

Short note on the current state of the negotiations for the closure of Chernobyl

At Jonathan Heller's request I had a discussion with the European Atomic Forum about the current state of the negotiation between the G-7 / EBRD / Euratom authorities / other international institutions, and the Ukrainian government, on the closure of Chernobyl.

The main points that came out of this discussion are as follows:

- The change of government in Germany had very much delayed the negotiation of an acceptable agreement. Mr. Mandil's view - that the Greens have achieved nothing in terms of German nuclear policy, but have prevented Chernobyl from being closed - was correct. The German government had proposed a completely new approach to providing new electrical capacity in the Ukraine: instead of completing and commissioning the new nuclear plants at Khelmitsky and Rovno (K2 and R4) they had proposed a new diesel electric plant to be built by the German company, MAN. This proposal has been rejected by ex-President Kuchma as unacceptable and a lot of time has been lost.
- Since that period internal political changes in the Ukraine had resulted in substantial further delays.
- The only realistic proposal on the table still involves the completion and commissioning of K2 and R4. Quite a bit of progress had been made in completing the term sheets for the EBRD loan and for the Euratom loan. One critical issue had been to get the Ukraine to commit to a date for closing Chernobyl, and they have now announced a date of November 2000. However this would not be the first time that closure dates had come and gone. The negotiations were not robust. In particular there were probably some key individuals within the international institutions who were in favour of dragging out the negotiations for as long as possible. This was in the hope that the Ukrainians might be forced by engineering problems to close Chernobyl before the West had committed to paying for K2 and R4.
- Given this, our contact at the European Atomic Forum thought that it might well be valuable if an organisation with strong humanitarian credentials was able to give some political impetus to keeping the discussions moving forward. Without that they could easily become paralysed as they have been for much of the last three years. It would of course be necessary to choose the right psychological moment in the G-7 / EBRD / Euratom process.
- He also felt it was very important to discuss such an initiative with the Ukrainians and will provide us with coordinates of two people who he recommended talking to in Kiev and Brussels.
- One additional point on which he thought it would be very valuable to have a 'humanitarian' intervention concerns the living conditions in Slavutich, the new town near Chernobyl to which many of the staff and victims have been relocated. He said the mayor of Slavutich, Mr. Udovichenko, has worked with heroic effort to maintain the medical facilities there, but that financial help from the West is urgently needed.

Our contact at the European Atomic Forum told me that they would be happy to be involved in further discussions in any way that we thought was helpful.

CHARP
WORKING GROUP MEETING

MINUTES

21 December 1999

Minsk, Belarus

Participants:

1. Members of the Working group (3)

Vladimir Yarmolik	BelRC
Anatoliy Zagrebelsky	UkrRC
Vladimir Belyaevskiy	RusRC

2. Chairpersons of RC Regional Committees (6)

BELARUS:

Valentina Nesteruk	Brest
Ludmila Strozskaya	Mogilev (Deputy Chairperson)
Natalia Mazurenok	Gomel

UKRAINE:

Alexander Bogdan	Zhitomir
Vladimir Sokolenko	Rovno

RUSSIA:

Raisa Lukutzova	Bryansk
-----------------	---------

**3. Minsk Delegation: Jürgen Kronenberger, *Chairman*,
CHARP team, Elena Shkrob (6)**

1. Opening, approval of the Agenda

J.Kronenberger made a brief survey of CHARP activities since the time of the extended meeting of donors in March 1998 (Kiev, Ukraine) when CHARP funding was already of concern. Even at that time it was already clear that it is necessary to involve external and internal donors too, CHARP faced a crisis situation in summer 1999 but the programme managed to get funds to cover 1999. As far as the future is concerned, there is again no definite guarantee for the running of the programme. J.Kronenberger also made comments on four options of future CHARP funding (already discussed previously) and pointed out that local input which is now about 10% should be a reality and by the year 2001 it should be increased by 20%. It is necessary to work on this at different levels. And at the same time we should be realistic and flexible to deal with the situation.

There were no amendments to the agenda and it was approved.

2. Follow-up of the Minutes of the Working Group Meeting (Bryansk, 5 October, 1999)

Following the decision of the Working Group Meeting in Bryansk the meeting discussed (see paragraph 3) the Plan of Action. There were no comments made concerning minutes.

