## Analysis of Uganda's Radiological Emergency Preparedness and Response Arrangements in Comparison with IAEA Requirements

Joshua Birungi <sup>a, b\*</sup>, Inyoung Jeon<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Nuclear and Quantum Engineering Dept., KAIST, 291 Daehak-ro, Yuseong-gu, Daejeon, Republic of Korea 34141 <sup>b</sup> Atomic Energy Council, Plot 40 Bukoto Street, Kisementi, Kampala, Republic of Uganda <sup>c</sup> Korea Institute of Nuclear Safety, 62 Gwahak-ro, Yuseong-gu, Daejeon, Republic of Korea, 34142 \*Corresponding author: joshbirungi@kaist.ac.kr

### 1. Introduction

The Republic of Uganda is a developing country that is quickly adopting modern technologies in its socioeconomic activities. In particular, nuclear technology has gained widespread adoption in medicine, industry, research, and academia over the last few years. However, the proliferation of activities that use radiation sources also indicates an increased possibility for radiological accidents and emergencies in the country.

Although rare, radiological accidents can become disastrous if there are no adequate measures to manage them. Therefore, adopting nuclear technologies requires commensurate safety measures, including radiological accident prevention, emergency preparedness, and response arrangements to prevent disaster situations. In this research, we analyzed the comprehensiveness and effectiveness of Uganda's radiological emergency preparedness arrangements in light of IAEA international standards.

#### 2. Methodology

In 2011, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) issued safety requirements for preparedness and response for a nuclear or radiological emergency in the Safety Standards Series as General Safety Requirements Part 7 (GSR-7) [1]. The Requirements provide a helpful instrument for contracting parties to assess their performance on nuclear and radiological emergency preparedness and response (EPR). The document highlights and describes twenty-six requirements. As a member of the IAEA, Uganda uses IAEA standards to develop its laws, regulations, and guides. Concerning EPR, the Atomic Energy Act no. 24 of 2008 [2] and the Atomic Energy Regulations of 2012 contain relevant legal provisions and requirements [3].

In this analysis, we compare and contrast Uganda's current legal and regulatory infrastructure provisions with the requirements in GSR-7. We applied the descriptive-analytic approach to assessing the comprehensiveness of the existing national arrangements for EPR against the IAEA requirements specified in GSR-7. The requirements were tabulated, matched against the existing national EPR framework in Uganda, and evaluated to determine whether each provision was fully or partially met or not met at all.

The gaps, challenges, and areas of improvement in the national radiological emergency management arrangements were also identified. Recommendations and best practices are derived from a review of the radiological emergency preparedness and management practices in countries with advanced nuclear technology, such as the Republic of Korea [4].

#### 3. Results and discussions

National regulatory requirements vary according to the nuclear applications in the country. Thus, the IAEA recommends that each member state use the provisions in the GSR-7 to determine and establish a level of radiological emergency preparedness consistent with the country's hazards [1]. For example, although it is a potential nuclear embarking country, Uganda does not have any activities that use nuclear materials. Therefore, the adoption of the requirements is customized to suit prevailing conditions.

# 3.1. National radiological Emergency Management System (EMS)

The EMS for Uganda is generally described in the Atomic Energy Act no. 24 of 2008 (AEA), the Atomic Energy Regulations, 2012 (AER) and the National Radiological Emergency Response Plan (NRERP) [5]. However, Uganda's NRERP is still pending approval by the responsible Ministry.

The AEA provides for establishing the Atomic Energy Council (AEC) as the national regulatory body for nuclear and radiation safety. Consequently, the government created AEC in 2009. AEC developed and issued the AER to specify the minimum requirements for protecting individuals and the environment from the dangers of ionizing radiation and providing for the safety and security of radiation sources. The regulations specifically stipulate that the primary responsibility for the safety of radiation sources lies with the licensed user.

