



**HAL**  
open science

## **An updated strategic research agenda for the integration of radioecology in the european radiation protection research**

Rodolphe Gilbin, Thuro Arnold, Nicholas Beresford, C. Berthomieu, Justin Brown, Govert de With, Nele Horemans, Maria José Madruga, Olivier Masson, Mohammed Merroun, et al.

### ► To cite this version:

Rodolphe Gilbin, Thuro Arnold, Nicholas Beresford, C. Berthomieu, Justin Brown, et al.. An updated strategic research agenda for the integration of radioecology in the european radiation protection research. *Journal of Environmental Radioactivity*, 2021, 237 (237), pp.106697. 10.1016/j.jenvrad.2021.106697 . hal-03431478

**HAL Id: hal-03431478**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03431478>**

Submitted on 10 Jan 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

# Journal of Environmental Radioactivity

## An updated strategic research agenda for the integration of radioecology in the European radiation protection research

--Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	
<b>Article Type:</b>	Letter to the Editor
<b>Keywords:</b>	Strategic Research Agenda for radioecology; Environmental exposure to radionuclides; Radiation protection of the environment; Integration of radiation protection research; Education and Training; Infrastructures
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	Rodolphe Gilbin IRSN Saint-Paul-Les-Durance Cedex, France
<b>First Author:</b>	Rodolphe Gilbin
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Rodolphe Gilbin Nicholas Beresford Catherine Berthomieu Justin Brown Govert de With Nele Horemans Maria José Madruga Olivier Massion Mohammed Merroun Boguslav Michalik Maarit Muikku Pedro Nogueira Simon O'Toole Jelena Mrdakovic Popic Almudena Real Suzanne Sachs Brit Salbu Karolina Stark Martin Steiner Lieve Sweeck Thuro Arnold Hildegard Vandenhove Miquel Vidal Jordi Vives i Battle
<b>Suggested Reviewers:</b>	Carl-Magnus Larsson CEO, Australian Radiation Laboratory - ARL: Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency carl-magnus.larsson@arpansa.gov.au CEO at the Australian Radiation Laboratory member of the ICRP

	<p>Thierry Schneider  CEPN  thierry.schneider@cepn.asso.fr  CEPN, chair of ICRP committee 4</p>
	<p>Andrzej Wojcik  Stockholm University: Stockholms Universitet  andrzej.wojcik@su.se  Centre for Radiation Protection Research, Stockholm University, Sweden  MELODI chair</p>
	<p>Domenico Rosetti  European Commission  Domenico.Rossetti-Di-Valdalbero@ec.europa.eu  Deputy-Head of Euratom Research (RTD.C.4)</p>
<p><b>Opposed Reviewers:</b></p>	

1 **An updated strategic research agenda for the**  
2 **integration of radioecology in the European**  
3 **radiation protection research**

4 **AUTHORS**

5 (FIRST AUTHOR IS THE CORRESPONDING AUTHOR (\*); OTHER AUTHORS ARE LISTED FOLLOWING AN  
6 ALPHABETIC ORDER)

7 **RODOLPHE GILBIN\***, **THURO ARNOLD**, **NICHOLAS A. BERESFORD**, **CATHERINE**  
8 **BERTHOMIEU**, **JUSTIN E. BROWN**, **GOVERT DE WITH**, **NELE HOREMANS**, **MARIA JOSÉ**  
9 **MADRUGA**, **OLIVIER MASSON**, **MOHAMMED MERROUN**, **BOGUSLAV MICHALIK**, **MAARIT**  
10 **MUIKKU**, **SIMON O'TOOLE**, **JELENA MRDAKOVIC POPIC**, **PEDRO NOGUEIRA**, **ALMUDENA**  
11 **REAL**, **SUSANNE SACHS**, **BRIT SALBU**, **KAROLINA STARK**, **MARTIN STEINER**, **LIEVE**  
12 **SWEECK**, **HILDEGARDE VANDENHOVE**, **MIQUEL VIDAL**, **JORDI VIVES I BATLLE**

13

# **An updated strategic research agenda for the integration of radioecology in the European radiation protection research**

## **Abstract**

The ALLIANCE Strategic Research Agenda (SRA) for radioecology is a living document that defines a long-term vision (20 years) of the needs for, and implementation of, research in radioecology in Europe. The initial SRA, published in 2012, included consultation with a wide range of stakeholders (Hinton et al., 2013). This revised version is an update of the research strategy for identified research challenges, and includes a strategy to maintain and develop the associated required capacities for workforce (education and training) and research infrastructures and capabilities. Beyond radioecology, this SRA update constitutes a contribution to the implementation of a Joint Roadmap for radiation protection research in Europe (CONCERT, 2019a). This roadmap, established under the H2020 European Joint Programme CONCERT, provides a common and shared vision for radiation protection research, priority areas and strategic objectives for collaboration within a European radiation protection research programme to 2030 and beyond. Considering the advances made since the first SRA, this updated version presents research challenges and priorities including identified scientific issues that, when successfully resolved, have the potential to impact substantially and strengthen the system and/or practice of the overall radiation protection (game changers) in radioecology with regard to their integration into the global vision of European research in radiation protection. An additional aim of this paper is to encourage contribution from research communities, end users, decision makers and other stakeholders in the evaluation, further advancement and accomplishment of the identified priorities.

## **KEYWORDS**

- **Strategic Research Agenda for radioecology**
- **Environmental exposure to radionuclides**
- **Radiation protection of the environment**
- **Integration of radiation protection research**
- **Education and Training**
- **Infrastructures**

## 30 **Research in radioecology: societal and technological** 31 **drivers**

32 Radioecology is a branch of environmental science devoted to studying the fate of radioactive substances in the  
33 environment, the environmental exposure of humans and wildlife populations, and their consequences on  
34 ecosystems. Its field of research is broad and multidisciplinary in nature, and embraces basic science to form the  
35 foundation for environmental risk assessment and management. This includes the risks to human health, ecosystem  
36 health and protection of biodiversity, and the development of prevention and mitigation strategies to reduce  
37 exposure. Radioecology emerged as a science in the late 1940s and 50s in response to concerns about releases  
38 from nuclear weapons production facilities and radioactive fallout from the use and testing of nuclear weapons. In  
39 subsequent decades radioecology further developed along with the increased use of nuclear power for civil  
40 purposes. Following the Chernobyl accident in 1986 European research in radioecology expanded, but was faced  
41 with a substantial decrease in funding at the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The accident at the Fukushima Daichi nuclear  
42 power plant, in 2011, highlighted the limitations in experimental data and in the robustness of models to predict  
43 the transfer of radionuclides in the environment and hence the human food chain (Raskob et al. 2018; Beresford  
44 et al. 2020a) as well as the scarcity of qualified personnel.

45 Technological developments in the nuclear and non-nuclear fields may impact on the exposure of ecosystems,  
46 wildlife and humans in particular. These include for example developments in decommissioning activities and  
47 long-term nuclear waste disposal, expansion of nuclear power in many countries (as part of the low-carbon  
48 transformation of economies worldwide). They also include hazards associated with naturally occurring  
49 radioactive materials (NORM) e.g. from mining and process industries, and the increasing use of medical  
50 radioisotopes. Simultaneously, there is a growing awareness among the public on the importance of global quality  
51 of the environment and its biodiversity. Furthermore, human and ecosystem health are increasingly recognised as  
52 strongly interconnected and need to be in balance with economic and social activities (United Nations, 2015).  
53 Research in radioecology is needed not only as a goal in itself, but also to maintain credibility in human health and  
54 ecological risk assessment and ensure public trust. The main drivers that demand for continued and innovative  
55 research in radioecology can be summarised in following three points.

- 56
- 57 *1. To provide independent scientific evidence and practical assessments to address public concerns about*  
58 *radiological hazards and the interconnection between human health and the environment.*

59 The need for scientific evidence stems from the fact that present models used in risk assessment are still subject to  
60 major uncertainties and sometimes even lack predictive power to demonstrate the (long-term) impact from major  
61 radiological events (Garnier-Laplace et al., 2018). The divergent scientific opinions on the effects on human health  
62 and wildlife in the Chernobyl exclusion zone are a typical example on this issue and do little good to public  
63 confidence (Beresford et al., 2020b). Further to this, recent scientific advancements in areas such as epigenetic  
64 changes, bystander effects, and genomic instability and population consequences from multigenerational  
65 exposures are also relevant in radioecology (Mothersill et al., 2018; Horemans et al., 2019). Radioecology must  
66 capitalise on the rapid advances in these scientific areas to help develop mechanistic explanations and early

67 warning biomarkers. Finally, addressing public concerns requires more realistic, site-specific dose assessment  
68 tailored to the exposure conditions of the public or wildlife that is at risk. This implies further advancement of  
69 existing assessment models but also the need to improve risk communication among stakeholders on uncertainties.

