第 5 回 QST 国際シンポジウム　伴委員挨拶

令和 3 年 9 月 21 日

On behalf of the Nuclear Regulation Authority, I would like to say a few words.

First, I would like to thank President Hirano, Dr. Nakano, Dr. Yamashita, and all the relevant QST staff for organizing this symposium. Ten years ago, the unprecedented earthquake hit eastern Japan, which was followed by a large tsunami and the nuclear accident at Fukushima Daiichi site. Since then, we have learned much from this traumatic event, and have discussed how we can be better prepared for a nuclear emergency. It is quite meaningful to share the experiences and ideas that have accumulated in these 10 years.

At the time of the Fukushima Daiichi accident, protective actions were supposed to be decided based on estimates of the projected dose to the public. This scheme did not work at all. To make matters worse, the earthquake and tsunami disabled most of the radiation monitors around the site. Consequently, monitoring of the environment and people was performed in a rather ad-hoc manner with limited equipment and staff. These difficulties reaffirmed our understanding that radiation monitoring forms foundation of emergency response.

Regarding the medical care system in case of nuclear emergency, treatment for those who are exposed to radiation or radioactive materials has been emphasized since the criticality accident in Tokai-mura in 1999. However, what we experienced in the Fukushima Daiichi accident was the substantial loss of life following the unprepared evacuation of patients and the elderly from hospitals and nursing homes. We also faced the reality that protective actions against radiation exposure deteriorate people's health and well-being. These harsh consequences suggest the importance of maintaining medical infrastructure for usual care even in an emergency.

Based on these lessons learned, the NRA developed the new Emergency Preparedness and Response Guide. QST has played a role in implementing it in terms of radiation exposure monitoring and medical care.

I believe that the newly established framework is more practical than ever before. Nevertheless, we have to keep in mind that there is no perfect emergency plan. Accident is always beyond our expectation and imagination. We can never be ready for it. What

we can do is to be better prepared by continuing improvement.

We should not stop asking ourselves “What could have been done better in Fukushima?” and “Are we doing our best to improve preparedness for a nuclear emergency?” Asking these questions will continue to be painful and daunting, but only with this attitude, we will be able to avoid complacency. And answers should be sought based on open and candid discussions. I hope this symposium provide an opportunity for frank and lively exchange of views in this regard. Thank you for your attention.