Press briefing at the Prime Minister's Office for members of the foreign press

7 April 2011

Mr. Noriyuki Shikata, Deputy Cabinet Secretary for Public Relations: Good evening. We would like to start today's briefing for international press. We have representatives from different ministries but I think Mr. Hidehiko Nishiyama, Deputy Director-General of the Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency (NISA) is still on his way to the Prime Minster's Office, so we will go ahead with the briefing by the officials represented here. My name is Noriyuki Shikata, Deputy Cabinet Secretary for Public Relations at the Prime Minister's Office.

To my right is Mr. Ichiro Nakayama, Counselor of the Resources Enhancement Promotion Department, Fisheries Agency of Japan. To his right is Takeshi Matsunaga, Assistant Press Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA). To my left is Mr. Shinichi Kawarada, Advisor to Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), and to his left is Mr. Masanori Shinano, Counselor, Secretariat of the Nuclear Safety Commission (NSC). Last is Mr. Eiichi Yokota, Senior Technical Officer of the Food Safety Department of the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (MHLW).

At the outset I would like to just give a very brief overview of the situation after the Great East Japan Earthquake. At this point in time, the number of people who are confirmed dead is a little over 12,600. The number of people who are missing is still over 15,000. At the same time, the number of people who were rescued is at over 26,000, and the number of confirmed displaced persons is a little over 162,000. Still, relief operations are continuing, with over 100,000 Self-Defense Forces (SDF) members, nearly 3,000 police, about 1,200 fire service members, and the Japan Coast Guard with over 50 vessels and about 20 aircraft.

Let me just refer to Chief Cabinet Secretary Mr. Edano's press conference today. There was a question asked regarding the issue of the discharging of radioactive water into the sea. Mr. Edano mentioned that this has caused anxiety amongst fishermen and also people in neighboring countries. What we are trying to do is preventing highly-contaminated or highly-radioactive water from entering the sea. We are trying to make use of various measures, including for example, the mega-float. We are also

collaborating very closely with the Tokyo Electric Power Company (TEPCO), between TEPCO and the Japanese government, in order to make room for highly-radioactive water. We made a choice to discharge water that has relatively lower levels of radiation into the sea.

We are making our utmost efforts to minimize any possible impacts and we have been able to stop the water being emitted through the pit at this time, but we are looking into other possible areas where there could be the emission of highly-radioactive water into the sea. So this is something we are carrying out with our utmost efforts, and we are making our best efforts to control the situation, especially when preventing highly-radioactive water from entering the sea.

I would like to stop here and ask Mr. Matsunaga from MOFA to go next.

Mr. Matsunaga: Thank you, Mr. Shikata. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. As always, I would like to update you about foreign assistance regarding the earthquake.

Yesterday afternoon, relief supplies from the government of Canada arrived in Narita Airport. They are nuclear-related supplies which consist of radiation survey meters and dosimeters. Immediately after the earthquake, the government of Canada expressed its readiness for cooperation. It provided 225,000 blankets which have been distributed to those who have suffered from the disaster. We deeply appreciate the cooperation of the government of Canada to date.

Yesterday, relief supplies arrived in the Disaster Response Headquarters from a private school in Moscow State of the Russian Federation. The school is Moscow First Gymnasium, which was referred to by the Department of the Russian President on the occasion of the signing of the book of condolences by Mrs. Svetlana Medvedeva, spouse of the President of Russia. The relief supplies are blankets, clothes, and others collected by the students of the school, as well as pictures drawn and messages written by the students of the school. These supplies had been conveyed to the Embassy of Japan in Russia, and thereafter transported from Moscow to Niigata with the cooperation of Japan Airlines and Nisshin Corporation. They will be distributed to the disaster-effected evacuees in Niigata prefecture through the prefecture's Disaster Response Headquarters.

I also would like to mention monetary donations. In response to the earthquake, the government of the Hellenic Republic informed us that the government will provide relief money to the Japanese Red Cross Society. From Greece, letters of sympathy were sent from H.E. Mr. Karolos Papoulias, President of the Hellenic Republic; H.E. Mr. Georgios A. Papandreou, Prime Minister; H.E. Mr. Philippos Petsalnikos, President of the Hellenic Parliament; H.E. Mr. Dimitris P. Droutsas, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and others. The government of Japan deeply appreciates the sense of solidarity expressed and assistance extended by the government of the Hellenic Republic and the people of Greece.

