

31 August 2015

To:

Directors

Prefectural Labour Bureaus

From:

Director

Labour Standards Bureau

Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare

(Official seal imprinted)

**Enforcement of the Ministerial Ordinance for Partial Revision of the Ordinance on Prevention of Ionizing Radiation Hazards and Other Related Regulations**

The Ministerial Ordinance and related regulations were promulgated today to be enforced or applied from 1 April 2016: including the Ministerial Ordinance for Partial Revision of the Ordinance on Prevention of Ionizing Radiation Hazards (Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare Ordinance No. 134 of 2015, hereinafter referred to as “Revised Ordinance”), the Special Education Rule for Exceptional Emergency Works (Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare Notification No. 361 of 2015, hereinafter referred to as “Special Education Rule”) and events that the Minister of Health, Labour and Welfare specifies pursuant to Article 7-2, paragraph 2, item 1 of the Ordinance on Prevention of Ionizing Radiation Hazards (Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare Notification No. 360 of 2015, hereinafter referred to as “Event Notification”).

Considering the need to develop provisions concerning the prevention of radiation hazards during the period of emergency works in preparation for the cases where nuclear emergencies should occur at nuclear facilities in the future, this revision prescribes actions required to prevent radiation hazards in response to the nature of the said works.

Objectives and details of the Revised Ordinance, Event Notification, and Special Education Rule are shown below. You are requested to make these known to employers and to take measures so that they will be implemented without omission of the proper radiation hazard prevention measures to be taken in response to actual conditions of each nuclear facility.

## Note

### Section 1 Objectives of the revision

In the accident at the TEPCO Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant associated with the Tohoku – Pacific Ocean Earthquake on 11 March 2011 (hereinafter referred to as "TEPCO NPP accident"), after declaring a nuclear emergency, the Ministerial Ordinance to Define Exceptional Cases of the Laws Concerning the Prevention from Radiation Hazards due to Radioisotopes and Others to Cope with the Situation Which was Caused by the Tohoku – Pacific Ocean Earthquake (Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare Ordinance No. 23 of 2011, hereinafter referred to as "exceptional ministerial ordinance") was issued based on the comparison between the risk to workers' health and the benefits received by protecting local residents' lives and properties. In the exceptional ministerial ordinance, the emergency exposure dose limit was raised to 250 mSv as an exceptional case.

Although the exceptional ministerial ordinance was applied to all the emergency works of the TEPCO Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant (hereinafter referred to as "TEPCO Fukushima Daiichi NPP") at the beginning, applicable works were gradually limited step-by-step with the reduction of the exposure dose (1 November 2011). Finally it was lifted at the stage when the stability of the nuclear reactor was secured (16 December 2011).

During that period, the number of workers engaged in emergency works in the TEPCO Fukushima Daiichi NPP amounted to approximately 20,000, which caused various problems such as a shortage of dosimeters, unsuitable use of personal protective equipment, and delay of internal contamination measurements. A total of 174 workers had exposures exceeding 100 mSv which is the dose limit for regular radiation works per five years specified by Article 4 of the Ordinance on Prevention of Ionizing Radiation Hazards (Ordinance of the Ministry of Labour No. 57 of 1972, hereinafter referred to as "Ionizing Radiation Ordinance"), among which the exposure doses of six workers exceeded 250 mSv which was the exceptionally raised emergency dose limit.

Based on this experience, the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare recognized that, in preparation for the cases where emergency works need to be done, it is necessary to establish a basis for the exceptional emergency dose limit, etc. beforehand as well as to specify the radiation hazard preventive measures in response to the actual condition of the works concerned so that the exposure dose which workers receive can be minimized. Therefore it revised the Ionizing Radiation Ordinance as well as established the Special Education Rule and the Event Notification.

