

**For Official Use**

**NEA/RWM/FSC(2005)2/REV1**



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

**03-Jun-2005**

**English text only**

**NUCLEAR ENERGY AGENCY  
RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

**Forum on Stakeholder Confidence (FSC)**

**Proposed Agenda and Convocation for the 6th Meeting of the RWMC Forum on Stakeholder Confidence (FSC)**

**OECD Headquarters, Paris, France, 8-10 June 2005**

**JT00185697**

Document complet disponible sur OLIS dans son format d'origine  
Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

**NEA/RWM/FSC(2005)2/REV1  
For Official Use**

**English text only**

**PROPOSED AGENDA AND CONVOCATION FOR THE  
6<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE RWMC  
FORUM ON STAKEHOLDER CONFIDENCE (FSC)**

The 6<sup>th</sup> session of **the Forum on Stakeholder Confidence (FSC)** will take place on **8-10 June 2005**. It will start **at 09:00** on the first day and is scheduled to end at **12:00** on the third day. It will be held at the OECD, Château de la Muette, 2 rue André Pascal, F-75016 Paris, France. The NEA web site has information on how to get there as well as on accommodations in this area of Paris [<http://www.nea.fr/html/general/welcome.html>].

The Core Group will meet briefly during lunch on the 10th.

Working Language: English

The letter **D** next to an agenda item indicates that a decision is elicited.

Delegates participating are advised further, that the security arrangements in force at OECD include the obligation to present an identity document bearing a photograph. This document will be requested at the time of issuing Delegates' cards for the meeting on first entry to the OECD. It should also be presented subsequently with the card every time OECD premises are entered.

<b>8 June – Day 1</b>
-----------------------

**INTRODUCTION**

- 9:00    **1. Welcome**  
*FSC Chairman; NEA Secretariat*
- 2. Review and adoption of the agenda** NEA/RWM/FSC(2005)2/REV1  
**D** *FSC Chairman; NEA Secretariat*
- 3. Approval of summary record of FSC-5 meeting (1-3 June, 2004)** NEA/RWM/FSC(2004)9  
**D** *FSC Chairman*

**FSC ADMINISTRATION**

- 4. Review of FSC activities since June 2004 meeting**  
*NEA Secretariat, FSC Chairman*
- *Release of General Distribution documents*
  - *Publication of reports*
  - *Update of web site*
  - *Business meeting*
  - *Workshop in national context*
  - *Core Group meetings (PoW; mandate; strategic document)*
  - *Report to, and from, the RWMC-37 meeting.*
- 9:15    **5. Renewal of Mandate, and Approval, by the RWMC of the proposed Programme of Work** Mandate:  
NEA/RWM(2005)13/REV1  
PoW:  
NEA/RWM/FSC(2005)1/REV1  
**D** *Chairman*
- The PoW was discussed and commented upon by the FSC on several occasions, including by the CG last January. The RWMC accepted the proposed PoW without changes.*
- 9:45    **6. The FSC Strategic document for Phase-2** NEA/RWM/FSC(2005)3  
**D** *The strategic document for Phase-I can be downloaded from the web. Its direct address is:*  
<http://www.nea.fr/html/rwm/docs/2001/rwm-fsc2001-2-rev2.pdf>
- In Hitzacker we agreed to the follow-on actions:*
1. *provide written comments by November 15, 2004*
  2. *discussion draft final document within the Core Group.*
- The present takes into account both comments received and the discussion within the FSC-CG. It is a proposed update of the document that informed our first phase of work and on which we based our self evaluation. The document has been drafted in a way not to require frequent updating (as the PoW would).*

## BRIEFINGS ON RELEVANT INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES/RESULTS

	<b>7.</b>	<b>INFORMATION FROM :</b>	
10 :00	<b>7.a</b>	<b>OECD</b> <i>M. Dissly</i>	Oral report
10 :15	<b>7.b</b>	<b>European Commission – Research under the 6<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme (Cowam-II)</b> <i>S. Webster</i>	Oral report
10: 25	<b>7.c</b>	<b>European Commission – Eurobarometre 2005</b> <i>W. Hilden</i>	Oral report
10: 35	<b>7.d</b>	<b>The CARL project</b> <i>TBC</i>	Oral report
11: 45	<b>7.e</b>	<b>The “Cowam Spain” project</b> <i>J. Lang-Lenton</i>	Oral report
11:00		<i>Break</i>	

## IMPLEMENTING THE FSC PROGRAMME OF WORK

	<b>8.</b>	<b>ORGANISATIONAL CHANGES IN RWM INSTITUTIONS</b>	
11:30	<b>8.a</b>	<b>Introduction and first results of survey</b> <i>C. Pescatore, A. Vári</i>	Survey document distributed earlier, plus room document
		A survey document was distributed to FSC members. First results will be presented.	
	<b>8.b</b>	<b>Discussion and way forward</b> <i>FSC Chair</i>	
12:00	<b>9.</b>	<b>Election of new chair and Core Group</b>	
		Present members of the CG are: <i>Y. Le Bars, Chair ; C. Ruiz ; B. Hedberg ; M. Aebersold ; H. Sakuma ; J. Kotra ; C. Létourneau</i>	
		The following new composition is proposed by the present CG: <i>P. Brown, Chair</i> <i>B. Hedberg</i> <i>E. Atherton</i> <i>M. Takeuchi</i> <i>J. Kotra</i>	

.....