I also would like to refer to the visit of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Argentina. H.E. Mr. Héctor Timerman, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Worship of the Argentine Republic will visit Japan from Sunday, 10 April – Monday, 11 April. During his stay in Japan, Minister Timerman is scheduled to hold a meeting with Mr. Takeaki Matsumoto, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan. The visit will take place based on the wishes of Mr. Timerman to express the condolences and solidarity to Japan upon the Great East Japan Earthquake.

Today, I received a message from a senior official of the government in which attention was drawn to the fact that some foreign press reports suggested that many Japanese wear masks due to the fear of inhaling radioactive substances. Of course, the respectable press corps on the floor who are very familiar with the sight of Japanese who wear masks due to hay fever at this time of the year would not make such a mistake, but I would like to mention that such a press report might be misleading. Thank you very much.

Mr. Shikata: Thank you, Mr. Matsunaga. Now, I would like to ask MEXT to go next, Mr. Kawarada of MEXT.

Mr. Kawarada: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. As I have been reporting to you up until now, MEXT is responsible for monitoring beyond the 20km radius from Fukushima Daiichi Power Plant. Land, sea, and air monitoring is being carried out, and I have distributed materials compiled as of 7 April.

I do not have anything special to highlight today. Thank you.

Mr. Shikata: They are making use of simultaneous translation during initial remarks, with channel one for English. Now, I would like to ask Mr. Shinano of the NSC to go next.

Mr. Shinano: Thank you. From the NSC, I would like to report to you the evaluation of the environmental radiation monitoring results, which is the assessment of the data that was collected between 10:00 on 5 April to 10:00 AM on 6 April. Overall, there was no data that was gathered that would immediately impose health risks.

Starting with spatial radiation dose rates, there was some fluctuation in the readings.

Going on to radioactivity in the air, compared to the previous data, the readings has gone down.

Turning to aviation monitoring, as we did not have additional gathering of data, we are going to utilize aviation monitoring as a tool to carry out the monitoring of the radiation level on the plane, not on each monitoring point.

We did not have any additional data for environmental samples. Therefore, naturally, we do not have any additional assessment carried out.

Going on to the environmental radioactivity level surveyed by prefecture, the level for tap water has gone up slightly compared with the previous day. This has all been below the index value for the restriction of the ingestion of food and beverages. That is all for tonight.

Mr. Shikata: Mr. Hidehiko Nishiyama, Deputy Director-General of the Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency (NISA).

Mr. Nishiyama: Thank you, Mr. Shikata. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to report the recent status of the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant. First of all, regarding the reactor of Unit 1, we are injecting nitrogen to the containment vessel of Unit 1. This is a precautionary measure to prevent a hydrogen explosion, which may occur when the amount of vapor shrinks.

The reactors of Units 2 and 3 are relatively stable, and we will inject nitrogen into those

two units, 2 and 3, in the future. Regarding the spent fuel pool, we threw pure water into the spent fuel pool of Unit 3 through the spent fuel pool cooling system, and the spent fuel pool of Unit 4 with a concrete injecting machine. Regarding stagnant water in the turbine building, we are transferring the water in the hot well to the condensate storage tank of Units 1 and 2, as preparation to move the stagnant water to the hot well. Regarding Unit 3, since the hot well is full of water, and there may be some water flowing into that hot well, we are now waiting for the analysis of how we can deal with that.

As for the leaking of the highly radiated water spilling from the outside wall of the pit near Unit 2, as I reported yesterday, we have successfully stopped the leaking. However, we are alerted by the possibility that this kind of water may appear elsewhere, or the surface of the same kind of water in the trench attached to Unit 2 may rise. So we are closely monitoring those possibilities. As I reported, regarding this spilling water, we stopped it, and we don't want to allow contaminated water to spill into the sea again, so we took several measures, including placing a rubber plate over the crack, and placing a steel plate at the intake of Unit 2. Also, we continue to place sandbags at the broken park of the bank, which is a part of the peripherals of the pond in front of the intakes of Units 1 through 4.

In addition to that, we will place a silt fence in front of the intake of Unit 2, and also at the place adjacent to the sandbags, and at the entrance into the place in front of the intakes of Units 1 through 4. Those actions mean that we keep contaminated water in the area of the sea that is a rectangular shape before the intakes of those four units, and not allow water to spill over to the outside. It will not be perfect, but we will try not to allow proliferation of the contaminated water.