3. Plan of Action on PSS development in the frameworks of CHARP

C. C. - HAYAN
SKODOLADH
- OLS
- PIRE
28.01.00

3.1. N.Nagorny briefly informed the participants about the background of the PSS development and mentioned main events/activities held in the frameworks of PSS. It was also stressed that PSS should not be restricted by training only and it should deliver services to the population which is more important objective. It was agreed to analyze the Plan of Action in detail.

S.Otchik explained the structure and the composition of the Plan and its main elements.

Since last evaluation mission on CHARP stressed the term *rehabilitation* which means information activities to reduce fear among affected population through cooperation between media, governments and Red Cross, it was agreed to interpret rehabilitation in this way. (1.Title and Purpose of Project). V.Yarmolik mentioned that actually we work not with governments but with Regional executives authorities and this was accepted.

It was proposed to mention just the total amount of PSS messengers which is 225 (2.Summary).

The participants of the meeting discussed project partners. J.Kronenberger proposed to add p. 6.2. from the report of the last evaluation mission on CHARP to this paragraph (3.3. Other Partners):

NSs should initiate discussions with all relevant ministries and media to start coordinated programmes for rehabilitation in all three countries.

The participants of the meeting decided to edit p.4.3. (4.Objectives) in the following way: To train the affected people on self-help techniques in stress management.

3.2. In connection with the discussion of *p.4. Objectives*, J.Kronenberger made comments on the report of J.Gaugin, an external expert of the Danish RC who was on mission in Belarus in summer 1999 aimed at PSS evaluation (report attached). One of the observations made in the report was a lack of proper reporting system on PSS. The participants agreed to this. But since the time of the evaluation the reporting system in CHARP was established and improved.

The participants supported J.Kronenberger who mentioned that following the recommendations of J.Gaugin, PSS reports should be more precise, they should contain figures on what has been done; two aspects are of importance: training and feedback from those whom we look after and the second aspect - there should be a documentation how we reach beneficiaries.

The participants of the meeting also agreed with that " the reporting of frequent psychological symptoms of stress and discomfort is only to a minor extent caused by the Chernobyl disaster". A.Zagrebelny mentioned that social and economic factors are now more important but it does not mean that people forgot about Chernobyl.

In the report of J.Gaugin it is written that communication and authorization problems hamper the PSS inside the CHARP administration. This was not clear to the participants of the meeting and they could hardly give some comments.

The meeting decided that the recommendations of the J.Gaugin's report should be taken into consideration.

3.3. It was also proposed to add to the objectives the following: *guidance and supervision should be given to the methodology and theory; training should be followed up* (4.Objectives).

3.4. The participants raised a question of issuing a certificate for persons trained on PSS. There were different opinions. Summarizing the discussion J.Kronenberger remarked that we could provide trained persons with a document certifying participation but not achievements. The document of this kind would be valid only within Red Cross.

3.5. Further, the participants discussed the paragraph on the activities of PSS in the three countries (5.Activities).

3.6. Country reports/comments:

Belarus

V.Yarmolik briefed the participants on the PSS running in Belarus the start of which was in 1997. He also asked to make changes concerning dates for publishing leaflets. BelRC wants to have them published in 2000 (2001 - according to Plan of Action). Besides, V.Nesteruk mentioned also that together with the MDL team they have drafted two leaflets: 1) life and stress, 2) thyroid gland pathology; which they also want to publish as soon as possible.

In this connection J.Kronenberger reminded that whatever we publish we should think about our unique emblem and not forget about corporate identity of our organization.

Ukraine

A.Zagrebely asked clarification concerning budget and human resources of PSS in Ukraine. S.Otchik mentioned that there were proposals from Federation's experts to increase human resources and this will be done in the future running of PSS.

Russia

V.Belyaevsky pointed out some mistakes in the Plan of Action concerning Russia: there are no visiting nurses in Bryansk Region and also no Disaster Preparedness Program so the references can not be made to this.

3.7. The issue of PSS reporting was touched upon once again. J.Kronenberger supported V.Yarmolik in that we should have the internal structure of monitoring/reporting. It was proposed to prepare (by PSS Co-ordinator) quarterly reports for the ICCG members. (to be added to p.7.2. of p.7.Monitoring and Evaluation). The Timetable should also include monitoring.