70 *2. To support evolution of policy making, international guidance and harmonisation.*

71 A growing demand from the public for the protection and well-being of wildlife, ecosystems and the environment  
72 as a whole is resulting in regulations directed to the protection of the environment and everything within. This also  
73 includes the legislative framework for radiation protection, which is moving towards the need to demonstrate the  
74 protection of the environment explicitly as opposed to an assumption of protection (ICRP, 2007). For example,  
75 this is seen in the latest version of the international Basic Safety Standards (BSS) (IAEA, 2011). ICRP's  
76 rearrangement of its Committees in 2017 to address protection of people and the environment in an integrated  
77 manner is a further indication on the importance in environmental protection at the highest scientific level. Such  
78 developments must be complemented with methods and practices to demonstrate compliance with regulation and  
79 international guidelines. Radioecology research is needed to contribute to such a framework of methods and  
80 practices, to enable a mature regulatory framework where compliance can be demonstrated in an unambiguous  
81 manner.

82 *3. To support new technological developments in the nuclear field, NORM and nuclear medicine.*

83 For many of the developments involving radionuclide releases in the environment (e.g. decommissioning and  
84 nuclear waste, NORM disposal, legacy sites management, and medical uses of radioisotopes), shortcomings are  
85 prominently linked with the radionuclides concerned, some specific exposure conditions, transport and uptake  
86 routes. To address these shortcomings dedicated radioecology research is necessary.

87

88 Within this context, prioritisation of research efforts towards answers, methods and solutions that will be of  
89 greatest utility to society is required. Addressing and prioritising radioecological research challenges must be  
90 reinforced through a strong multidisciplinary coordination with scientific disciplines that address environmental  
91 hazards (ecotoxicology, ecology, climate sciences in the context of global change and environmental sciences in  
92 general), wider radiation protection issues (radiochemistry, radiobiology, radiotoxicology, dosimetry, nuclear and  
93 radiological emergency preparedness and response), and also with social and human sciences (sociology,  
94 philosophy, economics, ethics and communication).

## 95 **Changing the game: research in radioecology to** 96 **impact and strengthen radiation protection**

97 The H2020 European Joint Programme CONCERT recently provided the opportunity to contribute to the  
98 integration of research across radiation protection, through the building of a joint European research roadmap  
99 (CONCERT, 2019a). Six European radiation protection research platforms contributed to this roadmap: MELODI<sup>1</sup>  
100 - health risks from low-dose ionising radiation exposure; ALLIANCE<sup>2</sup> - radioecology; NERIS<sup>3</sup> - nuclear and  
101 radiological emergency preparedness and response; EURADOS<sup>4</sup> - radiation dosimetry; EURAMED<sup>5</sup> - medical  
102 radiation protection; SHARE<sup>6</sup> - social sciences and humanities in ionising radiation research.

103 The Joint Roadmap defines priority areas and strategic objectives for collaboration and provides a vision for a  
104 European radiation protection research programme to 2030 and beyond (CONCERT, 2019a). It presents joint  
105 research challenges across the radiation protection platforms, which are relevant from both societal and radiation  
106 protection perspectives, in the context of existing and potential exposure scenarios.

107 The identified joint research challenges (CONCERT, 2019a) cover many disciplines, requiring collaboration of  
108 different research communities in addressing targeted **‘Game Changers’, defined as research issues that, when**  
109 **successfully resolved, have the potential to impact substantially and strengthen the system and/or practice**  
110 **of radiation protection for humans and/or the environment** through: 1) significantly improving the scientific  
111 evidence base, 2) developing principles and recommendations, 3) developing standards based on  
112 recommendations, and 4) improving practices.

113 Here we summarise how the updated ALLIANCE SRA for radioecology links with the joint research Challenges  
114 and ‘Game Changers’ for overall radiation protection in Europe, as illustrated in **Figure 1**. The SRA responds to  
115 the question: ‘What topics, if critically addressed over the next 20 years, would significantly advance  
116 radioecology?’.

117 The SRA for radioecology presents a strategic vision of what research can achieve in the future through a directed  
118 effort and collaboration. Its development considers the state of the art in radioecology research and where  
119 appropriate allied sciences, stakeholder views, identified research needs and data gaps. The development of the  
120 SRA is driven by the need for improvement of mechanistic understanding across radioecological research, with a  
121 goal of improving research efficiency. By these means, we may more rapidly advance the science such that we  
122 can provide fit-for-purpose impact/risk assessments for human and wildlife encompassing any relevant exposure  
123 situation (i.e., planned, existing and emergency as defined by the International Commission on Radiological  
124 Protection – ICRP, 2007).

---

<sup>1</sup> Multidisciplinary European Low Dose Initiative - <https://www.melodi-online.eu>

<sup>2</sup> European Radioecology Alliance - <https://www.er-alliance.eu>

<sup>3</sup> European Platform on Preparedness for Nuclear & Radiological Emergency Response & Recovery - <https://www.eu-neris.net>

<sup>4</sup> European Radiation Dosimetry Group - <https://eurados.sckcen.be/>

<sup>5</sup> European Alliance for Medical Radiation Protection Research - <https://www.euramed.eu/>

<sup>6</sup> Social Sciences and Humanities in Radiation Research - <https://www.ssh-share.eu/>

125 The SRA has three research Challenges which prioritise the major objectives that radioecology should complete  
126 and provides the key research lines deemed necessary to accomplish these. The Challenges refer to the three  
127 interlinked steps of radiological environmental impact and risk assessments:

- 128 i. the determination of the exposure of humans and wildlife to radioactive substances (Challenge One);
- 129 ii. the determination of ecological effects under realistic exposure conditions (Challenge Two);
- 130 iii. the characterisation of the risk with its associated uncertainties, including the evaluation of risk  
131 management options for both humans and wildlife (Challenge Three).

132 Implementation of the SRA, and the future of radioecology, relies upon adequate research infrastructures and  
133 capabilities (qualified personnel and financial support for the maintenance and development of observatory sites,  
134 facilities, equipment, methods, databases and models), and our ability to attract, recruit and retain new talents to  
135 the discipline. The two final challenges within the SRA, complementary to the research ones, present a strategic  
136 vision for Education & Training (E&T) and Infrastructures & Capabilities in radioecology. Implementation of the  
137 E&T aspects of our SRA will also ensure the qualification of a continued group of professionals who have the  
138 skills to meet the future needs of society, regulators, industry and other stakeholders.

## **Scientific Challenge One: To Predict Human and Wildlife Exposure in a Robust Way by Quantifying Key Processes that Influence Radionuclide Transfers and Exposure**

One of the fundamentals of radioecology is to understand and be able to predict the transfer of radionuclides within environmental compartments, in order to estimate the exposure of humans and wildlife. This is needed for a wide range of sources, radionuclides and release scenarios, exposure situations and assessment contexts in atmospheric, terrestrial (agricultural, semi-natural, natural, urban) and aquatic (marine, freshwater, brackish water) environments.

The key processes that govern radionuclide behaviour and transfers through environmental compartments, and hence resulting exposures are to date not always well understood and in some instances, we lack data to parameterise models. This leads to models that have an incomplete, or potentially inaccurate, representation of the system or scenario under assessment. Whilst scientific knowledge is gradually being accrued through on-going improvements in our understanding of the underlying processes, the challenge faced by radioecologists is to incorporate this knowledge into models capable of representing the behaviour of the radionuclides in a more realistic way. By making models more realistic and process-based, we expect: (i) a significant reduction in model uncertainty; (ii) a better quantification of environmental variability; (iii) identification of the most influential parameters; and of parameters/factors contributing the most to the overall uncertainties, (iv) improved modelling tools capable of predicting radionuclide migration overtime and subsequent exposure to humans and wildlife under a variety of conditions, thereby enhancing predictive power and the robustness of both human and wildlife assessments of exposure to ionising radiation, and; (v) to be able to provide scientifically justified safety assessments for hypothetical future situations that need to take into account biogeochemical cycling of radionuclides over large time scales, changing climate conditions, and changing landscapes.

*Our strategic vision is that over the next 20 years radioecology will have achieved a thorough mechanistic conceptualisation of radionuclide transfer processes within major ecosystems (terrestrial, aquatic, urban) for a wide range of source terms, release and migration scenarios and exposure situations, where relevant and needed, and be able to accurately predict exposure to humans and wildlife by incorporating a more profound understanding of environmental processes and assure that fit-for-purpose process-based models based on scientific modelling of the radioecological mechanisms will have found a way into future assessment tools.*

170 The major aim under this Challenge is to develop mechanistic ‘process-based’ models of environmental  
171 radionuclide transfer and exposure to substantially improve human and wildlife dose and impact assessment by  
172 replacing/augmenting the empirical ratio-based approach which underpins most existing radioecological models.  
173 The priority research identified contributes to Game Changers **F.1** (robust prediction of food chain contamination),  
174 **F.2** (key processes influencing radionuclide behaviour), **G.1** (application of AI and big data) and **G.2** (further  
175 development of risk assessment for novel threats and accident scenarios) (Figure 1). Here we define process-based  
176 models as representing and simulating physiological and biogeochemical processes and their interactions with the  
177 abiotic environment by using functional relationships (after Larocque, 2016). Process-based models should be  
178 more generically applicable than ratio-based models as they should be parameterised in such a way as to take into  
179 account the important factors controlling radionuclide behaviour (e.g. Almahayni et al. 2019; Smith et al. 2000).

180 The SRA sets out a plan of how we will achieve this overall goal for Challenge One through the research lines  
181 described below.

