts were be undertaken to get people to return to work?

-

A:

- How was the issue of who pays for what addressed? What was provided under Public or individual assistance? How was insurance handled? Where there Liability issues such as Caps or Limitations? Where timelines imposed on clean-up activities for funding allowances?

A:

- Was a long-term monitoring plan developed? Was this plan developed in conjunction with other stakeholders (local, national governments, public)?

A:

- Who was responsible for assuring adequate resources, personnel and funding for the duration of the recovery process?

A:

Other observations:

Please attach to this evaluation questionnaire any recovery plan or framework that was developed during this exercise (in their original language and, if available, in English).

4 OTHER INFORMATION

- Were the INEX 4 Technical Materials appropriate for planning your exercise, or was additional information or guidance needed?

A:

- Were there any topics or issues that arose during the exercise for which national or international guidance would have been useful?

A:

- Please list any other observations or comments on the exercise planning, conduct or evaluation that would facilitate the assessment and follow-up of the overall INEX 4 series:

A:

REFERENCES

INEX 4: General Information, NEA/CRPPH/INEX(2009)6

INEX 4: Guide for National Planning Committees, NEA/CRPPH/INEX(2009)7

INEX 4: Guide for Exercise Players, NEA/CRPPH/INEX(2009)8

INEX 4: Exercise Evaluation Questionnaire, NEA/CRPPH/INEX(2009)9