Regarding the emergency release of slightly radiated water in the radioactive waste disposal system, I think we almost finished today. The amount of water is 8,000t and it is slightly radiated. With respect to the emergency release of slightly radiated water in the sub-drain pit, which originally came from the underground, this release will finish by 9 April. Regarding the synthetic plastic which we sprayed to settle the radiated dust which fell to the ground after the hydrogen explosions at Units 1, 3, and maybe 4, we are assessing the effectiveness of the plastic. So far, we think that we can use this plastic to settle down the radiated dust in other places. Thank you very much. That is all for my report.

Mr. Shikata: Thank you, Mr. Nishiyama. Then, I would like to ask Mr. Ichiro Nakayama, Counsellor of the Resources Enhancement Promotion Department of the Fisheries Agency.

Dr. Nakayama: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. On the safety of the fishery products, I wish to give you the following presentation. We have prepared a number of materials.

The first is the bio-accumulation of the bio-concentration of radionuclides through the food chain, so I hope you will refer to this page. We have the concentration factors, which is the ratio between the concentration in the fish body and the concentration in seawater, so we try to determine the degree of accumulation. As you can see here, the values are given for cesium, iodine, uranium, plutonium, mercury, DDT, and PCB. And cesium and iodine, which are curre6ntly measured, are at a very negligible level when it comes to the concentration factor, when compared to, for example, DDT or other mercury. The value is very low. Now, the source of this information comes from the data that is compiled by the Fisheries Research Agency, and previously there was a study-group meeting held at the Fisheries Agency. From 1978 59 types of fish, as well as seashells and various marine products, and 230 samples on an annual basis had been monitored every year for more than 30 years. So that is the basis of this data. Now, coming back to this page, DDT has a value of 12,000. That is the concentration factor. When it comes to cesium and iodine, it would be 5 to 100, or 10, so it would be a totally different order of magnitude. Now, if you would look to the graph at the right, through the food chain, how this would be increased is shown. So, to the left you see the value of the seawater and then zooplankton. So, from seawater to zooplankton, there would be a concentration increase of about ten times an order of magnitude. And for DDT, this is a logarithmic scale. So when you go up to mollusks it is in the order of 100s, and going to fish, it would be in the order of 10,000s, so the number of zeroes would change. In the case of cesium, the order of magnitude is quite constant, so through the food chain, concentration does not take place for cesium. Now going on to the next page, iodine and cesium, this is something I would like to elaborate on. Iodine-131 has a half-life of eight days. Cesium, this is solid, and if it is in the same marine product, it does not accumulate, so it is said that it does not accumulate in a specific organ of these organisms. However, the mechanism within the organism is not fully elucidated. Caesium-137 has a half-life of 30 years and caesium-134, about a half-life of two years.

The periodic table you can see here. Cesium is on the same order as potassium, so it shows the same behavior as that of potassium.

Now going on the next page, how marine products would excrete the salt. Marine products drink a lot of sea water, and with that cesium, chloride, potassium, sodium, magnesium. These are all taken in through the intake of sea water, but this is immediately excreted through the gills and urine. Over a very short period of time this is excreted ex vivo. Therefore it does not accumulate in fish. That is why the concentration factor is very low, like iodine being 10. The concentration factor of fish is really dependent on the intake of sea water.

Moving on to the next page, this is caesium-137 and sea water's relationship. From 1990 the data is plotted, and as I have mentioned earlier, this data is accumulated over 30 years. From 1990, radionuclide had gradually come down, so simultaneously with the reduction of the level in the sea water, the cesium level in the fish is coming down, so it is correlated. The fish body and the sea water shows a correlation here.

Now going on to the next page, we have this data that was taken from the experiment, and caesium-137 is shown to the right. It has a biological half-life of about 50 days. Biological half-life means after it goes into the biological organism, it takes 50 days to be reduced to half the level. After 50 days, the cesium that is taken in by an organism would be excreted. What about the natural half-life? That is shown in the bar chart below. This is from 1985, and in 1986 the accident in Chernobyl took place and so there was a spike here. But starting from the following year 1987, Japanese sardines, caesium-137 is shown here, and after the Chernobyl accident this came down quite dramatically, which means that the metabolism of caesium-137 is very rapid. Also, like in the experimental value, in the natural condition, caesium-137 is excreted very quickly.

