

Key Considerations for a Future Framework

Neil Porter (HSE)

Dr Andy Franks (ERM)

Topics Considered



Public perception – evidence for scale aversion

Gross disproportion

Risk reduction

The Dutch experience

Building damage

Risk Criteria Document



Evidence of Scale Aversion (1)

- There has been a long-running debate about scale aversion and how it should be taken into account (if at all), in both the land-use planning and COMAH contexts.
- Review examples of public reactions to major accident disasters to establish evidence or otherwise of scale aversion.

Evidence of Scale Aversion (2)

- There is some evidence of scale aversion, but not enough to build a quantitative model
- Other factors influence societal concerns, not just scale (dread, outrage, trust, control ...)
- Risk analyses tend to focus on fatalities, people are concerned about a wider sense of 'loss'
- Next steps
 - Investigate other issues related to societal concern.
 - The regulator's perception

Gross Disproportion (1)

- To date, disproportion factors (DFs) have been considered to lie in the range 1-10 (based on statements made at the Sizewell B inquiry).
 - Is this appropriate?
 - What factors influence the DF?
- Review safety-related decisions by regulators and others to derive DF values and the underlying reasons

Gross Disproportion (2)

- Higher DF associated with: potential for multiple fatalities, potential to affect sensitive / vulnerable people, regulations introduced after accidents / incidents, media attention.
- Review further cases studies – measures implemented in response to accidents / disasters; measures required by standards / codes of practice.

Risk Reduction (1)



- Providing guidance on taking societal risk into account in a proportionate way when deciding upon the adequacy of risk reduction measures.
- Review approaches used by risk practitioners & industry to develop guidance.
- Consideration of the 'reverse COMAH' issue & development of policy.



Risk Reduction (2)



- Draft guidance prepared which seeks to address societal risk in a proportionate way, through a series of screening steps.
- Relationship with 'gross disproportion' work



Experience in The Netherlands (1)



- The Netherlands has experience in both the development of societal risk methodology and handling societal risk in land-use planning
- Review societal risk methods and experiences of dealing with societal risk ('Accountability for Societal Risk')



Experience in The Netherlands (2)



- The Dutch have proposed a number of methods for representing societal risk on a map, some of which appear quite useful and may be used in the trials.
- The ‘Accountability’ approach is worth further investigation and discussion with stakeholders



Building Damage (1)

- Should damage be taken into account in a land-use planning system? Is it HSE's role?
- Consider how damage might be taken into account in land-use planning advice.
- Is there anything that can be learned from experience in France post-Toulouse?

Building Damage (2)



- French system allows for ‘building reinforcement’ in some zones, but no experience of this having been done to date
- HSE may be able to provide information, but the advisory role / decision will fall to others
- This is an area that HSE considers to fall beyond its remit



Risk Criteria Document



- The 1989 Risk Criteria Document needs to be updated and revised to reflect:
 - Changes in HSE's approaches and policy developments since 1989 (e.g. PADHI, new major hazards, post-Buncefield changes)
 - Societal risk



Questions?

