

Unclassified

NEA/RWM/FSC/M(2013)2

Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Économiques
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

07-Jan-2014

English - Or. English

NUCLEAR ENERGY AGENCY
RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Forum on Stakeholder Confidence (FSC)

Summary Record of the 14th Session of the Forum on Stakeholder Confidence (FSC)

With Detailed Summary, Lexicon, etc. in Appendix

The 14th Regular Meeting of the RWM Forum on Stakeholder Confidence (FSC) was held at NEA Headquarters on 17-19 Sept. 2013.

Main discussion points and the resulting decisions and actions are summarized in this record.

Appendices contain: 1) a detailed record of presentations and discussions; 2) the Lexicon developed for the Hungary National Workshop in 2006; 3) list of materials and 4) list of participants at FSC-14.

Claudio Pescatore (claudio.pescatore@oecd.org)

JT03350858

Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

This document and any map included herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.



NEA/RWM/FSC/M(2013)2
Unclassified

English - Or. English

**RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT
FORUM ON STAKEHOLDER CONFIDENCE (FSC)**

SUMMARY RECORD

OF THE 14TH SESSION OF THE FSC

NEA, Issy-les-Moulineaux, France, 17-19 September 2013

This summary record consists of a main text and four appendices.

- *The main text reports principal suggestions and orientations discussed at FSC-14. It reproduces, with small needed changes in date or emphasis, the decisions and action points that were circulated to meeting participants and delegates on 30 September 2013 [NEA/RWM/FSC(2013)1].*
- *Appendix 1 is a detailed summary of presentations and discussions; appendix 2 is the short Lexicon provided at the 2006 Hungary workshop; appendix 3 is the list of materials made available for the FSC-14 meeting; appendix 4 is the list of participants.*

1.a, b Welcome and Roundtable

The Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation are represented for the first time at the FSC. The Russian Federation is a new (2013) Member of the NEA.

Note that (a) the FSC has become renewed in the past year or so with delegates from Belgium, France, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Spain, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, United States and the European Commission; (b) this fact has been considered in the agenda (discussion of our Annotated Glossary); (c) this is a good omen for the FSC. We witnessed the vibrant contribution of new members at the Czech Republic workshop last year.

Action: The Secretariat will circulate a notice on formalising membership. Action should be taken by those designated at that time.

2.a Agenda

Decision: Adopted without significant change. The overall composition of the agenda implied considering together the FSC mission and mandate. Throughout the meeting the FSC identity was jointly elaborated, and orientations were drawn for updating at least the “Identity” flyer.

2.b Summary Record of FSC-13

Decision: Adopted in principle. Additional comments that arrived in Sept 2013 after the deadline were integrated.

3. The FSC (Review of main activities launched or achieved since Oct 2012)

At various points during FSC-14, a new delegate presented a glossary entry pertinent to the particular theme or topic of discussion. Delegates were asked to listen with a mind to deepening their understanding of FSC concepts and their evolution, identifying concrete examples, and proposing actions to take our work forward inside and outside our meetings. *(The PPTs have been formatted onto NEA template and a members-only library of presentations is created; see item 5b.)*

4. Review of RWMC and its Working Parties

At its 46th meeting in March 2013 the RWMC expressed high appreciation for the FSC support, in particular for the [Collective Statement](#) released at the time of the Toronto “International Conference on Geological Repositories” entitled “National Commitment, Local Involvement”. The RWMC is starting a project for regular publication of Status and Trends with the EC and IAEA.

The WPDD released a flyer on “[Estimation of Nuclear Facility Decommissioning Costs](#)”. While cost categories and plans can be established, at this stage it’s not wise to compare actual costs of entire projects; this flyer explains why, and what we are doing to diminish the difficulties.

The RK&M project looks at the phases after closure of a geological disposal. There are 15 member organisations from 12 countries that pay a voluntary contribution, which demonstrates their high interest. Phase-II is under preparation, with a large international conference to be held in Verdun, France in Sept. 2014. The FSC should consider making a contribution to this conference.

5 International Conferences and Projects

A dozen upcoming meetings and their dates were noted (see appendix 1). Information on future meetings should be sent to the Secretariat.

On the **FSC secure web space (members only access)**, the Secretariat will post conferences and meetings that have a Stakeholder Confidence dimension, upon submission of such items by members.

Actions and decisions: Members are invited to submit notes or mission reports from major conferences, even “anonymously” if preferred.

Information will be shared there about opportunities to collaborate on projects by, for example, presenting FSC learning.

To support this, an NEA/FSC PPT library will be stocked with materials: for instance, presentations that were made about our work at the RWMC, or the Glossary concepts presented by new members at this meeting.

6. Special Country Update (Czech Republic)

The presentation by Lucie Steinerová (SURA) included an update on evolutions in the Czech Republic siting process, which took place in winter 2012. Central government hypothesized that because the Kraví hora former uranium mining area was experienced with the nuclear industry the residents would have less fear. Former mining operator DIAMO-GEAM was thus instructed to conduct repository siting and development steps in that zone. A new national strategy for siting was introduced by Government decision at the end of 2012. Both existing pre-candidate sites and nuclear installation host sites should be investigated. Surface-based surveys are supposed to reduce the number of sites from 7 to 4 by 2015. In 2016-18, survey drilling should take place at these four sites and local opinion should be monitored. Final site selection should focus on 2 candidate sites and terminate in 2020-25. Stakeholders, including SURA, judge this schedule and strategy to be infeasible.

The Chair of the Czech Republic Working Group for Dialogue on Site Selection Process, Dr. Vajdová, gave feedback on the FSC National Workshop and Public Meeting organized in the Czech Republic in October 2012. She reported that her working group recognized the mediation offered by the FSC and

expressed high appreciation of the relations established at the workshop between the FSC and the local Czech people and their problems. The citizens received with great trust the replies given to their questions by the FSC participants, understanding that this information from colleagues from abroad was authentic and sincere without any hidden interest. On the basis of the FSC public debate meeting Dr. Vajdová concluded that her working group must go to the localities and apply all available procedures to encourage the participation of local people in the process.

Dr. Vajdová confirmed that her group is interested in FSC views. She asked for a message to deliver to the working group and to local people involved in the siting process, regarding the FSC workshop and also, subsequent national events as reported during this FSC-14 session.

The FSC cannot comment officially on the subsequent national events, especially if we have not heard all views. Regarding the workshop, the FSC asked Dr. Vajdová to convey the message that the enthusiasm and active involvement of the national participants was highly appreciated by the international delegates. The WG is still an article of interest for the FSC community. We hope that the impressive broad-based stakeholder participation and interest and authentic discussions experienced during the workshop can carry on.

See also a related decision under Item 20.

7. Special Country Update (Finland)

Last year the ONKALO construction license application was submitted, including both technical and socio-economic (employment) angles. Reviews are underway by the Ministry of Employment and Economy and the regulator STUK.

Open, public meetings held by the Ministry and the regulator have been very poorly attended. The discussion in society is more focused on new build – e.g. the difficulties with Olkiluoto 3. This can explain in part STUK's approach to the review, which is seen as particularly cautious because the regulator wants more developed planning to avoid construction delays.

8. Special Country Update (Russian Federation)

In 2011, a new Federal Law on RWM came into force. ROSATOM is tasked to deliver a repository very quickly.

ROSATOM conducted an interactive policy in preparing their Annual Public Report. Innovative forms of interaction were implemented, resulting in more than 90 proposals and recommendations. Most were considered for inclusion in the ROSATOM Report.

ROSATOM has Community Waste Management Projects around facilities addressing both management (efficiency orientation) and governance (safety focus). Each facility has to develop its own expert group to collect knowledge and speak with the different stakeholders. A small number of facilities are piloting this development.

In a separate presentation, interaction between RADON and technical and non-technical communities was described.

Action: As a result of this country update, it was suggested that, at FSC-15, we address *international reporting standards and guidance*, including stakeholder communication guidance. Let us examine their application in several country contexts to understand where these standards come from, and what these standards bring.

9. Special Country Update (Japan)

Plans for trust-building for NUMO following the Fukushima accident include active participation mechanisms.

The Science Council of Japan was solicited by the Japan Atomic Energy Commission in 2010 to give guidance on the possible approaches to final disposal. Following an exchange of statements, Government started discussions in May 2013. It has focussed questions on disposal methods, R&R, and social acceptance and trust (must nuclear policy be accepted before disposal can progress? What should implementation and siting policy look like?). Efforts are made in parallel to increase public understanding and provide discussion opportunities.

10. Considering Glossary Entries (Local Partnership)

New delegates were asked to study a Glossary entry and to prepare a very short presentation to stimulate the FSC: recalling the main features of the entry/concept, and offering a personal reflection (e.g., asking a critical question, indicating a way in which reference to the Glossary could be useful in his or her “home” context...). As a reminder, these PowerPoints will be made available online in the FSC members-only space and can be adapted by any member for presentation on behalf of the FSC.

11. Special Country Update (UK)

Policy maker standpoint: The six-stage Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) process in West Cumbria was brought to an end. Since the decision in January 2013, the UK Government has been conducting a review of the siting process for a geological disposal facility. An advice seminar including RWMC and FSC representatives was held in spring 2013. A call for evidence was issued. Replies showed that clarity of process is key and accountability is a stronger demand than flexibility.

Government’s consultation proposal as of September 2013 is to conduct a two-phase process consisting of “learning” then “focussing” by local communities. Engaging in learning does not require opting in as a siting candidate. Once the option is taken there are opt-out opportunities all through the focussing stage. Regarding veto power: Government intends to combine the principles of Localism and Subsidiarity meaning that the most closely situated tier should have a predominant voice.

Before looking for volunteers, national commitment must be demonstrated. Government will take a much more pro-active role in awareness-raising in early stages.

In the former process, vagueness on community benefits created uncertainty. Going forward, community benefits including added value programs will be clarified to provide visibility to local planning commissions. The aim is to demonstrate that participating in the process is fruitful.

Implementer experience: The process of stimulating and collecting feedback from local authorities and other stakeholders was described.

Regulator observations: The Environment Agency (lead regulator in terms of waste disposal) judge they need to do more in the siting phase without undermining their independence. They have no formal role in site selection but will participate actively in consultation events in order to respond to any questions on roles and responsibilities. The EA still needs to work out their key messages. Once the policy is announced they will work within the framework and will be freer to fill out the details of the role.

Some lessons learnt in the UK include:

Partnerships should include all the stakeholders who are supposed to participate in the partnership’s research and deliberation.

- Excluding the implementer in order to avoid creating the impression that decisions have already been taken, simply deprives the other stakeholders of access to their expertise.
- The partnership should also include all the tiers of local government to allow a full range of opinions to input to decisions, even if policy may ensure that ultimately the decisions are taken by the community to be most affected by the facility itself.

Stakeholders appreciate getting a demonstration of readiness (adequate funding and expertise) from the regulators.

Institutions, groups and individuals in favor of a process or a decision need to advocate actively for their position (just as those against make their position widely known).

12. Refreshing Theme 7 “KNOWLEDGE CONSOLIDATION AND TRANSFER” - FAQ

FSC annual meeting summaries and workshops syntheses (as well as some full proceedings) were reviewed so as to identify the topics raised by stakeholder participants, and any “frequently asked questions” (FAQ).

According to NRC experience, an important part of developing FAQs is to put together a multi-disciplinary team – including technical, social affairs, managerial, project management, communications, administrative, and IT profiles. Communication Plans are a key tool to support these staff. The steps to follow include finding messages, identifying audiences and stakeholders before selecting tools and methods for delivery. FAQs are complemented by other informational materials.

Who actually asks the questions that are gathered in FAQs? Are they created by the providers of the answers themselves? One thought behind the possible FSC project was to identify and address questions we have heard from local communities, mayors, regions...

It is agreed that what is needed are high-level principles, and recognition that the actual implementation of these principles is necessarily adapted to each context. Possibly we should single out overarching issues like those identified by Peter Andersson’s review of FSC documents: Added Value, Monitoring, etc., for which the FSC could provide online information without interfering in the important face-to-face relationship-building which has to take place in member countries.

Decision: The Core Group will reflect further on the FAQ proposal, its specific goal, potential audience, pertinence and utility. The CG will think about the differences between the existing Glossary and a proposed FAQ – what are the objectives for each? Do we want to give “FSC replies” or show the diversity of how others have replied? How much work do we want to put into this? Links to existing FAQs will be circulated to the FSC.

13. Refreshing Theme 3 “MEDIA, INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL COMMUNICATION, AND STAKEHOLDER CONFIDENCE”

Jay Redgrove reviewed the FSC’s Theme 3 activities highlighting some key findings from each activity 2004-2012. She thanked all the participants in topical sessions and especially Timo Seppälä for his theme leadership. Proposals for the way forward were focussed on the Social Media and it was agreed that the FSC is interested to continue looking into this.

The commercial “WebSite-Watcher” application was presented as a comparison tool that highlights the difference between a page the last time you checked and today. It is simple to choose the filters. Such a tool supports serious and reliable participation in a process, because your organisation remains well informed, and can input information and corrections if necessary. Monitoring the web calls for few resources whereas opening a SM platform is highly demanding: users expect a response to their input within minutes or hours.

Gianluca Ferraro summarised the Glossary entry “Confidence and Trust”, adding some theoretical references to highlight how much attention has been given to these terms. He invited the FSC to reflect on the components of institutional behaviour that may influence confidence and trust, and focussed on one potential choice: improving the communication of scientific information.

Decision: Jay Redgrove will start development of a questionnaire or another way of collecting social media examples and experience from our members.

14. Transparency as a transversal theme - Refreshing Theme 2: “CHANGING DYNAMICS OF INTERACTION AMONG RWM INSTITUTIONS AND STAKEHOLDER CONFIDENCE”

Activities in this theme across the three phases of the FSC were reviewed. The thematic chairs suggested that, going forward, Theme 2 could look into the regulatory *system* – which comprises not only the technical regulators but also operators and the community, in the context of RWM oversight.

Ansi Gerhardsson presented the glossary entry “Dialogue”. She proposed advice based on Sweden’s 30-year long experience in geological disposal development. Other delegates highlighted the importance of facilitation, because without it dialogue can easily turn into debate. In Russia “multilogues” are used.

Antoinette Warnback reviewed “Community of practice” (CoP) as a social theory of learning, according to which people learn when doing things together and form new knowledge in the process. They form a group around a task. They do not necessarily agree. The practice evolves and changes as people are replaced, and across task phases. She briefly presented her doctoral work for which she went through 5000 pages of documentation exchanged between industry and regulators in the context of the environmental impact assessments related to Sweden’s SNF management. It is hard to avoid a CoP in a long planning process. At the least it is necessary to be aware of roles, who has power over the discussion, who introduces new concepts and opens consideration of alternatives, etc. A process built to be transparent may circumvent CoP pressures and foster more communication.

SFOE and NAGRA made a joint presentation highlighting context, successes and challenges in dialogue between two organisations whose role in RWM is legally and pragmatically distinct – and yet which must interface strongly.

Dialogue about challenges is not only necessary but beneficial. Moreover, bringing different perspectives to bear can be helpful in dealing with challenges. Can this idea be transposed into the FSC? There are many different perspectives here. A dialogue in the FSC about challenges could be of added value to delegates who are at different stages in processes.

Bernadett Kakasy illustrated features of the glossary entry on “transparency” with practical examples from Hungary. Aarhus Convention compliance cases highlight that effective “access to information” is interpreted differently by various actors. The European Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom groups access to information and participation under the joint heading of transparency.

Wolfgang Hilden indicated that article 10 of Council Directive 2011/70 is intended to provide some flexibility to member states in how they implement transparency in their context. As of September 2013, all states have not yet notified their transposition of the directive’s National Framework requirement into their legislation but the road is open. The next focal point is the required Programme showing how the policy is to be implemented in practice (deadline to provide these implementation details is 2015).

Holmfridur Bjarnadottir suggested that the flyer could be updated, notably by introducing a dimension of understandability/comprehensibility alongside the issues of openness and accessibility which are addressed in the current flyer.

Four mixed breakout groups discussed the research, case study, and definitions provided during this long Theme 2 session. Suggested discussion themes were:

- 1) Challenges encountered in the relations between different actors in long-term RWM processes
- 2) Transparency as a requirement and as a helper in these relations.

Rapporteurs’ input could be categorised as follows: Paradigm shift needed from culture of secrecy to transparency - Transparency is about “how you do it”, not only “how much” - Challenges to achieving transparency - Are there limits to transparency (its extent, its effects)? - Balancing transparency and confidentiality.

The Secretariat, under the initiative of the Regulators' Forum, periodically updates the Regulatory System and Functions table. The most recent table was sent on 30 Sept. (with FSC-14 decisions) for information and use by delegates, and further checking and comment.

Suggestion that members read the 2005 report by the RF, [The Regulatory Function and Radioactive Waste Management: International Overview](#).

Decision: a group will be formed to look at the FSC transparency flyer, refining the definition of transparency and its application in our FSC context. Core Group and other FSC members can be part of this group. This update will incorporate discussion material from FSC-14.

