

Unclassified

NEA/RWM/RKM(2013)4

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

21-Jun-2013

English - Or. English

**NUCLEAR ENERGY AGENCY
RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

Expert Group on Preservation of Records, Knowledge and Memory across Generations

**Summary Record of the Fourth Meeting of Records, Knowledge and Memory (RK&M) Across
Generations Project**

16-18 April 2013, OECD Conference Centre, Paris (France)

Claudio.pescatore@oecd.org

JT03342268

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/RKM(2013)4
Unclassified

English - Or. English

Introduction

This is a summary record of the 4th Project Meeting of the RK&M project. The Powerpoint presentations are available on the internal RK&M webpage. There are three appendices:

- Annex A: Agreed changes to the key observations of the September 2012 Workshop Proceedings
- Annex B: Summary of the discussion and action points regarding the development of the MDD Wiki
- Annex C: Decisions and Actions

The list of participants is also attached to the end of the document.

Please note that the actions and decisions from the meeting are not noted with the Summary Record, but in Annex C. The actions and decisions were also sent on separately to the Project Group shortly after the Project meeting.

Summary Record

Claudio introduced the meeting and welcomed participants, particularly guests to the project.

Day 1

Item 1: Progress Report – Claudio Pescatore

There was a recap of the project background, aim and mission statement.¹

The Progress Report has been presented to the RWMC Bureau. It summarises the project work since June 2012, especially relating to project visibility and development. Key dates for 2013 were noted as the Third Workshop, 24-26 September.

The Progress Report is available for comment on the RK&M password protected webpage. Once it is approved by the group, it will be published on the RK&M home webpage.

Item 2: September 2012 Workshop Proceedings – Claudio Pescatore

The Second Project Workshop: 'Improving Our Understanding' was held at Issy-Les-Moulineaux, 13-14 September 2012. There were 50 attendees from 11 countries. There were 34 presentations, reflecting a diversity of discussion.

Draft Proceedings have been produced. They are available for comment on the RK&M password protected webpage. Nineteen main observations were presented on the themes of Regulation, Records and Archives, Oversight and Monitoring, Knowledge and Knowledge Management, Engagement, Costs and Mechanisms.

The agreed changes will be made to the Proceedings. It was noted that the information was substantially the same as in the Progress Report, but the Observations have been reordered and organized thematically. It was agreed this was useful.

¹ Use mission statement on the Wiki.

Item 3: Glossary and Bibliography Update – Anne Claudel

Bibliography

Additional publications have been included; especially notable is the material contributed by the IAEA. A historiography of ‘atomic priesthood’ idea has been outlined, as it is a frequently raised notion in discussion within the general RK&M discussion (i.e. outside of the project).

Discussion

The historiography of the atomic priesthood was thought to be worth noting or developing. It would be useful for the project to show awareness of the concept and outline why it is not considered a substantive method of RK&M preservation. It was noted that the idea was a ‘good catchphrase’ that has been frequently reinterpreted.

The example of the Westinghouse Time Capsules was raised. It was agreed that they should be cited in the bibliography. There may be scope to develop work looking at ‘attempts to contact the future’ that have been made.

Glossary

The definition of Knowledge has been updated. This was agreed to.

Two proposals had been made for additions to the bibliography:

1. Channel
2. Relay

It was asked if these terms be integrated into the existing definitions. It was noted that these terms were not generally used across the project. They were pertinent to the study on Loss of Memory, and defined within the associated glossary. It was asked if we use other words to indicate these concepts. It was noted that the term ‘Relay’ did not reflect that reinterpretation of information that was implicit in the transfer of knowledge to a new party.

It was generally agreed that if a term is not frequently used, it does not need to be defined.

It was asked if the glossary should define the ‘Minimal Set of Records’. It was agreed that the definition will be a result of the work. It was suggested that the definition could usefully say what we mean by the MSR, rather than what they will be. It was noted that it was useful to make the distinction that the MSR was intended as a *communication* tool, not *regulatory requirement*.

Any changes to the glossary should be proposed to Anne and Claudel. They will then be discussed at the following meeting.

It was noted that project members will be present at the upcoming IGD-TP meeting. Anne Claudel would present the RK&M project to the IGD-TP project.

Item 4: UNESCO Digital Conference Report and Work with CoData – Claudio Pescatore

A 1h15 showcase of the RK&M project was presented at the conference. Other presentations at the conference raised points of interest to the project. A wealth of initiatives were presented that may

provide avenues of collaboration for the project. Currently, the project is working with the CoData-sponsored Task Group for Data at Risk.

