

Unclassified

NEA/RWM/FSC/M(2013)1

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

11-Oct-2013

English - Or. English

**NUCLEAR ENERGY AGENCY
RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

Cancels & replaces the same document of 06 September 2013

Forum on Stakeholder Confidence (FSC)

**SUMMARY RECORD
OF THE 13TH SESSION OF THE FORUM ON STAKEHOLDER CONFIDENCE (FSC)**

**22-24 October 2012
HOTEL PRAHA, Prague, Czech Republic**

This final version of the FSC-13 minutes includes material added by the Swiss members (item 10).

Please send any queries regarding this document to claudio.pescatore@oecd.org

JT03346174

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)1
Unclassified

English - Or. English

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

SUMMARY RECORD

OF THE 13TH SESSION OF THE FSC

HOTEL PRAHA, Prague, Czech Republic, 22-24 October 2012

The 13th Session of Forum on Stakeholder Confidence took place on 22-24 October 2012, and was chaired by interim by Ms. Holmfridur Bjarnadottir.

The original PowerPoint presentations by delegates and guests form essential background to this summary record and were made available immediately after the FSC-13 in the password-protected Internet delegates' area. They remain available online.

In red: Deliberations, comments and decisions were identified in the course of the meeting and during the “stocktaking”, and reviewed at the final item. They were then circulated to the FSC on 16 November 2012 with a request for comments.

MONDAY 22 OCTOBER - DAY 1

INTRODUCTION

1. Welcome

Holmfridur Bjarnadottir, FSC Chair by interim; Claudio Pescatore for NEA Secretariat; Czech Hosts including Vlastimil Tesař from Ministry of foreign affairs and his colleague Aleš Ždimera, and Jan Prachař, DG of RAWRA (SURA0)

Special information on FSC governance and acting Chair for this meeting

Welcome to new FSC delegates and thanks to those who are moving on.

In attendance:

Janet Kotra retires from the NRC, and as Chair of the FSC (a position she held for six years); she was a founding member of our group. We are delighted that she has agreed to join us for FSC-13 and the Czech Republic National Workshop and Community visit as a consultant to the NEA. The USNRC is represented in the FSC henceforth by **Jose Cuadrado**.

Vera Sumberova (RAWRA), one of our hosts in the Czech Republic, takes retirement as well. Vera joined us at FSC-4. Her colleague **Ivana Skvorova** who replaces Vera as member, already attended our France workshop in 2009. Former member Lucie Steinerova returned from maternity leave to organize, along with Ivo Kaplan, our meetings here in the Czech Republic.

Mariano Molina (ENRESA), who joined at FSC-7 in 2006, attends his last FSC meeting and Workshop. His colleague **Silvia Rueda Sanchez** joins at FSC-13.

Julia Kiss has left PURAM and the FSC to take a job at the European Commission DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion. Julia is replaced at PURAM and the FSC by **Bernadett Kakasy**.

Gabriele von Goerne (BMU) joins us for the first time at these meetings.

Grazyna Zakrzewska-Trznadel (Institute of Nuclear Chemistry and Technology) joins us as Poland's official member. Poland acceded as an NEA Member Country in 2010. Grazyna also attended our Ten-year Anniversary Colloquium and FSC-11.

Note also that this is the first FSC meeting for Michael Siemann, who replaces Hans Riotte as Head of the RPWM Division of the NEA.

Absent today:

Ansi Gerhardsson (SSM) replaces **Josefin Päiviö Jonsson**, who first joined at FSC-5 in 2004.

Eva Simic leaves the FSC having recently become Director of Research at SSM. Eva first joined FSC at the France Workshop of April 2009.

Meinert Rahn (ENSI) leaves FSC but continues to participate in NEA technical safety groups; he first joined at FSC-11 and the 10-year Anniversary Colloquium in 2010.

Hervé Pero (EC) replaces **Simon Webster**, who was a founding member of the FSC.