15. Supporting (Early) Public Involvement (Exploratory Session under Theme 4: “TOOLS AND PROCESSES TO HELP SOCIETY PREPARE AND MANAGE DECISIONS (E.G., ABOUT TECHNOLOGY, SITES) THROUGH STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT”)

In the Canadian context, the early involvement requirement stemmed from a failed process of deciding about SNF management – where early involvement was seen to be lacking, and essential to forming social consent. The mission statement of NWMO thus focusses on the collaborative development and implementation of a SNF management approach. NWMO has tried to use early involvement and dialogue to develop the overall plan and presently the site selection process. Jo-Ann Facella showed how these have been built up in the absence of a stringent regulatory or legislative prescription. She presented the siting process steps, and the particular attention given to traditional Aboriginal knowledge and to engaging these populations. “Preliminary Assessment of Potential Suitability” of a community as a host site is an example of dialogue-driven early involvement in a process, in the absence of a specific regulatory or legislative framing. “Feasibility Studies” were presented in this context as an opportunity.

Going forward, FSC Theme 4 may consider questions like:

- What does ‘leadership’ mean, and look like? How may it differ at national, local and regional levels? How to leverage synergies?
- How can divergent stakeholder perspectives be reconciled?
- How are tools evolving? What about referenda?
- How can social consensus be sustained (over decades, with new entrants)? How can organisations foster continuous buy-in to a multi-year process? How can programs be adapted over time?
- How to support governments or implementing organizations to do more than “check-box” involvement as a response to legal requirements?

Wolfgang Hilden indicated that the European Nuclear Energy Forum (ENEF) advances European Commission DG ENERgy objectives through two new organs under its Transparency Working Group. E-TRACK or “Energy Transparency Centre for Knowledge” will collect the extensive knowledge on participation, establishing the link between concepts and their practical implementation, monitoring, dissemination and sharing of best practices. A Task Group on Benefits of Effective Public Participation (TgBEPP) planned to start in Oct 2013 will identify ways to improve processes and increase the actual influence of citizens.

NEA Legal Affairs provided an overview of some difficulties, identified from current available case law, to the implementation of the Aarhus and Espoo Conventions in the nuclear domain. The Aarhus Convention on access to information, participation and justice directly links environmental protection to a human rights norm, by stating that “*every person has the right to live in an environment adequate to his/her health and well-being*”. Individuals can submit a claim at their national level (through national administrative or judicial authorities – which may go faster) and also, in parallel, to the Compliance Committee at European Commission level. The EC can refer the case to the European Court of Justice. As a last resort, individuals may go to the European Court of Human Rights. NGOs and associations can bring actions if they have “protection of the environment/nature” in their statutes (and if, in some national contexts, they count a minimum number of subscribing members).

The Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee online information clearinghouse describes 58 cases of which 5 are nuclear-related. Case 41 concerns the Mochovce NPP. Permits and authorisations had been obtained several years ago but the construction process stopped when funding was short. Slovakia meanwhile became a Member state and Party, and launched the EIA process in 2009. Construction was scheduled to be completed in 2011 meaning that it might be terminated before any EIA comments were addressed. Thus the court recently recognized that the principle of early involvement was not respected.

Discussion: Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is a form of early involvement. Early involvement implies that the organisation must already prepare upstream for this involvement, and identify what measures are required so that this involvement can effectively lead at term to decision making. Early involvement is perhaps not appropriate in every situation. What is the basic framework or structure that is needed to support early involvement? Where is early involvement appropriate? Who is the leader, guardian or steward of the process?

Decisions: Improve and update the FSC Stakeholder Involvement Techniques booklet through review and inclusion of country examples, and consider completing it with 2 new chapters: the first on early involvement – framing the issues – and the last on compliance and assessment of whether there has been “enough” involvement, including oversight arrangements. Both chapters could address the generic questions that have arisen in this session.

The FSC approves of a continuing exchange with the NEA Nuclear Law Committee on experience with Aarhus and Espoo conventions compliance.

The FSC agrees to receive more information on the process of building the initiatives to foster effective citizen participation on RWM in Europe, that is “E-TRACK” (jointly by DG ENER/JRC) and “TgBEPPa” (by ENEF), and to receive invitations for specific tasks.

Agreed that “transparency” should be considered as a “transversal” theme in our PoW.

16. Special Country Update (Republic of Korea); Proposal for 2014 National Workshop and Community Visit in Korea

There are four different nuclear fuel cycle facilities in the Republic of Korea. Korea also possesses a dedicated ship to take LILW from each NPP site to the pertinent repository area. A second stage surface disposal facility has been started, for completion in 2016.

The 5th basic plan of electricity supply and demand foresees 34 reactor units by 2033 and allows estimation of SNF generation through 2083.

SNF is safely managed in storage facilities at the 23 reactor sites. Saturation would be attained as early as 2016 in one case (and as late as 2021 for the least saturated site). Expansions are planned extending the capacity through 2024 to 2028. All in all this gives about 10 years to develop a national storage solution.

Mr. Song reviewed policy history including the 2004 decision on the need for consent-based national policy on siting a centralised facility for SNF.

The FSC workshop and community visit (as well as a technical visit) could be held in Gyeong-Ju city, host of both the LILW repository and masterpieces of the golden age of Silla, including a 1600-year old observatory, the oldest surviving in East Asia.

The title of the workshop in KORAD’s view could be “Stakeholder engagement for policy-making on SNF management”. Principal themes could be: Establishing a policy and Preferable Stakeholder Engagement approach.

Participants would be: technical establishments, Korean government and national assembly, residents, local governments and councils of 5 NPP areas, the “civil watch group of NPP environment”, and local communities and NGOs.

Host expectations for workshop effects, as expressed by Mr. Song, are that social consensus would be enhanced, the necessity of the stakeholder engagement on SNF management would be widely understood; confidence and trust in stakeholder engagement programme would be enhanced.

Decision: The national workshop proposal by Republic of Korea is accepted in principle. The present discussion process will continue on the level of Chair, Secretariat and Hosts, with advice from the Core Group, and all players will be kept informed. A meeting should take place in Korea between stakeholders gathered in a programme committee, the FSC Chair and NEA Secretariat.

The workshop concept is to create a neutral ground for dialogue. We cannot necessarily deliver everything that hosts desire, and envisioned workshop effects cannot be “guaranteed”.

With regard to maximising participation, we considered whether the event should combine the regular FSC-15 meeting with the workshop and visit. Pragmatic considerations of funding arise. The Chair and Secretariat will consider how to best address this question.

[Nota bene, the dates discussed here at FSC-14 have had to be reconsidered over the course of Fall 2013. Information will be provided as early as possible in 2014.]

17. Refreshing Theme 5 – “INCREASING THE VALUE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES TO LOCAL COMMUNITIES”; Visioning

The FSC identified as early as 2002 the need to foster a durable relationship between a community and a facility, notably through maximising the value added by hosting a facility. The value-added theme was added to the PoW in 2005, and from 2007 onward we heard “cross-fertilisation” presentations from e.g. the water sector and artists. Work has progressively focussed on understanding the ways relationships are built between RWM institutions and communities to co-define added value and desired futures.

Jo-Ann Facella reminded us that there is no single definition of community well-being, and moreover, of community. The many dimensions of community identity all have implications. Communities who are invited to define their vision of a desired future may include consideration of economic health, environment, safety and security, spiritual aspects, social conditions, and the ambition to enhance opportunities for community members.

NWMO has started to develop a five-sided concept of assets that may be enhanced in a relationship between a community and a long-term RWM facility project. The current representation of this concept embraces Human, Social, Natural, Physical and Financial Assets. The visioning process is done in a collaborative mode, like the rest of the process.

Jay Redgrove presented four very different types of value added that stretch the concept beyond the sole economic basis. These are compliance; mitigation, remediation and managing environmental risks; compensation and community benefits; added value and shared value. She reviewed the main principles of added value and shared value, based in a sustainability concept, that were put forward in our 2007 FSC study “Fostering a Durable Relationship”.

Decision: Taking into account the new experience in several countries on collaborative creation of added value, the booklet [Fostering a Durable Relationship between a Waste Management Facility and its Host Community](#) can now be updated 7 years later, respecting the usual FSC practice of indicating a wealth of approaches rather than a “best practice” prescription.

18. Special Country Update (France)

Cigéo is the “Industrial geological disposal centre”; Gérald Ouzounian noted that the installation title does not mention radioactive waste. Like every large infrastructure project this project dossier is submitted to public debate in conformity with French legal requirements and the Aarhus Convention. The independent debate commission (five members and chair) was formed nine months before the start of the debate in May 2013. Andra prepared a “project owner document” also summarized in English and available on the debate

website <http://www.debatpublic-cigeo.org/> as well as Andra's website: <http://www.cigeo.com/en/>. Forty "actors' statements" (*cahiers d'acteur*) have been published, including one from agricultural unions and national political parties.

The first two public meetings of the debate had to be halted because of noisy protest in the room, and the schedule of large meetings was cancelled. The national commission extended the debate period by 2 months, and the smaller dedicated commission reorganised its programme to include webcast panel discussions and a consensus conference to take place in December 2014.

Various information tools have been developed by Andra (many websites, press conferences, print materials, exhibits and science museum collaboration, open houses and school visits, participation in trade fairs, 'infobus', advertisements, etc.). The international website is available in French, Spanish and English. It's important for Andra and for stakeholders to have international visibility. However, "active communication" during the debate period is forbidden.

ANCCLI (the national federation of local information commissions associated with nuclear installations) wished to investigate safety cases in general, in a continuing process. Ludivine Gilli from IRSN described how her institute cooperated with ANCCLI and CLIS de Bure on a programme to inform local commissioners. It was decided that in 2012-13 there would be a focus on intermediate and high level long lived waste as a capacity building exercise in anticipation of the public debate on Cigéo. Mostly technical subjects have been broached, but there is a request also for consideration of ethical issues. The dialogue initiative, financed by IRSN, is suspended during the national debate period.

Luis Aparicio organised a conference at Andra on megaprojects; proceedings will be published in 2014. Megaprojects are often plagued by cost and planning overflows. Each one is unique, complex and situated in its time and space. This means that a continuous process-oriented evaluation also must monitor flexibility and learning. Learning is difficult to measure. Which approaches are more suitable for conceptualising and evaluating the social dimensions of megaprojects? What can the experience from social impact assessment (SIA) teach us about challenges and possibilities in project evaluation and governance? What role should indicators play in monitoring the social impacts of megaprojects? Can social impact monitoring be designed in a way that would simultaneously foster learning and accountability?

Action: As a result of the France update, the Core Group will consider whether a topical session on socio-economic evaluation of megaprojects could be programmed at a future meeting.

19. Monitoring, Memory and Stakeholder Confidence

After reviewing the main features of the Glossary entry on Safety, Adriano Gambi related these to the development of Belgium's approach to long term waste management. Societal requests are integrated in the waste plan safety strategy as boundary conditions. Adriano Gambi showed a diagram of how these conditions are checked against or influence safety principles, strategic choices, and progressively more specific requirements resulting in a safety concept. The sustainability model is another framework for cross-checking conditions and requirements. Societal requests are seen as entry points for on-going dialogue. The glossary defines the main concepts that could guide dialogue and as such should be useful.

Claudio Pescatore reminded us that monitoring has been investigated by two Secretariat Studies: one technically oriented (physical processes with the IGSC), the other oriented to societal uses and demands (with the FSC). The RK&M project plans to combine the two reports once they are endorsed or commented upon by the FSC and IGSC, respectively, recognising those inputs.

The IGSC has issued a report on safety indicators for use with the safety case (<http://www.oecd-nea.org/rwm/docs/2012/rwm-r2012-7.pdf>; July 2012). The FSC could collaborate with the IGSC if desired, along the lines of the joint work on Natural Analogues: IGSC and FSC could develop and reply to a same set of questions, with discussion in a topical session at FSC, followed by a report to the IGSC.

In 2012 a quick online survey to FSC members formed the first basis for the Secretariat Study on “Local stakeholders’ positions on monitoring and memory”. Claire Mays presented a new brief survey from Summer 2013 intended to monitor this topic. It confirmed that, with variations appropriate to the context and RWM phase in each country, there is civil society and local stakeholder interest in monitoring and also in the preservation of RK&M.

Meritxell Martell presented the pre-final report of the extensive Secretariat Study. Areas that local people say should be monitored were reported in descending order of citation as: environment, socio-economic impacts, epidemiology, “general monitoring and control”, physical processes, and institutional processes and players. Requests for monitoring in the operational and pre-operation phases are most clearly articulated. The post-operational phase limited to a few hundred years has gained some attention but there are few demands recorded for monitoring in the far long-term (thousands of years post-closure).

Monitoring can strengthen confidence through its contributions to safety and transparency. In this light it is important to involve independent oversight bodies in both monitoring and review of outcomes. Going forward (and in harmony with the discussions at FSC-14 on Early Involvement), an active role for communities can be foreseen in defining monitoring aspects: what to monitor, why, who would be in charge, how much it would cost, etc...

Discussion: In Switzerland, monitoring will form part of law.

Monitoring is not only to capture and punish failures, but also to give ongoing information about events and changes in the broad field of the RWM facility. For instance, monitoring can be a way of learning about how people define their well-being, and how this changes over time. All issues need not be solved within the scope of the implementer’s action. Monitoring may be led concurrently by other actors on e.g. overall environmental and public health.

Decisions: The existing survey/interview study report is favorably viewed. Comments and updates, if any, to the study report are expected by mid-October. (None received.)

The FSC will keep a watching brief on monitoring and memory issues.

Beyond the FSC, monitoring is a topic of interest to the RK&M project and the IGSC. The FSC is open to future collaborations with these groups.

20. Modus Operandi of the FSC

It was proposed that in each meeting some discussion could focus on one challenge. Examples could be: how to sustain a dialogue over time, with entry and exit of individuals and stakeholder groups. The overarching issues picked out by Peter Andersson in his FAQ survey of our literature (item 12.c) could give a good starting list. “Safe space” rules are needed (for proposal of topics, and for confidentiality of informal discussions engaging only personal opinions).

In future presenters should provide, before the meeting, one page identifying main actors and process/programme features for each country –so that less basic information needs to be delivered during presentations, while still keeping members abreast of developments in other contexts. Factual information could be referenced by websites etc.

Decisions: Czech Workshop: each participant should produce a 10-line or half page statement about what they learned and their personal recommendations, if any. This work will be facilitated by circulation of the draft proceedings in the first part of November. An extract of these statements was communicated to the WG on dialogue in the Czech Republic via the Czech representatives in the FSC, on 24 Dec. 2013.

The Core Group will take into consideration the various proposals regarding safe space, purpose of meetings, balance between presentations and discussion time, combination of regular meeting and national workshop. Individual members are free to input their particular concerns in writing.

The FSC will renew its practice of requesting country updates on items of FSC interest prior to each meeting. The Secretariat will propose a template. Information provided in writing will not need to be presented orally, thereby leaving more time for discussion.

21. Updating Identity and Workshop flyers

Jose Cuadrado presented a general proposal for text and visual updating of the Identity flyer. It is also proposed to update the Workshops flyer to reflect both the most recent Workshops and the Questionnaire for Potential Hosts recently developed by the Secretariat and Core Group.

Action: The Core Group will continue to work with Jose Cuadrado to revise the flyers and submit drafts to the membership.

22. Core Group membership

Decision: Core Group composition was confirmed.

Renewing members are:

- Ms. Holmfridur BJARNADOTTIR (Sweden) - *Chair*
- Ms. Jo-Ann FACELLA (Canada) – *Principal Vice Chair*
- Ms. Jay REDGROVE (UK)

New members are:

- Mr. Jose CUADRADO (USA)
- Ms. Martine HURAUT (France)
- Ms. Pascale KÜNZI (Switzerland)

Thanks are expressed to our former member who leaves the FSC and the CG in 2013:

- Mr. Sébastien FARIN (France)

Extra item. A picture technique used in Russia as a tool for facilitating discussion

Russia has built a unified system of RWM. To ensure transparency, four levels of concern and decision must be mapped using models and indicators. Tatiana Rakitskaya proposes to share with the FSC such tools and methods to support dialogue and multilogue.

APPENDIX 1

DETAILED SUMMARY OF PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

of the 14th Session of the Forum on Stakeholder Confidence

NEA, Issy-les-Moulineaux, France, 17-19 September 2013

TUESDAY 17 SEPTEMBER - DAY 1

INTRODUCTION

1.a,b WELCOME and Roundtable

FSC Chair; NEA Secretariat;

This is the second meeting chaired by Holmfridur Bjarnadottir, and her first as Chair (at FSC-13 she was Chair by interim).

With Michael Siemann (Head) and Claudio Pescatore (Principal Administrator) of the NEA RPRWM Division, she welcomed new FSC delegates and acknowledged those who have moved on. All present introduced themselves.

Action: The updated list of FSC-14 attendees (without emails) was placed on the password protected meeting website (1 Oct 2013).

For the record:

The Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation are represented for the first time at the FSC. The Russian Federation is a new (2013) Member of the NEA.