182 *1) Identify and mathematically represent key processes that make significant contributions to the environmental*  
183 *transfers of radionuclides and resultant exposures of humans and wildlife*

184 Criteria will be developed to identify key processes that have a significant impact on radionuclide transfers in  
185 atmospheric, terrestrial, aquatic and built-up (e.g. urban) environments. Amongst the model features considered  
186 will be source-term-specific release scenarios, spatial and temporal dynamics in source term–environment  
187 interfaces, migration and cycling pathways in specific ecosystems, and radionuclide uptake, accumulation,  
188 redistribution and depuration by organisms. One of our goals is to identify the key processes, based on fundamental  
189 physical, biogeochemical and ecological principles that govern the transfer of radionuclides within major  
190 ecosystems types (e.g., agricultural, grasslands, coniferous forests, freshwater lakes and rivers, marine systems,  
191 urban environments) and for different contexts (e.g. nuclear or NORM related industrial environments, waste  
192 disposal environments).

193 *2) Acquire the data necessary for parameterisation of the key processes controlling the transfer of radionuclides*

194 Major data collection activities (such the IAEA handbooks of radioecological transfer parameters) have identified  
195 significant data gaps and limitations for many of the empirical parameters which underpin dose assessment models  
196 for humans and wildlife. The wide range of radionuclides, human foodstuff and species of wildlife means that,  
197 pragmatically, we may never be in the position of having empirical data for everything. There is a need to consider  
198 alternative approaches to address this lack of data for model parameterisation in the most robust manner possible  
199 (rather than relying on highly conservative judgment to avoid analysing the problem in more depth, as is often the  
200 case currently). Phylogeny (use of ‘common ancestry’ to categorise transfer data) and allometry (mass  
201 dependence) have been suggested as approaches to extrapolate data across species (Beresford et al. 2016)). Initial  
202 testing has shown that these techniques are promising but need further development (e.g. Beresford et al. 2020c).  
203 Bayesian statistics allow a low number of empirical observations to be supported by inferences from more  
204 comprehensive, larger datasets (Brown et al., 2016). The data for model parameterisation will require dedicated  
205 laboratory-based work and field studies, as well as on-going reviews of published information from the wider  
206 scientific community. Long-term data series obtained along routine surveillance programs can also provide  
207 information for transfer modelling (Brimo et al., 2019).

208 3) *Develop process-based transfer and exposure models that incorporate physical, chemical and biological*  
209 *interactions and associated kinetics, and enable predictions to be made spatially and temporally*

210 Process-based radioecological modelling reduces model conceptual uncertainty and can for instance reduce the  
211 uncertainty of model predictions, leading to a greater confidence in the results. For instance, assessments of the  
212 globally-circulating radionuclides  $^{14}\text{C}$  and  $^3\text{H}$  were greatly improved by including the influence of stable carbon,  
213 nitrogen and hydrogen cycles in radionuclide transfers (e.g., Schell et al., 1974). More recent examples are soil-  
214 plant system process-based models for modelling Cs and Sr uptake and the behaviour of radioactive particles  
215 (Beresford et al. 2020d). Process based models could be developed and applied to a wide range of sources  
216 encompassing existing (e.g. uranium mining and milling sites, NORM sites, post-accident situations), planned  
217 (e.g., new build, (geological) waste disposal, NORM involving industries, medical radioisotope and  
218 radiopharmaceuticals production facilities) and emergency (accident, incident, malevolent acts) exposure  
219 situations. The developed process-based models will begin to form part of the next generation of assessment tools  
220 and will contribute to addressing the need for an integrated approach to human and wildlife exposure assessment  
221 (Challenge Three).

222 There is a need to assess wildlife exposure more realistically by considering spatial as well as temporal variability  
223 in for instance, habitat utilisation, contaminant densities and interactions between organisms, all of which impact  
224 animal movement and hence exposure in heterogeneously contaminated environments. Recent studies in which  
225 GPS units and dosimeters were attached to free ranging animals show the potential impact of not taking these  
226 factors into account in assessments (Aramrun et al., 2019; Hinton et al., 2020). Advances in this area would have  
227 synergies with population modelling approaches (Alonzo et al., 2008; Vives i Batlle et al., 2012) being developed  
228 to better predict ecosystem level effects (links with Challenge Two). Wildlife dosimetry is also in need of some  
229 advancements (e.g. Stark et al., 2017). Current wildlife dosimetry models are simplistic and generally describe  
230 organisms as single ellipsoid forms that are homogeneous in composition and contamination. We should evaluate,  
231 in connection with Challenge Two on effects assessment, how important it is to incorporate radionuclide-specific  
232 heterogeneous distributions within the body and microdosimetry measurement to be able to account for differences  
233 in sensitivity among various organs and to better assess the dose-response relationships in particular situations for  
234 improved future predictions.

235 4) *Represent radionuclide transfer and exposure at a landscape or large geographic scale with an indication of*  
236 *the associated uncertainty*

237 The objective of this research line is to improve the current status by mapping radionuclide transfer and exposure  
238 at the European or global scale based on thematic maps, including spatial and temporal variability, using the newly  
239 developed process-based models. Since geographical distributions of radionuclides tend to be highly  
240 heterogeneous, a detailed understanding is needed of radionuclide transfer processes at multiple scales, such that  
241 transfer can be mapped at the landscape level. Within this research line we intend to design and implement a user-  
242 friendly and state-of-the-art interface, facilitating mapping of radionuclide transfer and exposure at a landscape  
243 level to identify sensitive environmental compartments/areas.

## 244 **Scientific Challenge Two: To Determine Ecological** 245 **Consequences under Realistic Exposure Conditions**

246 The regulatory requirements for the radiation protection of wildlife has shifted during the last two decades from  
247 an implicit to an explicit requirement to be able to demonstrate an appropriate radiological environmental  
248 protection. The IAEA's Fundamental Safety Principles (IAEA, 2006), the revised ICRP Recommendations (ICRP,  
249 2007), the revised versions of the international Basic Safety Standards (BSS) (IAEA, 2011) and to a lesser extent,  
250 the Euratom BSS (European Commission, 2013) promote developing guidance on wildlife radiological risk  
251 assessments. As a consequence of these, there is a stringent need for ecological protection criteria (dose criteria,  
252 benchmark or reference values) to optimize radiological protection of the environment in various environmental  
253 exposure situations (Real and Garnier-Laplace, 2020). However, contrary to the radiation protection of human  
254 populations, there is still no unified approach, nor consensus on the effects of radiation on the ecosystems. This  
255 prevents the emergence of consensual approaches and criteria applicable for radiation protection of the  
256 environment.

257 Over the last 20 years, international efforts have focused on data and methodologies to develop Ecological Risk  
258 Assessment (ERA) approaches to assess the potential impact of radiation on wildlife (e.g. the ERICA integrated  
259 approach (Larsson, 2008)). Whilst the developed ERA approaches are a substantial advancement in radioecology,  
260 a lack of sufficient knowledge prevents current ERA analyses from fully accounting for the realistic environmental  
261 conditions and radiation level that organisms are exposed to. Environmental relevant exposure scenarios for which  
262 knowledge gaps still exist include (i) different exposures from external irradiation and internal contamination, (ii)  
263 variable dose rates in time, (iii) dose deposit heterogeneity in space (from molecular targets up to individuals and  
264 ecosystems), (iv) multi-contaminant scenarios. Likewise, the knowledge of the effects of ionizing radiation on  
265 wildlife species is very partial, and does not allow a robust description of (i) species variations in radiation  
266 sensitivity as a function of their life-history traits and habitats, and (ii) radiation effects on communities and  
267 ecosystems features, as illustrated by the scientific disagreement on the actual extent of the radiation effects on  
268 ecosystems in contaminated areas (Strand et al., 2017; Beresford et al., 2020b). This controversy challenges  
269 published ecological protection criteria and guidance for radiological exposures (UNSCEAR, 2008; ICRP, 2008;  
270 Anderson et al., 2009; Garnier-Laplace et al., 2010; ICRP, 2014) as well as the whole radiation protection system.

271 Such knowledge gaps are still accounted for via extrapolation (e.g. inference of effects at one level from well-  
272 known effects at another level of biological organisation) and the use of assessment factors (or safety factors)  
273 which, while ensuring sufficient conservatism in low tier (screening level) risk assessments, increase the associated  
274 uncertainties (see Challenge Three).

275 *Our strategic vision is that over the next 20 years radioecology will have gained a thorough mechanistic*  
276 *understanding of the processes inducing radiation effects at different levels of biological organisation, including*  
277 *the consequences on ecosystem integrity, and be able to accurately describe and predict effects under the realistic*  
278 *conditions in which organisms are actually exposed.*

279 The major aim under this Challenge is to identify and link the key processes that drive the impact of radiation in  
280 individuals, populations and ecosystems level at environmental relevant exposure situations (including existing

281 contaminated areas). The expected benefit for the ecological risk assessment approaches will be to bring  
282 consensual ecological protection criteria applicable in various environmental exposure situations,

283 Studies will have to include an appropriate combination of laboratory studies and field studies, statistical data  
284 treatment and/or mathematical modelling. Common to all five research lines outlined below and in connection with  
285 challenge one, there is a crucial need for an improved dosimetric assessment to reduce uncertainty and enhance  
286 robustness of dose estimates. Additionally, radioecology will need to benefit from and collaborate across different  
287 disciplines such as ecology and ecotoxicology, stress ecology (Van Straalen, 2003) and the other European  
288 radiation protection research disciplines such as radiobiology (Mothersill et al., 2020). The priority research  
289 identified is directly linked to the Joint Roadmap issues on the health effects of radiation and the concept of dose  
290 (Figure 1) as identified here further.