Glenna Shields (USEPA) replaces **Helen Burnett**, who attended FSC-11 in 2010.

Jay Jones (USDOE) became a member this year.

Our meeting in Prague is the first instance of a regular FSC meeting held outside Paris.

The FSC-13 was greeted by **Vlastimil Tesař** and his colleague **Aleš Ždimera**, *Multilateral Cooperation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic*

“Over 30% of Czech electricity supply is nuclear; this should grow significantly. Public support of nuclear energy remains strong despite a dip observed in the aftermath of the Fukushima accident.

We highly appreciate the achievements of the NEA including its exchange of expert information on a high level and its information and communication actions. We expect that our cooperation will remain strong.”

Jan Prachař, Director of RAWRA

“RAWRA appreciates FSC interest in the siting of the CR repository. We will do our best to offer helpful background. We look forward the international view of the Czech situation and fruitful discussion among the stakeholders.”

Statement by Janet Kotra, USNRC (ret) and one of the founding members of the FSC

“The launch of the FSC in 2000 took place at a key and troubling time in the work of those trying to site RWM facilities. The science and engineering were good but we were not finding ways to convey that soundness to neighbours, friends, and members of communities. We needed a way to communicate what goes on in our institutions to assure safety. One of our first serious undertakings in the FSC was the publication on *Role & Image of Regulator* (originally drafted in 2003 by Carmen Ruiz Lopez; updated in 2012). It has been an honour to share experience from my home country but moreover I became a better regulator through participating in the FSC.

“Many members say that we bring more back than we bring here, and improve as listeners and ethical agents through our interaction here. We are better able to ensure that others have a voice in decisions that affect them.

“The FSC has enriched my professional and also personal life. I thought I would preside over the orderly shutdown of the FSC but in 2007 the energy and new ideas of the Brainstorming WS proved that there was much more to be done, and that continues. We have evolved a body of literature and tools for dialogue and our excellent record is a good starting point for going forward in what continues to be an important mission.”

2. Review and adoption of the Agenda

NEA/RWM/FSC/A(2012)1

FSC Chair; NEA Secretariat

D *Agenda adopted with small changes.*

3. Approval of Summary Record of the FSC-12 meeting

NEA/RWM/FSC/M(2012)1

FSC Chair

D The FSC-12 summary record was circulated for comments and corrections in February 2012, and finalised accordingly. *Approved.*

BRIEFINGS ON NEA WORKING PARTIES AND PROJECTS

4. THE FSC

4.a Review of main activities launched or achieved since September 2011

I *NEA Secretariat*

Including Publications:

-Updating the 2003 report of the Regulators' Forum – It uses the concept of the “Regulatory System” which includes government, communities, implementers as well as safety regulators

-The FSC Annotated Glossary of Key Terms – [this was effectively released by NEA Publications in March 2013]

And Secretariat studies:

- Monitoring and memory: See item 9

4.b Last minute information on the FSC Czech Republic Community Visit and National Workshop

I *Ivo Kaplan (RAWRA)*

The 9th FSC National Workshop and Community Visit takes place directly after the FSC-13, in Karlovy Vary, and Lubenec (Certovka), under the high patronage of CR's Minister for Trade and Industry Dr. Martin Kuba.

The local visit includes a public meeting. On request of the programme committee (including RAWRA, Mayors, NGOs and the pluralistic working group “Geological Repository Deliberation”), international delegates will participate on panels at this public meeting and regarding safety/regulatory role expectations.

Delegates attend from 15 NEA countries and Romania, and international organisations including the EC and the Group of European Municipalities with Nuclear Facilities (GMF). Belgium, Hungary, and Sweden are represented also by significant delegations of local community leaders.