- **Myung Jae Song** and **Joo Wan Park**, respectively President and CEO, and Director of KORAD (Korea Radioactive Waste Agency).
- New Russian members present are: **Tatyana Rakitskaya** (ROSATOM), **Oleg Grishin** (RADON), **Alexei Khovanov** (VNIPIET), **Mikhail Stakhiv** (ROSEA).
- **Gianluca Ferraro** joins from the EC Joint Research Centre.
- **Conor Ritchie** replaces Clare Bayley from DECC (UK). Clare joined us at FSC-13 and attended the Karlovy Vary workshop.
- From Niras-Ondraf, **Adriano Gambi** becomes a member today. Sigrid Eeckhout ceases her membership (she joined at the Sweden Workshop in 2011) and is replaced by our long-time member Evelyn Hooft (who joined us at the 1st National Workshop in Finland, and organised the 2nd Workshop, in Belgium).
- Stefan Jordi (Swiss Federal Office for Energy) is replaced by Pascale Künzi. Stefan first joined us at the Hungary Workshop in 2006. We met Pascale in Prague and Karlovy Vary last year.
- Sébastien Farin (Andra) is replaced by Martine Huraut. Sébastien joined us in 2008 at FSC-9. We met Martine with Bure local stakeholders at the Sweden Workshop in 2011.
- Karina de Beule left FANC and FSC. Karina first joined at our 10-year Anniversary Colloquium and FSC-11 in 2010.
- Ivo Kaplan left SURAO and FSC. Ivo joined at the 10-year Anniversary Colloquium and FSC-11. When attending the Sweden Workshop in May 2011 he was inspired to organise the 2012 Czech Republic Workshop.)

Note that (a) the FSC has become renewed in the past year or so with delegates from Belgium, France, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Spain, Switzerland,

the United Kingdom, United States and the European Commission; (b) this fact has been considered in the agenda (discussion of our Annotated Glossary); (c) this is a good omen for the FSC. We witnessed the vibrant contribution of new members at the Czech Republic workshop last year.

Claudio Pescatore briefly reviewed OECD guidance on formalising membership status. As a working party of the lead committee RWMC, the FSC has three categories of participants:

1) FSC Member Delegates

- Delegates officially nominated to the FSC according to **internal national procedures**. *They are committed to the year-round work of the FSC* including review of reports. They receive all communications, have access to the restricted webpage, and can become Core Group members.

2) Non-member or ad-hoc Delegates

- Delegates officially nominated as participants in a specific FSC meeting or activity (including individuals who represent members in their absence). They are informed about the meeting they attend but do not systematically receive other communications or invitations.

3) Observers

- Individuals who do not represent their countries, invited by the NEA to participate.

Who can be – or should be – a Member Delegate? The FSC welcomes the participation of the broadest range of individuals. FSC membership remains open to any individual formally nominated by their NEA member country, or by an organisation in their country. All persons who wish to participate regularly should seek to formalise their membership. This consolidates the legitimacy of our international working party, and provides administrative clarity.

How is membership recorded? The nominating country or organisation should inform their National Mission to the OECD of the nomination. The NEA adds the name to the official roster of Member Delegates upon receiving the formal nomination from the Mission.

How should participants register for meetings and workshops? All Member or Non-member Delegates are registered for each meeting by their National Mission to the OECD. (The list of country representatives/contacts is always provided with the invitation to each FSC meeting and can be obtained from the Secretariat upon request.) All observers are registered directly by the NEA Secretariat.

Action: The Secretariat will circulate a notice on formalising membership. Action should be taken by those designated at that time.

2. REVIEW OF DIRECTING DOCUMENTS

Review and adoption of the agenda

2.a FSC Chair; NEA Secretariat

D The objectives of this Fourteenth Regular Meeting of the FSC are to:

1. Become better acquainted with the individuals making up the FSC and with their contexts;
2. Familiarize new members with the work and the vocabulary of the FSC, by considering the Annotated Glossary (2013);
3. Renew our investment in our Programme of Work (PoW), by “refreshing” its themes and receiving country updates on particular topics;
4. Discuss our Modus Operandi and consider new formats for our meetings;

5. Review and bring forward the decision-making process related to our next National Workshop and Community Visit (candidate: Republic of Korea);
6. Set plans to reinforce our knowledge transfer activities, which could include e.g. an “FAQ” section on our website.

The overall composition of the agenda implied considering together the FSC mission and mandate. Throughout the meeting the FSC identity was jointly elaborated, and orientations were drawn for updating at least the “Identity” flyer. (*current version dated Aug. 2009*).

Decision: Adopted without significant change.

2.b Approval of Summary Record of the FSC-13 meeting

FSC Chair

D The FSC-13 list of decisions was circulated 16 Nov 2012.

Decision: Adopted in principle. Additional comments that arrived after the Sept 2013 deadline were integrated.

BRIEFINGS ON NEA WORKING PARTIES AND PROJECTS

3. THE FSC

I

3.a Review of main activities launched or achieved since October 2012

NEA Secretariat

A paper copy of the [FSC Annotated Glossary of Key Terms](#) was mailed to FSC members in May 2013. We wish to foster appropriate uses for the glossary in different national and institutional contexts, translations, distribution of the document, etc.

At various points during FSC-14, a new delegate presented a glossary entry pertinent to the particular theme or topic of discussion. Delegates were asked to listen with a mind to deepening their understanding of FSC concepts and their evolution, identifying concrete examples, and proposing actions to take our work forward inside and outside our meetings.

3.b Deliberations of the FSC Core Group

FSC Chair, NEA Secretariat

Several meetings were held between the Core Group and the Secretariat to prepare the agenda.

They worked together as well to identify clearly the objectives of the FSC National Workshops and Community Visits, developing a Questionnaire for Potential Hosts.

Potential new members were approached to round out the Core Group composition and respond to the departure of several members; nominations are to be confirmed at the end of this meeting.

4. REVIEW OF RWMC AND ITS WORKING PARTIES

NEA Secretariat

I

For the benefit of new members, C. Pescatore explained that the Radioactive Waste Management Committee (RWMC) is a large lead committee. It is supported by and oversees the Forum on Stakeholder Confidence (FSC), the Regulators Forum (RF), Working Party on Decommissioning and Dismantling (WPDD), Integration Group for the Safety Case (IGSC), and various international initiatives or projects including one that is garnering special interest: “Preservation of Records,

Knowledge and Memory Across Generations” (RK&M). The new Chair of RWMC is J-P. Minon of Belgium.

Claudio Pescatore reviewed main messages and principal products of the RWMC and working parties. At its 46th meeting in March 2013 the **RWMC** expressed high appreciation for the FSC support, in particular for the [Collective Statement](#) released at the time of the Toronto “International Conference on Geological Repositories” entitled “National Commitment, Local Involvement”. The RWMC is starting a project for regular publication of Status and Trends with the EC and IAEA.

Cooperation took place in the past year between the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) and NEA’s RWMC and the Committee on Radiation Protection and Public Health (CRPPH). This resulted in the publication in June 2013 of the report ICRP 122, providing guidance on RP in geological disposal. The report clarifies the classical ICRP 81, and highlights new concepts, including oversight, which interests the Regulators Forum and Preservation of Records, Knowledge and Memory (RK&M) project in particular. ICRP 122 states that there is never an intention to cease oversight but plans for geological disposal must prepare for its potential loss. There is thus a role for society in keeping this watchful eye, with different levels of stringency across time. See the jointly published RWMC-CRPPH-ICRP flyer “*Radiological Protection and Geological Disposal: The guiding principles and recommendations of the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP)*”. Oversight is carried out by humans, while control can be carried out by machines too. The **RF** has carried out an analysis of international texts and found that the term of “control” is very ambiguous (confusion of controller and function).

The **WPDD** released a flyer on “[Estimation of Nuclear Facility Decommissioning Costs](#)”. While cost categories and plans can be established, at this stage it’s not wise to compare actual costs of entire projects; this flyer explains why, and what we are doing to diminish the difficulties.

The **RK&M** project looks at the phases after closure of a geological disposal. There are 15 member organisations from 12 countries that pay a voluntary contribution, which demonstrates their high interest. Phase-II is under preparation, with a large international conference to be held in Verdun, France in Sept. 2014. The FSC should consider making a contribution to this conference.

The RK&M project has looked at Markers and at Loss of Memory/Records (where regulatory effectiveness emerges as a central issue). As for Monitoring, the FSC is helping with the investigation of stakeholder demand, and practical possibilities are being looked into with the help of IGSC. RK&M has found that international mechanisms beyond RWM can help us (example: UNESCO heritage provisions).

A study was started on criteria for the “Set of Essential Records” (SER) to accompany a repository. The study will reach out to specialists and non-specialists to get their views on what should be included in the SER. In Summer 2013 a pre-pilot phase established an interview questionnaire for this purpose.

The final deliverable from RK&M Phase-I, for release by March 2014, is a Menu-Driven Document. It is currently being developed on a Wiki platform. The intention is to help build national RK&M strategies.

IGSC: Last year the peer review of the Swedish safety case was completed. The terms of reference requested review of the stakeholder part too – indicating that the safety case does contain some dimension of stakeholder involvement. The peer review considered public outreach, input and consent, and continuity of knowledge.

The IGSC international symposium 7-9 October 2013 includes a Secretariat presentation of the FSC experience on stakeholder aspects. Monitoring and safety indicators are identified as areas of cooperation with the IGSC.

SELECTED INTERNATIONAL INPUT

5. INTERNATIONAL MEETINGS AND PROJECTS

- 5.a** Our organisations are interested in learning from others about stakeholder aspects. As a group we can flag upcoming meetings and opportunities. We can find a mechanism to keep each other informed.

The Secretariat indicated the following meetings:

- 2nd InSOTEC Stakeholder Seminar “Socio-Technical Challenges of Long-Term Radioactive Waste Governance”. Berlin, Germany, 12-13 Nov. 2013.
- End Users Conference of the IPPA Project. Prague, 30 September - 1 Oct. 2013.
- EURADWASTE '13, the 8th European Commission conference on the management of radioactive waste - Community policy and research on disposal, Vilnius, Lithuania, 14-16 October 2013.

New input from delegates included:

- KORAD Technology Symposium, Science Town, South Korea, 14-15 Nov. 2013. Technology of SNF management; Current status of SNF management in various countries.
- Symposium of Swedish National Council, Stockholm, 20-21 November 2013. “New Insight into Repositories Engineered Barriers”. Long term safety of copper canisters, with international studies. Long-term performance of the bentonite buffer, with Swedish, Finnish and French research.
- WM2014, Phoenix, Arizona USA, 2 – 6 March 2014. “How Clean is Clean”. RK&M panel and four papers. NEA Sweden Peer review.
- IAEA peer review mission of decommissioning, Fukushima, Nov-Dec 2013: NEA is invited as stakeholders expert on this mission.
- IGD-TP Conference, Manchester UK, 24-26th June 2014. “The inaugural IGD-TP-Geodisposal conference will take place at the University of Manchester, birthplace of many great nuclear scientific discoveries. IGD-TP Geodisposal 2014 will showcase Geodisposal Science from across the EU and beyond and share best practice in geological disposal research and implementation. <https://www.meeting.co.uk/confercare/geodisposal2014/> “
- NEA activities in Japan in 2014: public workshop on low doses, thyroid cancer; off-site decontamination.
- EAGLE – a European Commission coordination action seeking to enhance education, training and public information on Ionizing Radiation Risks (and safety arrangements). International meetings will be announced.
- PLATENSO coordinated by Kjell Andersson is an EC platform for socio economic research on waste management in Eastern European countries, comparable to technical platforms on RWM. Holmfridur Bjarnadottir will be an Advisory Board member.

Action: Information on further meetings should be sent to the Secretariat.

5.b Discussion: Projects and collaboration opportunities

FSC Principal Vice Chair, FSC members

The Core Group proposed that we should have a (web-based) log of meetings and conferences, to keep track of where delegates have been and plan to go, and to share meeting notes and

presentations. Delegates agreed that it would be helpful to keep a running list.

FSC members are (once again) encouraged to act as ambassadors, proposing presentations about our work to conferences. People should make this presentation as members of the FSC rather than of their own organisation.

These efforts will contribute to keeping our work alive and continuously updated.

Actions and decisions:

- On the **FSC secure web space (members only access)**, the Secretariat will post conferences and meetings that have a Stakeholder Confidence dimension, upon submission of such items by members.
- Members are invited to submit notes or mission reports from major conferences, even “anonymously” if preferred.
- Information will be shared there about opportunities to collaborate on projects by, for example, presenting FSC learning.
- To support this, an NEA/FSC PPT library will be stocked with materials: for instance, presentations that were made about our work at the RWMC, or the Glossary concepts presented by new members at this meeting.

SPECIAL COUNTRY UPDATES (1)

6. CZECH REPUBLIC

6.a Feedback on the 2012 FSC Workshop and Subsequent Developments – Principal Host

Lucie Steinerová (SURAO)

About 140 persons in all participated in the FSC Workshop of 2013.

SURAO (formerly referred to as RAWRA) considers voluntarism to be a major organising principle for repository siting including the current step of seeking local agreement to participate in geological survey work. At Certovka, a referendum in one of the four associated municipalities came out against the siting, which stopped the process for all. At Kravi Hora too, the process was stopped for 8 municipalities by one referendum.

Central government hypothesized that because the Kravi hora former uranium mining area was experienced with the nuclear industry the residents would have less fear. Former mining operator DIAMO-GEAM was thus instructed to conduct repository siting and development steps in that zone. A new national strategy for siting was introduced by Government decision at the end of 2012. Both existing pre-candidate sites and nuclear installation host sites should be investigated. Surface-based surveys are supposed to reduce the number of sites from 7 to 4 by 2015. In 2016-18, survey drilling should take place at these four sites and local opinion should be monitored. Final site selection should focus on 2 candidate sites and terminate in 2020-25. Stakeholders, including SURAO, judge this schedule and strategy to be infeasible.

6.b Feedback on the FSC Workshop and Subsequent Developments –Working Group for Dialogue on the Site Selection Process of a Deep Geological Repository

Zdenka Vajdová (Chair of the Working Group)

The FSC Workshop took place at a “*better time, when all things looked good for negotiations and the work of the Working Group was appreciated by state agencies*”. Dr. Vajdová reviewed the

FSC workshop sessions, identifying as most important the one entitled “Developing Confidence in a Participatory Process of Siting”. There is little local confidence that agreeing to allow investigations does not in fact mean automatic agreement to host a geological disposal facility. The referendum appears thus to be a very important tool for the local people, whereas from the agency perspective it is an obstacle to refining site knowledge. It is hard to say whether residents are better represented by local elected officials favourable to siting or NGOs who called for the referenda. Dr. Vajdová, who is also a sociologist, judges that probably more people are needed to interview the different parties to reach some conclusion on the state of acceptance in each locality.

The post-workshop governmental decision to push survey work forward on a short time schedule is perceived as despotism. There is a very strong demand on SURAO to keep their promise of voluntarism; involved municipalities need to be full-fledged partners.

The Working Group recognized the mediation offered by the FSC and expressed high appreciation of the relations established between the FSC and the local Czech people and their problems. The citizens received with great trust the replies given to their questions by the FSC participants, understanding that this information from colleagues from abroad was authentic and sincere without any hidden interest. On the basis of the FSC public debate meeting Dr. Vajdová concluded that her working group must go to the localities and apply all available procedures to encourage the participation of local people in the process.

Dr. Vajdová also reported on the WG’s legislative subgroup which after 2 years of labour produced a legislative proposal aimed at empowering communities in the siting process. There has been little response to this submission and the WG feels that officialdom has no interest in the matter.

The Working Group’s two years of engagement are seen as positive. Understanding was created among its stakeholder members. However, uncertainties inbuilt to its status, its “*foggy relation to the IPPA research project*” hindered the work. The WG cannot function as “*no agency needs its advice*”. The need to input to energy policy as part of waste management was not clearly stated in its mission. The group finds itself in a vacuum of information about state intentions. It “*lost its legitimacy as well as its funds*”. In May 2013, the Working Group responded to the overall situation by suspending its plenary work indefinitely.

On the positive side, new research projects are partially financed:

- Scenario of future development of the micro region of NPP Dukovany – Charles University and Assoc of Municipalities around Dukovany.
- Social communication and trust building in process of site selection for geological disposal at Kravi Hora – an application of the RISCUM technique by Dr. Vajdová’s Institute of Sociology.
- PLATENSO platform.

6.c Discussion

FSC Chair

SURAO noted that the FSC workshop demonstrated the need to involve the regulator. The regulator did engage during the event but more time is needed to find out how to create a continuous involvement – the present law mentions the regulator’s role only in regard to licensing and not as guarantor of the safety of the process and site.

The workshop experience was very positive, many opinions were expressed. FSC speakers, especially the local representatives who spoke in the Public Meeting, were very much appreciated by the Czech participants. However, “*what happened afterwards was completely opposite to what we had experienced*”. The government decision regarding Kravi hora effectively broke the promise by SURAO to proceed only with the full agreement of local communities. The May 2013

decision to interrupt Working Group meetings was unanimous. The report is on SURAO's website (SURAO is a member of the Working Group).

Under the government directive, DIAMO was contracted by SURAO and applied to the Environment Ministry for administrative designation of the Kravi hora research zone. The permission has not been granted in 9 months; this is seen as a bad start, and suggests that there will be further large delays despite the new siting calendar imposed by government.

One important conclusion from the FSC WS was that trust is built on the local level. SURAO sees its only option is to try to gather people to talk, to build a circle of people interested in the siting process, who will follow the information. Forty municipalities must find an agreement. No actor is happy, especially under the pressure to settle final candidate sites by 2018.

SURAO is hosting the upcoming End Users Conference of the IPPA project. It is hoped that this conference will provide the opportunity to "*start something new*". The director of the energy section of the Ministry of Industry has accepted to speak about the need for a participatory process in siting. Although as a member of the Working Group he never attended any meeting he appears prepared to support the group's continuation.