3.8. It was agreed that local authorities have nothing to do in the day to day management (8.Implementation Arrangements) which will be carried out at different levels by CHARP/PSS Co-ordinator, Counterparts and Chairpersons of Oblast RC. Chairpersons of City and District RC Committees should mentioned in p.8 as messengers of the programme.

3.9. Also the decision was made not to include *p.9 Critical Assumptions* to the Plan of Action.

3.10. All representatives asked questions concerning budget breakdown in the three countries. It was explained that the budget will be clarified internally, it should be considered as a draft so far. It depends on the income we will have in the year 2000. Minsk Delegation will keep to a tradition to inform National Societies about the budget.

3.11. Minsk Delegation will incorporate all comments into this final draft to be presented to the ICCC.

4. Proposals of NSs on further development of PSS in Belarus, Russia and Ukraine

Following the decisions of the previous Working group meeting the three Nss submitted to the Delegation in due time their written proposals concerning further development of PSS. V.Belyaevsky added that Russian Red Cross would like to have a PSS counterpart based in Bryansk, not in the NS.

The participants agreed that the three National Societies will work out concrete budget planning till the next ICCC meeting (deadline: mid February to be presented to Minsk Delegation). In addition Russian RC and Ukrainian RC will give their plan of activities like Belarus Red Cross which provided seven concrete proposals. V.Yarmolik proposed to draft a joint plan of activities.

The above budget planning should include two budgets:

- 1) PSS == CHARP;
- 2) PSS == CAS, institutional development.

5. Medical screening: the number of checkups and results of screening in 1999

A.Komov briefed the meeting about the total number of checkups and by each MDL, touched upon the most common diseases detected in the current year. He also asked the Chairpersons to facilitated the reporting so that to prepare the annual medical report at the beginning of January.

6. Activity of the National Societies on CHARP implementation in Belarus, Russia and Ukraine following the recommendations of the 3rd Evaluation Mission

The three RC Nss and six Oblast Committees were sent the translation of the evaluation mission report. All representatives of Nss got acquainted with this report and mentioned that they would try to organize their activity in line with it.

7. Any other business, Closure

As all issues included into the agenda were discussed, the meeting was closed.

CHARP

MINUTES OF THE WORKING GROUP MEETING

Bryansk Red Cross Committee

5 October 1999

Participants

Russian Red Cross:	Victor Sedelkin
Belarus Red Cross:	Vladimir Yarmolik
Ukrainian Red Cross:	Anatoliy Zagrebelny
Minsk Delegation:	Jurgen Kronenberger, Chairman

Nikolai Nagorny
Alexander Komov
Tamara Reshko

Guests:

Elena Shkrob
Raisa Lukutsova, Chairlady of Bryansk RC
Committee
Anatoliy Proshin, Head doctor of the Bryansk
Regional Diagnostic Centre

1. Opening, approval of the agenda; Follow-up of the last ICCC meeting (July, Ukraine)

Having added the issue on PSS for the discussion (p.8) the participants approved the agenda. There were no comments on the minutes of the previous meetings so they were also approved.

R.Lukutsova briefed the participants about the activity of Red Cross in the Region and about work of the Bryansk MDL and Red Cross programmes implemented in the Region.

A.Proshin informed the meeting about the co-operation of Red Cross and the Diagnostic Centre where the MDL is based and also mentioned about the wish of the Diagnostic Centre to arrange a biopsy room with the assistance of Red Cross.

2. Discussion of the report of the 3-rd CHARP Evaluation Mission

N.Nagorny informed briefly about the evaluation mission and mentioned the importance of its report as it gives grounds for further activities.

J.Kronenberger also stressed the relevance of the report since it should give a true picture of the situation, shows us how we perform our work and provides support to convince those concerned that CHARP is a project the Red Cross needs to continue with.

Following the proposal of J.Kronenberger the report of the evaluation mission was discussed in details. The results of the discussion can be summarised as follows.

The Working group suggested to add the two questions to the ToR to be commented by the assessment team in the report as they had been mentioned to the team before they had started their work.

1. To what extent CHARP contributed to the strengthening of the NSs institutional development capacity (administration and management). What could be improved? This was the request of the British RC.