5. REVIEW OF RWMC AND ITS WORKING PARTIES

NEA Secretariat

We note:

1. the suggestion by the IGSC to consider “Safety Indicators” in the Theme 1 of the FSC PoW

2. a number of WPDD publications can potentially interest FSC members (including the flyer on estimation of nuclear facility decommissioning costs).

3. the “oversight” or “watchful care” concept, which underscores the radiological protection criteria of the new recommendations by the ICRP. The concept embraces societal oversight activities.

4. the RK&M project has introduced the concept of the Safety Story and is exploring this.

5. Finally, we look forward to the upcoming publication of the Regulators’ Forum brochure on the Evolving Role of the Regulator and of the FSC Annotated Glossary of Terms. Members are asked please to distribute the FSC glossary widely.

SELECTED INTERNATIONAL INPUT

6. THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON GEOLOGICAL REPOSITORIES (ICGR)

Michael Siemann (NEA Secretariat)

The ICGR was held 1-2 October 2012 in Toronto, and was organised by Natural Resources Canada, NWMO, OECD/NEA, IAEA, EC and EDRAM for a small group of senior people in RWM.

“Wait and see” was criticized as a strategy because it moves the problem to the next generations.

Mr. Siemann noted that long term storage, and separation and transmutation remain as partial options but that deep geological disposal will still be needed in any case. Challenges discussed at Toronto include in-depth cost estimation of geological disposal, operational safety conforming to nuclear and mining safety requirements, and continuing R&D.

The FSC is pleased to learn that its seed document on the conference theme National Commitment, Local and Regional Involvements was revised and adopted by the RWMC as a collective statement (March 2012) and that this document was also used as a background document to the conference.

7. RELEVANT EUROPEAN-LEVEL PROJECTS

FSC Chair

7.a InSoTeC – including Czech Republic participation

Zdenek Konopasek, Karel Svacina (Charles University, Prague)

InSoTeC (International Socio-Technical Challenges for Geological Disposal; 2011-2013) is an EC-sponsored project aiming to generate a better understanding of the complex interplay between the technical and the social in radioactive waste management. It broadens the stream of socio-political research on radioactive waste management to include research on social aspects of science and technology in this matter and on the technical translation of socio-political requirements.

The InSOTEC consortium consists of 12 research partners from 10 European countries: Belgium (coordination: Antwerp University), the Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Norway, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the UK. Several FSC member organisations and FSC contacts participate. The Group of European Municipalities with Nuclear Facilities (GMF) is also a partner. C. Pescatore, NEA, is a member of the “Stakeholder Reflection Group”. www.insotec.eu

We take note that the InSoTec project has prepared, inter alia, an analysis (DI.1) of the FSC modus operandi and publications. All are invited to look at the report "Review of initiatives

addressing socio-technical challenges of RWM & geological disposal in international programs" and comment on it. Comments can be passed on to the NEA Secretariat.

7.b IPPA

Kjell Andersson (Karita Konsult)

IPPA (Implementation Implementing Public Participation Approaches in Radioactive Waste Disposal; 2011-2013) is an EC-sponsored project involving 16 organizations from 12 countries, including some FSC organisations and contacts. In the framework of the IPPA project, the RISCUM Model and other novel approaches to public involvement are being implemented in Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland, Slovenia and Romania. The main goals of the implementation are to aid the current processes of RWM in the selected countries, to establish a “safe space” for stakeholders, and to provide guidance for future processes by creating schemas for how implementation can be organized and executed. The implementation is also viewed as an excellent opportunity to further test and evaluate the approaches. www.ippaproject.eu

IPPA processes in some Eastern Countries show how difficult it is at this time to attract a diversity of stakeholders to sit at the same table. The Czech Republic working group has achieved this.

Mr. Andersson noted that the IPPA groups are very interested in conducting comparisons with Sweden, UK, France, etc. While the history and political structures are quite different, this interest highlights IPPA countries’ need to look at other countries as well as their own traditions to invent new processes.

