

Can the stress tests be saved from greenwash?

Brussels, 17 January 2012

Public meeting
Post-Fukushima stress tests peer review

Jan Haverkamp
Greenpeace

GREENPEACE

www.greenpeace.org

the stress tests general concerns

no assessment of off-site emergency response

- we need a third track!

the security track seems inadequate

GREENPEACE

www.greenpeace.org

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?

GREENPEACE

www.greenpeace.org

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!

NO MAS FUKUSHIMA
GREENPEACE

GREENPEACE

GREENPEACE

jan.haverkamp@greenpeace.org

www.greenpeace.eu