291 *1. Mechanistically understand how processes link radiation induced effects in wildlife from molecular to*  
292 *individual levels of biological complexity*

293 As identified above considerable knowledge gaps on the effects induced by radiation still exist. This research line  
294 aims at identifying key molecular/cellular and individual characteristics driving radiation induced effects at the  
295 individual level, thereby taking advantage of advanced analytical methods from molecular biology for enhancing  
296 our mechanistic understanding of radiation induced responses at the sub-cellular levels and their consequences to  
297 individuals. This research line is shared between human and other organisms (Mothersill et al., 2018). Adverse  
298 Outcome Pathway (AOP) (Groh et al., 2015) and coupled Biokinetics/Dynamic Energy Budget (DEB) approaches  
299 can aid in understanding the metabolic mode of actions at the individual level (Kooijman, 2000). In the long term,  
300 the development of an integrative Systems Biology approach, through the organization of mechanistic  
301 toxicological data would help in better linkages of initial perturbation of a biological system by ionising radiation  
302 to the negative impacts at the individual or population level (Chauhan et al., 2021).

303 This research line shares many issues with the understanding and quantification of the human health effects of  
304 radiation exposure. It will also gain from the improvement of the concept of dose quantities, through refining our  
305 understanding of the physical interaction between radiation and matter (Game Changer **B.1**) and quantifying  
306 correlations between track structure and radiation damage (Game Changer **B.2**) for the dose calculation of  
307 inhomogeneous distribution of irradiation agents such as short-range  $\alpha$ - and  $\beta$ - emitters in the case of internal  
308 contamination. Progress in fundamental understanding of the concepts of dose quantities' (i.e. Game Changers **B.1**  
309 **and B.2**) would potentially help radioecology in the identification and validation of biomarkers of exposure and  
310 effects that are relevant for effects at the population level.

311 *2. Understand what causes intra-species and inter-species differences in radiosensitivity (i.e. among cell*  
312 *types, tissues, life stages, among contrasted life histories, influence of ecological characteristics including*  
313 *habitats, behaviour, feeding regime...)*

314 Even though the fundamental mechanisms that cause radiation damage seem universal, individual responses to  
315 radiation exposure vary tremendously, depending on radiation type and duration, cell type; life stage, species and  
316 level of biological organisation (UNSCEAR, 2008). This research line aims at highlighting the key drivers for  
317 intra- and inter-species radiosensitivity differences and will strongly benefit from and combined with the first one  
318 of this Challenge. This research line echoes the more general concern in radiation protection on the characterisation

319 and quantification of variation in response between population sub-groups/individuals because of genetic factors,  
320 sex, co-morbidities, life history and environmental factors (Game Changer A.3). Knowledge on the range of  
321 variation in susceptibility to radiation effects in populations would be informative for the development of the  
322 system of radiation protection.

323 *3. In a broader exposure context, understand the interactions between ionising radiation effects and other*  
324 *co-stressors*

325 A shared vision with the Joint Roadmap is that a better understanding of the mechanisms involved in the long-  
326 term effects of ionising radiation may be integrated with mechanisms resulting from the exposure to environmental  
327 stressors, including the combined exposures with stable toxic substances (Game Changer A.3). Studying a  
328 contaminant in isolation is necessary and provides critical information on the underlying mechanism resulting in  
329 detectable effects and can be used to test the specificity of biomarkers but cannot predict possible interactions  
330 among the many stressors to which organisms are exposed. In the longer term, an integrative protective system  
331 should cover realistic multi-exposure scenarios. Research on the impact of multi-exposure scenarios will gain  
332 considerable from the outcome of the first two research lines within this Challenge two as it is expected that this  
333 will make it possible to better mechanistically understand the combined effects of ionising radiation and other  
334 stressors.

335 More widely, new approaches adopted by environmental sciences in general, and ecotoxicology and ecology in  
336 particular, emphasise that to properly determine the effects from any contaminant we must address the realistic  
337 environmental conditions in which organisms are actually exposed. Realistic environmental conditions incorporate  
338 natural abiotic factors (e.g., climate change, temperature, flooding events, snow and ice, air quality) as well as  
339 biotic factors (e.g., physiological and life-history status of organisms; ecological processes such as competition,  
340 predation, and food availability). Adding this realism will aid in developing integrated exposure assessment  
341 approaches including the development of proper tools for the dose calculation for wildlife species that encompass  
342 the dynamics over time and space during the entire life cycle of organisms (links with Challenge One).

343 The last two research lines addressing this ALLIANCE Challenge are related to the understanding of radiation-  
344 related effects at ecologically-relevant levels:

345 *4. In a broader ecological context, understand the mechanisms of underlying multi-generational responses*  
346 *to long-term ecologically relevant exposures (e.g., maternal effects, hereditary effects, adaptive*  
347 *responses, genomic instability, and epigenetic processes).*

348 A strong connection with evolutionary ecology is needed to study adaptive responses and modulation of effects at  
349 a multi-generation scale following exposures to radiation. Understanding long-term effects of radiation on the  
350 phenotypic and genetic characteristics of the population is crucial to assess the risk of population extinction and  
351 its consequence for the maintenance of both genetic biodiversity and species biodiversity. This is true whatever  
352 the radiation type and exposure pathways. The mechanisms involved in organism responses to chronic radiation  
353 exposure, both within and between generations, are the subject of an active debate in the scientific literature (e.g.  
354 Boubriak et al., 2016; Horemans et al., 2019; Møller and Mousseau, 2016; Goussen et al 2015) and are still far from  
355 conclusive in particular when it comes to environmental relevant settings.

356 To support the understanding and prediction of the evolutionary response of populations chronically exposed to  
357 ionising radiation there is a need to (i) increase knowledge on key processes driving radiation-induced changes in  
358 genomic stability e.g. coming from changes DNA damage, mutations or changes in epigenetic marks; (ii)  
359 distinguish between effects of chronic exposure of populations such as those currently living in  
360 Chernobyl/Fukushima and residual impact of historical exposures on today's populations/ecosystems; (iii) identify  
361 key factors determining the vast variation in wildlife populations' sensitivity to radiation; and (iv) identify and  
362 validate biomarkers of exposure and effects that are relevant for effects at the population level.

363 5. *Understand how radiation effects combine in a broader ecological context at higher levels of biological*  
364 *organisation (trophic interactions, indirect effects at the community level, and consequences for*  
365 *ecosystem functioning)*

366 In radioecology, the importance of an ecosystem approach has been emphasised many times over the last decade.  
367 Several publications and international workshops have led to a number of recommendations and consensus  
368 statements (Bradshaw et al., 2014; Bréchnac et al., 2016; Mothersill et al., 2018, 2019; Haanes et al., 2020). In  
369 relation to these issues, resolving the controversy with regard to chronic exposure effects on wildlife reported in  
370 the Chernobyl and Fukushima exclusion zones is the priority Game Changer (Game Changer C.1). Resolving this  
371 controversy would have a significant impact on the confidence and credibility of radiation protection of the  
372 environment (e.g., robustness of 'no-effect' benchmark dose-rates).

373 If this research demonstrates that the ecosystem functioning processes are more sensitive to radiation than  
374 anticipated from current understanding of effects at the population level, then the robustness of current risk  
375 assessments that in effect rely only on interpretation of population-effect relevant data is highly questionable. On  
376 the other hand, if it is shown that the functional or structural redundancy of the ecosystems brings greater  
377 robustness against the effects of radiation, the conservatism of the current assessments would be confirmed. This  
378 is why the determination of the effects of radiation on ecosystem functioning (Game Changer C.2) is the long term  
379 priority for this research challenge. This involves using the combination of tailored experimental studies and  
380 population modelling to explore the potential population level consequences of ionising radiation in the context of  
381 ecological factors such as resource availability, migration, spatial heterogeneity and the impact of historical doses.  
382 One operational outcome, directly relevant to radioprotection of flora and fauna, will be to establish sound  
383 scientifically-based ecological protection criteria, thereby underpinning regulations and ensuring that ecosystems  
384 and their sub-organisational levels are protected.

## 385 **Scientific Challenge Three: To Improve Human and** 386 **Wildlife Protection by Integrating Radioecology**

387 The management of and the protection from risks that the presence of radionuclides in the environment may pose  
388 to human health and wildlife can range from the minimal through ascending levels of complexity and details.  
389 Although a significant amount of valuable knowledge exists for a wide range of exposure situations, it is  
390 fragmentary with respect to constituting an integrated strategy sufficient to deal with complex, dynamically  
391 changing conditions. Linked to this issue, the research outputs from the priorities described above for the exposure  
392 assessment (Challenge One) and effects analysis (Challenge Two) will need to be integrated within an efficient,  
393 balanced and adaptable assessment approach in planned, existing and emergency exposure situations. Beyond, the  
394 individual contaminant-medium-pathway paradigm is changing towards a more integrated view of the  
395 environment as a whole. Radioecology's position relative to this paradigm shift can be best advanced by embracing  
396 the concept of integration.