Item 5: Observations on the Proceedings of the UNESCO Digital Memory Conference – Anne Claudel

The proceedings of the UNESCO conference indicate that the focus of digitization is access to data, rather than preservation. It is notable that the timescales under consideration are very different to those of the RK&M project – for example, 10 years is considered long term. It was noted that digitization would be one of the many strategies for RK&M preservation.

Item 6: Discussion

The distinction between access and preservation was raised. It was noted that the RK&M Second Workshop had observed that creating access to information is a means to enhance the value of that information. Whether the focus was on access or preservation could be linked back to the question of why to preserve RK&M. This area could be elaborated.

It was suggested that there could be partial preservation across different groups, who may be interested in particular sections of the records.

It was noted that E-archives could increase the visibility information. It was suggested that the project could focus on this.

The possibility of an initiative such as the Hathi Trust storing RWM records was raised. It was asked what the difference would be to storing records with a national archive. It was observed a commercially funded organization may be a vulnerable place to store information, as it depended ultimately on continued profitability. It was suggested that a multiplicity of organizations could store the information. It was also noted that National Archives adhered to strict rules as to what is worth archiving and the archiving process. Archives other than the National Archive could be used to store records.

The notion of Collective Memory was raised, and the possible use of internet-based digitization and storage systems. It was asked if this presented problems for the reliability of the information; technical innovations such as digital fingerprints.

There was a discussion on the merits of making records freely available online. Three key points were raised:

1. The benefits of accessibility - accessible information is easier to remember and preserve.
2. The problems of authenticity – records would still need to be corroborated, probably against a hard copy, and protected against change to their content.
3. The problem of Safeguards – not all records may be cleared for general public access.

It was noted that these points highlighted that, in execution, digitizing information had much in common with traditional archives.

It was noted that the classical distinction between archives and libraries was the notion of access, and this is being eroded by progressive digitization.

It was noted that storing records is not just a question of access: people need to make sense of the information. A collection of waste inventories is not easy to interpret without other information and knowledge.

Item 7: Archives and Digital Libraries: Per Carlsson

The presentation gave an overview of the SKB Archive approach and processes. An important feature is the need for good abstracts, which serve to introduce and summarize complex information. The inter-connectivity of different elements of the system, and the search-ability of the system, were emphasized. Non-traditional records such as interviews with employees and films of the RWM system were also integrated into the system.

The system is based on ISO standards. This ensures compatibility with the national archives, in order to simplify migration in the future, and secures against data loss. This approach was suggested by the National Archives.

Discussion

The usefulness of digital libraries was discussed. It was noted that there was clearly a strategy for the Short Term; but how do you prepare for later? Clarification was asked for on the role of the national archive. The response was that the National archive is an end point and a governmental demand. Adopting same standards as the national archive in the system is part of longer term planning and migration planning; adopting the same standards help ensure continued readability and access.

It was agreed that using the standards of national archives is desirable.

The level of Stakeholder interest was discussed. SKB audits are performed, and the Municipality has requested periodic reviews from SKB.

The level of Stakeholder interest was discussed. SKB audits are performed, and the Municipality has requested periodic reviews from SKB.

Per Carlsson noted that all government organizations and municipalities try to achieve smarter information transfer. We are heading to spatial data approaches, a more or less new way of storage, more interoperable and standardized than ever. These concerns are agreed not from town to town, but must be global, because the vendors are global today. Additionally, we should not think only of written records - samples also are records, as are videos.

The possibility of bringing together a few international archivists to discuss these issues and compare approaches was raised.

It was noted that a broader understanding of records, including information such as samples, images, and films, could usefully be adopted.

Item 8: Literature Survey on Markers and Memory Preservation – Marcos Buser

An overview of the status of the Study was presented.

Item 9: Tsunami Stones Report: Development Work – Helen Gordon-Smith

A redrafted version of the Report was presented. Suggestions were made for further development.

Item 10: Markers Discussion – Jantine Schröder

It was noted that the Literature Study provides a rich resource for discussion. It also shows that some questions are still frequently asked, such as ‘is it not safer to simply forget the repository’? It also shows that the objectives of marking are not consistent, and the messages and function of markers are less well addressed in the literature than the technical questions. It was noted that the distinction between active and passive control was fluid.

The possibility was raised that the transfer of knowledge between generations as exemplified by the Tsunami Stones relied on respect for the knowledge of the previous generation. It was suggested that the messages of the Tsunami Stones were different to those which could appear on the repository markers because they were a call for action in the case of an emergency. Possibly the Tsunami Stones were effective because they could call on a precedent (a previous Tsunami) which made the case for the relevance and importance of their message. The general agreement was Repository Markers should provide factual information, rather than warnings.