Dr. Vajdová highlighted the workshop statement by the mayor of Dukovany: "*Who defines energy policy? Lobbies and producers, following their short term interests. There is a strong need for a long term concept related to energy and it is not yet on the table.*" She noted the need for a stable and permanent interlocutor for the Working Group that would not be limited by short term interests. There is currently an appeal to the Senate to take over from the Ministry as the recipient of the Working Group advice, as this would provide more legitimacy under present legislation.

Dr. Vajdová asked for an FSC message to deliver to the Working Group for dialogue on Site Selection Process and to local people involved in the siting process, regarding the workshop and subsequent national events.

Actions:

- The FSC cannot comment officially on the subsequent national events, especially if we have not heard all views.
- Regarding the workshop, the FSC asked Dr. Vajdová to convey the message that the enthusiasm and active involvement of the national participants was highly appreciated by the international delegates. The WG is still an article of interest for the FSC community. We hope that the impressive broad-based stakeholder participation and interest and authentic discussions experienced during the workshop can carry on.

See also a related decision under Item 20.

7. FINLAND

7.a Progress in the Licensing Process in Finland

Timo Seppälä (Posiva)

Last year the ONKALO construction license application was submitted, including both technical and socio-economic (employment) angles. Reviews are underway by the Ministry of Employment and Economy and the regulator STUK. Sixteen thousand pages of documentation were submitted to the regulator including the preliminary long-term safety assessment report. Hundreds of additional requirements and questions are expected throughout the year. STUK has judged some points deficient: descriptions of technical systems (this is the critical point), operational accident analysis, basis of safety classification required in plant design. Posiva still hopes to begin construction in 2015. The next ONKALO licensing step would be for operations (targeted for 2022).

Open, public meetings held by the Ministry and the regulator have been very poorly attended. The discussion in society is more focused on new build – e.g. the difficulties with Olkiluoto 3. This can explain in part STUK’s approach to the review, which is seen as particularly cautious because the regulator wants more developed planning to avoid construction delays.

7.b Discussion

Do municipalities still retain some type of veto power vis. the national decision process even at this advanced stage? No – the Decision in Principle was the veto opportunity. The only way to stop the process now would be to refuse to grant POSIVA the construction license. This is quite unlikely. Moreover there is at the moment strong support among the municipal leaders for the project.

8. RUSSIAN FEDERATION

8.a Principal current issues of Rosatom

Tatiana Rakitskaya (Rosatom)

In 2011, a new Federal Law on RWM came into force. ROSATOM is tasked to deliver a repository very quickly.

Interaction policy in the process of public report preparation: The Annual Public Report is seen as a dynamic process to manage stakeholder interactions. It is a highly integrative activity throughout the corporation as it involves the mapping of competences and knowledge.

Innovative forms of interaction include intergenerational collaboration (schools project); public discussion of plans for legacy waste management; inter-professional collaboration... Dialogues resulted in more than 90 proposals and recommendations. Most were considered for inclusion in the ROSATOM Report.

New Practice of Stakeholders Engagement in the Context of the Entry into Force of the Federal Law on RWM on July 11, 2011: the new concept of RWM activities recognizes a need for not only a safe but also cost-effective system, taking into consideration economic, natural and technological cycles. The staged system has radiation safety monitoring at its core; the system seeks to maintain safety, maintain efficiency, and also meet global expansion goals. ROSATOM has modelled a “multifocal system of strategic management” – creating an “advanced governance system”.

ROSATOM has Community Waste Management Projects around facilities addressing both management (efficiency orientation) and governance (safety focus). Each facility has to develop its own expert group to collect knowledge and speak with the different stakeholders. A small number of facilities are piloting this development.

8.b Innovative technologies of dialogue with technical and non-technical community

Oleg Grishin (Radon)

Interaction with technical and non-technical communities was described: TV, print media, social networks, exhibits and conferences, live and virtual press conferences all are used. Overall these activities illustrate that his institution, Radon, begins to be open.

Discussion: The present international guidelines G3.1 do not require reporting the quantity of radioactive waste, but new guidelines G4 will call for integrative reporting of financial and safety information together. ROSATOM has already established this with the present Annual Public Report. In Russia only the emplacement of the waste must be disclosed, while site-specific information on quantity for example is closed. However, everything ROSATOM is authorised to reveal they put into the report and there is enough for people to draw their conclusion. Indicators

have been established so that when the law changes one day, all information will be immediately available.

Action: As a result of this country update, it was suggested that at FSC-15 we address *international reporting standards and guidance*, including stakeholder communication guidance. Let us examine their application in several country contexts to understand where these standards come from, and what these standards bring.

9. JAPAN

9.a Brief on recent developments in Japan

Reiko Nunome (NUMO)

Plans for trust-building for NUMO following the Fukushima accident include active participation mechanisms:

- Interactive communication in grassroots-style workshops
- Feedback system to gather public opinion
- Effective PR activities for better understanding
- Continued good discussions by listening to the communities

In Sept 2010, prior to the accident, the Japan Atomic Energy Commission (JAEC) sent a formal request to the Science Council of Japan to give guidance on the possible approaches to final disposal. The Council's reply in September 2012 pointed to a need to overhaul HLW disposal policy, recognizing the tenacious efforts that would be required. It was advised to:

- Realize the limitations of scientific and technological capability and secure scientific autonomy
- Rebuild a policy framework centered on "Temporary Safe Storage and Total Volume Control"

The Council highlighted the need for an acceptable policy-making procedure to address "fair burden-sharing" and recommended that a multi-step discussion procedure to build consensus be undertaken.

JAEC responded in December 2012 with an aligned statement, also recognising that Government leads policy restructuring. Government started discussions in May 2013. It has focussed questions on disposal methods, R&R, and social acceptance and trust (must nuclear policy be accepted before disposal can progress? What should implementation and siting policy look like?).

Efforts are made in parallel to increase public understanding and provide discussion opportunities.

Measurements show that levels of trust continue to decrease.

IMPLEMENTING THE FSC PROGRAMME OF WORK (1)

10. CONSIDERING GLOSSARY ENTRIES (1)

FSC Chair

New delegates were asked to study a Glossary entry and to prepare a very short presentation to stimulate the FSC: recalling the main features of the entry/concept, and offering a personal reflection (e.g., asking a critical question, indicating a way in which reference to the Glossary could be useful in his or her "home" context...). As a reminder, the glossary Powerpoints will be made available online in the FSC members-only space and can be adapted by any member for presentation on behalf of the FSC.

10.a “Local Partnership”

Silvia Rueda Sanchez

The major principles identified for the formation of Local Partnerships around siting a RWM facility include voluntarism, veto right, collaboration in facility design and implementation, and provision of community benefits. Enresa has implemented these principles in its relationship with the communities around the El Cabril LIL short-lived waste facility, and in the case of decommissioning Vandellos I and Jose Cabrera NPPs.

As for the Centralised Interim Storage Facility for Spent Fuel and HLW, no specific law requires public involvement for siting, however SIA and EIA legislation and the licensing process do call for it. COWAM Spain proposed a siting procedure and an Interministerial Commission was set up by royal decree to lead the process. At present, the facility is sited, working groups are in place and trust and confidence are established between the host community and the managing technologists.

Enresa congratulates the FSC on the publication of the Glossary reflecting the synthesis of the international collaboration taking place in our Forum. This collaboration fostered Spain’s transparent, voluntary and successful siting process.

Note that the powerpoint file is made available online for adaptation by member delegates, to be presented on behalf of the FSC.

SPECIAL COUNTRY UPDATES (2)

11. THE UK

11.a The MRWS Process: Status and lessons learned from policy maker standpoint

Conor Ritchie, DECC

Since the 2012 FSC meeting, the six-stage Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) process in West Cumbria was brought to an end.

Enough had been learned about West Cumbria to know that some areas were potentially suitable for geological disposal but stage 4 had to be engaged to learn more. In terms of public acceptance, the WC communities had knowledge but also a long history including experience of a less transparent process.

The borough councils (tier 1) voted in favour of proceeding to stage 4 (site selection) of the MRWS process, however the county (tier 2) voted against. In 2011 Government had given a specific undertaking that the existing site-selection process would continue in West Cumbria only if there was agreement at both borough and county level. The county’s decision therefore ended the existing site selection process in West Cumbria. The UK Government remains firmly committed to geological disposal as the right policy for the long-term safe and secure management of higher-activity radioactive waste, to be implemented through the principles of voluntarism and partnership.

Since the decision in January 2013, the UK Government has been conducting a review of the siting process for a geological disposal facility. An advice seminar including RWMC and FSC representatives was held in spring 2013. A call for evidence was issued.

Practical inputs have highlighted the need for earlier information on a number of issues from geology to community benefits – the decision points in the MRWS process meant that communities couldn’t get the needed information without committing to the next phase whereas they felt they needed that information in order to deliberate the commitment. Clarity of process is key and accountability is a stronger demand than flexibility.

Government's consultation proposal as of September 2013 is to conduct a two-phase process consisting of "learning" then "focussing" by local communities. Engaging in learning does not require opting in as a siting candidate. Once the option is taken there are opt-out opportunities all through the focussing stage.

Before looking for volunteers, national commitment must be demonstrated (recalling the RWMC Collective Statement shaped by FSC learning). Government will take a much more pro-active role in awareness-raising in early stages. Independently produced, detailed geological survey information will be available so that communities can look into the issues on their own before deciding to join the process.

The 2008 MRWS White Paper did not specify which tier of local government should exercise veto power. At present Government intends to combine the principles of Localism and Subsidiarity meaning that the most closely situated tier should have a predominant voice. That tier should attempt to demonstrate public support for its decision, through referendum or survey.

In the former process, vagueness on community benefits created uncertainty. Going forward, community benefits including added value programs will be clarified to provide visibility to local planning commissions. The aim is to demonstrate that participating in the process is fruitful.

11.b Implementer's experience: Concluding and reviewing at the end of a local process

Jay Redgrove, NDA

The process of stimulating and collecting feedback from local authorities and other stakeholders was described here in more detail. The call for evidence in May 2013 produced 188 responses from a range of actors and these will be published. Responses were fed into a consultation document launched in Sept 2013. It was developed with a range of major stakeholders. This consultation will run for 12 weeks. Engagement is planned so as to present and discuss the proposed process in more detail during public meetings run by NDA. Articles in journals, website, bilateral meetings with key stakeholders, workshops, deliberative public events are all planned. Five 2-step focus groups will be conducted (step one is an information session, with a deliberative discussion in step 2). NDA has engaged the very extensive Women's Institute among others.

11.c Observations by the Regulator

David Brazier, Environment Agency

The Environment Agency is lead regulator in terms of waste disposal, while the Office of Nuclear Regulation deals with safeguards and transport. These two regulators have a joint programme on scrutiny. The EA plans to respond to the government consultation setting out key issues from their perspective. The call for evidence produced 8-10 submissions concerning the regulators' role reflecting generally integrated ideas (regulator needs to be active, ensure safety...). No West Cumbrian comments addressed the regulator.

The EA judges they need to do more in the siting phase without undermining their independence. They have no formal role in site selection but will participate actively in consultation events in order to respond to any questions on roles and responsibilities. The EA still needs to work out their key messages. Once the policy is announced they will work within the framework and will be freer to fill out the details of the role.

The EA has the ability to stage own events and workshops, as in 2008 just before the first policy came out. Plans for a national workshop to understand regulatory approach, principles, standards, and requirements were vetoed by the West Cumbrian partnership management organization who felt that it would be destructive to the ongoing process. In hindsight it would seem instead that the regulator could well have shown their presence and role in ensuring safety. It is now resolved to

take an enhanced role under the next policy.

To maintain independence, the regulator does not advocate for the government process proposal but does express support for geological disposal. At this time there is no specific published guidance for safety in geological disposal past the 2009 general guidance.

Analysing the press, it appears that media think that a new policy has been launched, not simply a consultation. Government's proposal to give the right of veto to the closest local level (district authority or equivalent) has led to headlines about the "County Council being sidelined", and this is much discussed in social media. An online petition asks whether people agree that the County Council should not have right of veto. People who may not pay attention to the formal process get their information from the media, which, in consequence, have an instrumental role in setting the context.

11.d Discussion

Some lessons learnt include:

Partnerships should include all the stakeholders who are supposed to participate in the partnership's research and deliberation.

- Excluding the implementer in order to avoid creating the impression that decisions have already been taken, simply deprives the other stakeholders of access to their expertise.
- The partnership should also include all the tiers of local government to allow a full range of opinions to input to decisions, even if policy may ensure that ultimately the decisions are taken by the community to be most affected by the facility itself.

Stakeholders appreciate getting a demonstration of readiness (adequate funding and expertise) from the regulators.

Institutions, groups and individuals in favor of a process or a decision need to advocate actively for their position (just as those against make their position widely known).

IMPLEMENTING THE FSC PROGRAMME OF WORK (2)

“Reviewing and refreshing the PoW”

12. REFRESHING THEME 7: “KNOWLEDGE CONSOLIDATION AND TRANSFER”

Exploratory session under PoW Theme 7

12.a Brief review of FSC Theme 7 PoW text and proposed activities

FSC Chair, Jose Cuadrado

12.b Proposal for an online FSC ‘FAQ’

NEA Secretariat, FSC Chair

Many pragmatic questions have come to our attention – for example from Mayors in the Czech Republic. The FSC can give information on stakeholder engagement and confidence, without giving the “definitive answer” since we know that there is no single answer.

12.c Report on topics raised in the FSC Workshops and Meetings

Peter Andersson, Swedish National Council on Nuclear Waste

On the request of the Core Group and Chair, FSC annual meeting summaries and workshops syntheses (as well as some full proceedings) were reviewed so as to identify the topics raised by stakeholder participants, and any “frequently asked questions” (FAQ).

The FSC Glossary focusses on concepts and explains these. In contrast, an FAQ identifies

questions, and organizes information according to the questions. The presentation reviewed specific questions arising in workshops proceedings in the areas of:

- Stakeholder involvement
- Confidence/trust
- Siting
- Benefits/Compensation/Added Value
- Transparency
- Local partnership
- Monitoring
- Ethical issues/aspects

Peter Andersson urged the FSC to consider what would be its goal in publishing an FAQ – for instance “*to make communication and understanding among the different actors as good as possible, regardless of the outcome of the process*”? He confirmed that “*there is no problem finding questions, but the answers often vary among different organisations and different countries.*”

12.d US NRC's experience and perspectives on developing public information tools

Jose Cuadrado, US NRC

For the Yucca Mountain project, NRC folded FAQs into 2-page brochures or fact sheets formatted as Q&A, using plain language, highly illustrated, and including a glossary of key terms. For the Waste Confidence Directorate Communication Program, 25 Q's are posted on NRC's public website (including questions about how to participate). These are periodically updated based on feedback and interactions.

An important part of developing FAQs is to put together a multi-disciplinary team – including technical, social affairs, managerial, project management, communications, administrative, and IT profiles. Communication Plans are a key tool to support these staff. The steps to follow include finding messages, identifying audiences and stakeholders before selecting tools and methods for delivery. FAQs are complemented by other informational materials.

Knowing and understanding the audience is essential – it helps to identify what they are concerned about or not. Frequent and diverse communication with stakeholders let you form that knowledge. The FSC is already multidisciplinary and could form a good team from this perspective.

The NRC prefers to develop FAQs for explaining complex subjects and processes to people with little prior understanding - they can migrate into more detailed technical reports when they get the basics. FAQs allow them to assess where they want to focus their learning process. If FSC wants to develop an FAQ set for more experienced people this can be done of course.

Document sharing and collaboration software has helped manage the development and revision of large FAQ catalogues and associating remote staff and contractors. Choosing a print format means longer revision timelines and fatter logistics.

It has been valuable for NRC to make the effort of presenting complex information in a total of 72 sets – it helps to think about how you are discharging your job. Staff development benefits are dramatic. This FAQ effort also builds trust among audiences that the NRC is determined to transfer information.

12.e Discussion

Chair

According to one delegate, community benefits should be the outgrowth of a process – but in early stages, there is a need to discuss these in principle, and to make realistic projections to help

the community measure its potential change. Usually a candidate locality is a low density, agricultural community whose industrial and socio economic asset will be changed (for example the community at the very least may grow by 50 % when the farming population is joined by engineers and their families). The new development of the local community must be sustainable.

Some contrasting experiences with FAQ were mentioned. In one context an FAQ created controversy because it was seen as an attempt to influence people's attitudes. By contrast, in the Czech Republic, according to Dr Vadová definitions and terms like "participation, involvement" are not familiar to many officials. Therefore every means to help people learn about transparency is useful.

Who actually asks the questions that are gathered in FAQs? Are they created by the providers of the answers themselves? One thought behind the possible FSC project was to identify and address questions we have heard from local communities, mayors, regions...