## Section 2 Details of the revision

### 1. Radiation controlled areas as well as the limit and measurement of exposure doses (Those related to Section 2 of the Ionizing Radiation Ordinance, and Event Notification)

#### (1) Exceptional emergency dose limit (Details related to Article 7-2)

##### a. Those related to paragraph 1

- i. The statement in paragraph 1 of this article "when it was recognized that it is difficult to comply with the effective dose prescribed in paragraph 2 of this article, considering the situations such as conditions of the accident concerned with the emergency works" means the time when the Minister of Health, Labour and Welfare recognizes the need to raise the emergency exposure dose limit exceptionally based on the comparison between the risk to workers' health and the benefits to protecting local residents' life and their properties in a situation when the nuclear emergency should be declared or events that are highly likely to lead to such situation should occur.

Considering that, in order to raise the emergency dose limit exceptionally, special reasons shall be required for justifying doing the emergency works concerned even for receiving the dose exceeding 100 mSv which is the exposure dose limit for regular works per five years specified in Article 4, paragraph 1 of the Ionizing Radiation Ordinance, and that "to avoid a destructive situation" is shown in the recommendation of the International Commission on Radiological Protection or the guidelines of the International Atomic Energy Agency as one of the objectives for general workers among the works that the exposure dose limit which exceeds 100 mSv is accepted, the works and workers that the exceptional emergency dose limit concerned in this revision should be limited to are the works with the main purpose of avoiding a destructive situation of nuclear facilities and the workers that engage in such works.

- ii. The statement "within the effective dose limit (limited to that not exceeding 250 mSv)" means that the upper limit of the exceptional emergency dose should be made to be 250 mSv. This is based on the experience in the TEPCO NPP accident in which it was possible to respond urgently to the severe accident, in which the cores of two or more nuclear reactors melted, by setting the exceptional emergency dose limit at 250 mSv, and it is hard to find a need presently for future emergency works that would cause an exposure dose exceeding this value. Moreover, from the literature about the health effects by acute exposure to humans, it is thought that the threshold of the lymphocyte count reduction is in the range from 250 mGy to 600 mGy. However it is hard to decide a threshold clearly, since there are few data between these values. Based on these things the exceptional

emergency dose limit of 250 was set from the viewpoint of preventing certainly the fall of the immune function by the reduction of the lymphocyte count during the carrying out of emergency works.

- iii. The limits of the equivalent dose received in the crystalline lens of the eye and the skin specified in Article 7, paragraph 2, items 2 and 3 were not raised, because those limits are unlikely to be exceeded even in the case where the upper limit of the exceptional emergency dose is defined by restricting the limit of the effective dose to 250 mSv, provided that suitable personal protective equipment are worn (for prevention of exposure to beta rays, such items as a full-face mask to protect the crystalline lens of the eye, a whole body type chemical protective suit, waterproof clothing, boots, etc. to protect the skin).
- b. Those related to paragraph 2
- i. This provision establishes that the Minister of Health, Labour and Welfare sets an exceptional emergency dose limit as 250 mSv since it is necessary to carry out required actions immediately from the viewpoint of risk management of the nuclear hazard when "a destructive situation" should occur. It also prescribes the criterion of judgment with respect to the occurrence of "the destructive situation" in nuclear facilities that, among the events provided in the Act on Special Measures Concerning Nuclear Emergency Preparedness (Act No. 156 of 1999, hereinafter referred to as "The Nuclear Emergency Act"), as the case when the nuclear emergency should be declared or events that are highly likely to lead to such a situation should occur.
  - ii. The statement in item 1 "events which the Minister of Health, Labour and Welfare defines among the events specified in Article 10 of the Nuclear Emergency Act" means those specified in each item of the Event Notification. These include, among the events specified in Article 10 of the Nuclear Emergency Act (hereinafter referred to as "notification events"), those that are expected to promptly lead to a nuclear emergency and require works under a high radiation environment to prevent its expansion. Specifically, they are shown in Article 4, paragraph 4, items 1 to 4 of the Cabinet Order for Act on Special Measures Concerning Nuclear Emergency Preparedness (Cabinet Order No. 195 of 2000): (1) the case where 5  $\mu$ Sv per hour is detected on the site boundary of nuclear facilities, (2) the case where radiation materials above the criteria are detected in an exhaust stack, a drain, etc. (3) the case where 50  $\mu$ Sv per hour is exceeded at a place outside the radiation controlled area. They were set based on the fact that, in the TEPCO NPP accident, it took approximately one hour after the notification events occurred for the nuclear emergency to develop.
  - iii. The statement in item 2 "the cases which are listed in each item of Article 15, paragraph 1