It was noted that Markers could be a good entry point to the RK&M project because it touches on many of the topics of the project, such as social engagement and the dual track strategy.

It was agreed that the Literature Study was currently personal in style. This however is acceptable as it is not a project document. It was noted that the Literature Report showed that there was no final conclusion on the use of Markers. Mr Buser warned against using materials that can be re-used, and suggested as well relying on clay-type materials as the main support.

It was agreed that the Tsunami Stones Report could be used as a case study, although this should be limited in scope and based on what the Tsunami Stones example tells us.

From the observations made in the Tsunami Stones study, there was discussion on whether it was possible to change a place name to create memory of the repository in the area. Vio Szabo said that this had been suggested in a working group in the Östhammar Municipality. It was pointed out that place names are very personal to people; this could make them both effective and very difficult to achieve. However, it was a possible route for memory preservation.

It was agreed that the observations made in the original Tsunami Stones report regarding ethical obligations should be explored in a separate study.

It was agreed that the Literature Study would be edited, finalised and published.

Item 11: Study of local communities’ position on monitoring and the preservation of knowledge and memory and the relationship to confidence - Meritxell Martell

Meritxell Martell presented an update on the progress of the study. The general conclusion is that there is variability across countries, but there is interest in monitoring, particularly in health, although there is little evidence of formal demand over the medium-term or discussion.

In the discussion, the concept of a Pilot Plant was raised. It was clarified that the study was looking at whether demand existed rather than how to collaborate with host communities.

The nature of the participation at the MoDeRn Conference was described as the presentation of the Oversight paper and participation in working groups.

It was clarified that the nature of the responsibilities of municipalities post-closure varied across countries.

Item 12: The Concept of Oversight – Claudio Pescatore

Claudio Pescatore presented the paper on insights from the RK&M project on the concept of oversight at the MoDeRn Conference.

Item 13: Monitoring and Oversight Discussion

It was noted that baseline information would be important for successful monitoring and oversight.

There was discussion around the level of commitment implied by oversight and monitoring, and for whom. Should the value of hosting a repository be 'recognised' in monetary terms? Will desire for monitoring and oversight fall off if 'nothing happens'? The distinction was made that the protection of humans from the repository was a system of passive safety; however, protecting the repository from humans required a system of active safety.

It was noted that the draft ICRP guidelines are available online.

The concept of monitoring institutional provisions was discussed.

The relevance of monitoring to the RK&M was discussed. It was noted that the concept that there should be no planned end to oversight is not well understood in the technical community.

Item 14: Minimal Set of Records

The history of the project was recapped, and the current Vision Document was presented.

The nomination of interviewees was discussed. It was suggested that we should be guided by uses of the information in order to identify users. This could be difficult to separate at the moment. It was emphasised that one point of designing the study in this way was to broaden participation and to open further the participating organization to civil society.

It was noted that the study still needed to be designed in full, and that this would be the work of the NEA intern.

It was agreed that countries would nominate no more than ten interviewees each. The focus should be on the range of the interviewees. It was noted that the language barrier implied additional costs of having an interviewer, transcribing and translating the interview. Practical considerations would be developed in the course of the study design. It was general agreed to use the English language participants as a 'pilot' for the scheme. A protocol and official invitation would be agreed for approaching interviewees.

Item 15: Wrap Up

Recap the day's discussions, as noted in the Day 1 Summary PowerPoint on the RK&M webpage.

Day 2

Item 16: Introduction

Claudio Pescatore welcomed participants to Day 2 of the meeting. The question was presented to the group, 'are we integrating the observations from the second workshop into the project?'

It was noted that Digital Preservation is a specialist field and the opportunities for collaboration with the field of RK&M preservation should be considered. The practice of creating abstracts of complex information was noted as a useful concept, as was the use of visual media.

Item 17: Exploratory investigation into the loss of memory on conventional landfills and contaminated sites of the past – Marcos Buser

Marcos Buser gave an overview of the study. The largest problem was the sensitivity of the files detailing the reasons for the loss, which could be difficult to access.

The report made several recommendations.

Item 18: Difficulties in preserving knowledge across generations: Exemplification by the repository "Asse II mine"

Karston Leopold gave an overview of the loss of records at the Asse II Mine and the current need to recreate the knowledge and memory of the mine.

The chief problem is that the original documentation is insufficient for the current work at the mine. There was no continuous documentation system, the design of the records changed, a lack of detail, and not all of the existing documentation is available.