Other candidacies are welcome, and members should manifest themselves to the Secretariat.

12:10

*Lunch*

14:10 **10. MEDIA RELATIONS (Topical Session)**

*Chair: T. Seppälä*

*An effective media strategy and timely interaction with the media are indispensable tools for organisations/institutions involved in risk management. Transparency, availability and a structured exchange of information are particularly relevant to issues such as radioactive waste management. With this aim in mind, the FSC Core Group decided in 2002 to do a survey on media work within the FSC member states. The results of this survey were presented to the FSC in 2003. Subsequently, the FCS created a working group on media relations and in 2004 the first topical session on media strategy was organized with the participation of a senior media consultant and three journalists. In the draft programme of work for the FSC Phase 2 the link between RWM organizations, the Media and stakeholder confidence is one of the five investigations themes.*

**Content**

Representatives of the policy makers, the regulators and the implementers from the FSC organizations present their media strategy, their best practice cases and examples of media successes and failures. Alternatively, it would be interesting to hear how they would foresee a strategy for dealing with media.

- What is the impact and value of the media work for each institution/organisation and how do you measure its effectiveness?
- Media strategy – draft and coordination of a media strategy in collaboration with all the stakeholders in order to provide clear and coherent messages to the media.
- Specific results? Value for money? Did the core messages come across? Where all the relevant journalists/editors informed? Did the media coverage help the messages to reach the appropriate audience? Number of media encounters? Number of interviews?

**10.a Introduction**

*T. Seppälä*

14:20

**10.b Approach and experience of a policy maker**

*M. Aebersold*

Oral report supported by  
written text

14:50

**10.c Approach and experience of a regulator**

*S. Chandler*

Oral report supported by  
written text

15:10	<b>10.d</b>	<b>Approach and experience of an implementer</b> <i>P. Ormai</i>	Oral report supported by written text
15:40	<b>10.e</b>	<b>Approach and experience of an implementer</b> <i>A.-M. Bölenius</i>	Oral report supported by written text
16:10		<i>Break</i>	
16:45	<b>10.f</b>	<b>Observations by media expert external to FSC</b> <i>S. Di Biasio</i>	Oral report
17:00	<b>10.g</b>	<b>Plenary discussion</b> <i>T. Seppälä</i>	
17:30	<b>11.</b>	<b>Way forward on media work</b> <i>FSC Chair</i>	
18:00		<i>Adjourn</i>	

<b>9 June – Day 2</b>
-----------------------

9:00	<b>12.</b>	<b>THE LINK BETWEEN RD&amp;D AND STAKEHOLDER CONFIDENCE (Topical session)</b> <i>Co-Chairs Y. Le Bars, K. Shaver</i> <i>Rapporteur: S. van den Hove</i>
------	------------	---

*Within the FSC it is agreed that any decision making process should take place in stages, in order to allow collective learning and self-training of the various actors. In this process each actor must feel that it can influence the process, including generating complementary investigations on topics of significance in the field of safety and to the long-term impacts.*

*Moreover, the science involved in radioactive waste management is not fundamental science of the kind that is driven mainly by our curiosity to understand the world around us and ourselves, it is issue-oriented science, as its primary objective is to provide a solution to an actual national problem. The issue at hand combines the complexity of the geophysical systems under consideration and the complexity of the societal framework in which radioactive waste is produced and managed. This complexity implies that science, as well as societal decision making, have to deal with - and live with -, to some extent, with uncertainty, indeterminacy, ambiguity and even ignorance. Another important feature of the scientific enterprise – and even more so for issue-oriented science – is that it is not a value-neutral exercise: the very definition of the problem includes value choices. And so do the choices of boundaries, of important variables, parameters and criteria.*

*Finally, because, today, the issue is no longer only how to implement an economically-optimal project of waste storage or disposal on a site imposed by the higher authorities, new challenges are posed to the technical community and their roles and the approaches they take. In this new environment, the place of research, development and demonstration (RD&D) in the elaboration of waste management policies and their implementation deserves to be debated.*

