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the stress tests
general concerns

no assessment of off-site emergency response

- we need a third track!

the security track seems inadequate
the peer-reviews
general concerns

1. National regulators hijacked the peer-review system and undermined its credibility

2. Can you think the unthinkable?

3. Can you live up to your own standards?
the peer-reviews

general concerns

4. Can you raise the next issues?
   - emergency operation rooms
   - adequacy of seismic data
   - autarky of 10 hours
   - “fore-seeing” events
   - radioactive water run-off
   - liquidators
   - ageing
the peer-reviews
general concerns

5. Can you call the bluff? - comparison with earlier assessments

6. Can you clear out the fog? - airplane crashes
the peer-reviews some concrete issues

7. Lack of a true secondary containment.
8. Multi-reactor failure or multi-installation failure
9. Mobile generators and pumps
transparency issues

- no national public seminars when it mattered
- refusal of access to the operator reports
- reports lack proper sourcing of data
- no independent NGO or academic experts
- no transparency on how suggestions taken up
- today: too limited input from the audience
- peer-review team lists?
- we need better possibilities for NGO and other independent experts' input
conclusions

> too much business as usual!
> too little information for decision makers
> some decision makers already satisfied?

IT IS NOT TOO LATE
YOU ARE THE LAST CHANGE
TO PREVENT GREENWASH

GREENPEACE www.greenpeace.org
Thank you!