



Understanding disaster risk: hazard related risk issues

SECTION IV Technological risk

Elisabeth Krausmann
Coordinating lead author

Maureen Heraty Wood
Lead author 3.12

Lee Allford
Zsuzsanna Gyenes
Mark Hailwood

Emmanuel Raimond
Lead author 3.13

Dries Gryffroy
Andrej Prošek

Elisabeth Krausmann
Lead author 3.14

Ana Maria Cruz
Roland Fendler
Ernesto Salzano

3 Understanding disaster risk: hazard related risk issues

Section IV. Technological risk

CONTENTS

Introduction	340
3.12 Technological risk: chemical releases	341
3.12.1 Introduction	341
3.12.2 Chemical accidents with serious impacts continue to occur with disturbing regularity.	341
3.12.3 Chemical risk management in modern times - the theory is well-established but implementation lags behind	345
3.12.4 Implications for future scientific study	353
3.12.5 Conclusions and key messages	356
3.13 Technological risk: nuclear accidents	357
3.13.1 Introduction	357
3.13.2 Nuclear safety framework	357
3.13.3 Lessons from past events	359
3.13.3.1 Three Mile Island, 1979	359
3.13.3.2 Chernobyl, 1986	360
3.13.3.3 Fukushima Dai-ichi, 2011	361
3.13.3.4 High-amplitude external hazards at nuclear power plant sites	362
3.13.4 Safety assessment methodologies	362
3.13.5 Risk reduction, a multiform activity	365
3.13.6 Conclusions and key messages	366
3.14 Technological risk: Natech	367
3.14.1 Introduction	367
3.14.2 Forensic analysis of Natech accidents and lessons learned	368
3.14.2.1 General lessons learned	368
3.14.2.2 Lessons learned from Natech accidents due to earthquakes, floods and lightning	369
3.14.3 Status of Natech risk management in European Union member states and in organisation for economic co-operation and development member countries	370
3.14.3.1 European Union	370
3.14.3.2 The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)	371
3.14.4 Natech risk assessment	372
3.14.4.1 General methodology	372
3.14.4.2 Methods and tools for Natech risk assessment	372
3.14.5 Natech risk reduction	373

3.14.5.1 Structural prevention and mitigation measures	374
3.14.5.2 Organisational prevention and mitigation measures	375
3.14.5.3 Natech risk governance	375
3.14.5.4 Emergency planning	375
3.14.5.5 Early warning	376
3.14.6 Conclusions and key messages	376
Recommendations	378
References	382

Introduction

The risk of technological accidents from man-made and natural hazards is increasing as a result of industrialisation, population growth that leads to more urbanisation and community encroachment on natural-hazard areas, and climate change. The last few years have seen major technological accidents, with significant social, environmental and economic impacts that have had repercussions around the globe. Examples include the explosions at chemicals warehouses at Tianjin Port in 2015, the Fukushima nuclear disaster caused by the 2011 Great East Japan earthquake and tsunami, and the Deep Water Horizon oil spill in 2010.

There is no overarching framework for the reduction of technological risks, and disaster risk reduction initiatives have not commonly addressed this type of risk. With the Sendai Framework for Action, the importance of technological hazards has been recognised and an all-hazards approach to disaster risk reduction is promoted. This includes dangerous situations arising from man-made activities caused by human and organisational error, mechanical failure and natural hazards — so-called Natech risk. Prevention and preparedness for these risks, and for environmental emergencies in general, also has implications for sustainable development.

There are many hazardous industrial activities that provide society with important goods and services (e.g. chemical processing, oil and gas transport and some forms of electricity production). For the purpose of this report, three examples of major technological hazards were selected and the state of play in the management of the associated risks is discussed: (1) chemical accident risks due to the relatively frequent occurrence of accidents, (2) nuclear risks due to the potential for major cross-border consequences, and (3) Natech risks as an example of a multihazard cascading risk.