	<b>12.a Introduction</b> <i>Y. Le Bars</i>	Oral report supported by a room document
	<b>PART-1 : STAKEHOLDER CONFIDENCE VIS-A-VIS THE ROLE OF SCIENCE, SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS, AND EXPERTS IN TODAY'S SOCIETY</b>	
9:10	<b>12.b Role of, and relation to, science in today's societies, as well the issue of confidence in researchers/institutions.</b> <i>M. O'Connor</i>	Oral report supported by a room document
9:40	<b>12.c The role and behaviour of the experts (technicians, engineers, researchers) and how to expose the experts' value system in order to gain stakeholder confidence.</b> <i>K. Andersson</i>	Oral report supported by a room document
10:10	<b>Discussion of Items 12.a, 12.b, 12.c</b>	Oral report supported by a room document
10:40	<i>Break</i>	
	<b>PART-2: THE ROLE OF RD&amp;D FOR STAKEHOLDER CONFIDENCE AS SEEN BY INSTITUTIONAL ACTORS</b>	
11:10	<b>12.d An implementer's view of how research and research capability are approached in order to gain stakeholder confidence in the implementer fulfilling its mission</b> <i>F. Jacq</i>	Oral report supported by a room document
11:30	<b>12.e A regulator's view of how research and research capability are approached in order to gain stakeholder confidence in effective regulation and safety</b> <i>J. Kotra</i>	Oral report supported by a room document
11:50	<b>12.f A policy maker view of how research and research capability are to be approached in order to have stakeholder confidence in policy and its implementation</b> <i>C. Létourneau</i>	Oral report supported by a room document

12:10		<i>Lunch</i>	
14:10	<b>12.g</b>	<b>Discussion of Items 12.d, 12.e, 12.f</b>	
		<b>PART-3: THE ROLE OF RD&amp;D FOR STAKEHOLDER CONFIDENCE AS SEEN BY NON- INSTITUTIONAL ACTORS</b>	
14:40	<b>12.h</b>	<b>The perspective of a local community</b> <i>H. Åhagen (Sweden)</i>	Oral report supported by a room document
15:00	<b>12.i</b>	<b>The perspective of a mayor</b> <i>J. Castellnou (Spain)</i>	Oral report supported by a room document
15:20	<b>12.j</b>	<b>The perspective of an academic</b> <i>G. De Marsily</i>	Oral report supported by a room document
15:40		<i>Break</i>	
16:10		<b>PART-4 LESSONS TO BE LEARNT</b>	
	<b>12.k</b>	<b>Discussion of Part-3, plus overall discussion, including suggestions for way forward</b> <i>K. Shaver</i>	
17:00	<b>12.l</b>	<b>Stocktaking</b> <i>S. van den Hove</i>	Oral report
17:15		<i>Adjourn or Country Reports</i>	

<b>10 June – Day 3</b>
------------------------

### **PoW Implementation (cont'd)**

9:00	<b>13.</b>	<b>Workshops in a national context</b>	
	<b>13.a</b>	<b>Documentation of FSC 2004 Workshop in Germany</b> <i>NEA Secretariat</i>	NEA/RWM/FSC(2005)4/REV1
	<b>13.b</b>	<b>Proposal for next national workshop in Spain</b> <i>Spanish colleague</i>	Information Document #1
		<b>D</b> <i>The target date is 29-20 Nov – 1 December 2005. We would have the FSC business meeting on 28 Nov.</i>	
		<i>Suggestions are elicited, especially on roundtable discussion topics.</i>	



- 9:20 14. **Work in the area of providing added value to WM facilities** Information Document #2  
*C. Pescatore, C. Mays*  
**D**  
*The Secretariat has done background work with a view to better understanding the potentialities in this area and discuss follow-on initiatives by the FSC.*
- 9:40 15. **Outreach and Dissemination of FSC information** Information document #4  
*C. Létourneau*  
**D**  
*The CG has remarked that this is an important area. Suggestions are made for a more effective outreach of the FSC work.*
- 10:00 16. **Topical session of the Working Party on Decommissioning and Dismantling on Stakeholder aspects (Brussels, Nov. 2005) and FSC representation** Information Document #3  
**D**  
*A proposed programme for the topical session will be presented and FSC involvement elicited.*
- 10:10 17. **Proposed dates of next full sessions of the FSC**  
**D**  
  - *Business meeting half a day in the week of the 2005 workshop*
  - *Regular meeting in Paris: 7 to 9 June 2006*

## NATIONAL UPDATES WITH EMPHASIS ON STAKEHOLDER ISSUES

- 10:15 18. **Country updates** Oral reports
- National Updates on  
Stakeholder Issues (Room  
Documents)
- 5 minutes *per country* may be taken to report on significant events or activities regarding stakeholder issues. Delegations are asked to e-mail their update report to the Secretariat one week ahead of the meeting. *FSC Stakeholder Issues Updates are all that is needed.* (*Full, country updates from RWMC are already available within the Secretariat and can be distributed*)
- Please send written text by 31 May ([Lydie.guyot@oecd.org](mailto:Lydie.guyot@oecd.org)) or bring 40 copies to meeting.*
- A break may be held at an appropriate time.*

## CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

11:45 **19. Any other business**

**20. Review of main items and decisions**  
*FSC Chairman*

Oral report

12:00

*Adjourn*