397 By constituting an integrated strategy for radioecology, we expect: (i) a comprehensive integration of the sources  
398 of uncertainty and variability into risk characterisation; (ii) consistent assessment for both humans and wildlife  
399 radiation protection; (iii) balanced risk assessment frameworks for ionising radiation in regard to the other threats;  
400 (iv) an optimised decision-making system for radiation protection, and; (v) a better alignment of research with the  
401 values, needs and expectations of society.

402 *Our strategic vision is that over the next 20 years radioecology will develop the scientific foundation for the holistic*  
403 *integration of human and wildlife protection, as well as their associated management systems.*

404 Therefore, radioecology's future success, broadly defined as meeting stakeholder needs, will require integration  
405 in several ways and from different perspectives:

- 406 1. *Integrate uncertainty and variability from source term characterisation, transfer modelling, exposure*  
407 *assessment, and effects analysis into risk characterisation*

408 Challenge One of the SRA identifies that radionuclide transfer and exposure have to be assessed at multiple  
409 spatial scales, while Challenge Two emphasises that effects have to be characterised not only at the individual  
410 level, but also at higher levels of biological organisation and the research outputs from both exposure  
411 assessment and effects analyses will need to be integrated. For wildlife, this means that any risk assessment  
412 at such integrated scales should simultaneously take into account: (i) variability of doses, depending on spatial  
413 variability of radionuclide transfers, as well as behavioural heterogeneity among exposed species, (ii) and  
414 variability in radiosensitivity among species, including gender- and life stage-dependencies. Variability of  
415 doses and behavioural heterogeneity over space and time should also be taken into account in human risk  
416 characterisation. Recent results from EJP CONCERT projects (TERRITORIES and CONFIDENCE) provide  
417 improved, structured information about parameter uncertainty, conceptual model uncertainty, scenario  
418 uncertainty as well as the role of variability together with analytical, probabilistic and Bayesian methodologies  
419 to quantify and (where possible) reduce these uncertainties. In light of integration, these new developments  
420 provide initial steps towards fulfilling the objectives of this research line. Nonetheless, the requirement still

421 remains to reduce uncertainties so that risks to humans and biota can be better quantified, whatever the situation  
422 (low, as well as high risk situations; planned, existing and emergency situations).

423 *2. Integrate humans and wildlife protection frameworks*

424 Over recent decades, the need was recognised for explicit demonstration of the protection of the environment from  
425 the effects of radioactive contaminants, which also resulted in changes to international policies (ICRP, 2007;  
426 European Commission, 2013; ICRP, 2014). Significant effort has been expended in that regard and a system of  
427 environmental protection is emerging, along with the tools required to estimate exposure, evaluate risk and  
428 demonstrate protection (Larsson, 2008; Brown et al., 2016; Bréchnac et al., 2016). However, in some important  
429 areas the methodologies for human and wildlife risk assessments still differ, e.g. the human dosimetric system  
430 accounts for the kinetics of radionuclides transfer within the body and differential sensitivity of organs to derive  
431 dose conversion factors whereas the environmental system does not. This may undermine credibility by its  
432 suggestion of inconsistencies causing difficulties for operators, stakeholders and regulators. A more integrated  
433 assessment and management (Game Changer **F.3**) – both in terms of the underlying philosophy and the practical  
434 application via appropriate tools and systems - will enable radiation protection to make more balanced decisions  
435 as it will take in the ‘whole-picture’ the assessments for both humans and wildlife. It also represents a more  
436 comprehensible approach when communicating to stakeholders (Game Changer **H.1**).

437 *3. Integrate the risk assessment frameworks for ionising radiation and chemicals*

438 Radionuclides and the associated risks posed to human health and wildlife populations typically occur as part of a  
439 complex suite of co-contaminants and other stressors that may act as confounding variables, as exemplified by  
440 waste streams from nuclear and non-nuclear industries, complex legacy contamination and releases as a result of  
441 accidents. There is a clear and long-standing gap in our understanding of contaminant mixtures that include  
442 radioactive materials. Radioecological research integrated with other disciplines (Game Changer **H.1**) and directed  
443 towards better understanding of mixture effects (Game Changer **A.3**), as well as adapted risk assessment methods  
444 (Game Changer **F.3**), will make it possible to determine whether radiation protection criteria are robust in a  
445 multiple contaminant context, and aligned with the values, needs and expectations of society.

446 *4. Provide a multi-criteria perspective including decision support systems for an optimised decision-making*

447 In dealing with a range of actual or potential exposure situations, a gradient of integrated management approaches  
448 based on multi-criteria decision analyses and the means of creatively implementing them are required (Game  
449 Changers **F.3** and **G.1**). The development of appropriate tools – Decision Support Systems (DSSs) – for best  
450 implementing such approaches must occur in tandem with the development of management objectives to ensure  
451 that maximum benefit is derived. The need for integrated, graded management approaches and the tools to  
452 implement them in handling the entire spectrum of possible effects of exposure and ensuring the productivity and  
453 societal benefit of impacted areas will be a primary driver for radioecological research in the coming decades  
454 (Game Changer **H.1**). The events at Fukushima in Japan exemplify these problems and the existing challenges.  
455 Intrinsicly bound to this need is the requirement for sound, fundamental and progressive science to underpin and  
456 derive maximum benefit from these efforts.

457 *5. Towards better interaction of radioecology with social sciences and humanities (SSH)*

458 Radioactive contamination can occur as a result of a range of different scenarios, disparate in character and often  
459 specific in their actual or potential impacts, but commonly of great concern to the public. Societal perception of  
460 the technical capacity and resources required to prevent, mitigate or remediate impacts and ensure recovery of any  
461 contaminated area after a release should take into account the disparities and specificities inherent in the exposure  
462 scenarios, as they play a significant role in the assessment of consequences – in terms of economic considerations  
463 and from a societal perspective. A continuum of effects includes societal concerns, varying degrees of economic  
464 impact or loss of societal benefit, administrative disruption, health impacts or loss of life and impact on ecosystem  
465 services. In addition to these impacts, the measures taken to address them may, in turn, incur societal and  
466 environmental side effects. This complex interplay has been well demonstrated in the aftermaths of both the  
467 Chernobyl and Fukushima accidents. Not spectacular examples, but noticeably more often present are observed in  
468 non-nuclear industries involved in NORM issues. Those examples and existing information have been taken into  
469 consideration when developing the Joint roadmap for a better alignment of research with the values, needs and  
470 expectations of society (Game Changer **H.1**). Such alignment should always lead to an evidence-based approach  
471 to policy making, and the scientific method should be upheld in all radioecology research; in order to be useful,  
472 science must be independent and impartial. In addition, it is essential to communicate the scientific basis to society  
473 in an understandable way to increase acceptance.

474

## 475 **Challenge for Education and Training: To Maintain** 476 **and Develop a Skilled Workforce in Europe and** 477 **Worldwide**

478 Scientific research in radioecology and implementation of that knowledge into the radiation protection of human  
479 health and wildlife populations requires scientists and workers with adequate competence and appropriate skills.  
480 Research-based education and training (E&T) depends on radioecology being included in university programmes  
481 and access to relevant infrastructures and capabilities. The EC EURAC project (2005) and the Radioecology  
482 Master Programme at the Norwegian University of Life Sciences (2007) have been important steps in promoting  
483 environmental radioactivity as an academic discipline under the Bologna Model<sup>7</sup>. The STAR project solicited  
484 stakeholder engagement (industry, regulators, academics, educators, etc.) in the development of a strategic plan  
485 for securing the long-term sustainability of education and training in radioecology (STAR, 2015).

486 To internationally secure the sustainability of E&T in radioecology, potential funding mechanisms were discussed  
487 by the ALLIANCE and other relevant organisations, to maintain the ‘E&T Platform’ initially developed by STAR  
488 (Bradshaw et al., 2013) in part these discussions are reflected in our action lines below.

489 *Our strategic vision is to secure and further develop a sustainable, integrated European training and education*  
490 *platform in radioecology that attracts top-level graduates and provides a workforce that has the necessary skills*  
491 *to meet future scientific, economic and societal needs within radioecology and other nuclear and environmental*  
492 *sciences.*

493 The following 11 action lines are important in achieving this vision:

- 494 1. Increasing student and teacher/researcher mobility requires sustainable funding mechanisms within  
495 radioecology. Actions such as travel grants for students and guest lecturer fees have a relatively low cost,  
496 but need to be maintained. The ALLIANCE fosters attendance of students at international radioecology  
497 conferences and placements in other laboratories by offering small supportive grants to students  
498 supervised by its members.
- 499 2. Inclusion of bespoke E&T work packages in EU (and other large) funded projects with wide reaching  
500 outreach activities to deliver training across all levels from the public to professionals and researchers.
- 501 3. Allocation of funding for PhD, post-doctoral or other early career researcher positions in EU (and other  
502 large) funded projects.
- 503 4. Exploring joint EU MSc opportunities through the Erasmus Mundus programme, as well as the inclusion  
504 of radioecology modules in BSc and MSc degrees originated from the European Universities Initiative,  
505 which are transnational alliances, funded by the Erasmus+ programme. This would enable students to  
506 obtain a degree by combining studies in several EU countries, forming transnational creating teams to  
507 address societal challenges, especially those related to Sustainable Development Goals. This would  
508 include mechanisms to increase the number of accredited courses in radioecology that are given by  
509 European universities as well as to stimulate integration within the ALLIANCE.