We have another sheet of paper which says FA, the Fisheries Agency. And these are officially asked questions. But in the interest of time, I will not go into this. But I hope you would also refer to the following pages. This is by prefecture, by fishery cooperatives. The testing sample results, the fish as well as sea shells, these are the results of the crustaceans as well as marine products. This is for your reference. Thank you very much.

Mr. Shikata: Now I would like to ask Mr. Yokota of MHLW to go next.

Mr. Yokota: Thank you. I wish to give you the test results of the food that were submitted to MHLW yesterday. All together, 78 samples of seven foods were reported to our ministry. As you would see, on the right, those that are shaded in gray, those are samples that have surpassed the provisional value. There were 26 samples that surpassed the standard levels. They are all vegetables produced in Fukushima. And as you know, there has been a restriction on shipment and also intake, so they do not exist in the market or distribution channel.

We also have one sheet of paper which is the sum of the past findings. We have altogether 1,049 samples tested, of which 164 were above the level that required action. Thank you.

Mr. Shikata: Thank you, Mr. Yokota. Having finished the initial remarks from the officials, I would like to now open the floor for questions. When you ask a question, please approach the microphone and limit your question to only one.

QUESTION (Mr. Narioka, Dow Jones Newswires): This is a question to Mr. Nishiyama and Mr. Shinano possibly. Correct me if I am wrong but Chief Cabinet Secretary Edano is seeking some advice or recommendation from NISA and the Japan Nuclear Safety Commission on the evacuation zones. What is your view on these? What do you think the evacuation zone should look like?

Mr. Nishiyama: The evacuation zone has been determined up to now based on the guidelines that have been laid down by the NSC. And under those guidelines, for instance, a radiation level of 50mSv would be the criteria for seeking evacuation. Considering, however, the fact that a considerable period of time has passed since the earthquake and the tsunami has occurred, the exposure to cumulative radiation may be building up. And therefore, one direction in which we are giving consideration is how we should look at the cumulative radiation in relation to the current criteria of 50mSv. That is the first point.

And the second point is we have to consider how we can respond to the needs of the residents in the evacuation area who wish to go back to their homes, although it may be temporarily, in order to bring back what they need for their daily life. We intend to

compile our consideration of these factors and also discuss this with the NSC to be reported to the Chief Cabinet Secretary and others concerned.

Mr. Shinano: I am from the NSC. The NSC does have the role of providing technical advice to the government, but the government has not sought any advice regarding a review of the evacuation zone, we have not provided the government with any advice regarding the evacuation zone, and we have not received any instructions from the government to provide them with any advice regarding a review of the evacuation zone. However, as Mr. Nishiyama has explained earlier, since the period of the evacuation is becoming rather protracted and also in view of the fact that there are areas where the cumulative exposure is expected to have become rather high, we are giving consideration to what kind of criteria may be possible, taking into account various international criteria that we have.

QUESTION (Mr. Pollack, New York Times): I was wondering, the two gentlemen over there who talked about the environmental sampling – would it be possible to synthesize a little instead of just presenting a whole bunch of numbers, to sort of summarize or analyze a little? Are the radiation levels in the environment going down, and if so could you give an example or two? Are they going up, or are they going down in some areas and up in some areas? Can you sort of describe the pattern so that readers might have a better feel for what's happening?

Mr. Kawarada: Since I am giving this presentation every day, I tended to just pick up the main topics, but as a trend, as you can see on page 6 of the document that we have distributed to you, there is a graph on page 6 which shows the spatial radiation dose rate trend in the various monitoring posts 20 kilometers and beyond from Fukushima Number 1 nuclear power plant, and the graph shows that measurements have been taken every day since the incident has occurred.

This graph on page 6 shows the measurements from 17 March until 6 April, and as you can see the graph is declining continuously although there are some ups and downs here, some slight ups and downs.

On the graph on page 6 on the right hand side, you can see numbers which show the different curved lines, and these numbers correspond to the various monitoring locations shown on page 8.

Another example is the sea area monitoring that starts on page 9 in the material distributed to you, and the trends from day to day shown on page 13 and page 14. And as you can see from those graphs, for most monitoring points the numbers are declining. There are some exceptions however, for instance Number 5 shows an increase from 1 April to 5 April. So this is only one example, but that is the general feel.

QUESTION (Mr. Walker, CNN): If I could direct this to Mr. Nishiyama or whoever else can answer, we have seen today the mega-float that has begun to come in. That's certainly part of a solution, but I was wondering if people could address some of the other machinery that will be coming in – UAVs, robots. Also, whether or not there has been any outreach to the Russians that we understand about a floating waste processing service boat as well.