In the discussion, it was clarified that no nuclear fuel was stored at the Asse II Mine, but it was medium and low level waste. The lack of quality, as well as the lack of consistency, in the documentation was noted.

Item 19: Loss of Records and Memory Discussion

It was emphasised that diplomacy and sensitivity was needed in order to talk about the loss of RK&M constructively.

It was asked how far these issues were still relevant today, given the increased awareness of the importance of record keeping.

It was agreed that the Asse II Mine case report would be added to the Bibliography. BfS will identify the report which is available online. Possibly a new report could be written for the RK&M project.

It was generally agreed that enough examples of memory loss had been identified, and new ones should only be added if they represented a different type of memory loss.

It was agreed that the project report would be reviewed and finalised by the group before publication, and the value judgements in the report would need to be separated from the empirical research. Simon Wisbey and Claudio Pescatore will review the paper.

It was noted that 'loss' is a relative term: Memory was only considered 'lost' if it was later needed.

Item 20: Regulatory Catalogue – Helen Gordon-Smith

There was a recap of the development of the Catalogue and the initial conclusions drawn. The possibility for further analysis and the need for quality control by national regulators were emphasised.

Item 21: Regulatory Catalogue Discussion – Stephan Hotzel

The opinion was given to make the Catalogue accessible, after due quality control.

The recommendation was made to remove or rephrase the ‘why’ category, which created an uneasy distinction between the notion of a ‘licensing’ and ‘safety’ requirement, and did not distinguish between the ideas of RK&M preservation being undertaken as a *safety requirement* or only for the additional *assurance of safety*.

The Excel spreadsheet should be transferred to the Wiki Menu Driven Document.

There should be an introductory note to the Catalogue. This should note the limitations of a comparative approach – for example, the different legislative philosophies that exist in different countries mean that the Catalogue is not comparing like with like.

The interpretation of terminology used for timescales could be sensitive – we could adopt a convention of giving the original wording and then noting the project wording.

Stephan Hotzel and Helen Gordon-Smith will propose a format for the use of the Regulatory Catalogue on the Wiki, reflecting the comments made in this discussion.

Item 22: Supranational Mechanisms to support Records, Knowledge and Memory Preservation over the medium term – Thierry Schneider

An overview was given of the study, which was commissioned for the RK&M project by the NEA Secretariat. The overall conclusion was the supranational mechanisms can contribute to the preservation of RK&M, and the new strategies could involve the use of existing mechanisms.

The issue of timescales was raised, and it was noted that the mechanisms were not created to last for a specific length of time.

Item 23: Supranational Mechanisms Discussion – Jean-Noël Dumont

The discussant commented that the analytical grid introduced in the study was interesting and useful. The importance of a ‘multilevel’ approach was emphasised. The use of International Conventions was identified as a possible framework for developing expertise.

Similarities were drawn between space debris and nuclear waste – they are both made-made, a side effect of technology, need to be managed and the memory of their disposal needs to be kept.

There was discussion on whether the mechanisms discussed would be interested in preserving geological repository records, and other possible mechanisms which were not ‘supranational’ in scope. It was said that our aims in contacting existing mechanisms as a project were not clear. The symbolic value of using an environmental or a nuclear mechanism was raised.

It was agreed that any use of existing mechanisms should be seen as an augmentation of national strategies, not a replacement for national responsibility. The use of as wide a variety of RK&M preservation options as possible was seen as an advantage for RK&M preservation. The inclusion of radioactive waste issues within existing mechanisms should be promoted. The possibility of regional supranational agreements between small groups of states was raised.

Simon Wisbey, Jean-Noël Dumont and Claudio Pescatore will review the report by the start of June, before it is reviewed by the whole project group, and the final agreed version is published as a project document.

Item 24: Bibliography Analysis – Richard Ferch

An overview was given of the current status of the Bibliography Analysis. Around 64 documents have been analysed so far; there are a further 100 documents in the bibliography, including those added in the past year.

The useful purpose of the bibliography will be its search-ability, rather than the overall analysis. We need to be able to keep adding documents. Should the analysis be extended to the entire bibliography, or should a ‘core set’ be analysed?

Item 25: Bibliography Analysis Discussion – Anne Claudel

The discussant noted that the original aim of the bibliography analysis was to show where synthesis was needed in the research.

The idea of a ‘core’ bibliography was seen as a good idea. We should continue to have a ‘literature repository’ to which we can add new documents. Nagra can continue to act as a ‘document holder’ for the group.

It was noted that there was a category of reports in the bibliography which were people ‘discovering’ the idea of RK&M preservation without adding anything new to the discussion.