The IPPA Project has developed an online toolbox of participation methods. This could be examined to see if there is any possible link in activities. [*Nota bene, the Secretariat examined the toolbox: <http://toolbox.ippaproject.eu/>, an interesting online application to help identify "participation tools, methods or processes, depending on a range of search criteria, for use in stakeholder engagement activities associated with contentious issues". It does not appear to address any other type of question. Gratifyingly, two FSC publications from 2004 are acknowledged as "important literature": Stakeholder Involvement Techniques: Short Guide and Annotated Bibliography and Stepwise Approach to Decision Making for Long-term Radioactive Waste Management: Experience, Issues and Guiding Principles.]*

Several points were identified for consideration by the Core Group:

- Not all our members interpret in the same way the meaning given to certain words like "incentive, compensation". We developed the Annotated Glossary to help new members identify quickly the FSC development and experience with several concepts, but not all terms are in the table of contents. In fact, the FSC did comment before on terms such as "incentive and compensation", for instance in its publication [Stepwise Approach to Decision Making for Long-term Radioactive Waste Management](#) of 2004, and also in the lexicon provided in the context of the 2006 Hungary workshop.
- To potentially develop an FAQ, most promising at this stage may be to look at existing FAQ sets, e.g., at NRC and NWMO, to see which ones could potentially be exported. The FSC might "host" certain questions, referencing how they have been considered or answered in our work, or pointing to where they have been answered by national programs or research.
- It is agreed that what is needed are high-level principles, and recognition that the actual implementation of these principles is necessarily adapted to each context. Possibly we should single out overarching issues like those identified by Peter Andersson's review of FSC documents: Added Value, Monitoring, etc., for which the FSC could provide online information without interfering in the important face-to-face relationship-building which has to take place in member countries.

12.f Way Forward

D

Chair

Decision: The Core Group will reflect further on the FAQ proposal, its potential audience, pertinence and utility. The CG will think about the differences between the existing Glossary and a proposed FAQ – what are the objectives for each? Do we want to give "FSC replies" or show the diversity of how others have replied? How much work do we want to put into this? Links to existing FAQs will be circulated to the FSC.

13. REFRESHING THEME 3 “MEDIA, INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL COMMUNICATION, AND STAKEHOLDER CONFIDENCE”

Exploratory session under PoW Theme 3

13.a Brief review of recent and proposed activities

Jay Redgrove

Jay Redgrove reviewed the FSC’s Theme 3 activities highlighting some key findings from each activity 2004-2012. She thanked all the participants in topical sessions and especially Timo Seppälä for his theme leadership.

Jay focussed her proposals for the way forward on the Social Media (SM). At FSC-13, two researchers were pessimistic about the likelihood that RWM could ever properly use SM. By nature, these democratise information and decision making across a broad base. This information technology is in the hands of the citizen. The third panellist advised hiring a young person to deal with this in your company. The outcome of the session was that there should be a place for social media in radioactive waste management. The FSC can look into it possibly through the following questions:

- What can member organisations expect from social media?
- How might they use social media?
- Is it possible to use social media to make science fashionable?
- Could waste management organisations make use of ‘crowdsourcing’? If so, what issues could benefit? How can SM support this process?
- Can using SM help to educating the traditional media, positioning e.g. the waste management organisation as the point of reference?
- How can Social Media support the process of face to face interactions between stakeholders, which remain the ideal?
- What is the next step after an SM interaction?

The FSC should decide on whether to:

- Look at best use of SM or Media generally?
- Collect good practice? Set Ground rules?
- Collate member experiences? Past, current, and going forward?
- Create an observatory of interesting tools for internal use?
- A minima, investigate how people are using SM? Hear about experiences with SM (interesting for institutions that are not yet using them, comparing other uses in RWM area).

13.c *WebSite-Watcher* – Demonstration of a software tool

Philipp Senn (Nagra)

The commercial “WebSite-Watcher” tool [<http://aignes.com/>] is very simple to apply. It is not spyware nor does it provide analytics of who visits sites. It is just a comparison tool that highlights the difference between a page the last time you checked and today. It is simple to choose the filters. It takes 5 minutes of server time to check updates to 800 bookmarked sites. WebSite-Watcher supports serious and reliable participation in a process, because your organisation remains well informed, and can input information and corrections if necessary.

Monitoring the web calls for few resources whereas opening a SM platform is highly demanding: users expect a response to their input within minutes or hours.

13.b Pertinent Glossary entries - “Confidence and Trust”

Gianluca Ferraro (JRC-Petten)

Gianluca Ferraro summarised the Glossary entry, adding some theoretical references to highlight how much attention has been given to the terms “confidence” and “trust”. He recognized that the difference between the two terms may be lost in translation. In many languages there is a single word for the two concepts.

Gianluca Ferraro invited the FSC to reflect on the components of institutional behaviour that may influence confidence and trust, and focussed on one potential choice: improving the communication of scientific information. Analysing the processes by which interpersonal trust may be established, he hypothesized that “*if I have a good experience, I have trust*”. He called “confidence” the stepping stone between distrust and trust.

Discussion: Another pertinent meaning of “confidence” was brought forward. Confidence is not only an interpersonal construct. The term is used in statistics and its measure is a mathematical estimate of the quality of model predictions.

Note that the powerpoint file is made available online for adaptation by member delegates, to be presented on behalf of the FSC.

13.d Discussion and way forward

D

FSC Chair and Jay Redgrove

Decision: We are interested to continue looking into Social Media. Jay Redgrove will start development of a questionnaire or another way of collecting some examples and experience from our members.

WEDNESDAY 18 SEPT 2013 - DAY 2

14 REFRESHING THEME 2: “CHANGING DYNAMICS OF INTERACTION AMONG RWM INSTITUTIONS AND STAKEHOLDER CONFIDENCE”

Exploratory session under Theme 2

14.a Update on FSC PoW Theme 2 and ideas for action

Holmfridur Bjarnadottir; Claudio Pescatore

Activities in this theme across the three phases of the FSC were reviewed. Areas of focus in the recent years have included:

- Concepts and requirements of transparency, and the implications for stakeholders’ confidence. Surveys were performed to assess the meaning of transparency in various institutional contexts.
- The roles and responsibilities assigned to different stakeholders in the national processes; how explicit these are; how they evolve; the significance of institutional arrangements.
- The particular role of the regulators in the process; “community of practice” between operators and regulators. (A presentation at FSC-14 will follow this up.)

The thematic chairs (responsible Core Group members) suggested that, going forward, Theme 2 could look into the regulatory *system* – which comprises not only the technical regulators but also operators and the community, in the context of RWM oversight. The Regulators’ Forum publishes a table matching the different regulatory functions to the actors who actually deliver these functions in a given context. The 2010 table¹ is in the process of updating. In some countries the

¹ <http://www.oecd-nea.org/rwm/Regulat-Infra-NEA-MC-12Apr2010.pdf>

panorama of regulation is very complex. There are many pertinent stakeholder discussions that have not been picked up yet by the FSC. Copies of the table were distributed for discussion.

14.b Pertinent Glossary entries – “Dialogue”

Ansi Gerhardsson

The word “dialogue” is derived from the ancient Greek: *dia* means “through”, and *logos* means “speech, oration, discourse”. The Concise Oxford English Dictionary defines dialogue as discussion between representatives of two groups etc., exchange of proposals.

Based on Sweden’s 30-year long experience in geological disposal development, Ansi Gerhardsson proposed advice for institutions conducting multi-stakeholder dialogue: accept that you will make mistakes (you might address the wrong people, listen badly, say wrong things); listen more than you talk; dialogue is easier to sustain at local level than at regional or national level, because interest is harder to maintain with less affected parties; dialogue requires participation; don’t exclude any stakeholder category; dialogue takes time.

Discussion: Other delegates highlighted the importance of facilitation, because without it dialogue can easily turn into debate. Dialogue requires suspension of judgment in order to listen. At the beginning of the dialogue all participants must be made aware of ground rules.

In Russia “multilogues” are used. In dialogue, you can speak informally; in multilogue – ROSATOM’s preferred term for e.g. a “national dialogue” – you need a more stringent organisation and discipline. In multilogues participants can address only the selected problem and follow 4 logical steps. ROSATOM take a week for the multilogue; if the problem is not solved, then a second week is convened at another time.

14.c Follow-up report on “Community of Practice” research

Antoienette Warnback, Swedish EIA Centre, Uppsala

“Community of practice” is a social theory of learning, according to which people learn when doing things together and form new knowledge in the process. They form a group around a task. They do not necessarily agree. The practice evolves and changes as people are replaced, and across task phases.

Antoienette Warnback briefly presented her doctoral work for which she went through 5000 pages of documentation exchanged between industry and regulators in the context of the environmental impact assessments related to Sweden’s SNF management. To understand the EIA process she had to look back into the preceding years of R&D. She focussed in particular on the issue of deep boreholes as an alternative long-term management method.

The structure of the nuclear regulatory authorities changed in the 1990s and, with the merge of SKI and SSI, again in 2008. These regulatory actors stopped sharing taxis and dinner tables with SKB because community members perceived them as too close. Indeed it was sometimes thought at community level that the industry is a type of authority. The behavioural change shows how aware these actors were of perceptions by other stakeholders. These actors’ own perception was that they had very clearly distinct roles. In order to emphasise this, they used full organisational titles instead of acronyms.

The benefits of sharing a community of practice (CoP) in this context were seen to be: ease of communication (person-to-person to clarify small questions); ongoing communication in the periods between official dossiers; mutual respect and an awareness of the relationship and what is needed to maintain it. Drawbacks were: outward confusion of roles; voicing of each other’s arguments (example: NGOs submitted that SKI documents and expressions were more similar to industry positions whereas SSI asked “harder questions” of the industry); an early closure upon one

method without alternatives; over-politeness and avoidance of conflicts; tacit agreement to avoid delay in the planning calendar.

It is hard to avoid a CoP in a long planning process. At the least it is necessary to be aware of roles, who has power over the discussion, who introduces new concepts and opens consideration of alternatives, etc. A process built to be transparent may circumvent CoP pressures and foster more communication.

In discussion, Dr. Warnback confirmed that the dialogue between the regulator and industry and also the community has changed recently in the context of the license application. The regulator has to weigh which information can be released in reply to community requests for updates. Giving tentative interim positions could be counterproductive.

14.e An example of open dialogue between organisations with differing roles in the RWM process

Pascale Künzi (BFE), Philipp Senn (Nagra)

This presentation highlighted context, successes and challenges in dialogue between two organisations whose role in RWM is legally and pragmatically distinct – and yet which must interface strongly.

SFOE is the special planning regulator (not the technical regulator), bearing overall responsibility for the Sectoral Plan (the planning instrument providing the frame for siting any large infrastructure project in Switzerland, including a geological repository). SFOE also reviews the general license application according to the Sectoral Plan². Nagra proposes the regions and sites and submits an application for general license. While the respective roles are clearly defined, there are some crossovers. SFOE prepares the budget but Nagra must fund it; this places effective limits on the budget. SFOE is responsible for building up regional participation and supporting the siting cantons and communes in their information-gathering. Nagra is present at the meetings as well since they are responsible for preparing the concrete projects in collaboration with the siting regions.

Political events, calendar and media influence the process, resulting periodically in the need for direct coordination – while keeping in mind the clear divisions defined in the Sectoral Plan. The two organisations are aware of and sensitive to the issues of CoP. They agree that challenges in maintaining distinct roles and positions should not lead to a non-dialogue. Both are convinced that an open dialogue is needed to bring the Sectoral Plan forward.

For example, the Sectoral Plan restricts participation to a relatively short period. Misunderstandings can produce drags and delays – dialogue can avoid this. 250 meetings have been held in the past 2 years. SFOE and Nagra both have limited manpower. It is important to cooperate and ensure smoothness in organisation, otherwise participants lose confidence in the professional bodies.

Dialogue about challenges is not only necessary but beneficial. Moreover, bringing different perspectives to bear can be helpful in dealing with challenges. Can this idea be transposed into the FSC? There are many different perspectives here. A dialogue in the FSC about challenges could be of added value to delegates who are at different stages in processes.

Discussion: The risks of proximity between operator and planning regulator are different than those involving the relationship with the technical regulator. This highlights the extent and the complexity of the regulatory system with its different functions.

² Note that, in Switzerland, there is another body, ENSI, in charge of nuclear safety specifically.

14.f Pertinent Glossary entries – “Transparency”*Bernadette Kakasy (Puram)*

Bernadett Kakasy illustrated features of the glossary entry on “transparency” with practical examples from Hungary. For instance, regarding the need to balance openness and confidentiality: she explained how in Hungary, some information about RWM installations is withheld in the interest of site security.

Regarding the structural component of transparency, she pointed to the information association linked to each RWM facility in Hungary. Each one includes several local governments/municipalities. A “Ready for action” day hosted by TETT, or a “Compass” day by NYMTIT allow the different actors from the various institutions (local government, implementer, etc.) to appear together and clarify their roles.

Recognizing that transparency is needed to earn confidence on a continuous basis, PURAM monitors its performance through a survey completed every 24 months in the municipalities.

The Aarhus Convention compliance cases highlight that effective “access to information” is interpreted differently by various actors. Bernadett Kaskasy ended by noting that the European Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom groups access to information and participation under the joint heading of transparency.

Note that the Powerpoint file is made available online for adaptation by member delegates, to be presented on behalf of the FSC.

14.g Expectations for European member states’ transparency provisions*Wolfgang Hilden (DG ENER)*

Article 10 of Council Directive 2011/70 is intended to provide some flexibility to member states in how they implement transparency in their context. The Aarhus Convention cannot be named in the directive but it is certainly meant by the reference to “international legislation”.

The required National Framework is the combination of legislative, regulatory and organisational features that should specify all the roles in the RWM process. European member states were supposed to demonstrate the transposition in law of this requirement 23 August 2013. Today, in September, all states have not yet notified their legislation but the road is open. The next focal point is the required Programme showing how the policy is to be implemented in practice. The European deadline for member states to provide these implementation details is 2015.

Both individual nations and the European community have an interest in these practical processes and their steps – as do the public. The European Nuclear Energy Forum (ENEF) has developed criteria and guidelines for the national programmes. Each should describe the precise arrangements for ensuring participation over the course of the disposal project with its specified milestones and decision points. The status of RWM, tasks, efforts needed, financing, risks etc. also must be specified. A timeline should allow the public to see exactly how advanced the process is and where they can participate, and also the resources made available for this. The national programme must be disseminated and communicated.

14.h Draft Flyer “Transparency”*Holmfridur Bjarnadottir*

A first edition of the FSC “Transparency” flyer, similar in text to the Glossary entry, was proposed at the Sweden National Workshop and Community Visit in 2011. Holmfridur

Bjarnadottir suggested that the flyer could be updated, notably by introducing a dimension of understandability/comprehensibility alongside the issues of openness and accessibility which are addressed in the current flyer.

We have mentioned Transparency in many contexts and parts of our PoW and glossary. It seems appropriate to identify transparency then as a transversal theme in our Programme of Work (comparable to the Symbolic Dimension or Knowledge Consolidation & Transfer), because transparency issues can arise in all the themes.

14.i Subgroup discussion

4 mixed breakout groups discussed the research, case study, definitions...Suggested discussion themes were:

- 1) Challenges encountered in the relations between different actors in long-term RWM processes
- 2) Transparency as a requirement and as a helper in these relations.

14.j Feedback from the subgroup discussions on transparency

Rapporteurs

Input from the four subgroups could be categorised as follows:

Paradigm shift needed from culture of secrecy to transparency.

- Commitment to transparency can be perceived by organisations as a burden, but it is a desirable commitment. They need to hold themselves to this principle to design policy and decision making processes.
- There is sometimes institutional willingness to be open and transparent but no one is there to listen... You initialise the first step by funding civil society stakeholders so that they start taking part in dialogue. Industry was against this at first but now see the benefit.
- The funds must not compromise the independence of the participants.

Transparency – it’s about “how you do it”, not only “how much”.

- It’s possible to achieve transparency without participation. Transparency is an attribute of a particular decision making process, its structure and the roles assigned.
- Transparency is a sign to the public that you are committed to what interests them.
- Personal contacts must be established even in the case of a simple transmission of document. The citizen must be able to start to develop confidence.
- Within a process with many players, individual players should be mindful of providing information proportionately. For example, if the regulator is communicating strongly about deficiencies this could reduce confidence in the overall system. All should pay attention to language and presentation, don’t enhance your role at the expense of credibility and reliability of others.
- Procedural, structural and behavioural aspects: 1st two are essential, facts are more important than words. Behaviour: there are 2 levels – organisational level and personal level.

Challenges to achieving transparency.

- A very diverse set of top challenges to transparency in different countries: geographic extent of country; manpower requirements; moving from one actor organisation to another during individual career; different interests by different actors within the RWM system; roles not clarified; demands on different actors not clear; demand placed on regulator by municipality; non-involvement of regulator or other actors; situations that

are not highly regulated; gaps between NGOs and public opinion.

- Dialogue is defined as mutual learning process, moving from personal established beliefs to informed viewpoints. It's difficult to involve some interest groups as they have established positions linked to their missions, which may even affect their ability to be involved in some exchanges.

Are there limits to transparency (its extent, its effects)?

- How transparent is “transparent enough”?
- Transparency is not a substitute for participation.
- The perception of transparency can be influenced by different cultural interpretations.

Balancing transparency and confidentiality.

- On a policy or safety issue – how do you achieve transparency?
- When stakeholders don't have detailed information about the timing of a decision making process (DMP), transparency is not affected by delays. There should be private space in a DMP for open and frank discussion among technical and policy staff to delve into issues without losing transparency.
- Even at the FSC we need to think about reaching a balance between our public transparency and in-depth discussions. Need for guidelines or frame for our own transparency.

14.k Theme 2: Discussion and way forward

D *Holmfridur Bjarnadottir*

The Secretariat, under the initiative of the Regulators' Forum, periodically updates the Regulatory System and Functions table.