of the Nuclear Emergency Act" is the situation where a considerable quantity of radiation and radiation materials is released outside the nuclear facility site by the accident (nuclear emergency). In that case, it is assumed that the air dose rate in workplaces is also significantly increased.

c. Those related to paragraph 3

- i. This provision establishes that, from the viewpoint of optimization of exposure dose, the Minister of Health, Labour and Welfare should change and lift the exceptional emergency dose limit as promptly as possible based on evolution of the dose which the workers engaged in exceptional emergency works received, exposure dose they are expected to receive, and progress, etc. of the works which are needed to bring the accident under control.
- ii. The description "change" includes the limitation of works to apply the exceptional emergency dose limit and step-by-step reduction of the exceptional emergency dose limit to new workers after a certain time period.
- iii. The statement "lift the exceptional emergency dose limit as promptly as possible" means that the Minister of Health, Labour and Welfare should lift the exceptional emergency dose limit as promptly as possible when the stability of the nuclear reactor has been secured (corresponding to the time of completing Step 2 in the TEPCO NPP accident) even if it is before canceling of the nuclear emergency declaration, as specified in Article 15, paragraph 4 of the Nuclear Emergency Act.

d. Those related to paragraph 4

This provision establishes that, when the works to apply the exceptional emergency dose limit and the value of the exceptional emergency dose limit are specified, these should be presented through a public notice in order to make them clear to all concerned. It should be noted that the exceptional emergency dose limit specified pursuant to Article 7-2, paragraphs 1 and 2 shall be effective at the time when it is specified (the time when the situation becomes one of those corresponding to paragraph 2, item 1 or 2 of the same article). Therefore this provision specifies that the specified exceptional emergency dose limit must be presented through a public notice.

(2) Exceptional emergency dose limit (Details related to Article 7-3)

a. Those related to paragraph 1

- i. This provision, based on the principle of justification, limits the workers to whom the exceptional emergency dose limit are applied to those who have knowledge and experiences required for the works which have the main goal of avoiding the destructive situation of the nuclear facility (the works for preventing health hazards by radiation

exposure of the workers in the facility are also included). Specifically it limits workers to the nuclear disaster prevention workers specified in Article 8, paragraph 3 of the Nuclear Emergency Act, nuclear disaster prevention managers specified in Article 9, paragraph 1 of the Nuclear Emergency Act, and nuclear disaster prevention sub-managers specified in paragraph 3 of the same article of the Nuclear Emergency Act (hereinafter "nuclear disaster prevention workers, etc.").