Regarding emergency preparedness and response (EPR), the regulations stipulate the responsibilities of a licensed user in an emergency, emergency response planning requirements and interventions, and the protection of workers undertaking an intervention. In particular, where a licensed source is involved in an incident, the licensee is responsible for taking all required protective actions.

Additionally, Section 9 (1)(k) - (l) of AEA specifies that the functions of AEC are to assist in emergency response to radiological incidents and accidents; and to initiate, recommend, and provide appropriate support on interventions relating to radiological emergencies.

# 3.2. Compliance of Uganda's EMS with GSR-7 requirements

GSR-7 stipulates twenty-six requirements under three chapters: general, functional, and infrastructure. The explicit details of each requirement are explained within the standards. This subsection summarizes the findings of the analysis of the extent to which the EMS in Uganda meets the different requirements in GRS-7. In Tables I to III, the requirements and the country status are matched and rated. Symbols are used to show fully met ( $\bullet$ ), partially met ( $\bullet$ ), or not met (O).

### 3.2.1. General requirements.

General requirements (1 to 5) are essential for adequate emergency arrangements for hazards assessed based on a graded approach. Table I shows Uganda's status concerning the general requirements.

Tabla I. Ca	malionaa	with the	aanaral	roquiromonto
I able I. Co	inpliance	with the	general	requirements

Requirement	Country Status	
1. The emergency	The EMS is provided	
management system	for in the AEA, AER	
	and NRERP	
2. Roles and	The AEA, AER and	
responsibilities in	NRERP specify roles	
emergency	and responsibilities	
preparedness and		
response		
3. Responsibilities of	Not applicable	
international		-
organizations in		
emergency		
preparedness and		
response		
4. Hazard assessment	A hazard assessment	_
	is still under	$\bullet$
	development	
5. Protection strategy	A protection strategy	_
for a nuclear or	was developed, but it	$\mathbf{O}$
radiological	does not meet all	
emergency	GSR-7 specifications	

Table I above demonstrates an effort by the country to establish an effective EMS. However, there is a need to fast-track the finalization of the documentation process.

3.2.2. Functional requirements.

Functional requirements (6 to 19) establish the provisions necessary for effectively carrying out actions critical for effective emergency response. Table II shows Uganda's status concerning the functional requirements.

Table II: Com	pliance with	the functiona	l requirements
---------------	--------------	---------------	----------------

Requirement	Country Status	10
6 Managing	The NRERP describes	
operations in	the mechanisms for	
emergency response	managing response	•
7 Identifying and	The mechanisms for	
notifying a nuclear or	identification and	
radiological	notification of an	
emergency and	emergency are	
activating an	outlined in the	
emergency response	NRERP	
8 Taking mitigatory	Each operating	
actions	organization is	
uetions	required to submit	
	procedures for taking	
	mitigatory actions	
	before licensing	
9 Taking urgent	The NRERP briefly	
protective actions and	describes actions to be	
other response	taken but they are not	
actions	comprehensive to	
detions	GSR-7 specifications.	
10 Providing	There is no public	
instructions.	communication	
warnings, and	strategy, although the	
relevant information	NRERP designates the	
to the public for	responsible	
emergency	organizations	
preparedness	8	
11. Protecting	The protection of	
emergency workers	emergency workers is	
and helpers in an	described in the	
emergency	protection strategy	
	document	
12. Managing the	The NRERP	
medical response in a	designates the	
nuclear or	responsible	$\bullet$
radiological	organizations, but no	
emergency	efforts have been	
	made to build capacity	
	for medical response	
13. Communicating	There is no public	
with the public	communication	_
throughout a nuclear	strategy, although the	Ο
or radiological	NRERP designates the	
emergency	responsible	
	organizations	
14. Taking early	The NRERP briefly	
protective actions and	describes actions to be	-
other response	taken, but they are not	$\bullet$
actions	comprehensive with	
	GSR-7 specifications.	
15. Managing	There is a policy for	
radioactive waste in a	radioactive waste	
nuclear or	management that	
radiological	includes waste from	
emergency	emergency incidents	