Decisions:

- The most recent table was sent on Sept. 30 (with FSC-14 decisions) for information and use by delegates, and further checking and comment.
- Suggestion that members read the 2005 paper by the RF, [The Regulatory Function and Radioactive Waste Management: International Overview \(NEA Report 6041\)](#).
- Suggestion to form a group to look at the FSC transparency flyer, refining the definition of transparency and its application in our FSC context. Core Group and other FSC members can be part of this group. This update will use the input of the breakout groups and subsequent discussion.

15. SUPPORTING (EARLY) PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Exploratory Session under Theme 4: “TOOLS AND PROCESSES TO HELP SOCIETY PREPARE AND MANAGE DECISIONS (E.G., ABOUT TECHNOLOGY, SITES) THROUGH STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT”)

15.a (Early) Involvement as a FSC PoW Theme 4

Jo-Ann Facella (NWMO)

In the past 2 FSC meetings we have explored the issues of “Early Involvement”. A case study of NWMO's dynamic, process-oriented view on (early) public involvement was presented to give ideas for a way forward.

Principles of stakeholder involvement are enduring but the expectations and execution in practice may change in time – as we have seen in the years of the FSC. Approaches must vary in regard to country and local circumstances.

In the Canadian context, the early involvement requirement stemmed from a failed process of

deciding about SNF management – where early involvement was seen to be lacking, and essential to forming social consent. The mission statement of NWMO thus focusses on the collaborative development and implementation of a SNF management approach. NWMO has tried to use early involvement and dialogue to develop the overall plan and presently the site selection process. Jo-Ann Facella showed how these have been built up in the absence of a stringent regulatory or legislative prescription.

Phases of developing the plan included an extensive and documented study of options (2002-05); Adaptive Phased Management best met key priorities uncovered in this early dialogue. APM is a value and principle-driven approach. Detail is built up over successive runs, but the overall shape comes from the early input by Canadians.

Jo-Ann Facella presented the siting process steps, and the particular attention given to traditional Aboriginal knowledge and to engaging these populations. “Preliminary Assessment of Potential Suitability” of a community as a host site is an example of dialogue-driven early involvement in a process, in the absence of a specific regulatory or legislative framing. “Feasibility Studies” were presented in this context as an opportunity.

Going forward, FSC Theme 4 may consider questions like:

- What does ‘leadership’ mean, and look like? How may it differ at national, local and regional levels? How to leverage synergies?
- How can divergent stakeholder perspectives be reconciled?
- How are tools evolving? What about referenda?
- How can social consensus be sustained (over decades, with new entrants)? How can organisations foster continuous buy-in to a multi-year process? How can programs be adapted over time?
- How to support governments or implementing organizations to do more than “check-box” involvement as a response to legal requirements?

15.b European Nuclear Energy Forum (ENEF) and its Transparency Working Group – Recent activities and ideas for collaboration with the FSC

Wolfgang Hilden

The transparency objectives of the European Commission Directorate General for Energy include ensuring effective public participation in decision making (e.g., the implementation of the RWM Directive). To reach this goal DG ENER wants to deliver to stakeholders state of the art research and experience in participation. The DG also wants to overcome institutional reluctance to implementing true participation. The European Nuclear Energy Forum plays a role here with two new organs under its Transparency Working Group. Wolfgang Hilden proposed that the OECD-NEA and the FSC could contribute in some way.

E-TRACK is the Energy Transparency Centre for Knowledge and is a joint initiative of DG ENER and the Joint Research Centre (JRC). It will collect the extensive knowledge on participation, establishing the link between concepts and their practical implementation, monitoring, dissemination and sharing of best practices. The bouquet of services will include a web-based clearinghouse, meetings and seminars, and optional guidelines. The initiative will not reinvent the wheel but make use of what is already developed, including here at FSC.

Aarhus Convention in Nuclear (ACN, a joint initiative of ANCCLI and DG ENER) showed that public participation can contribute to the quality and implementation of decisions, but that effective participation is not always achieved (little actual citizen influence is felt, even when formal requirements are met). A Task Group on Benefits of Effective Public Participation (TgBEPP) planned to start in Oct 2013 will identify ways to improve processes. Winston Churchill’s

statement is relevant: “*Courage is what it takes to stand up and talk; courage is also what it takes to sit down and listen*”.

15.c NEA Legal Affairs: Overview of Aarhus (and Espoo) Case Law

Ximena Vasquez, Claire Flüry-Herard

NEA Legal Affairs provided an overview of some difficulties, identified from current available case law, to the implementation of the Aarhus and Espoo Conventions in the nuclear domain.

The Aarhus Convention on access to information, participation and justice directly links environmental protection to a human rights norm, by stating that “*every person has the right to live in an environment adequate to his/her health and well-being*”. Individuals can submit a claim at their national level (through national administrative or judicial authorities – which may go faster) and also, in parallel, to the Compliance Committee at European Commission level. The EC can refer the case to the European Court of Justice. As a last resort, individuals may go to the European Court of Human Rights.

NGOs and associations can bring actions if they have “protection of the environment/nature” in their statutes (and if, in some national contexts, they count a minimum number of subscribing members).

In the case of the Espoo Convention on environmental impact assessment in a transboundary context, only the parties to the convention can bring actions. Extremely practical concerns are seen in the actions brought. In an Armenian case, four neighbouring countries were notified of an EIA although only one country was a (required target) convention party. All replied they wished to participate in the EIA procedure. However, Armenia and Azerbaijan had no diplomatic relations. An email was therefore not considered an official response. So the court had to assess the legal validity of an email and how communication can take place between parties without diplomatic relations.

Although individuals cannot submit actions directly under Espoo, because it is subsumed under the Aarhus treaty this pathway can be used. The Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee has more cases. The mechanism can be triggered by parties, the Secretariat, one or several members of the public, or the Compliance Committee on its own initiative. The Compliance Committee submits its recommendations to the Meeting of the Parties who usually approve them. This resembles a peer review process.

The Compliance Committee online information clearinghouse describes 58 cases of which 5 are nuclear-related. Case 41 concerns the Mochovce NPP. Permits and authorisations had been obtained several years ago but the construction process stopped when funding was short. Slovakia meanwhile became a Member state and Party, and launched the EIA process in 2009. Construction was scheduled to be completed in 2011 meaning that it might be terminated before any EIA comments were addressed. Thus the court recently recognized that the principle of early involvement was not respected.

Another interesting judicial finding cited in this presentation was that under the “scope of permissible arguments” doctrine in force in the Czech Republic, NGOs are improperly prevented from challenging the substantive legality of environmental decisions and are thus forced to focus on infringements of their procedural rights.

The UNECE Secretariat and Compliance Committee follow up applications of the treaties but they are not regulators. A consultation is currently underway to improve guidance to parties on assuring access to justice. “Too much law kills the law”, but there is still a need for more detailed guidance.

15.d Discussion

FSC Chair and Principal Vice Chair

Remember that Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is a form of early involvement.

The environmental regulator does not have a uniformly designated role in procedures like SEA, EIA, or in the Aarhus or Espoo Conventions.

Early involvement implies that the organisation must already prepare upstream for this involvement, and identify what measures are required so that this involvement can effectively lead at term to decision making. Much contextual knowledge and information have to be transferred in a focused manner and in a short time. An example is the need to inform potential participants about the pertinent levels of decision authority, and the requirements for transparency and accountability on transnational, national, and regional/local level. Participants must understand the procedure that allows them to participate in RWM. It was suggested that members of society must have the possibility to understand the wider impacts of nuclear energy decisions, of which RWM is only one component.

Discussion of actual community-based decisions looks like late-stage involvement. Early involvement is what takes place far upstream, framing the issues and the desired decision process. Early involvement is not principally for taking decisions, but mainly to gain knowledge, to check and understand possible directions that could be taken. It can help to ensure that people understand the scope and consequence of the future decisions. We need to consult and engage a broad circle at this framing stage – to gain knowledge but also to justify that we have tried to build a fair process. All sets of actors can be engaged early (it is not just for civil society, it could also be for regulators, etc.).

If the organisation can commit to take a direction indicated by civil society then it is legitimate to consult citizens on aspects they are prepared to orient. As an example, citizens may not be competent to assess safety, but they can input as to which actors should be called on to formulate the assessment and which kinds of citizen concerns should be considered. Their level of responsibility is appropriately engaged here.

Early involvement is perhaps not appropriate in every situation. What is the basic framework or structure that is needed to support early involvement? Where is early involvement appropriate? Who is the leader, guardian or steward of the process?

15.e Way Forward

D

FSC Chair and Principal Vice Chair

Decisions:

- Improve and update the FSC Stakeholder Involvement Techniques booklet through review and inclusion of country examples, and consider completing it with 2 new chapters: the first on early involvement – framing the issues – and the last on compliance and assessment of whether there has been “enough” involvement, including oversight arrangements. Both chapters could address the generic questions that have arisen in this session.
 - The FSC approves of a continuing exchange with the NEA Nuclear Law Committee on experience with Aarhus and Espoo conventions compliance.
 - The FSC agrees to receive more information on the process of building the initiatives to foster effective citizen participation on RWM in Europe, that is “E-TRACK” (jointly by DG ENER/JRC) and “TgBEPPa” (by ENEF), and to receive invitations for specific tasks.
-

- Agreed that “transparency” should be considered as a “transversal” theme in our PoW.

SPECIAL COUNTRY UPDATES (3)

16 REPUBLIC OF KOREA

16.a Radioactive Waste Management in Korea: Status and prospects

Myung Jae Song (Korea Radioactive Waste Agency, KORAD)

There are four different nuclear fuel cycle facilities in the Republic of Korea. Korea also possesses a dedicated ship to take LILW from each NPP site to the pertinent repository area. A second stage surface disposal facility has been started, for completion in 2016.

The 5th basic plan of electricity supply and demand foresees 34 reactor units by 2033 and allows estimation of SNF generation through 2083.

SNF is safely managed in storage facilities at the 23 reactor sites. Saturation would be attained as early as 2016 in one case (and as late as 2021 for the least saturated site). Expansions are planned extending the capacity through 2024 to 2028. All in all this gives about 10 years to develop a national storage solution.

Mr. Song reviewed policy history including the 2004 decision on the need for consent-based national policy on siting a centralised facility for SNF. A stakeholder engagement programme was triggered by this in April 2008. The implementation plan for SNF management overall was approved in Dec 2012, resulting in the creation of a pluralistic 15-member Stakeholder Engagement Committee (SEC) in 2013, with support and oversight by the Ministry of Trade and Industry (MOTIE). SEC was expected to be inaugurated by 1 Oct 2013. Final recommendations by this group regarding a basic plan for RWM including plans for siting and funding are expected to be rendered in short order.

16.b Proposal for a 2014 FSC National Workshop and Community Visit

Myung Jae Song (Korea Radioactive Waste Agency, KORAD)

Mr. Song reviewed the background to the proposal by the Republic of Korea, and his organisation KORAD, to host the next workshop and visit. According to this review, the projected SNF central repository planning process and theoretical site were uncoupled from the LILW facility development, in response to public fears. The siting history is one of trial and error. Recognizing the recent development of citizen participation in RWM decision making in other countries, the lesson was learnt that it is important to go through a transparent and democratic process by involving civil society in establishing siting plans. KORAD considers it would be very helpful in creating this dynamic to hold an FSC workshop.

In this view, as potential main hosts, KORAD delegates have moved quickly to become integrated with the FSC: membership, attendance, these presentations, and translation of all the FSC flyers. The FSC flyers have been shared by posting on both Intranet and Internet. Principal and co-hosts have been identified.

KORAD has experience in conducting relationship-building activities, through a “community cooperation department”. This department operates a joint council with the LILW host community to collect opinions of local residents. A policy forum for SNF collected opinions and recommendations for the government (submitted 2012) calling for implementation of the Stakeholder Engagement Committee as soon as possible. The siting process will be finalised by this committee, which is composed of technical and social science experts along with nominees from host communities of current facilities.

The FSC workshop and community visit (as well as a technical visit) could be held in Gyeong-Ju

city, host of both the LILW repository and masterpieces of the golden age of Silla, including a 1600-year old observatory, the oldest surviving in East Asia.

The title of the workshop in KORAD's view could be "Stakeholder engagement for policy-making on SNF management". Principal themes could be: Establishing a policy and Preferable Stakeholder Engagement approach.

Participants would be: technical establishments, Korean government and national assembly, residents, local governments and councils of 5 NPP areas, the "civil watch group of NPP environment", and local communities and NGOs.

Host expectations for workshop effects, as expressed by Mr. Song, are that social consensus would be enhanced, the necessity of the stakeholder engagement on SNF management would be widely understood; confidence and trust in stakeholder engagement programme would be enhanced.

16.c Discussion

FSC Chair

Discussion: What is meant by *policy*? Reply: Siting for interim storage and disposal will be the most important issue in the entire framework.

The visibility of regulators should be emphasised in workshop plans and presentations.

The Korea Radwaste Society KRS, proposed co-host, has all types of disciplines and roles represented among its 1500 members. Mr. Song presides this society.

Decision:

- The national workshop proposal by Republic of Korea is accepted in principle.
- The present discussion process will continue on the level of Chair, Secretariat and Hosts, with advice from the Core Group, and all players will be kept informed. A meeting should take place in Korea between stakeholders gathered in a programme committee, the FSC Chair and NEA Secretariat.
- The workshop concept is to create a neutral ground for dialogue.
- We cannot necessarily deliver everything that hosts desire, and envisioned workshop effects cannot be "guaranteed".
- With regard to maximising participation, we considered whether the event should combine the regular FSC-15 meeting with the workshop and visit. Pragmatic considerations of funding arise. The Chair and Secretariat will consider how to best address this question in view of also the other requirements above.

[Nota bene, the dates discussed here at FSC-14 have had to be reconsidered over the course of Fall 2013. Information will be provided as early as possible in 2014.]

IMPLEMENTING THE FSC PROGRAMME OF WORK (3)

17 REFRESHING THEME 5 "INCREASING THE VALUE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES TO LOCAL COMMUNITIES"

An exploratory session under PoW Theme 5

17.a Brief review of achievements to date and proposals for new activities

Jo-Ann Facella and Jay Redgrove

The FSC identified as early as 2002 the need to foster a durable relationship between a community and a facility, notably through maximising the value added by hosting a facility. Prof. Martin O'Connor and Erik van Hove were particularly influential in this realisation. Theme 5 was formally initiated in 2005 to integrate "added value" learning from throughout the FSC documentation.

Progress in collecting and elaborating material was presented in 2006 and a series of stakeholder interviews was undertaken. Our study was published in 2007. From 2007 onward we heard “cross-fertilisation” presentations from e.g. the water sector and artists. Work has progressively focussed on understanding the ways relationships are built between RWM institutions and communities to co-define added value and desired futures.

17.b Visioning the mid-term: A case study from Canada

Jo-Ann Facella (NWMO)

This case study shares the process perspective taken at NWMO, to discuss how the organisation works with communities to help them “vision” the mid-term.

Jo-Ann Facella reminded us that there is no single definition of community well-being, and moreover, of community. The many dimensions of community identity all have implications. Communities who are invited to define their vision of a desired future may include consideration of economic health, environment, safety and security, spiritual aspects, social conditions, and the ambition to enhance opportunities for community members.

NWMO has started to develop a five-sided concept of assets that may be enhanced in a relationship between a community and a long-term RWM facility project. The current representation of this concept embraces Human, Social, Natural, Physical and Financial Assets. Four key questions help to frame the preliminary assessment of potential siting suitability led by a potential candidate community and NWMO:

- *Is there the potential to find a safe site?*
- *Is there the potential to foster the well-being of the community through the implementation of the project, and what might need to be put in place (e.g. infrastructure, resources, planning initiatives) to ensure this outcome?*
- *Is there the potential for citizens in the community to continue to be interested in exploring this project through subsequent steps in the site selection process?*
- *Is there the potential to foster the well-being of the surrounding area and to establish the foundation to move forward with the project?*

As an example, the way in which the RWM facility interacts with the community can generate economic value. With investment and capacity building smaller firms can bid for future contracts. This is an example of “harnessing” and capitalising on the potential brought by repository hosting. Alignment has to be assessed – can hosting implementation plan achieve what communities and their regions want? Can NWMO bring and/or fund the necessary support? The visioning process is done in a collaborative mode, like the rest of the process.

17.c NDA work on Added Value

Jay Redgrove (NDA)

Socio-economic community benefits would generally form a substantial part of a formalised benefits package to a community in recognition of their part in accepting a large project taking place ‘in their back yard’. The NDA recognises that the process to identify (build and operate) a site for a repository has the potential to contribute, not only to the local socio-economic conditions, but also to building good community relations and a strong community going forward.

Jay Redgrove presented four very different types of value added that stretch the concept beyond the sole economic basis. These are compliance; mitigation, remediation and managing environmental risks; compensation and community benefits; added value and shared value.

Adding value on the level of compliance means assuring that the quality of the siting process is in full conformity with principles and with the spirit of regulations and laws whose function is to

protect the community, foster democracy and favour long-term well-being.

The focus on environmental risks includes both respect for formal assessments (SEA, EIA and HIA or Health Impact Assessment) and a search for means of lessening potential impacts.

Socio-economic benefits from government may be direct or indirect.

The implementer seeks to add value to the siting process by practicing transparency and active information including correcting misapprehensions. NDA commit to engaging with and serving community stakeholders. They are clear about what these stakeholders can influence and they build time into the formal processes to facilitate stakeholders' actual study and response.

Jay Redgrove ended by reviewing the main principles of added value and shared value, based in a sustainability concept, that were put forward in our 2007 FSC study "Fostering a Durable Relationship".