- ii. The nuclear disaster prevention workers, etc. shall be the radiation workers who received the special education specified in Article 52-6 or 52-7 of the Ionizing Radiation Ordinance as well as the special education for the exceptional emergency works specified by Article 52-9.
  - iii. It should be noted that, for works such as operation of the apparatus which does not require advanced knowledge, experience or skill, since it is possible to control dose per worker by increasing the number of workers engaged in such works, the exceptional emergency dose limit should not be applied to the works in the nuclear facility where exceptional emergency works is done except by nuclear disaster prevention workers, etc. even if it is a case where an exceptional emergency dose limit is set, but the dose limit for regular radiation works specified in Article 4 shall be applied. Moreover, employers need to provide the special education concerned beforehand when these works correspond to those specified in Article 52-6 or 52-7.
  - iv. When nuclear facility employers outsource part of the works required for preventing occurrence or expansion of a nuclear disaster at the nuclear facility (e.g. remediation of damaged equipment in the case that unexpected events such as damage of equipment occurred at the site of the emergency response activities) in accordance with Article 2, paragraph 3 of the Order Concerning Nuclear Facility Employer Disaster Prevention Plan, etc. to be Prepared by the Nuclear Facility Employer Pursuant to the Act on Special Measures Concerning Nuclear Emergency Preparedness (MEXT and METI Ordinance No. 4 of 2012), the workers belonging to the outsourced operator shall be included in the nuclear disaster prevention workers, etc. In this case, the scope of work to be outsourced needs to be optimized based on lessons learnt from the TEPCO NPP accident.
  - v. In selecting nuclear disaster prevention workers, etc., the employers should show work conditions of the exceptional emergency works and conclude a labor contract by mutual agreement on the conditions. In conducting the emergency works in the future, the employers should consider workers' intention as much as possible in arrangement of the actual works.
- b. Those related to paragraph 2 and paragraph 3
- i. Paragraph 2 establishes that employers should ensure the effective dose which workers

receive during the time when they are engaged in exceptional emergency works does not exceed the exceptional emergency dose limit.

- ii. Paragraph 3 establishes that, from the viewpoint of optimization of the exposure dose in the ICRP recommendation “all exposures should be kept as low as reasonably practical taking social and economic factors into consideration”, the employers should lessen chances for radiation exposure according to the situation of the accident concerning exceptional emergency works as much as possible. Specifically, actions such as appropriate radiation control, exposure dose measurements (including internal dose measurement) and proper wearing of personal protective equipment at the time of exceptional emergency works should be required, including in-advance preparations of dosimeters and personal protective equipment.

(3) Exposure dose measurement, check and recording of exposure dose measurement results, etc.

(Details related to Article 8 and Article 9)

- a. Article 8 establishes that, based on the lessons learnt from the fact that the internal exposures by short half-lived nuclides such as iodine-131 could not be measured appropriately in the TEPCO NPP accident, the frequency of internal exposure measurement should be set as once in less than one month for male workers or female workers diagnosed as having no possibility to become pregnant who are engaged in emergency works. It should be noted that the internal exposure measurement should be conducted at the highest possible frequency depending on the conditions of the accident since short-lived nuclides include those with a half-life of tens of hours such as iodine-133.
- b. Article 9 establishes that employers should calculate and record the total of the effective dose (containing the exposure dose by internal exposure) of male workers or female workers diagnosed as having no possibility to become pregnant engaged in emergency works, in every month, every year and every five years, and keep these records for 30 years, pursuant to Article 8.

2. Special education (Those related to Section 6-2 and the Special Education Rule)

(1) Special education for exceptional emergency works (Details related to Article 52-9)

- a. This provision aims at reducing the exposure dose during the works by providing special education through lectures and practices required for implementing actions specified in the Ionizing Radiation Ordinance such as details of works and handling of personal protective equipment when requiring the nuclear disaster prevention workers, etc. engage in the exceptional emergency works.
- b. Although paragraph 1 obligates the employers to provide special education when requiring

nuclear disaster prevention workers, etc. engage in exceptional emergency works, the employers need to provide special education beforehand to nuclear disaster prevention workers, etc. since it is difficult to provide special education as a matter of fact after the accident occurred.

- c. In order to maintain the workers' skills and knowledge concerning exceptional emergency works, employers should provide nuclear disaster prevention workers, etc. actually engaged in exceptional emergency works with safety and health education regularly once a year for the subjects of practical skills, pursuant to the guideline on the safety and health education for those who have actually taken the post involving dangerous or harmful works (Guidelines for Safety and Health Education, Notification No. 1 of 1988, 22 May 1988). In order to update the workers' knowledge concerning the exceptional emergency works, when changes arise after providing the education about the subjects of the lectures, employers should provide them with safety and health education about the relevant changed contents at any time. It should be noted that it will be appropriate, to take advantage of opportunities such as nuclear emergency training sessions, to provide periodical or temporary education for nuclear disaster prevention workers, etc. who have not been actually engaged in exceptional emergency works such as those who received the special education concerning exceptional emergency works beforehand.
- d. Lectures should be provided for subjects listed in paragraph 1, items 1 to 4 and practices should be provided for subjects listed in items 5 and 6 of the same paragraph. Articles 2 and 3 in the Special Education Rule should be referred to regarding the scope and hours of each.