Mr. Nishiyama: Regarding the mega-float, we are thinking of using the mega-float for disposing of the large amount of water that we need to take care of. Besides the mega-float, we have placed orders already for a large amount of tanks, and we intend to use barge vessels as well. What is UAV?

QUESTION (Mr. Walker, CNN): Remote helicopters and aerial monitoring.

Mr. Nishiyama: In that case, we are now looking into the possibility of using UAVs as well as using robots to work in places that human beings cannot get near, and we do have offers for cooperation from various different countries. Also, regarding the vessel or boat for processing radioactive waste that Russia has, this is something that Japan provided to Russia in the past as part of our cooperation with Russia, and Japan is now studying whether or not we can use these vessels for the incident that we are now facing.

QUESTION (Mr. Kujath, ARD Radio): One general question regarding the simulations, for example, with SPEEDI computer, there are many kinds of simulations going on but the result was just shown once to the public, why didn't you share this more often to the public? There is also simulation going on regarding streams in the ocean where the radioactive substances are going actually, so this would be also something that you can share with the public I assume. And just one short question to Mr. Nishiyama, when you have to do a risk assessment at the moment, where do you see the biggest risk at the

reactors in Fukushima Daiichi?

Mr. Nishiyama: Regarding simulations that have been already done, we are trying to share the result of the simulation as much as possible, and actually there is the greatest need for simulation usually at the initial stages right after the incident has occurred. Let me just answer one more point then have the representative from the NSC respond to this question. Regarding the risk, the greatest risk I would say is the difficulty in how to dispose of the water that is playing the role of cooling the reactor.

Mr. Shinano: Right now we have a system called SPEEDI, which can predict the proliferation of radioactivity. If I briefly explain the SPEEDI system, the SPEEDI uses information regarding what kind of material is released from the nuclear power plant, in what kind of concentration, and furthermore it adds climatic predictions and also topography data, in order to arrive at a prediction of what kind of concentration may be expected in different areas.

But in the case of the incident that we are now facing, we do not have access to the information regarding the source of the release of radioactivity, for various reasons such as power blackouts on the site, and so forth, but we have a situation now where we cannot make an accurate prediction.

So what we are doing now is we are doing some trial calculations to try and see whether we can input the data regarding the source of the release of radioactivity by calculating backwards from the monitoring data that we have, so that we can use the system even without the information regarding the source of the radiation.

We are now working on this system with the intention in mind of making public the data that we obtain from SPEEDI, once this work we are doing moves forward and we are able to gain more accurate data.

QUESTION (Mr. Kujath, ARD Radio): When do you think it will come out? When do you think you can propose this data to the public?

Mr. Shinano: We are really working hard on this right now, but I do not have any information for sure that would enable me to tell you, at the moment, when we will be able to release the data.

QUESTION (Mr. Kincaid, The Economist): This is a question for Mr. Nakayama of the Fisheries Agency. Thank you very much for your explanation. I appreciate that the cesium is not stored but is excreted from the fish. What happens if one of these smaller fish is eaten by a larger fish, before it excretes that cesium? The cesium of course is still in its body and is now ingested by larger fish that swim away. They of course travel far from the area of Ibaraki and Fukushima. What happens then?

Mr. Nakayama: As I have shown you earlier through the graph I showed you, it is known that concentrations do not increase in the food chain. The same is true when the radiation is derived from what the fish eat. When whatever they eat goes through digestive tract, even if it is taken into their cells, the same thing occurs; in other words, even if the small fish is eaten by the large fish, it will just be excreted by the big fish, after the big fish eats the small fish. It is known that eventually the levels will become closer and closer to the levels in the environmental water.

QUESTION (Mr. Normile, Science Magazine): I guess this question would be for Mr. Nishiyama or for Mr. Shinano. Now you have an evacuation zone of a radius of 20km. Once the crisis is resolved, will people be able to move back into that evacuation zone, or will there be some continuing zone of exclusion, which might be too dangerous to be inhabited for some time into the future?

Mr. Nishiyama: I believe we will have to monitor the levels and see the actual levels at that time to determine whether or not we can lift the evacuation zone. After the crisis at the nuclear power station settles down we will have to determine, based on the levels at that time, how much we can actually have the residents return to this area.

