



# 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