17.d Discussion and Way Forward

D FSC Principal Vice Chair

These added value approaches would seem to have potential for conversations with other communities in other countries and also in other industrial contexts. However it is recognized that there is no "gold standard" and that e.g. the compellingly described Canadian approach has a long history behind it.

Decision: Taking into account the new experience in several countries on collaborative creation of added value, the booklet [Fostering a Durable Relationship between a Waste Management Facility and its Host Community](#) can now be updated 7 years later, respecting the usual FSC practice of indicating a wealth of approaches rather than a "best practice" prescription.

DAY 3 - SPECIAL COUNTRY UPDATES (4)

18. FRANCE

As foreseen by the 2006 programmatic law for RWM, Andra prepared a repository project "Cigéo" (Centre industriel de stockage géologique; <http://www.cigeo.com/en/>). Like every large infrastructure project this project dossier is submitted to public debate in conformity with French legal requirements and the Aarhus Convention. The debate is organized by the Commission nationale de débat public, May-Oct 2013 (with a summer pause in July and August; www.debatpublic-cigeo.org/). Within two months of the close of the debate the Commission will publish a summary of the content of debate, as well as an assessment of the debate process. As project promoter Andra will then have three months to indicate how the project will be followed up in the light of what was learned from the debate. If Andra decides to maintain the project, Andra must announce how public information and participation will be ensured throughout the project lifetime.

18.a The public debate on Cigéo – Technical issues and confidence

Gérald Ouzounian (Andra)

Cigéo is the "Industrial geological disposal centre"; note that the installation title does not mention radioactive waste. The independent debate commission (five members and chair) was formed nine months before the start of the debate in May 2013. Andra prepared a "project owner document" also summarized in English and available on the debate website as well as Andra's website. Forty "actors' statements" (*cahiers d'acteur*) have been published, including one from agricultural unions and national political parties.

The first two public meetings of the debate had to be halted because of noisy protest in the room, and the schedule of such meetings was cancelled. The press highlighted perplexity that the debate

be blocked in the name of “democracy”. According to a survey performed at the request of the national commission in mid-June 2013, only 61 % of local residents had heard of the debate, while 70 % disapprove its being blocked.

The national commission extended the debate period by 2 months, and the smaller dedicated commission reorganised its programme to include webcast panel discussions and a consensus conference to take place in December 2014. For Andra the most important is that the debate activity takes place. As project owner, Andra will be awaiting the commission’s report of debate inputs, to be released in the first quarter of 2014. The debate recommendations will be considered for Cigéo. Teams are already at work to prepare a debate on R&R in 2016, amenities at the site location, design of first repository stages, costing...

Various information tools have been developed by Andra (many websites, press conferences, print materials, exhibits and science museum collaboration, open houses and school visits, participation in trade fairs, ‘infobus’, advertisements, etc.). The international website is available in French, Spanish and English. It’s important for Andra and for stakeholders to have international visibility. However, “active communication” during the debate period is forbidden.

18.b **The public debate on Cigéo – Societal issues and confidence**

Ludivine Gilli (IRSN)

ANCCLI (the national federation of local information commissions associated with nuclear installations) wished to investigate safety cases in general, in a continuing process. IRSN, ANCCLI, and CLIS de Bure, who have already had bilateral and multilateral collaborations, put together a programme to inform local commissioners. It was decided that in 2012-13 there would be a focus on intermediate and high level long lived waste as a capacity building exercise in anticipation of the public debate on Cigéo.

The first meeting sought to identify the main stakes according to invitees Andra, Ministries and the Safety Authority. A series of ANCCLI meetings identified the questions of interest to civil society, then seminars brought together speakers to try to provide answers. A film was produced by IRSN on the April 2013 meeting “*Your waste*”, at which 20 CLI were represented, and it can be viewed with other information on the IRSN and ANCCLI websites.

Mostly technical subjects have been broached, but there is a request also for consideration of ethical issues. The dialogue initiative, financed by IRSN, is suspended during the national debate period.

Dealing with uncertainties in socio-economic evaluation of megaprojects

Luis Aparicio (Andra)

Andra is required by law to submit, by 2015, a construction licence application for Cigéo, a deep underground repository for long-term disposal of high-level and long-lived radioactive waste. With a total cost estimated in 2005 at EUR 13.5 – 16.5 billion, and the over 100-year period of operation foreseen to start in 2025, Cigéo can be seen as a “megaproject”.

Megaprojects are often plagued by cost and planning overflows. Each one is unique, complex and situated in its time and space. This means that a continuous process-oriented evaluation also must monitor flexibility and learning. Learning is difficult to measure. Which approaches are more suitable for conceptualising and evaluating the social dimensions of megaprojects? What can the experience from social impact assessment (SIA) teach us about challenges and possibilities in project evaluation and governance? What role should indicators play in monitoring the social impacts of megaprojects? Can social impact monitoring be designed in a way that would simultaneously foster learning and accountability?

Luis Aparicio organised a conference at Andra on these issues; proceedings will be published in 2014.

18.c **Discussion**

FSC Chair

What impact or influence can the public debate have on the Cigéo project? The project owner gains feedback. Andra has already answered half of the 600 questions asked via internet, and has committed to consider all suggestions raised by the debate.

The Cigéo construction application is slated for 2015 and a debate on R&R planned for 2016. The press and politicians appear to say at this time that the debate on R&R should happen before Andra applies. The application would thus be postponed for up to a year.

A seriously considered suggestion is to have a “pilot” facility from 2025-2030. Under current plans the “cold” vitrified waste from the mid-1970s would be first disposed and observed, then hotter waste would be disposed from 2040. It was not thought to call this pilot phase, but this is a clear request, so Andra will treat this phase as an opportunity to monitor and demonstrate. The planned logistics and transport routes may change in consequence, but not the site choice nor the basic repository design.

Action: As a result of the France update, the Core Group will consider whether a topical session on socio-economic evaluation of megaprojects could be programmed at a future meeting.

IMPLEMENTING THE FSC PROGRAMME OF WORK (4)

19. MONITORING, MEMORY AND STAKEHOLDER CONFIDENCE

Exploratory session under PoW Theme 1 “THE LINK BETWEEN RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION (RD&D) AND STAKEHOLDER CONFIDENCE”

19.a Pertinent Glossary entry: “Safety and Stakeholder Confidence”

Adriano Gambi

After reviewing the main features of the Glossary entry on Safety, Adriano Gambi related these to the development of Belgium’s approach to long term waste management. During the development of the Belgian waste plan, NIRAS ONDRAF set up several consultations including a consensus conference run by an independent foundation. The societal requests relating to high level waste safety concerned: reversibility and retrievability, monitoring of the repository, transfer across generations of knowledge and options. Non-disposal options were examined but discarded.

Societal requests are integrated in the waste plan safety strategy as boundary conditions. Adriano Gambi showed a diagram of how these conditions are checked against or influence safety principles, strategic choices, and progressively more specific requirements resulting in a safety concept. This process reveals needs for new R&D, and aspects of active safety even in a passive safety concept. The shift during the repository life cycle from active to passive protection itself needs active preparation.

The sustainability model is another framework for cross-checking conditions and requirements. Societal requests are seen as entry points for on-going dialogue. The glossary defines the main concepts that could guide dialogue and as such should be useful.

Note that the powerpoint file is made available online for adaptation by member delegates, to be presented on behalf of the FSC.

19.b Potential avenues of development on Monitoring and Memory

Claudio Pescatore (NEA Secretariat)

The Preservation of Records, Knowledge and Memory (RK&M) project is finishing study reports on markers, loss of memory, international mechanisms. It has started an interview study on the “Set of Essential Records” that could accompany each repository.

Monitoring has been investigated by two Secretariat Studies: one technically oriented (physical processes with the IGSC), the other oriented to societal uses and demands (with the FSC). The RK&M project plans to combine the two reports once they are endorsed or commented upon by the FSC and IGSC, respectively, recognising those inputs.

Further avenues of work are possible:

- The FSC develops the “stakeholder” report further or uses it for further activities
- The IGSC has indicated that they would be interested in working or interacting with the FSC on monitoring.

Claudio Pescatore asked which direction the FSC wishes to take, suggesting that in a first step the monitoring reports could be discussed with local stakeholders.

The IGSC has issued a report on safety indicators for use with the safety case (<http://www.oecd-nea.org/rwm/docs/2012/rwm-r2012-7.pdf>; July 2012). Some indicators could be useful in communication, especially with non-technical audiences. Claudio Pescatore summarised three families of indicators: those related to content and concentration of radioactivity or toxicity; those related to flux of radioactivity and toxicity (between spaces or spheres); and those indicating the status of barriers.

The FSC could collaborate with the IGSC if desired, along the lines of the joint work on Natural Analogues: IGSC and FSC could develop and reply to a same set of questions, with discussion in a topical session at FSC, followed by a report to the IGSC.

19.c Online survey update on Monitoring and Memory - Results

Claire Mays (NEA Secretariat)

In 2012 a quick online survey to FSC members formed the first basis for the Secretariat Study on “Local stakeholders’ positions on monitoring and memory”. Meritxell Martell followed up with FSC members who responded and also performed extra interviews.

A new brief survey in Summer 2013 was intended to monitor this topic. This survey repeated the standard questions and asked for anything new. Ten replies were received.

Are local stakeholders asking for monitoring? Stakeholders in Italy, Hungary are interested in monitoring during the pre-siting or pre-operational phases. In Sweden, where the SKB repository construction licensing application is under review, local stakeholders draw attention to: “*the need to monitor conditions during the operating period in sealed parts of the repository to ensure that they evolve in accordance with the assumptions in the safety assessment - to verify the process between the Initial State and the Target State (that is expected to prevail for the rest of the pre-closure period)*”. These various requests appear to be in alignment with the actual stage in each country. A more general interest in records, knowledge and memory (RK&M) preservation post-closure is currently observed in these three countries as well.

In the UK stakeholders ask for monitoring but without specification of a life cycle phase. Reportedly, local demand for monitoring is not heard in Finland or Switzerland.

19.d Secretariat study: Local stakeholders' positions on monitoring and memory

Meritxell Martell (Merience)

The pre-final report of the extensive Secretariat Study was presented. 17 informants from 11 countries were consulted. The report reviews local communities' ideas, concerns, initiatives, requests, demands for the preservation of memory of the RWM facility (including monitoring of the physical processes and impacts related to the facility), and the relationship to confidence in RWM.

Areas that local people say should be monitored were reported in descending order of citation as: environment, socio-economic impacts, epidemiology, "general monitoring and control", physical processes, and institutional processes and players. Requests for monitoring in the operational and pre-operation phases are most clearly articulated. The post-operational phase limited to a few hundred years has gained some attention but there are few demands recorded for monitoring in the far long-term (thousands of years post-closure).

There appears to be implicit interest in how RK&M will be preserved. There is recognition that not only the local level, but also regional, national and international levels are important to be involved.

Monitoring and RK&M are understood in some countries to be tightly linked to reversibility and retrievability. The *oversight* concept developed concurrently by NEA and the ICRP could be a good framework embracing these aspects.

Monitoring can strengthen confidence through its contributions to safety and transparency. In this light it is important to involve independent oversight bodies in both monitoring and review of outcomes. Going forward (and in harmony with the discussions at FSC-14 on Early Involvement), an active role for communities can be foreseen in defining monitoring aspects: what to monitor, why, who would be in charge, how much it would cost, etc...

19.e Discussion

In Switzerland, monitoring will form part of law; it is not yet coming up on a large scale in sectoral discussions. The plan already highlights a future need to dialogue on how to implement socio-economic monitoring.

If you monitor, you are maintaining records, knowledge and memory. Why is a stronger link not seen then in demands? Perhaps because monitoring is seen as an immediate delivery of vital information.

Setting up oversight constitutes an acknowledgement of uncertainty and risk. People need confidence that these are seen and controlled. Accommodating these needs, with the tools of monitoring or RK&M, is a design feature of RWM programs.

Safety cases are developed on the basis of worst case scenarios or conservative values – the pilot monitoring could show that performance is in accordance with – or *better than* safety case assumptions. Monitoring is not only to capture and punish failures, but also to give ongoing information about events and changes in the broad field of the RWM facility. For instance, monitoring can be a way of learning about how people define their well-being, and how this changes over time.

All issues need not be solved within the scope of the implementer's action. Monitoring may be led concurrently by other actors on e.g. overall environmental and public health.

19.f Way Forward**D** *FSC Chair*

Even where these are not an active point of conversation in early stages of a siting process, monitoring and RK&M preservation are most likely to form part of stakeholder expectations for performance by authorities and implementers. These are topics that will most likely arise as a siting or management process advances.

Decisions:

- The existing survey/interview study report is favorably viewed. Comments and updates if any to the study report are expected by mid-October.
- The FSC will keep a watching brief on monitoring and memory issues.
- Beyond the FSC, monitoring is a topic of interest to the RK&M project and the IGSC. The FSC is open to future collaborations with these groups.

FSC BUSINESS**20. MODUS OPERANDI OF THE FSC****20.a Reviewing and refreshing the Modus Operandi**

FSC Chair, NEA Secretariat

In light of renewed membership, of last year's experiment combining a regular meeting and a workshop, and of the particular format of FSC-14 (Glossary presentations, subgroup discussions, etc.), suggestions were invited regarding the modus operandi of the FSC.

It was proposed that in each meeting some discussion could focus on one challenge. Examples could be: how to sustain a dialogue over time, with entry and exit of individuals and stakeholder groups. The overarching issues picked out by Peter Andersson in his FAQ survey of our literature (item 12.c) could give a good starting list. "Safe space" rules are needed (for proposal of topics, and for confidentiality of informal discussions engaging only personal opinions).

It's good practice to state several rules at the start of each meeting – e.g. switch off mobile phones.

More focus on discussion would be welcomed by some members, through e.g. breaking up more often into smaller groups. We could in future reduce the number of presentations per meeting. On the other hand, the packed agenda reflects a possible purpose of the annual meeting: to give the floor to each country or organisation with something to say about a chosen theme.

In future presenters should provide, before the meeting, one page identifying main actors and process/ programme features for each country –so that less basic information needs to be delivered during presentations. We used to have written updates on what has happened in members' country on each PoW theme. We should do this again, as it is one of the reasons that the group exists: to keep members abreast of developments in other contexts. A new template could be developed to ease the task. Factual information could be referenced by websites etc.

The national workshop has a different function, i.e. to delve deeply into different stakeholder views around one topic. Proceedings and International Perspective are archived online,. Czech Republic hosts asked for direct feedback from the 2012 workshop. The working group heard that the openness and authenticity of the international speakers was taken with great appreciation by local people. In return, the local participants need feedback to understand what they brought to the international delegates.

20.b Way forward

D *FSC Chair, NEA Secretariat*

Decisions:

- Czech Workshop: each participant should produce a 10-line or half page statement about what they learned and their personal recommendations if any. This work will be facilitated by circulation of the draft proceedings in the first part of October. An extract of these statements could be communicated to the WG on dialogue in the Czech Republic via the Czech representatives in the FSC.
- The Core Group will take into consideration the various proposals regarding safe space, purpose of meetings, balance between presentations and discussion time, combination of regular meeting and national workshop. Individual members are free to input their particular concerns in writing.
- The FSC will renew its practice of requesting country updates on items of FSC interest prior to each meeting. The Secretariat will propose a template. Information provided in writing will not need to be presented orally, thereby leaving more time for discussion.

IMPLEMENTING THE FSC PROGRAMME OF WORK (5)

21. Theme 7 – KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER AND CONSOLIDATION

21.a Reviewing and updating the FSC IDENTITY flyer

Jose Cuadrado

A general proposal for text and visual updating was presented.

21.b Reviewing and updating the WORKSHOPS flyer, and Questionnaire for Potential Hosts

NEA Secretariat; Jose Cuadrado

A proposal was made to update the Workshops flyer to reflect both the most recent Workshops and the Questionnaire for Potential Hosts recently developed by the Secretariat and Core Group. The questionnaire was recognised to have been helpful to all parties during the recent discussions of the proposal by the Republic of Korea to host the next Workshop and Community Visit.

Action: The Core Group will continue to work with Jose Cuadrado to revise the flyers and submit drafts to the membership.

CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

22. Core Group membership: Nominations, review and confirmation

D *NEA Secretariat*

Renewing members are:

- Ms. Holmfridur BJARNADOTTIR (Sweden) - *Chair*
- Ms. Jo-Ann FACELLA (Canada) – *Principal Vice Chair*
- Ms. Jay REDGROVE (UK)

New nominees are:

- Mr. Jose CUADRADO (USA)
- Ms. Martine HURAUT (France)
- Ms. Pascale KÜNZI (Switzerland)

Decision: The composition of the FSC Core Group was confirmed.

Thanks again to our former member who leaves the FSC and the CG in 2013:

- *Mr. Sébastien FARIN (France)*

23. Feedback on this meeting and review of main items and decisions

FSC Chair, NEA Secretariat

Action: The List of Action Points and Decisions was circulated on 30 September 2013.

Extra item presented on Day 3

A picture technique used in Russia as a tool for facilitating discussion

Tatiana Rakitskaya (Rosatom)

Russia has built a unified system of RWM. If we want to be transparent, we must work on four levels:

1. Technical level: the repository and its life cycle
2. Nuclear energy safety and economy, on the national and international plane
3. The place of the repository in the national industrial economy
4. The place of the repository in regard to global institutions and standards.