It was noted that the bibliography would be a good way to try out the MDD Wiki. The acknowledgement of where a document was not available online was agreed to be sufficient.

For the foreign language papers, it was agreed that Richard Ferch would identify the references needed to be included in the core bibliography, and then pass these on to colleagues to prepare the abstract and answer the analysis questions.

Item 26: Menu Driven Document Wiki – Eelco Kruizinga

The discussion on the Wiki is summarised in Annex B.

Item 27: Wrap-Up

Recap the day’s discussions, as noted in the Day 2 Summary Powerpoint on the RK&M webpage.

Day 3

Item 28 and 29: Introduction and Review of the Meeting – Claudio Pescatore

Claudio Pescatore welcomed participants to Day 3 of the meeting.

It was proposed that the FAQs and the MDD could be used to bring certain topics in Phase I of the project to a close.

The Minimal Set of Records sub-project was agreed to be too ambitious to complete in Phase I of the project.

The Loss of Memory study highlights the importance of working on a synthesis of information. The study needs to be reviewed by the group and become a group document. An introductory note should be added.

The Asse II Mine case could be written up as a short report of particular relevance to the RK&M project. The existing report can be cited in the bibliography if it is available.

The Supranational Mechanisms study needs to be reviewed by the group. Jean Noël Dumont and Claudio Pescatore will provide comments by mid-May. Authorship will be altered to reflect its status as a group document.

The Bibliography is a mature document. It could be split into two documents on the Wiki: the Core Entries, which have a rewritten abstract and full analysis according to the table of questions, and a Literature Repository, which would contain less important works to note.

Item 30: September Workshop

It was agreed that the workshop should be centred on drafting content for the Menu-Driven Document (MDD). This would be built from the Intellectual History of the project, using the Wiki.

The next workshop should be largely internal, a 'drafting' workshop, with some new experts to add to the drafting process rather than introduce entirely new ideas. The 'Archaeology of Landscapes' was suggested as a possible avenue from which to gain a new perspective on the project.

Many topics in the project are still at a fact-finding stage – we could focus on one or two specific topics in order to 'close' them.

The topics and Modus Operandi of Phase II should be discussed at the Workshop. Phase II implied financial commitment from the organisations, who would therefore want to see the value of the MDD and the results of Phase I. There would need to be a RWMC meeting in March 2014: the Secretariat will propose a topical session for the next RWMC meeting to discuss this. There would be a decision in principle at the RWMC Bureau meeting in December 2013. It was agreed that there was likely to be scope for Phase II.

The project would need to leverage international expertise.

The history of the project would provide an understanding of the breadth of the topic, show the potential to collaborate with other organisations, how we have understanding of the topics have matured. The main contribution of the project is the full set of ideas and the synthesis of learning.

Item 31: Phase II

ANDRA offered to look into hosting the international conference in 2014 to launch Phase II. June 2014 or September 2014 were suggested as possible dates.

The FAQs could be established and answered by the end of Phase I.

The contribution of the Glossary was agreed to be valuable. The use of these terms should be monitored to ensure they confirm with the given definitions. It is notable that all of documents produced by the Forum for Stakeholder Confidence reiterate the two-line definition of stakeholder.

Knowledge was discussed. Can the project say anything of note at this point? A one-page Wiki article could be achievable. The lack of information is also noteworthy – Knowledge is agreed to be an important concept and the project can indicate the scope of work to be done. Knowledge management is currently a short-term perspective – the project can show the need to also have a long-term perspective. It was noted that whilst there are many initiatives, the conclusion is always that one needs good knowledge management now. Part of the knowledge is to explain how we got the safety assessment data and why.

One advantage of the project is bringing the short, medium and long term together conceptually.

It was asked how the findings of the project should be publicized.

The related project run with the IGSC on short term RK&M was noted.

The *La Manche Memory Project* was noted as a relevant project, with a notable use of case studies. This could be worth presenting in detail, and linking to the Minimal Set of Records Initiative.

It was suggested that we need more understanding on different responsibilities. We could prepare information packages for different target audiences. Learning to extract complicated information would be important.

Item 32: Wrap-Up

The group went over the main points from day three:

- The next workshop will be a drafting workshop with external input.
- There is a willingness to draw conclusions from Phase I.
- There is interest in holding an international conference in 2014. If Phase II is approved, it will support the launch of Phase II.
- All supporting documents will be online.
- The Wiki will be developed further in advance of the next Workshop.