(2) Special education for exceptional emergency works (Details related to the Special Education Rule)

- a. The statement in Article 2, "methods of the works for coping with the severe accident etc." shall include those for coping with the major accident etc. which were assumed in the examination of conformity to new criteria for nuclear reactor facilities.
- b. The statement in Article 2, "severe accident etc., and examples of the works for coping with them" shall include in-advance preparations matters etc. based on lessons learnt from the TEPCO NPP accident as described in Labour Standards Bureau Notification No. 08310-1 of 10 August 2012.
- c. The statement in Article 2, "facilities and equipment that have a function to be used for coping with a severe accident, etc." shall include "facilities and equipment" specified in Article 2, paragraph 2, item 11 of the NRA Ordinance on Standards for the Location, Structure, and Equipment of Commercial Power Reactors (NRA Ordinance No. 5 of 2013, hereinafter referred to as "the Commercial Reactor Establishment Permit Ordinance" and



Article 1, paragraph 2, item 6 of the NRA Ordinance on Standards for the Location, Structure and Equipment of Reprocessing Facilities (NRA Ordinance No. 27 of 2013, hereinafter referred to as "the Reprocessing Permit Ordinance" as well as "facilities and equipment to be used to cope with severe accidents" specified in Article 2, paragraph 2, item 14 of the Commercial Reactor Establishment Permit Ordinance and Article 1, paragraph 2, item 7 of the Reprocessing Permit Ordinance.

- d. Details of the education specified in Articles 2 and 3 shall be focused on details of the works among those exceptional emergency works expected to be conducted and the facilities or equipment to be used in them, considering job assignments made for the nuclear disaster prevention workers, etc.
- e. Since the special education concerning exceptional emergency works is that for workers who have received the special education specified in Article 52-6 or 52-7, the subjects or scopes specified in Article 2 or 3 may be overlapped partially with those of the special education specified in Article 52-6 or 52-7 of the Ionizing Radiation Ordinance. However, in order to provide the special education concerning exceptional emergency works without fail, special education concerning the exceptional emergency works should be provided even to workers that have received the special education specified in Article 52-6 or 52-7 of the Ionizing Radiation Ordinance without omitting any subject or scope in principle.

### 3. Emergency actions (Those related to Section 5 of the Ionizing Radiation Ordinance)

#### (1) Diagnosis, etc. (Details related to Article 44)

- a. The description in paragraph 1, "check or treatment by a medical doctor" shall be applied when it corresponds to paragraph 1, item 2 during the emergency works. When the exposure dose does not exceed the emergency dose limit specified in Article 7 or 7-2 of the Ionizing Radiation Ordinance (the exceptional emergency dose limit in the case where the said exceptional emergency dose limit is set), the medical check stipulated in this article can be conducted together with the medical interview in the radiological medical examination as specified in Article 56-2 of the Ionizing Radiation Ordinance. It should be noted that, in the case where treatment by a medical doctor is required as a result of the medical examination, employers must ensure the workers have the required treatment promptly.
- b. In the case corresponding to paragraph 1, item 2 and the exposure dose exceeds the emergency dose limit (the exceptional emergency dose limit in the case where the said exceptional emergency dose limit is set), since there is a possibility that the exposure dose that may cause significant acute hazards by radiation (from 300 to 400 mSv) might be received for a short time, the examination of chromosomal abnormality, examination of white blood cell count and differential count, examination of red blood cell count, and

examination of hemoglobin content or hematocrit value shall be carried out, and the worker shall receive a medical examination by a doctor immediately. The frequencies shall be once immediately after the exposure, and once in every 6 or 12 hours over several days immediately after the exposure for other inspections. It should be noted that, in the case where treatment by a medical doctor is required as a result of the medical examination, employers must ensure the workers have the required treatment promptly.