Transparency requires mapping all these levels, using models and indicators. Decision on one level will have an impact on the other levels too. The most important dialogue is that taking place on the territorial level with the host community ... but positions must be elucidated on all levels – also through “multilogues” engaging a larger circle of persons and groups.

The first problem for discussion is legacy waste and the associated megaprojects. The suggested mapping is part of preparing for public debate. Each interlocutor should clarify from which level he speaks, what his responsibility is on that level, and what position he wants to take. Rosatom plays a role in helping each interlocutor develop understanding and competence on this positioning. The discussion is supposed to take place among rational adults rather than in an imbalanced relationship of “supply and demand” between host communities and implementer.

Tatiana Rakitskaya proposes to share with the FSC such tools and methods to support dialogue and multilogue.

Discussion: The “rational” deployment of scientific and technical arguments has not been successful in Europe. Perhaps this is due to their having been used in a Decide-Announce-Defend framework, whereas this is a proposal for Debate-Decide-Move forward...

The FSC Stepwise decision making report – like the Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom - shows the need for national parliamentary decision about the requirement for safe RWM, and its accompanying programmes and plans. Despite this upstream legitimization of local projects, people still have questions about “why here, why now”? There is a need in some contexts to explore the justification of earlier decisions that were taken without democratic consent. All in all, coming to shared societal understanding takes time (e.g. the process of deliberation in Sweden has unfolded over 30 years).

APPENDIX 2

LEXICON

(Developed for the FSC National Workshop and Community Visit held in Hungary in 2006)

Here we define some basic terms of interest during discussions about local and regional development in the context of radioactive waste management facility siting. The lexicon is drawn from the FSC's "Value Added Report", and was discussed with that report at the closing session of the Hungary workshop.

Added value - The increase in worth of a product or service provided by features and benefits over and above those representing the "core product".

Amenity - Feature of real property that although not essential to use, enhances its attractiveness and increases the user's satisfaction. It is a positive enhancement to living environment conditions, providing convenience, comfort, satisfaction or appeal.

Natural amenities include a pleasant or desirable location, scenic surrounding area, etc. Human-made amenities include recreational and other facilities for collective use.

Bribery - An offer of money, goods or services in order to persuade a second party to perform an action in the interests of the party offering the bribe, or to sway the second party's opinion or decision.

Persons objecting strongly to the presence of radioactive waste may view compensations or other socio-economic benefits as "the wages of risk", or bribery to persuade a community to accept a management facility which they view as inherently unsafe.

Community identity – Internal view that members have of their community.

Community image – View the outside world has of the community.

Community profile or brand - Strong points and values that the community wants to be known for.

Compensation - Repayment for any necessary expenditures or losses associated with the siting and operating of a facility.

Culture - "The set of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features of society or a social group, encompassing, in addition to art and literature, lifestyles, ways of living together, value systems, traditions and beliefs" (*UNESCO definition*)

Incentive - A benefit to motivate local communities to accept a facility.

Integrative local partnerships – Committee structures in which technical and community stakeholders come together to work out an integrated RWM project (setting physical and safety characteristics, socio-economic and cultural/amenity requirements)

Local community - Generic term to designate the collectivity of personal actors that become involved in RWM facility siting deliberations.

The FSC considers that "local community" is a social group of any size whose members reside in a specific locality, share government, and often have a common cultural and historical heritage. Community is not tied firmly to a geographic area.

Quality of life – A state of physical, psychological and social well-being.

Safety - The condition of being protected against failure, damage, error, accidents or harm.

Social capital - Features of social life - networks, norms, and trust - that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives.

Spin-off – An economic venture underwritten or made possible in the context of a larger undertaking.

Stakeholder - Any actor—institution, group or individual—with an interest or with a role to play in the process.

APPENDIX 3

LIST OF MATERIALS MADE AVAILABLE FOR THE FSC-14

ITEM	TYPE	NUMBER	TITLE	AUTHOR
01.a	Document		Policy on FSC membership & participation	NEA Secretariat
01.b	PPT presentation		Short clarification of participation and membership policy	C. Pescatore
02.a	OLIS	NEA/RWM/FSC/A(2013)1	Adoption of Agenda for FSC-14	NEA Secretariat
02.a	OLIS	NEA/RWM/FSC(2010)1	FSC Programme of Work	NEA Secretariat
02.b	OLIS	NEA/RWM/FSC/M(2013)1	Summary Record of FSC-13	NEA Secretariat
03.a	Publication	NEA No. 6988	FSC Glossary	NEA Secretariat
03.a	PPT presentation		The FSC: Review of Main Activities Launched or Achieved since Oct 2012	C. Pescatore
03.b	Document		Questionnaire for Potential Hosts of “Forum on Stakeholder Confidence” (FSC) National Workshop & Community Visit	NEA Secretariat
04.	PPT presentation		RWMC and its working parties	C. Pescatore
04.	Flyer		Estimation of Nuclear Facility Decommissioning Costs	NEA Secretariat
04.	Flyer		Radiological Protection and Geological Disposal – Joint ICRP/NEA Flyer	NEA Secretariat
06.a	PPT presentation		RWM Czech Republic 2012/13 – Feedback on 2012 FSC Workshop	L. Steinerová

06.b	PPT presentation		Czech Republic - Feedback on the FSC Workshop - Deliberating together on Geological Repository Siting	Z. Vajdová
07.a	PPT presentation		Finland - Posiva's construction license application	T. Seppälä
08.a	PPT presentation		Russian Federation - Principal Current Issues of ROSATOM	T. Rakitskaya
08.b	PPT presentation		Russian Federation - Innovative technologies of dialogue with technical and non-technical community	O.E. Grishin
09.a	PPT presentation		Brief on recent developments in Japan	R. Nunome
10.a	PPT presentation		“Local Partnership”	S. Rueda Sanchez
11.a	PPT presentation		United Kingdom - The MRWS Process: Status and lessons learned from policy maker standpoint	C. Ritchie
11.b	PPT presentation		United Kingdom - Implementer's experience: Concluding and reviewing at the end of a local process	J. Redgrove
11.c	PPT presentation		United Kingdom - Observations by the Regulator	D. Brazier
12.a	PPT presentation		Review of FSC Program of Work Theme 7: Knowledge Transfer and Consolidation	J. Cuadrado
12.c	PPT presentation		Report on topics raised in the FSC Workshops and Meetings	P. Andersson
12.d	PPT presentation		US NRC's experience and perspectives on developing public information tools	J. Cuadrado
13.b	PPT presentation		Pertinent Glossary entries - “Confidence and Trust”	G. Ferraro
13.c	PPT presentation		Webwatcher – Demonstration of a software tool	Ph. Senn

14.a	PPT presentation		Refreshing Theme 2 “Changing Dynamics of Interaction among RWM Institutions and Stakeholder Confidence”	H. Bjarnadottir, C. Pescatore
14.b	PPT presentation		Pertinent Glossary entries – “Dialogue”	A. Gerhardsson
14.c	PPT presentation		Follow-up report on “Community of Practice” research	A. Warnback
14.e	PPT presentation		An example of open dialogue between organisations with differing roles in the RWM process	P. Kunzi, Ph. Senn
14.f	PPT presentation		Pertinent Glossary entries– “Transparency”	B. Kakasy
14.g	PPT presentation		Expectations for European member states’ transparency provisions	W. Hilden
14.h	PPT presentation		Draft Flyer “Transparency”	H. Bjarnadottir
15.a	PPT presentation		(Early) Involvement as a FSC PoW Theme 4	J. Facella
15.b	PPT presentation		European Nuclear Energy Forum (ENEF) and its Transparency Working Group – Recent activities and ideas for collaboration with the FSC	W. Hilden
15.c	PPT presentation		NEA Legal Affairs: Overview of Aarhus (and Espoo) Case Law	X. Vázquez-Maignan
16.a	PPT presentation		Radioactive Waste Management in Korea: Status and prospects	M-J Song
16.b	PPT presentation		Proposals for a 2014 FSC National Workshop and Community Visit in Korea	M-J Song
17.b	PPT presentation		Refreshing Theme 5: "Increasing the Value of Waste Management Facilities to Local Communities" - Visioning the mid-term: A case study from Canada	J-A Facella

17.c	PPT presentation		NDA work on Added Value - Increasing the value of waste management facilities to local communities	J. Redgrove
18.a	PPT presentation		Cigéo, the French Geological Disposal Project	G. Ouzounian
18.b	PPT presentation		France - Debating ILW-LL and HLW: Perspectives drawn from the Anceli, Clis and IRSN Technical Dialog	L. Gilli
18.c	PPT presentation		France - Dealing with uncertainties in socio-economic evaluation of megaprojects	L. Aparicio
19.a	PPT presentation		Pertinent Glossary entry: "Safety and Stakeholder Confidence"	A. Gambi
19.b	PPT presentation		Potential Avenues of development on Monitoring and Memory	C. Pescatore
19.c	PPT presentation		Online survey update on Monitoring and Memory - Results	C. Mays
19.d	PPT presentation		Local communities' position on monitoring and the preservation of knowledge and memory and the relationship to confidence	M. Martell
19.d	Report		Local communities' expectations and demands on monitoring and memory preservation of a deep geological repository	M. Martell
21.a	PPT presentation		Update to FSC Identity Flyer	J. Cuadrado
21.a	Flyer		Draft Identity Flyer	NEA Secretariat
21.b	PPT presentation		Update to FSC Workshops Flyer	J. Cuadrado
21.b	Flyer		Draft Workshop Flyer	NEA Secretariat
Not on Agenda	PPT presentation		Additional Presentation	T. Rakitskaya

APPENDIX 4

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Belgium/Belgique	Adriano GAMBI Collaborateur processus décisionnels participatifs Communication et processus décisionnels participatifs Organisme National des Déchets Radioactifs et des Matières Fissiles Enrichies (ONDRAF) Avenue des Arts 14 1210 Bruxelles	+32 2 212 11 26
Canada	Marcia BLANCHETTE Senior Policy Advisor, Historic Waste Programs Uranium and Radioactive Waste Division Natural Resources Canada Electricity Resources Branch 17-C2 580 Booth Street K1A 0E4 Ottawa	+1 (613) 996 2836 +1 (613) 947 4205
	Jo-Ann FACELLA Director of Social Research and Dialogue Nuclear Waste Management Organization 22 St. Clair Avenue East 6th Floor M4T 2S3 Toronto	+1 (647) 259 3062
Czech Republic/République tchèque	Lucie STEINEROVÁ Communication Manager RAWRA Dlážděná 6 11 000 [(1100 Praha 1)] Prague	+420 221 421 532 +420 221 421 544
	Zdenka VAJDOVÁ Institute of Sociology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic Jilska 1, 110 00 Prague 1	+420 210 310 227 +420 222 220 143

Finland/Finlande	Timo SEPPÄLÄ Senior Manager of Communications Posiva Oy Olkiluoto SF-27160 Eurajoki	+358 2 8372 3710 +358 2 8372 3709
France	Luis APARICIO Chargé de mission SHS Direction Scientifique ANDRA (DS/DIR) ANDRA Parc de la Croix Blanche, 1-7, rue Jean Monnet 92298 Châtenay-Malabry Cedex	
	Ludivine GILLI Project Manager DSDRE\DOS IRSN BP17 92262 Fontenay aux Roses Cedex	+33 1 58 35 92 65
	Martine HURAUT Chef du Service Communication ANDRA Centre de Meuse/Haute-Marne CP 9 55290 Bure	+33329755367
	Gerald OUZOUNIAN Director International Division Andra Parc de la Croix Blanche1-7, rue Jean Monnet F-92298 CEDEX Chatenay-Malabry	+33 146118196 +33 146118268
Hungary/Hongrie	Bernadett KAKASY Information Assistant Communication Department Public Limited Company for Radioactive Waste Management Paks HeadquarterH-7031 Paks P.O.Box: 12.	+36 75519538

Italy/Italie	Pierfrancesco BALDASSARRI CSR and Regulatory Affairs Manager SOGIN VIA TORINO, 6 00184 Rome	
	Paola MAODDI SOGIN VIA TORINO, 6 00184 ROME	+393286113350
Japan/Japon	Reiko NUNOME Director International Coordination Group, Science and Technology Department Nuclear Waste Management Organization of Japan : MitaNN bldg 4-1-23 Shiba, Minato-ku, 108-0014, Tokyo, Japan	+81-3-6371-4027 +81-3-6371-4102
	Joo Wan PARK KRMC(Korea Radioactive Waste Management Corporation)	
Korea/Corée	Myung-Jae SONG Korea Radioactive waste Management Corporation	
	SILVIA RUEDA SANCHEZ Technical Management Division ENRESA c/ EMILIO VARGAS, 7 20843 MADRID Spain	+34 915668196 +34 915668167
Spain/Espagne		
Sweden/Suède	Peter ANDERSSON Scientific Secretary Swedish National Council for Nuclear Waste C/O Miljödepartementet 10333 STOCKHOLM	+46 8 405 20 94

Sweden/Suède	Holmfridur BJARNADOTTIR Administrative Director Swedish National Council for Nuclear Waste Karlavägen 100 A 10333 Stockholm	+46 (8) 405 27 28
	Ansi GERHARDSSON Head of Section Swedish Radiation Safety Authority Solna Strandväg 96 SE-171 16 Stockholm	+ 46 8 799 43 51
Switzerland/Suisse	Pascale KÜNZI Sektion Entsorgung radioaktive Abfälle Office fédéral de l'énergie (OFEN) MUHLESTRASSE 4 3063 Ittigen	
	Philipp SENN Nagra Hardstrasse 73 5430 Wettingen	+41 56 437 12 77
United Kingdom/Royaume-Uni	David BRAZIER Environment Agency Ghyll Mount, Gillan Way CA11 9BP Penrith, Cumbria United Kingdom	+44 01768 215876
United Kingdom/Royaume-Uni	Jay REDGROVE Partnership Engagement Manager Radioactive Waste Management Directorate Nuclear Decommissioning Authority Harwell Science & Innovation Campus, Building B587 Curie Avenue, OX11 0RH Didcot	+44 1925 80 2453 +44 1925 80 2835
United Kingdom/Royaume-Uni	Conor RITCHIE Office for Nuclear Development Department of Energy and Climate Change Managing Radioactive Waste Safely 55 Whitehall, SW1A 2EY London	+44 300 068 6555

United States/États-Unis	Jose CUADRADO Project Manager NMSS US NRC Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards Mail Stop EBB-2BO2, USNRC, Washington, DC 20555	301- 415-0929
EU/UE	Gianluca FERRARO DG JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE European Commission	+31224565410
	Wolfgang HILDEN Head of Safety and Radioactive Waste Section DG Transport and Energy European Commission Complexe Euroforum 10 rue Robert Stumper 2557 Luxembourg	+352 4301 33546 +352 4301 30139
Russian Federation/Fédération de Russie	Oleg GRISHIN FSUE «RADON» FSUE «RADON» 2/14, 7th Rostovsky lane 119121 Moscow	
	Aleksei KHOVANOV International Cooperation JCS VNIPIET Savushkina st., 82 197183 St. Petersburg Russian Federation	+07 (812) 4301551 +07 (812) 4301551
Russian Federation/Fédération de Russie	Tatyana RAKITSKAYA RAW, SNF Management and Nuclear Decommissioning Rosatom Bolshaya Ordynka Str., 24 Moscow	+74999494335 +74999494212

Russian Federation/Fédération de Russie	Mikhail STAKHIV Engineering support (Engineering support of spent nuclear fuel management, radioactive waste management and decommissioning of NPP) Ros Energo Atom 25 Ferganskaya Street, 109507 Moscow	+74957106322
OECD/OCDE	Mathieu CAREY Press Editor NEA/RE OECD Annexe Issy 726 2 rue André-Pascal 75016 Paris	+(33-1) 45 24 10 19
	Philippe MAUPAI Assistant NEA/PR OECD Annexe Issy 332 2 rue André-Pascal 75016 Paris	+(33-1) 45 24 11 07
	Claire MAYS Consultant NEA/PR OECD Annexe Issy 328 2 rue André-Pascal 75016 Paris	+(33-1) 45 24 11 46
	Claudio PESCATORE Principal Administrator NEA/PR OECD Annexe Issy 6013 2 rue André-Pascal, 75016 Paris	+(33-1) 45 24 10 48 +33 (1) 45 24 11 45
	Michael SIEMANN Head of Division NEA/PR OECD Annexe Issy 329 2 rue André-Pascal 75016 Paris	+(33-1) 45 24 10 40

Other/Autre

Liliana BENITEZ
Ph.D. Candidate
University of Victoria

Grégoire LITS +32 (0) 10 47 42 60
CriDIS/IACCHOS
Université catholique de Louvain (UCL)
Université catholique de Louvain /
PSAD
Place Montesquieu 1,
B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve

Meritxell MARTELL +34 664674180
MERIENGE STRATEGIC THINKING
C/ Llimoner, 30
OLÈRDOLA

Christian TAILLEBOIS +33 (1) 43 69 41 55
Head of Communications
Nuclear Fuel Department
EDF
Cap Ampère
Carrefour Pleyel
93200 Saint Denis

Antoienette WÄRNBÄCK +46 18 672 642
Research Assistant
Swedish EIA Centre
Inst. för Stad och Land
Department for Urban and Rural
Development
SLU, Box 7012
750 07 Uppsala