---

<sup>7</sup> European Higher Education Area and Bologna Process - <https://chea.info/>

- 510 5. Fostering links with other E&T programmes in nuclear and environmental sciences (e.g., radiation  
511 protection, emergency management, radiochemistry, ecology, ecotoxicology, environmental chemistry).  
512 Links with environmental sciences (e.g. via lectures on courses) should ideally be made at all educational  
513 levels, from schools to post graduate.
- 514 6. Providing courses and workshops for students, professionals and academics with both academic and  
515 vocational courses. This will ensure efficient use of resources and offer important networking  
516 opportunities for students, both across countries and disciplines, as well as with potential employees.
- 517 7. Increasing stakeholder and employer involvement in E&T through student placements, sponsored courses  
518 or university positions, and the development of focussed intensive courses designed to meet stakeholder  
519 needs. For professional training courses, particular focus will be placed on access to state-of-the-art  
520 methods and models.
- 521 8. Development of distance learning courses (including blended learning, i.e. a mix of self-learning and  
522 face-to-face sessions) (e.g. modelling, impact and risk assessment) to make courses more available to a  
523 wider audience.
- 524 9. Development of novel educational materials and approaches and promoting participation in science  
525 festivals to bring radioecology to the wider public.
- 526 10. Offering refresher courses and seminars at relevant regional and international conferences.
- 527 11. Organising international summer schools, field training courses and courses at specialised facilities.
- 528 Training and a well-defined communication strategy will also be required to ensure uptake of our scientific outputs.

## 529 **Challenge for Infrastructures and Capabilities: To** 530 **Maintain and Develop the Infrastructures Needed to** 531 **Support Radioecology**

532 Adequate infrastructures and capabilities are a necessary resource for state-of-the-art and excellence in  
533 radioecological research, as well as to support education and training activities in radioecology. Infrastructures  
534 and capabilities encompass the observatory sites, facilities, equipment, methods, databases and models, and also  
535 the expertise required to perform radioecological research.

536 The Radioecological Observatory sites were created as a focus for co-ordinated, hypothesis driven research to help  
537 answer scientific questions of the three scientific challenges of the SRA (Muikku et al. 2018; see  
538 <https://radioecology-exchange.org/content/radioecological-observatories>). They are considered as field  
539 laboratories where experiments can be conducted that support greater understanding of radioecological processes,  
540 enable model development, validations and improvement and forecasting of future radioecological conditions.  
541 Observatories are a unique tool for integration among different disciplines through common studies, shared data,  
542 and E&T activities. The concept has been successful, leading to broaden research collaborations and develop co-  
543 supervised PhD-studentships (e.g. Beresford et al., 2020b; Kaasik et al., 2020; Lecomte-Pradines et al., 2020).

544 In the recent past, several EURATOM funded projects have performed activities to drive the improvement of the  
545 awareness and use of radioecology infrastructures in Europe. The Network of Excellence on Radioecology STAR  
546 created an inventory of infrastructure, including databases and sample archives (STAR Deliverable 2.2). Within  
547 EJP-CONCERT efforts were subsequently made to increase visibility of radiation protection infrastructures  
548 including those of ALLIANCE members (see the AIR<sup>2</sup>D<sup>2</sup> database<sup>8</sup> and AIR<sup>2</sup> bulletin<sup>9</sup>).

549 The approaches used to study and evaluate the behaviour and impacts of radiation and radionuclides on the living  
550 world are changing. Consequently, the required infrastructures and capabilities are also changing. A robust long-  
551 term vision is essential to successfully and sustainably develop, construct and operate radioecological (and  
552 radiation protection) infrastructures and capabilities. A network of collaborating organisations will allow  
553 maximum benefit of advanced platforms within Europe or more widely.

554 *Our strategic vision for the next 20 years is that radioecology will develop a sustainable, integrated network of*  
555 *infrastructures and capacities, to best meet the needs of the radioecology community, both in research and in*  
556 *education and training activities.*

557 The following four action lines will need to be addressed to achieve the vision:

- 558 1. Identify the requirements for infrastructures and capacities and create the partnerships of excellence that  
559 bring together these required infrastructure and tools.
- 560 2. Maintain a web-based catalogue on physical infrastructures, e-infrastructures and capabilities to ensure  
561 an efficient and effective sustainable integration of resources and capacities at a European level and to  
562 show stakeholders the radioecology capabilities available.

---

<sup>8</sup> Access to Infrastructures for Radiation protection Research - <http://www.concert-infrastructures.eu/>

<sup>9</sup> Access to AIR<sup>2</sup> bulletin - [https://www.concert-h2020.eu/en/Concert\\_info/Access\\_Infrastructures/Bulletins](https://www.concert-h2020.eu/en/Concert_info/Access_Infrastructures/Bulletins)

- 563 3. Further development of the Radioecological Observatory sites (the Chernobyl Exclusion Zone, the  
564 Fukushima Exclusion Zone and NORM-impacted sites in Belgium and Poland are already established).
- 565 4. Promote the visibility and joint use of existing infrastructures. Encourage wider collaboration, not only  
566 in the field of radioecology, but also in the broader area of radiation protection and with other related  
567 disciplines, leading to more efficient use and further development of infrastructures.

## 568 **Conclusions**

569 The acquisition of new scientific knowledge and model optimization and development through research in  
570 radioecology is essential for protection of human health and wildlife populations from harmful effects of ionising  
571 radiation, responding to stakeholders concerns regarding the presence of radionuclides in the environment, and  
572 ensuring safe use of radioactivity from medicine to nuclear power and operation of NORM involving industries.  
573 Good science and robust models and associated assessments are important to society because over-estimation of  
574 exposures or effects could lead to unnecessary and costly restrictions or remediation; alternatively, under-  
575 estimation of risks may result in detrimental long-term effects for humans and wildlife.

576 Significant research is required to address the scientific challenges for radioecology presented above. The most  
577 effective way to provide timely and efficient solutions to these broad challenges is focused, hypothesis-driven  
578 research programmes with clear common goals and resources shared among the international radioecology  
579 community. For society to benefit significantly from radioecology in the future, a long-term, multidisciplinary and  
580 coordinated approach is needed that goes beyond national boundaries. Updating the SRA for radioecology in  
581 conjunction with the building of a Joint Roadmap for the European radiation protection research and identifying  
582 scientific game changers was a unique opportunity for a prioritisation of integrated research needs.

583 Importantly, the updated SRA for radioecology considers education and training, and the infrastructure required  
584 for our research. Sustaining knowledge and educating new scientists is crucial to the viability and sustainability of  
585 radioecology and is a concern expressed by stakeholders such as international organisations, regulatory bodies and  
586 industry.

587 It is our hope that the science-based SRA for radioecology which focusses and prioritises our collective efforts,  
588 will result in increased value and more rapid advancement of our understanding of environmental radioactivity,  
589 and in an improved ability to predict its effects on human health and the environment within reasonable  
590 uncertainties. We have evidence for future success from the joint activities conducted to address our initial SRA  
591 (e.g. Hinton et al., 2013; Garnier-Laplace et al., 2018). It is expected that further integration within the global  
592 radiation protection community and consideration and responsiveness to societal needs will maximise efficiency,  
593 completeness and societal relevance.

594 The SRA is a living document that will be updated on a regular basis, considering advances and developments that  
595 affect the research needs.

## 596 **Acknowledgements**

597 This Strategic Research Agenda was first developed under the European Commission's 7<sup>th</sup> Framework (STAR,  
598 Contract Number: Fission-2010-3.5.1-269672). Its 2019 update (CONCERT, 2019b), as well as the Joint Roadmap

599 for radiation protection (CONCERT, 2019a) was made possible partially through funding from the European Joint  
600 Programme for the Integration of Radiation Protection Research (EJP-CONCERT, Contract Number: H2020 –  
601 662287) with the participation of ALLIANCE ‘SRA working group’ members (some of whom were funded by  
602 their respective institution).