2. Provision of screening by RC MDL/CHARP for liquidators living in Moldova. The Request by the Moldova Embassy/Red Cross.

The Working group touched upon the problem of norms for radioprotection and was of the opinion that *Red Cross/CHARP has no mandate and no competence to advocate for norms to be changed. Besides, this is a delicate question. In case the norms are revised it will rightly mean, the contaminated areas will not have the stigma of radiation to the present degree, and the thread of it will be less. But this will result in losing privileges among the affected population they receive in connection with radiation in this area. It would mean getting less income, risk allowances, etc. It can bring about another psycho-social stress to the affected population. The economic advantages for the individual by having such a change (less norms mean more marketing of agricultural products in the country) can not be estimated by the Working group, this would be a speculation only.*

Therefore at the present time the Red Cross should be cautious providing this kind of activities because the aim described in the report, to improve socio-economic conditions for the target group of CHARP, can be reached or can even contribute to get things worse for them.

However in the long run CHARP should concentrate on its medical service and rehabilitation activities on the basis of revised norms, recommended from International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) could be helpful (Prof. Pellerin) and others.

The report mentioned views about norms which are based on the concept of one group of scientists who share the idea, that rather sufficient content of Caesium 137 in foodstuffs is not dangerous for the human health. But there are also other opposite concepts, fears and explanations. We should not only represent one side of the medal.

At the same time the participants put forward the following question:

Does Red Cross have the competence and recognition to deal with this issue in public? Should Red Cross really influence mass media, governments, etc, to change norms we have never dealt with?

REHABILITATION was understood by the participants of the meeting as one the key issues of the report as the mission is of the opinion that CHARP should focus its activities more on rehabilitation in future.

In general assessment team's concept of 'Rehabilitation' means that governments, media, Red Cross and other members of Civil Society work more together in getting the population psychologically released from being exposed to unfavourable conditions.

However, in connection with this, the mission should explain in more details what meaning is implied to rehabilitation and the role of the Red Cross.

The Working group decided that the difference should be made between:

A. Rehabilitation of territory (and here we can not recommend anything to the governments or media since we have no competence in this and it is doubtful we could deal in this);

B. Rehabilitation of people. Red Cross being a humanitarian organisation should try to approach individuals by means of providing relevant information, services, education, etc.

Indications, recommendations, tasks and ideas on rehabilitation should be given by the mission with regard to the activity of Red Cross and namely CHARP.

All participants commented on the role of Red Cross, governments and media with regard to rehabilitation.

The report says that "we have success in sustainability by innovating again", not explaining what our innovations are to be. If we have to invest in rehabilitation as in innovation, we should also briefly describe the investments necessary.

When we describe the role of governments, media, RC branches there should be a more clear message in defining each others role. The mission should explain what kind of rehabilitation measures governments should be involved more; also the message Red Cross gives to the media should be recommended in this report. A very concrete explanation is needed here.

The assessment team was asked to advise in 5-6 examples on rehabilitation and to elaborate text on the mentioned above if the message is like the meeting has put it.

PSS. *The other important issue discussed was PSS role and the Working group understands it in the way that PSS should further create links and networking with other non RC professionals. For these reasons, it is worth to foresee further development of this component and its integration in NSs' long term programmes.*

It may be reasonable to develop PSS as a service delivery in each NS for the various activities within the concept of capacity building by organising a focal point in order to advise the activities of all programmes run. This focal point should have a counterpart in the management of First Aid, VNS, DPP, etc. In a structure like this, PSS and capacity building could be mutually beneficial. On the other hand this may contribute finally to fund-raising and more competence in humanitarian work.

The Working group found it necessary to correct the report as there was no accurate information concerning Red Cross Visiting Nurses Programme (VNP) because it

experiences different situations in the three countries. In Ukraine it plays a very important role and is one of the key programmes of the NS which even increased its resources in the 90th. In Belarus it is also of significance in health programmes though the number of nurses were reduced. The above mentioned is true only for Russia, for example, in Bryansk Region VNP is no longer present due to financial problems.

The issue of CHARP administrative management was also touched upon. A.Sagrebely proposed to keep the previous frequency of the CHARP Management meetings (ICCC and WGroup). The proposal was not followed (the report suggested two meetings in a year, too), but at the same time it was mentioned that if there is really something urgent/important to discuss, then a special meeting will take place.

The participants also decided to structure more clearly the report in its paragraph 2. *PSS, Education and Information programme* in the following way:

2.1. Psychological rehabilitation must be at the top of the priority list for everyone. RC NSs should play a significant role in developing psycho-social support into service delivery within other Red Cross programmes among which VNP will be in future a key element in this regard.

2.2. Dissemination of adequate messages will be of utmost importance. In this regards, clear signals can be given in the CHARP Newsletter published by the Federation Delegation in Minsk.

2.3. NSs should initiate discussions with all relevant ministries and media to ask for support and to start co-ordinated programmes for rehabilitation purposes in all three countries.

Finally the Working group proposed something should be said in the evaluation report about the finance because CHARP is going to face the challenge of its sustainability.

It was also proposed to add the following remark: the Programme should be run at the present level at least till the year 2006. There are also demands to extend it in Orel and develop a biopsy element which can not be met in the present financial circumstances. However, it is clear that there will be still international efforts to be made for support and at the same time more should be invested from the local level. Concrete steps are to be taken by the ONS.

The participants also made some editorial work on data and information, all has been sent to the evaluation team for final editing.

3. Proposals of National Societies on future development of the Programme

Four options of CHARP were worked out to have a scheme in case of Programme reduction. J.Kronenberger commented briefly on the options. The proposal of

RusRC is to choose between option 2 or 4. This was agreed upon or not rejected. However, this issue was already discussed at the last ICCC Meeting.

4. CAS 2001/2002 and CHARP - Appeal

N.Nagorny briefed the participants about a new approach to planning activities. Instead of the past annual Emergency Appeal, the Delegation was asked to follow a new format designed in Geneva which is now called Country Assistance Strategy (CAS). The budget is planned for 2 years. It is already drafted for CHARP for the year 2000 and, taking into account reduced milk and vitamins, will be 1,300,000 USD and 1,150,000 USD for the year 2001.

J.Kronenberger added that CAS follows the outline of Almaty Declaration and previously CHARP was also included in the general (EA) Appeal produced by the Federation. The CAS is designed to provide better disaster response, disaster preparedness, health/social work and dissemination of Red Cross values. Disaster response means the physical capacity to act and co-ordinate, while DPP implies legal and administrative structures including training to act all over the country after an emergency situation.

5. MDL activity during 9 months of 1999

A.Komov briefed the participants about the latest medical situation, the number of examinations provided by each MDL. (For more details see *Medical Report* for 9 months).

6. Financial situation of CHARP

The financial situation was informed by N.Nagorny. The funds pledged by the NS are at the disposal of CHARP but this money is enough only till the end of 1999.

J.Kronenberger said fund-raising campaign for 2000 should be started already now in order to avoid the deficit later. CHARP should begin this work by providing the documents for negotiations with potential donors.

7. Proposals of issues for the agenda of the next ICCC Meeting

The representatives of the NS did not suggest any significant proposals for the next ICCC meeting, therefore the meeting was postponed for a later period of time.

8. Psycho-Social Support

Summarising the results of the meeting. Closure

J.Kronenberger recalled the participants about the PSS and mentioned it can not be an open issue any more. Since the Plan of Action was sent to NSs on the eve of the meeting they need some time to study it.

N.Nagorny remarked that following the recommendations of the PSS evaluation mission the Plan of Action on PSS was worked out in April and in May it was sent to Geneva and Copenhagen for consideration. Unfortunately, the comments on the

Plan were received only at the end of September. Therefore CHARP team could not forward in due time the Plan of Action to NSs to be discussed at the Working Group Meeting.

J.Kronenberger asked the representatives of the NSs to study the Plan of Actions on PSS in their National Societies and give the feedback on it till 16 October 1999.

Two main questions should be considered:

1. PSS as a general Programme of National Societies provided as a service delivery by creating a focal point at each National Society; how this can be implemented via capacity building.

2. PSS as a component of CHARP (meeting the target population); a plan for 2000 and 2001.

The participants agreed upon the following. The issue will be discussed once again, first internally then at a Working group Meeting at the Minsk Delegation in due course and after that it will be presented to the ICCC Meeting for the Presidents' approval.

The meeting was closed.