#### 4. Medical examination (Those related to Section 8 of the Ionizing Radiation Ordinance)

##### (1) Medical examination (Details related to Article 56-2)

- a. The provision in paragraph 1 specifies the medical examination items which need to be conducted within the period in the case where emergency works were conducted, considering lessons learnt from the fact that TEPCO was instructed to conduct temporary medical examination in the TEPCO NPP accident pursuant to the provision in Article 66, paragraph 4 of the Industrial Safety and Health Act (Act No. 57 of 1972). It should be noted that the items for the medical examination at the time of termination of the emergency works or the time of transfer to other works are specified in consideration of the health care provided at the time of being engaged in other radiation works after terminating the employment etc.
- b. The inspection items specified in each item of paragraph 1 are those specified in each item of Article 56, paragraph 1 plus the examination of the thyroid stimulating hormone specified in item 4 to check for acute hazards by radiation, considering that exposure at a high dose by iodine-131 was observed for the thyroid during the TEPCO NPP accident. In addition, the possible health risks in case of longer engagement in emergency work include lack of sleep, reduced appetite, accumulated fatigue, and heat stroke. To examine those risks, subjective and objective symptoms mentioned in item 1 shall be checked.
- c. The provision in paragraph 2 specifies that, considering that significant acute radiation hazards are unlikely to occur provided that the exposure dose is controlled within the dose limit as specified in Article 7 or 7-2, examinations shown in paragraph 1, item 2 to 6 may be omitted when a doctor recognizes that these will not be required. It should be noted that checking for the existence of subjective and objective symptoms as specified in paragraph 1, item 1 cannot be omitted when examining the health risks in the case of long-term emergency works and that the medical examination to be provided after the termination of the employment cannot be omitted in consideration of the health care provided at the time of being engaged in other radiation works.

##### (2) Medical examination (Details related to Article 56-3)

This provision specifies that, considering that the items of the medical examination in Article

56-2, paragraph 1 include the items of the medical examination specified in Article 56, paragraph 1, if the workers received the health examination specified in Article 56, paragraph 1 on the day when said workers are transferred to other works or the medical examination specified in Article 56-2 within one month before the regular medical examination, the medical examination specified in Article 56, paragraph 1 can be recognized to have been received.

(3) Hearing from a doctor about the results of the medical examination (Details related to Article 57-2)

This provision specifies that, considering that, hearing opinions from a doctor about the results of the medical examination by those receiving the emergency ionizing radiation medical examination (except those conducted at the time of termination of their employment) as specified in Article 56, paragraph 2 is conducted once within one month after the said medical examination, hearing from a doctor about results of the said medical examination must be conducted promptly after the said medical examination.

(4) Notification of the results of the medical examination (Details related to Article 57-3)

The results of the emergency ionizing radiation medical examination as specified in Article 56-2 need to be provided to workers together with the medical examination results at the time of termination of their employment. However, after the said workers have terminated their employment, it may also be assumed that they were notified of these medical examination results at the time of termination. Therefore paragraph 2 clarifies the need to notify persons who were workers.

(5) Actions based on the results of the medical examination (Details related to Article 59)

Among the emergency ionizing radiation medical examinations as specified in Article 56-2, paragraph 2, for those provided at the time of termination of their employment, follow up actions based on the results cannot be assumed for persons who were workers. Therefore the actions were removed from the provision.