16. Mitigating non- radiological	The guidelines and process for managing	
consequences of a	non-radiological	
nuclear or	effects are described in	
radiological	the NRERP	
emergency and an		
emergency response		
17. Requesting,	The NRERP outlines	
providing, and	the process for	
receiving	requesting assistance	
international	from the IAEA.	$\bullet$
assistance for	However, Uganda is	
emergency	not a party to the	
preparedness and	'Assistance	
response	Convention.'	
18. Terminating a	The process for	_
nuclear or	terminating a response	
radiological	is described in the	
emergency	NRERP	
19. Analyzing the	The NRERP provides	
nuclear or	for a review of the	
radiological	response process	
emergency and the		
emergency response		

Table II shows that most functional requirements are covered in the NRERP. However, some requirements are not comprehensive, and this will require a review of the NRERP or a separate additional document to cover them. Particularly, it is recommended that a communication strategy be developed.

### 3.2.3. Requirements for infrastructure.

The requirements for infrastructure (20 to 26) represent provisions for the facilities, personnel, logistics, and documentation necessary to develop and maintain appropriate arrangements for preparedness. Table III shows Uganda's status on the requirements for infrastructure.

Table III: Compliance with the requirements for infrastructure

Requirement	<b>Country Status</b>	
20. Authorities for	The authorities are	
emergency	designated in the	
preparedness and	NRERP	
response		
21. Organization and	No information is	
staffing for	available on staffing	$\bullet$
emergency	requirements for	
preparedness and	NRERP	
response		
22. Coordination of	The coordination	
emergency	mechanisms are	
preparedness and	provided for in the	
response	NRERP and AEA	
23. Plans and	There is a draft	
procedures for	national plan (NRERP)	$\bullet$
emergency response	and plans for operating	
	organizations but no	

	verified procedures for	
	responding	
	organizations	
24. Logistical support	The NRERP designates	
and facilities for	the organization	$\bullet$
emergency response	responsible for	
	logistics. The	
	organization has	
	facilities but lacks	
	some equipment	
25. Training, drills	Requirements for	
and exercises for	training and drills are	
emergency	provided in the AEA,	
preparedness and	AER, and NRERP	
response		
26. Quality	There is no provision	
management program	for quality	0
for emergency	management	
preparedness and		
response		

Table III shows a fair level of compliance with GSR-7 requirements for infrastructure. However, the provisions for staffing, quality management, procedures for the response, and logistical support should be addressed.

### 4. Conclusion

Adequate national arrangements and capabilities for radiological emergency preparedness and response are essential in minimizing the impacts of disastrous accidents involving radioactive materials and consequently building public trust in the safety of nuclear technology. In the case of Uganda, although considerable progress has been made to establish a radiological emergency management system, there are still several gaps in the framework that need improvement. Particularly, it is concerning that the National Radiological Emergency Response Plan (NRERP) is not approved and, therefore, cannot be implemented. The country should fully adopt, adapt, and implement the requirements specified in GSR-7 and ratify the relevant conventions to enhance its framework.

### REFERENCES

[1] IAEA, 2015, Preparedness and Response for a Nuclear and Radiological Emergency, No. GSR Part 7 (IAEA, Vienna, 2015)

[2] The Republic of Uganda, Atomic Energy Act no. 24 of 2008 (Parliament of Uganda, Kampala, 2008)

[3] The Republic of Uganda, Atomic Energy Regulations, 2012 (Atomic Energy Council, Kampala, 2012)

[4] The Republic of Korea, Act on Physical Protection and Radiological Emergency, Act No.06873 (Korea Institute of Nuclear Safety, Daejeon, 2003)

[5] The Republic of Uganda, National Radiological Emergency Response Plan (draft), 2019 (Atomic Energy Council, Kampala, 2019)