ANNEX A

Agreed changes to the key observations of the September 2012 Workshop Proceedings:

(numbering as on the item 2 Powerpoint presentation):

- Regulation
 1. RK&M *not* a requirement of the IGSC; reword to reflect this. The line ‘the project will be able to substantiate...’ will be changed to ‘is substantiating...’
 2. No change.
- Records and Archives
 3. National Nuclear Archive: wording will be changed to ‘as being developed in the UK’
 4. The CEA presentation does not need to be related to decommissioning and should be a separate observation.
 5. Change ‘Minimum’ to ‘Minimal’.
 6. Reword so the language is more circumspect. I.e. ‘Study indicates’ the ‘most important negative factor’ = ‘most important factor’ / ‘small third role’ = ‘third role’.. The point about Regulatory ‘weakness’ implies two separate areas: weakness in regulation and weakness in enforcement. This should be reflected.
- Oversight and Monitoring
 7. No change.
 8. The lessons from the DoE Office of Legacy Management may not be applicable outside the context of the USA. However, the observation only points to the presentation as informative, not as a positive recommendation to other countries. The sentence beginning ‘Re-using sites...’ should be change to ‘The conditional reuse of sites...’
- Knowledge and Knowledge Management
 9. The examples used, whilst illustrative during the original presentation, seem flippant in the context of the Main Observations. Keep the Swedish example, remove the final two.
 10. The notion of ‘Contradiction’ is really a tension, trade off or management. Sellafield and Ondraf cases are too different to form a unified observation and should form separate observations. The proceedings need to acknowledge two points made: need to cull and need to keep contextual information. – Adjustment needed. A proposal will be made by the Secretariat.

- Engagement

11. Change of concepts: statements are too strong. 'Fundamentally important' – make more general = 'useful'. The observation after the sentence ending with 'superseded' should be a separate observation. It should refer to the 'work of artists' rather than specific work. The idea of Regeneration should be captured more explicitly.

12. Sense making strategies: 'considering what is durable and interesting' – remove? Reword/ separate.

13. Cultural symbols: insert the word transfer into the line 'strategies for information *transfer*'.

14. Success: no change.

15. Sacrificial Layer: give an example and explain this concept within the text.

16. No change.

- Costs

17. PIC programme: There are two thoughts here: how to identify costs, then the loss of info across phases. Separate into two observations.

18. Andra Memory Programme: No change.

- Mechanisms

19. Propose a rewording of this observation for clarity.

ANNEX B

Menu Driven Document (MDD) Wiki

Summary of the discussion and action points regarding the development of the MDD Wiki.

There was a positive reaction to the use of the Wikimedia platform, and it was noted that it provides a useful way to document the work of the project.

Editorial Policy

We need a clear Editorial Policy.

The editorial functions of the wiki would remain open and accessible to the group. As there are only around 30 group members this can be managed through the 'watchlist' and the editorial tracking functions which are in integral part of the Wiki, such as the discussion tab. **We should have access to the discussion tabs.**

The current article names are suggestions only; please review and edit as appropriate. **We should have editorial rights to change the titles of articles.**

It was confirmed that the outside world will be encouraged to engage in the discussion on the Wiki, but will not have access to editorial functions.

Internal links within the Wiki are automatically maintained; links to external sites will have to be manually maintained.

Finalised articles which have been agreed by the group should be identified in some way. Other articles can be identified as 'Work in Progress', in the manner adopted by Skybrary.

There should be a disclaimer to the effect that the MDD is a resource generated by the project, not NEA policy.

Updating content which is specific to a particular country – such as legislation – will be the responsibility of the member organisation from that country. **The 'last updated' information should be visible.**

The Editorial Policy should note that articles are intended to be written as discreet items of information; as far as possible, changes to one article should not mean that changes need to be made to another article.

The Editorial Policy should be clearly visible on the MDD Wiki. **The 'Principles' should be renamed 'Editorial Policy'**. The principles should be reviewed, and separated into notes for the internal development of the MDD Wiki and messages to public.

Structure

There was general agreement that we should develop the structure of the MDD once we start writing the content in the Wiki format.

The structure may benefit from development through an email working group.

It was agreed to **include an FAQ on the Wiki** for questions which often come up when people are new to the subject, such as 'isn't it safer to forget the existence of the repository?' and regarding the 'atomic priesthood'.

The headings in guidance article tables should be clickable.

It is emphasised that the purpose of the MDD is to identify elements for the creation of a strategy. The learning in the project is not currently developed enough to make positive recommendations, but we can identify considerations which arise when coming to look at a strategy. It was noted that the original intention of having a 'menu' was to provide a choice: the notion was that the MDD would serve as a resource for RWM. The *modus operandi* is to inform rather than advise. The articles should synthesize our learning through the project.