## References

- 603
- 604 Almahayni T., Beresford N.A., Crout N.M.J., Sweeck L. 2019. Fit-for purpose modelling of radiocaesium soil-to-  
605 plant transfer for nuclear emergencies: a review. *J. Environ. Radioact.* 201: 58–66.
- 606 Alonzo F., Hertel-Aas T., Gilek M., Gilbin R., Oughton D., Garnier-Laplace J. 2008. Modelling the propagation  
607 of effects of chronic exposure to ionizing radiation from individuals to populations. *J. Environ. Radioact.* 99:1464-  
608 1473.
- 609 Andersson P., Garnier-Laplace J., Beresford N.A., Coppelstone D., Howard B.J., Howe P., Oughton D.,  
610 Whitehouse P. 2009. Protection of the environment from ionising radiation in a regulatory context (protect):  
611 proposed numerical benchmark values. *J. Environ. Radioact.* 100:1100-1108.
- 612 Aramrun, K., Beresford, N.A., Skuterud, L., Hevroy, T.H., Drefvelin, J., Yurosko, C., Phruksarojanakun, P., Esoa,  
613 J., Yongprawat, M., Siegenthaler, A., Fawkes, R., Tumnoi, W., Wood, M.D. 2019. Measuring the radiation  
614 exposure of Norwegian reindeer under field conditions. *Sci. Tot. Environ.* 687:1337-1343.
- 615 Beresford N.A., Barnett C.L., Chaplow J., Lofts S., Wells C., Brown J.E., Hosseini A., Thørring H., Almahayni  
616 T., Sweeck L., Guillén J., Lind O.-C., Oughton D.H., Salbu B., Teien H.-C., Perez- Sánchez D., Real A. 2020a.  
617 Coping with uncertainties for improved modelling and decision making in nuclear emergencies. Key results of the  
618 CONFIDENCE European research project. *Radioprotection* 55:S101-S108.
- 619 Beresford N.A., Barnett C.L., Chaplow J., Lofts S., Wells C., Brown J.E., Hosseini A., Thørring H., Almahayni  
620 T., Sweeck L., Guillén J., Lind O.-C., Oughton D.H., Salbu B., Teien H.-C., Perez- Sánchez D., Real. A. 2020d.  
621 CONFIDENCE Overview of improvements in radioecological human food chain models and future needs.  
622 *Radioprotection* 55(HS1):S101–S108.
- 623 Beresford N.A., Barnett C.L., Guillén J. 2020c. Can models based on phylogeny be used to predict radionuclide  
624 activity concentrations in crops? *J. Environ. Radioact.* 218:106263.
- 625 Beresford N.A., Horemans N., Raines K.E., Wood M.D., Orizaola G., Laanen P., Whitehead H., Burrows J.E.,  
626 Tinsley M.C., Smith J., Bonzom J-M., Gagnaire B., Adam-Guillermin C., Gashchak S., Jha A., Menezes A., Willey  
627 N., Spurgeon D. 2020b. Towards solving a scientific controversy – The effects of ionising radiation on the  
628 environment. *J. Environ. Radioact.* 211:06033.
- 629 Beresford N.A., Wood M.D., Vives I Batlle J., Yankovich T.L., Bradshaw C., Willey N. 2016. Making the most  
630 of what we have: application of extrapolation approaches in radioecological wildlife transfer models. *J. Environ.*  
631 *Radioact.* 151:373-386.
- 632 Boubriak I., Akimkina T., Polischuk V., Dmitriev A., McCready S., Grodzinsky D. 2016. Long Term Effects of  
633 Chernobyl Contamination on DNA Repair Function and Plant Resistance to Different Biotic and Abiotic Stress  
634 Factors. *Cytol Genet* 50(6):381-399
- 635 Bradshaw C., Kapustka .L, Barnthouse L., Brown J., Ciffroy P., Forbes V. et al. 2014. Using an Ecosystem  
636 Approach to complement protection schemes based on organism-level endpoints. *J. Environ. Radioact.* 136:98-  
637 104.

638 Bréchnignac F., Oughton D., Mays C., Barnthouse L., Beasley J.C., Bonisoli-Alquati A. et al. 2016. Addressing  
639 ecological effects of radiation on populations and ecosystems to improve protection of the environment against  
640 radiation: Agreed statements from a Consensus Symposium. *J. Environ. Radioact.* 158–159:21-29.

641 Bréchnignac F., Oughton D., Mays C., Barnthouse L., Beasley J.C., Bonisoli-Alquati A., Bradshaw C., Brown J.,  
642 Dray S., Geras'kin S., Glenn T., Higley K., Ishida K., Kapustka L., Kautsky U., Kuhne W., Lynch M., Mappes T.,  
643 Mihok S., Møller A.P., Mothersill C., Mousseau T.a., Otaki J.M., Pryakhin E., Rhodes O.E.Jr., Salbu B., Strand  
644 P., Tsukada H. 2016. Addressing ecological effects of radiation on populations and ecosystems to improve  
645 protection of the environment against radiation: Agreed statements from a Consensus Symposium. *J. Environ.*  
646 *Radioact.* 158–159:21-29.

647 Brown J.E., Alfonso B., Avila R., Beresford N.A., Coplestone D., Hosseini A. 2016. A new version of the ERICA  
648 tool to facilitate impact assessments of radioactivity on wild plants and animals. *J. Environ. Radioact.* 153:141-  
649 148.

650 Chauhan V., Villeneuve D., Cool D. 2021. Collaborative efforts are needed among the scientific community to  
651 advance the adverse outcome pathway concept in areas of radiation risk assessment. *Int. J. Radiat. Biol.* 97(6):815-  
652 823.

653 CONCERT. 2019a. Second joint roadmap for radiation protection. N. Impens, S. Salomaa (eds.), EJP CONCERT  
654 Deliverable 3.7, Contract Number: H2020–662287

655 CONCERT. 2019b. Updating the SRAs of MELODI, ALLIANCE, NERIS, EURADOS and EURAMED. S.  
656 Salomaa (ed.), ALLIANCE SRA Working Group (R. Gilbin, H. Vandenhove, A.Real, N. Beresford, J. Popick, N.  
657 Horemans; J. Vives I Battle, J. Brown, K. Stark, T. Arnold, S. Sachs, J. Tschiersch, B. Michalik, H. Tsukada, M.J.  
658 Maduga, C. Berthomieu), EJP CONCERT Deliverable 2.13, Contract Number: H2020–662287

659 Coplestone D., Hingston J., Real A. 2008. The development and purpose of the FREDERICA radiation effects  
660 database. *J. Environ. Radioact.* 99:1456-1463.

661 EURAC. 2005. Securing European Radiological Protection and Radioecology Competence to meet the Future  
662 Needs of Stakeholders. N. D. Priest, L. Skipperud and B. Salbu (eds.), EURAC project Final report, Contract  
663 number FI6O-CT-2003-508839.

664 European Commission. 2013. Basic safety standards for protection against the dangers arising from exposure to  
665 ionising radiation, and repealing Directives 89/618/Euratom, 90/641/Euratom, 96/29/Euratom, 97/43/Euratom and  
666 2003/122/Euratom. Official Journal of the European Union, COUNCIL DIRECTIVE 2013/59/EURATOM of 5  
667 December 2013.

668 FUTURAE. 2008. Networking – a way for maintaining and enhancing radioecological competences in Europe. J-  
669 C. Gariel, J. Garnier-Laplace, N.A. Beresford, B.J. Howard, R. Blust, M. Dowdall, C. Gasco, T. Ikaheimonen, L.  
670 Moberg, B. Smodis, H. Vandenhove, I. Zinger., FUTURAE project Deliverable 4, Contract Number: FP6 –  
671 036453.

672 Garnier-Laplace J., Della-Vedova C., Andersson P., Copplestone D., Cailes C., Beresford N.A., Howard B.J.,  
673 Howe P., Whitehouse P. 2010. A multi-criteria weight of evidence approach to derive ecological benchmarks for  
674 radioactive substances. *J. Radiol. Prot.* 30:215-233.

675 Garnier-Laplace J., Vandenhove H., Beresford N., Muikku M., Real A. 2018. COMET strongly supported the  
676 development and implementation of medium-term topical research roadmaps consistent with the ALLIANCE  
677 Strategic Research Agenda. *J. Radiol. Prot.* 38(1):164-174.

678 Goussen B, Pery A.R.R., Bonzom J.M., Beaudouin R. 2015. Transgenerational Adaptation to Pollution Changes  
679 Energy Allocation in Populations of Nematodes. *Environ Sci Technol* 49 (20):12500-12508.

680 Groh K.J., Carvalho R.N., Chipman J.K., Denslow N.D., Halde, M, Murphy C.A, Roelofs D., Rolaki A., Schirmer  
681 K., Watanabe K.H. 2015. Development and application of the adverse outcome pathway framework for  
682 understanding and predicting chronic toxicity: I. Challenges and research needs in ecotoxicology. *Chemosphere*  
683 120:764-777.

684 Haanes H, Hansen E.L., Hevroy T.H., Jensen L.K., Gjelsvik R., Jaworska A., Bradshaw C. 2020. Realism and  
685 usefulness of multispecies experiment designs with regard to application in radioecology: a review. *Sci. Tot.*  
686 *Environ.* 718(20):134485

687 Hinton T. G. 2000. Strong inference, science fairs and radioecology. *J. Environ. Radioact.* 51:277- 279.

688 Hinton T.G., Garnier-Laplace J., Vandenhove H., Dowdall M., Adam-Guillermin C., Alonzo F., Barnett C.,  
689 Beaugelin-Seiller K., Beresford N.A., Bradshaw C., Brown J., Eyrolle F., Fevrie, L., Gariel J.-C., Gilbin R., Hertel-  
690 Aas T., Horemans N., Howard B.J., Ikäheimonen, T., Mora J.C., Oughton D., Real A., Salbu B., Simon-Cornu M.,  
691 Steiner M., Sweeck L., Vives i Batlle J. 2013. An invitation to contribute to a strategic research agenda in  
692 radioecology. *J. Environ. Radioact.* 115:73-82.