5. Submission of records concerning workers who were engaged in designated emergency works (Those related to Section 9)

(1) Submission of records concerning workers who were engaged in designated emergency works (Details related to Article 59-2)

a. For workers presently engaged in or having been engaged in emergency works or exceptional emergency works, in order to register the results of the medical examination of the said workers, and their doses, etc. into the database which the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare has and utilizes for their long-term health care, this provision obligates employers to

submit the results of medical examinations, records of exposure dose, etc. to the Minister of Health, Labour and Welfare.

- b. For workers who were engaged in or have been engaged in exceptional emergency works, the long-term health care and exposure dose control should be implemented appropriately in accordance with the guideline on maintaining and improving health of emergency workers in nuclear facilities etc. (Notification No. 5 Guideline on Maintaining and Improving Health of Emergency Workers at TEPCO Fukushima Daiichi NPP, 11 October 2011).

(2) Reporting of emergency works implementation status (Details related to Article 59-3)

- a. This provision obligates employers to report periodically the numbers, etc. of workers who are engaged in emergency works to the Minister of Health, Labour and Welfare by exposure dose categories in order to understand the exposure situation of emergency workers correctly.
- b. The reporting specified in item 1 is, from the viewpoint of promptly reporting the exposure status, limited to those who exceeded the dose limit for regular works of 50 mSv as the effective dose by external exposure once in ten days as specified in Article 4.
- c. The provision in item 2 obligates employers to conduct the internal exposure measurement once within a month as well as report the numbers of workers that fall under each category of effective doses by internal and external combined exposure for all emergency workers.

6. Others

(1) Enforcement date, etc.

- a. The revised ministerial ordinance shall be enforced on 1 April 2016 (Those related to Revised Ministerial Ordinance Supplementary Provision Article 1)
- b. The Special Educational Rule shall be applied from 1 April 2016.
- c. The Event Notification shall be applied from 1 April 2016.

(2) Transitional measures

- a. Transitional measures for forms (Revised Ministerial Ordinance Supplementary Provision Articles 2 and 3)

Appropriate transitional measures for forms shall be set in association with the revision of Form Nos. 2 and 3 of the Ionizing Radiation Ordinance.

- b. Transitional measures concerning reporting of emergency work implementation status (Revised Ministerial Ordinance Supplementary Provision Article 4)

For employers who require workers to be actually engaged in emergency works in the case of enforcement of the ministerial ordinance, the timing of submitting the first emergency work implementation status report after the enforcement of the Revised Ordinance as specified in

Article 59-3 of the Ionizing Radiation Ordinance shall be 15 April 2016 for Form No. 1 of the same article, and 30 April 2016 for the Form No. 2 of the same article.

(3) Partial revision of related ordinances

a. Partial revision of the Ordinance on Industrial Safety and Health (Those related to the Supplementary Provision Article 4)

By revising Article 36 of the Ordinance on Industrial Safety and Health (Ordinance of the Ministry of Labour No. 32 of 1972), works related to exceptional emergency works were added to works that require special education as specified in Article 59, paragraph 3 of the Industrial Safety and Health Act.

b. Others

Relevant ministerial ordinances as listed below are those which were revised in association with the partial revision of the Ionizing Radiation Ordinance.

- (i) Industrial Safety and Health Act and ministerial ordinances related to registration and designation of orders based on the Act (Ordinance of the Ministry of Labour No. 44 of 1972)
- (ii) Enforcement Ordinance of the Act for Securing the Proper Operation of Worker Dispatching Undertakings and Improved Working Conditions for Dispatched Workers (Ordinance of the Ministry of Labour No. 20 of 1986)
- (iii) Ministerial ordinance on the use of information and telecommunications technology in the preservation of documents etc. by private companies pursuant to provisions in laws and regulations over which the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare has jurisdiction (Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare Ordinance No. 44 of 2005)
- (iv) Ordinance on Prevention of Ionizing Radiation Hazards at Works to Decontaminate Soil and Wastes Contaminated by Radioactive Materials Resulting from the Great East Japan Earthquake and Related Works (Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare Ordinance No. 152 of 2011)