We should explain the structure of the MDD Wiki, and how it makes use of the concepts and learning we have done, showing the interflow of information.

We have an enormous amount of information in the form of Workshop proceedings: we should use the Wiki to organize this information.

In the interests of creating a synthesis of the learning so far, we need an intellectual history of the project. This will provide the basis for the structure of the MDD.

The current categories are too complicated and are not self-explanatory. We should review whether the 'Issue Briefs' are in fact 'Principles', and whether the current 'Policy Briefs' will be useful. We should review whether we need 'external initiatives' *and* 'external programmes'. Historical examples could possibly be included in 'Study Summaries'. Recommendation is that, where possible, we change the titles rather than the underlying architecture. We need to develop the 'About' text for each of the articles.

We should link to the Collective Statement and Vision Document on main page, and make it explicit that categories are derived from these documents. We should use the Collective Statement as an article. However, the MDD needs to contain more information than these two documents; there should be the added value of the project work which has been carried out.

In designing the structure of the information we need to keep in mind that it should also be readable as a hardcopy report.

The September 2013 Workshop should be used to focus on the 'core principles' which the project needs to substantiate. Draft articles will be written in advance by project members, co-ordinated by the Secretariat, for review at the Workshop. Input from outside experts could help us to develop our ideas. We should aim to 'close' the discussion on certain points in the project.

ANNEX C

Decisions and Actions

Item #	Action for...	Topic	Action	Deadline
1	Group	Progress Report	Comment on or approve the Progress Report, as it appears on the project password-protected webpage.	15 May
2	Secretariat	WS2 Proceedings	Agreed changes will be made to the Main Observations and the full proceedings will be put on the RK&M webpage.	16 May
3	Secretariat, Anne Claudel	Bibliography	A citation on the Westinghouse Time Capsules will be added to the Bibliography. The Asse-II mine report mentioned by K. Leopold will also be added.	By September WS
25	Secretariat, Richard Ferch, Anne Claudel	Bibliography	<p>A 'core' bibliography will be created, which will have full abstracts and form part of the analysed bibliography.</p> <p>The entries which will form this group and abstracts for non-English entries will be requested from the group.</p> <p>Other entries will be part of a separate 'Literature Repository'.</p> <p>Nagra will continue to act as a 'document holder' for the group.</p>	By September WS
3	Secretariat	-	Apropos of the Westinghouse Time Capsules, the Secretariat will look into developing work on previous 'attempts to	Briefing at the Third Workshop in September

			contact the future'. This would be a Phase –II initiative.	
3	-	Glossary	The change to the definition of 'knowledge' is approved by the project group.	15 May
3	-	Glossary	The proposed additions of 'Channel' and 'Relay' to the Glossary will not be added, as they are not used frequently across the project. They belong rather to Marcos' Buser report on Markers. But this is his choice.	-
14	Secretariat, Anne Claudel	Glossary	A definition of the term 'Minimal Set of Records' will be proposed for addition to the Glossary, for approval by the group.	By the September WS
3	Group	Glossary	Any proposals for additions or modifications to the Glossary should be communicated to Anne Claudel and Claudio Pescatore, and presented for the approval of the group at the following meeting.	Ongoing
8	Marcos Buser	Markers Study	The Markers Study will be finalised with the addition of an Executive Summary and redrafted for a more impersonal style. Marcos made a case for the use of clay based materials for long-term preservation of memory and records of the repository.	By the September WS
9	Secretariat	Markers: Tsunami Stones	The Tsunami Stones report will be developed, focusing on what the example can tell	By the September WS

		Report	the project. This will be circulated before the Third Workshop.	
14	Group	Minimal Set of Records (MSR)	<p>Project members agreed to nominate up to ten interviewees per country, focusing on ensuring that a range of people are nominated.</p> <p>All interviewees will receive an invitation according to a protocol to be agreed by the MSR group.</p> <p>The English Language participants will be used as a pilot for the study to produce initial findings for the Third Workshop.</p>	15 May
18	Karston Leopold; Secretariat	Loss of Memory: Ass II Mine	<p>The Asse II Mine presentation will be written up as a short case study on RK&M loss.</p> <p>The existing BfS report is authorised for publication and will be included in the bibliography.</p>	
19	Claudio Pescatore, Simon Wisbey and Erik Setzman	Loss of Memory: Study	<p>The commissioned study on the Loss of Records and Memory needs to be finalised. Initial comments for editorial changed will be made by Claudio, Simon and Erik by mid June, noting the following comments from the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a clear separation between factual observations and the views of the author. • The tone should be neutral and focus on describing factors which 	Mid June