QUESTION (Mr. Klauser, WDR German Radio): I have two questions. The first one deals with the workers. Can you give us a little figures on how many workers are actually working on Fukushima and the surroundings, what type of workers are there, are they unskilled, or technicians, or engineers, and do by now have any data on how their personal radiation levels are, because we understood that in the beginning there were not enough dosimeters for all those guys working there. And the second question is that the only radionuclides that you mentioned were cesium and iodine. Aren't there any others which have been found, like strontium or plutonium? Are there any radionuclides in the surroundings?

Mr. Nishiyama: First of all, regarding the categories of people who are working in the Fukushima Nuclear Power Plant would consist of for instance employees of TEPCO, also workers from subcontractors of TEPCO who will be involved in the electricity work, and also members from the manufacturing companies such as Toshiba, Hitachi, and also workers from the construction companies who would be involved in repairing the building or digging the hole in the ground. So that would be roughly the breakdown of the types of workers that are working in the power plant. And also other members we should not forget are the considerable number of SDF personnel, and also in the beginning when we were spraying water a large number of people from the Fire Department were also involved. And regarding the management of radioactive levels, at one time we had a short period of time when we did not have enough dosimeters, but now we have one dosimeter each for each worker, and the dose of radioactivity is being properly managed and the workers are working within the limit where their level of radioactivity reaches 250mSv per year.

And also in response to your second question regarding what other nuclides have been found, for instance plutonium has been detected, but the levels of plutonium that have been detected at the current moment is about the same as the level of plutonium that was found in the atmosphere when atomic testing was done in the past, and we consider that there is no effect on the human body. If you can please refer to the news release by Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI), the point that I have just mentioned is written on the very bottom paragraph on page 1.

QUESTION (Mr. Klauser, WDR German Radio): How many workers?

Mr. Nishiyama: I believe the workers working would be roughly in the order of 300 to 500 people.

QUESTION (Mr. Inamura, Granma International Cuba): In 2004 we journalists organized in Japan, I am acting as Secretary General for the club, visited Cuba. And in Havana City we were invited by the government to see Tarara Rehabilitation Center. In this Rehabilitation Center they are now taking care of 10,000 nuclear victims from Chernobyl. I took a lot of photos of them, and now I am introducing them in my daily news, but I am now hesitating to show it to the mass media because all of the photos are too ugly girls and ladies.

Mr. Shikata: Could you ask a question?

QUESTION (Mr. Inamura, Granma International Cuba): Yes, so my question is, do you know this Tarara area, and do you have an idea to send people to see the victims?

Mr. Shikata: Who are you asking your question to?

QUESTION (Mr. Inamura, Granma International Cuba): To you.

Mr. Shikata: I have received your e-mail, so I know what you are talking about; I have seen your photos. But at this juncture I don't have any plan to go there. I think we have obligations to tackle the evolving situations in Japan, and that I think is our utmost priority, to address issues in this country.

QUESTION (Mr. Pollack, New York Times): Mr. Nishiyama, I just was wondering, what is your response to the statement made by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) that the very high levels of radiation in the dry well of Unit 2 suggest that some of the core has leaked out of the reactor pressure vessel, which would seem to make, perhaps, the situation more serious that we thought?

Mr. Nishiyama: We are having an exchange of views with the NRC everyday and we are sharing information, and the statement by the NRC that you have quoted I believe is not a statement that was made at the present stage. Regarding Unit 2 for instance, we did hear some kind of noise like an explosion in the suppression chamber, and even besides that we consider that there is probably some kind of leakage from the reactor as well. But I do not consider that we have a situation as you have described it earlier.

Mr. Shikata: A very last question.

QUESTION (Mr. Walker, CNN): Yes, when I was speaking earlier about the machinery I think maybe I was trying to get more at do you have a wish list of things that could really help turn the tide? What do you need most? Do you need more people? Do you need more equipment? Or do you also, as some of the experts we have spoken to, do you need more expertise from other countries and people outside of Japan in other industries? What could help you the most right now?

Mr. Nishiyama: Regarding equipment, technology and others, we are working closely together in cooperation with NRC and Areva from France, so we already have quite considerable support from these outside countries and organizations. And in relation to the risk that I mentioned earlier, I think the most urgent issue now is support in whatever form possible with regard to how we can dispose of the water while cooling and be able to build a sustainable cooling system.

Mr. Shikata: This concludes today's briefing. We will have another round of briefing of this kind tomorrow evening again. Thank you very much for coming.

(END)