



Key points for session 1

Consensus:

**A national action plan for radon is a
good idea!**

Why a national radon action plan:

- Radon is a public health problem.
- Several stakeholders:
 - The public, national authorities, local authorities, building industry and professionals, etc.
- Radon is an issue in different sectors in society
→ collaboration is needed.
- Recommend: WHO Handbook and IAEA BSS
- Required: EU BSS

An action plan should be based on:

- Knowledge
 - Indoor concentrations surveys
 - Awareness surveys
 - Economic analyses showing the need of an action plan
- Cooperation between different sectors and authorities in society
 - Also at national, regional and local levels.
 - Identification of leadership

Important issues in an action plan (1):

- Reference level and goals
- Communication and raise awareness
 - The public
 - Decision makers, local/national authorities
 - Employers
 - NGOs, also cooperation with NGOs
- Existing dwellings or new buildings: Both
- Workplaces, schools, kindergartens, buildings with public access
- Balance: Recommendations and regulations

Regulation and recommendation


- Existing dwellings
 - Schools and kindergartens
 - The workplace
 - New buildings

Recommendation

Regulation



Important issues in an action plan (2):

- Measurements
 - Mitigation
 - Prevention
 - Coordination of radon indoor air quality and energy efficient construction activities
- 
- Quality control
Guide lines
- Training and education of professionals
 - Building confidence in radon services
 - Identify issues no authority are responsible for
 - Financial support
 - Low-income

National strategy, responsibilities, collaboration, ...

IAEA, France, Switzerland : balance of responsibilities between the State and individual

WHO, France, Sweden, Belgium, USA : increase awareness and interest (politicians, authorities, public), collaboration among all responsible authorities, dispersion of competences on different bureaucratic levels, engaging high-level political officials (to launch the campaign and assert the long range goals)

USA : ensuring interested NGOs can participate and contribute, determining federal/NGO strategies, identification of leadership (EPA), facilitator and marketer (ALA), collaborative effort involving feds and allies

Sweden, Belgium : need of collaboration with academia position of medical practices

Priorities

IAEA, USA : priority (more/full attention) to new/future housing (less attention to existing attention)?, focusing on specific exposure-reduction actions (whenever possible), focus on strategies with large impact, innovative selection of actions to pursue

Concept (Reference Level and effective dose)

Spain, Chek Republic, Russia : concept of RL and optimisation (not a dose limit, ALARA), uniformisation of RL (impact on counter-measure), setting RL (philosophy, regional/national, value)

Switzerland, Russia, France : effective dose for smokers/non smokers, other health effects (than lung cancer), radon dose coefficients (dosimetry approach Versus epidemiological based approach), medical recommendation in case of very high doses (adults/child)

Norway : Importance of regulations for some of radon exposure and their effects on other radon exposures

Norway : Importance of multi-sector collaboration on radon issues