			<p>motivated behaviour rather than assigning blame.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turn negative statement into positive recommendations. • It may be advisable to include a section on specific lessons to HLW managers. • An introductory note will be drafted on the Study's relevance to the project. In this note we will explain that there has been evolution in safety culture. 	
21	Secretariat, Group	Regulatory Catalogue	<p>The 'Why' category will be rephrased or removed.</p> <p>An introductory note will be drafted to explain the relevance of the Catalogue to the RK&M project and will acknowledge that regulation is created on a different basis and point of view from country to country.</p> <p>The catalogue will be resent to the Project members to verify that the entries on their countries are complete and correct.</p> <p>The Regulatory Catalogue will be reviewed before being sent to regulators for review.</p>	<p>By end of May</p> <p>Replies by early September</p> <p>After the September workshop</p>
23	Group	Supranational Mechanisms	The commissioned study on Supranational Mechanisms needs to be finalised. Initial	Mid June

	Jean-Noël Dumont; Claudio Pescatore	Study	comments for editorial changed will be made by Claudio and Jean-Noël and submitted to the group for approval at the 3 rd workshop.	
30	-	Third Workshop	<p>The Third Workshop will be predominately a workshop for approving reports, forging common views and thus feed the MDD, which will be then finalized.</p> <p>Time will be taken as well to reflect and discuss on Phase-II proposal.</p> <p>There is consensus in the group that a Phase-II will be beneficial.</p>	
31	Secretariat	Phase II	<p>Phase II of the project will be proposed to the RWMC Bureau in Fall 2013 (possibly December), for later approval by the member countries.</p> <p>A topical session on the RK&M project will be proposed for inclusion in the RWMC Meeting in March 2014.</p> <p>Not-digitizing is not an option nowadays. We have learned that this is a wide and highly-specialised field, that preservation is a “hot” topic in the digital field, and there are ISO standards, plus a large number of initiatives. Phase II of the project could provide opportunities for specialised meetings of archivists.</p> <p>Also, it was note that visual</p>	

			<p>files are a new frontier in memory and, likely, knowledge preservation.</p> <p>Many other suggestions were raised at the meeting, and will be preliminarily collected in the summary record.</p>	
31	Jean-Noël Dumont; Group	Phase II	<p>Andra proposed to host an international conference to launch Phase II of the project in June or September 2014. The RK&M are in favour of this.</p>	
26	Group	Menu Driven Document (MDD) Wiki	<p>The Wiki framework for delivering the MDD and for informing on the RK&M project is confirmed as a valid and promising pathway. There has been progress in implementing the structure on the NEA server.</p> <p>The structure of the Wiki needs to be developed further. We will begin by compiling an intellectual history of the project and implement the underlying structure.</p> <p>The work leading up to the September workshop and to the MDD will reveal important concepts and leanings within the RK&M project, e.g., oversight, safety story...</p> <p>Full notes on the discussion on how to develop the MDD and the Wiki will be included as an Annex to the Summary Record.</p>	

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Belgium	Arne BERCKMANS	ONDRAF/NIRAS
	Jantine SCHRÖDER	CEN/SCK
Canada	Richard FERCH	Expert to NEA
Czech Republic	Miroslav KUCERKA	RAWRA
France	Jean-Noël DUMONT	ANDRA
	Thierry SCHNEIDER	CEPN
Germany	Stephan HOTZEL	GRS
	Karsten LEOPOLD	BfS
Hungary	Zoltan NAGY	PURAM
Netherlands	Eelco KRUIZINGA	DNV B.V.
Spain	Joaquin FARIAS	ENRESA
	Meritxell MARTELL	MERIENCE STRATEGIC THINKING
Sweden	Anders BERGMAN	Östhammars kommun

Sweden	Per CARLSSON	SKB
	Georg LINDGREN	SSM
	Erik SETZMAN	SKB
	Vio SZABO	Östhammars kommun
	Sofie TUNBRANT	SKB
Switzerland	Anne CLAUDEL	Nagra
	Simone BRANDER	Swiss Federal Office of Energy SFOE
	Marcos BUSER	Institut für nachhaltige Abfallwirtschaft INA GmbH
United Kingdom	Simon WISBEY	NDA

INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Peter ORMAI

OECD NUCLEAR ENERGY AGENCY

Helen GORDON-SMITH

Rong-Huei HOU

Claire MAYS

Claudio PESCATORE