693 Horemans N., Spurgeon D.J., Lecomte-Pradines C., Saenen E., Bradshaw C., Oughton D., Rasnaca I., Kamstra  
694 J.H., Adam-Guillermin C. 2019. Current evidence for a role of epigenetic mechanisms in response to ionizing  
695 radiation in an ecotoxicological context. *Environ. Pollut.* 251:469-483.

696 IAEA. 2006. Fundamental Safety Principles. IAEA Safety Standards for protecting people and the environment.  
697 Safety Fundamentals SF-1. International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna.

698 IAEA. 2011. Radiation Protection and safety of radiation sources: International basic safety standards Sources.  
699 Interim Edition. General Safety Requirements Part 3 - nGSR Part 3 (Interim). 96 pp. and annexes, IAEA, Vienna,  
700 Austria.

701 ICRP. 2007. Recommendations of the International Commission on Radiological Protection. ICRP Publication  
702 103. *Ann. ICRP* 37 (2-4).

703 ICRP. 2008. Environmental Protection - the Concept and Use of Reference Animals and Plants. ICRP Publication  
704 108. *Ann. ICRP* 38 (4-6).

705 ICRP. 2014. Protection of the Environment under Different exposure situations. ICRP Publication 124. *Ann.*  
706 *ICRPA* 43 (1).

707 Kaasik M, Mora J.C., Vives i Batlle J., Vanhoudt N., Tkaczyk A.H. 2020. Uncertainties in the use of concentration  
708 ratios for modelling NORM waste sites. *J. Environ. Radioact.* 222:106315.

709 Kooijman S.A.L.M. 2000. *Dynamic Energy and Mass Budgets in Biological Systems*. 2nd ed. Cambridge  
710 University Press: Cambridge, U.K.

711 Larocque G.R. 2016. *Ecological forest management handbook*. ISBN: 13:978-1-4822-4786-2. CRC Press, Boca  
712 Raton.

713 Larsson C-M. 2008. An overview of the ERICA integrated approach to the assessment and management of  
714 environmental risks from ionising contaminants. *J. Environ. Radioact.* 99:1364-1370.

715 Lecomte-Pradines C., Adam-Guillermin C., Gashchak S., Bradshaw C., Coplestone D., Beresford N.A. 2020.  
716 More than thirty years after the Chernobyl accident: What do we know about the effects of radiation on the  
717 environment? *J. Environ. Radioact.* 211:106108.

718 Michalik B., Brown J., Krajewski P. 2013. The fate and behaviour of enhanced natural radioactivity with respect  
719 to environmental protection. *Environ. Impact Ass. Rev.* 38:163–171.

720 Moller A.P., Mousseau T.A. 2016. Are organisms adapting to ionizing radiation at Chernobyl? *Trends Ecol. Evol.*  
721 31(4):281-289.

722 Mothersill C, Abend M, Brechignac F, Coplestone D, Geras'kin S, Goodman J, Horemans N, Jeggo P, McBride  
723 W, Mousseau TA, O'Hare A, Papineni RVL, Powathil G, Schofield PN, Seymour C, Sutcliffe J, Austin B. 2019.  
724 The tubercular badger and the uncertain curve. The need for a multiple stressor approach in environmental  
725 radiation protection. *Environ Res* 168:130-140.

726 Mothersill C, Abend M, Brechignac F, Iliakis G, Impens N, Kadhim M, Moller AP, Oughton D, Powathil G,  
727 Saenen E, Seymour C, Sutcliffe J, Tang FR, Schofield PN. 2018. When a duck is not a duck; a new interdisciplinary  
728 synthesis for environmental radiation protection. *Environ. Res.* 162:318-324.

729 Mothersill C.E., Oughton D.H., Schofield P.N., Abend M., Adam-Guillermin C., Ariyoshi K., Beresford N.A.,  
730 Bonisoli-Alquati A., Cohen, J., Dubrova Y., Geras'kin S.A., Hevroy T.H., Higley K.A., Horemans N., Jha A.N.,  
731 Kapustka L.A., Kiang J.G., Madas B.G., Powathil G., Sarapultseva E.I., Seymour C.B., Vo N.T.K., Wood M.D.  
732 2020. From tangled banks to toxic bunnies; a reflection on the issues involved in developing an ecosystem  
733 approach for environmental radiation protection. *Int. J. Radiat. Biol.* 1-16.

734 Muikku M., Beresford N.A., Garnier-Laplace J., Real A., Sirkka L., Thorne M., Vandenhove H., Willrodt C. 2018.  
735 Sustainability and integration of radioecology - Position paper. *J. Radiol. Prot.* 3851:152-163.

736 Raskob W., Almahayni T., Beresford N.A. 2018. Radioecology in CONFIDENCE: Dealing with uncertainties  
737 relevant for decision making. *J. Environ. Radioact.* 192:399-404.

738 Real A, Garnier-Laplace J. 2020. The importance of deriving adequate wildlife benchmark values to optimize  
739 radiological protection in various environmental exposure situations. *J. Environ. Radioact.* 211:105902.

740 Schell W., Sauzay G., and Payne B. 1974. World distribution of environmental tritium. In: Physical Behavior of  
741 Radioactive Contaminants in the Atmosphere. IAEA, STI/PUB/354, Vienna, Austria, pp. 375-400.

742 Smith J.T., Kudelsky A.V., Ryabov I.N., Haddingh R.H. 2000. Radiocaesium concentration factors of  
743 Chernobyl-contaminated fish: a study of the influence of potassium and “blind” testing of a previously developed  
744 model. *J. Environ. Radioact.* 48: 359-369.

745 STAR. 2012. Infrastructure: databases, sample banks, methods and facilities of radioecological research. TK.  
746 Ikäheimonen, P. Vesterbacka, I. Outola, J. Ylipieti, K. Vaaramaa, V. Vetikko, M. Muikku, J. C. Mora, N.  
747 Beresford, B. Howard, C. Barnett, C. Wells, N. Vanhoudt C. Bradshaw, R. Gurriaran, M. Komperød, L. Skipperud,  
748 C. Willrodt, A. Real. STAR project Deliverable 2.2, Contract Number: Fission20103.5.1269672.

749 STAR. 2013. The Radioecology Education and Training Platform. D. Oughton), L. Skipperud, C. Bradshaw, C.  
750 Barnett, T.G. Hinton, L. Février, B. Salbu. STAR project Deliverable 6.2, Contract Number:  
751 Fission20103.5.1269672.

752 STAR. 2015. Strategic Plan for Securing Long Term Sustainability for Education and Training in Radioecology.  
753 A. Real, L. Skipperud, C. Bradshaw, L. Février, N. Horemans, D. Oughton, C. Willrodt. STAR project Deliverable  
754 6.4, Contract Number: Fission20103.5.1269672.

755 Strand P., Sundell-Bergman S., Brown J.E., Dowdall M. 2017. On the divergences in assessment of environmental  
756 impacts from ionising radiation following the Fukushima accident. *J. Environ. Radioact.* 169:159-173.

757 United Nations. 2015. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. United Nations  
758 A/RES/70/1, 21 October 2015. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 25 September 2015  
759 <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>

760 UNSCEAR. 2008. Sources of ionizing radiation United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic  
761 Radiation. Vol. II. Report to the General Assembly, with scientific annexe E. United Nations, New-York, 313 pp.

762 Van Straalen N. 2003. Ecotoxicology becomes stress ecology. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 37:324A-330A.

- 763 Vandenhove H., Bradshaw C., Beresford N.A., Vives i Batlle J., Real A., Garnier-Laplace J. 2018. ALLIANCE  
764 perspectives on integration of humans and the environment into the system of radiological protection. *Annals of*  
765 *the ICRP* 47(3-4):285-297.
- 766 Vives I Batlle J., Sazykina T.G., Kryshev A., Monte L., Kawaguchi I. 2012. Inter-comparison of population models  
767 for the calculation of radiation dose effects on wildlife. *Radiat. Environ. Biophysics* 51(4):399-410.

- 768 Vandenhove H., Bradshaw C., Beresford N.A., Vives i Batlle J., Real A., Garnier-Laplace J. 2018. ALLIANCE  
769 perspectives on integration of humans and the environment into the system of radiological protection. *Annals of*  
770 *the ICRP* 47(3-4):285-297.
- 771 Vives I Batlle J., Sazykina T.G., Kryshev A., Monte L., Kawaguchi I. 2012. Inter-comparison of population models  
772 for the calculation of radiation dose effects on wildlife. *Radiat. Environ. Biophysics* 51(4):399-410.

773 **Figures caption**

774 **Figure 1.** ALLIANCE Challenges and Research Lines (1.x to 3.x, blue lines) links with the Joint Roadmap  
775 research challenges and Game Changers for radiation protection (A.x to H.x, green columns - CONCERT, 2019a):  
776 cross-cutting areas (gray) and specific topics (x) developed in the description of the 3 Scientific Challenges.



**Declaration of interests**

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests: