

Cross-border claims management

Brussels 21.1.2014/Eero Holma

Concluding report on session 1

- Recommendations of WG1 may not perfect, but they will greatly enhance the preparedness of the Member States to act in a coherent way in case of an accident
- The way to handle claims in different countries is different based on a multiple of factors incl. social security systems, wherefore a uniform EU system is difficult to implement
- We do not have much, if any, experience of serious nuclear accidents, so the debate about claims has been rather theoretical
- Fukushima is the first incident from which we really can learn
- Could working on different realistic claims scenarios be a way forward?

Concluding report on Session 1 (cont)

- EC Public Consultation was interesting as it shows that there is a desire to improve the current situation, but disagreement as to how
- Prioritisation of certain types of damage and proportionalisation of claims payment among victims when there are not enough funds available is a very difficult issue – role of the state
- Nuclear insurers and their members have resources to handle large and complex accidents, such as nuclear
- I hope that also the state representatives present take something home with them and we all start working together

Concluding report on Session 1 (cont)

- **The Japanese experience shows that mechanisms can be put in place reasonably quickly – it did not become clear to me what was in place before the accident and what was created after the accident**
- **The dispute resolution mechanism seems to work and shows that, where possible, claims do not have to be settled in court**
- **It is important that all nuclear countries carry out exercises how the society at large can cope with an emergency – example Oskarshamn in Sweden 2011**