

Aside from the fact the absence of nuclear power is the best form of radiation protection, I don't think that we can expect any effective radiation protection in the event of a large nuclear accident even after reading this publication.

For example, para(46) recommends the protection of pets and livestock as well as soil purification as emergency measure, while para(65) recommends special attention to children and pregnant woman. It is easy to say that and that.

Para(73) has established a reference level for the effective dose of each individual for the protection of people, but there is no technology to measure the effective dose accurately.

A reference level for an inaccurate effective dose is meaningless.

Para(77) recommended that "Generally should not exceed 100mSv" "Should not exceed one year". However, it is wrong use 100mSv as a standard. On the contrary, such a control is not possible in a large-scale nuclear accident. The ICRP readily admits "there may be situation where it is not possible to expect to keep all dose below or in the range of 100mSv".

There is no merit in the affected population of radiation exposure due to the nuclear power accident, and there is no room for the concept of "justification" to enter into it.

I think it should be made clear that "justification" in para(108) is a "choice of suffering" for reducing off-site residents' exposure.

That is completely different category from "justification" when comparing "benefits of treatment" and "disadvantages of exposure to radiation" which are often cited.

I have doubts about the use of the word "Optimization". In the para (29), "fear of radiation" is treated equally as "Collapse of the trust of experts" "Disintegration of family relationships" "apprehension about the children's future" etc.

However, since "Fear of radiation (not just fear,)" is the cause and other phenomena are the result, I cannot accept the idea of "Optimization" which equates these phenomena.

This Publication has many confusing expression and ill-defined terms.
Exactly, I feel “collapse of trust in experts”.

Even if the ICRP is based on the assumption that a large nuclear accident will occur and people will be forced to use unnecessary radiation exposure, the ICRP needs to seriously consider radiation protection and create a publication that are acceptable to the public.

Yumiko Fuseya
NPO Shinjuku Yoyogi Citizen Monitoring Center

22 September 2019