Mr. Andersson noted the “links” between the concurrent projects IPPA and INSOTEC: both look at the values loading the technical issues (risk vs. dose criteria, selection of disposal method). Value laden criteria are tacitly or explicitly exercised in social and ethical issues: responsibility for future generations, levels of retrievability, political decisions that must be taken to launch GD, etc.

InSOTEC can help IPPA participants to be more aware of the social and value-laden issues, to take them fully into account in the participative processes. IPPA can (perhaps) help InSOTEC with some clarification experiences from its case studies.

7.c IPPA – Work of the Czech Republic Reference Group

Hana Vojtechova (Nuclear Research Institute Rez plc, Czech Republic), Vera Sumberova (RAWRA)

The presentation was delayed until the National Workshop.

7.d IPPA – Work of the Poland Reference Group

Grazyna Zakrzewska-Trznadel (Institute of Nuclear Chemistry and Technology, Warsaw)

The first Polish NPP is planned in 2023 and the second by 2030. According to the Frame Programme for Nuclear Power Implementation in Poland prepared in July 2009 by the Government Commissioner for Nuclear Energy, the selection of the three potential sites for a low- and medium-level radioactive waste repository will be completed by the end of 2013, the design of the repository in 2013-2014 and by the year 2020 the repository will be put into operation.

Within IPPA, Dr. Zakrzewska’s institute formed a “reference group” with 12 participants (research institutes, ministry of economy, nuclear society, environmentalists from the nuclear sector, Polish ecological club –withdrew in 2012, radioactive waste management plan (ZUOP), PGE nuclear energy SA, community office from the locality of Rozan, Collegium Civitas...). 6 reference groups meetings have taken place, discussing how to organise activities (such as

training on stakeholder communication). A workshop was held on the application of the Aarhus convention to nuclear issues. A training through role play addressed integrating public participation into the decision making process for sustainable governance of nuclear energy and waste in Poland (28 participants).

7.e IPPA – Work of the Romania Reference Group

Daniela Diaconu (Institute of Nuclear Research, Pitesti)

Romania is an observer to the NEA. Dr. Diaconu gave a detailed introduction on the nation's nuclear and waste management programs. Two CANDU reactors exist in the eastern city of Cernavoda; units 3 and 4 are planned for 2015, and the ALFRED Gen IV reactor concept is explored for realization. At present, LIL waste (research, medicine, industry) is disposed of in Baita Bihor. A siting process is underway targeting the operation of an LILW near-surface repository in neighboring Saligny by 2017. Spent fuel is currently in wet or dry storage at the Cernavoda site and geological disposal of spent fuel and long lived waste, also in Saligny, is on the agenda for 2055.

Saligny is a small village with many critical infrastructure needs. Socio economic development is an integral part of the siting project. Dr. Diaconu's institute is deeply involved in helping local stakeholders gain a voice in decision making. In 2004, when RWM agency Andrad was created and Saligny village was pre-selected, INR joined Cowam 2 and subsequently CIP, supporting all these actors by organizing a pluralistic Romanian Stakeholder Group. Dialogue was facilitated and it was only regretted that this group had no formal legal status or decision authority.

The IPPA reference group includes nuclear organisations, public health & environmental protection organisations, local level (only mayor of Saligny – because IPPA is focused only on GD, not storage), NGOs (one pronuclear and one neutral). Diverse topics have been debated. In the meeting clarifying legal requirements, for instance, a representative of the Environment Ministry listened to civil society assessments:

- there are not clear requirements on what public consultation should be;
- asks only for public consultation and not involvement
- no provisions for local structures (Local Committees).

Various methods for participation are proposed for testing in IPPA and beyond.

7.f ACN - Aarhus Convention and Nuclear

Claire Mays (Symlog) on behalf of ACN Working Group 2 of the HCTISN, France

Roundtables regarding the practical implementation of the Aarhus Convention & Nuclear (ACN) were initiated by ANCCLI, the federation of French local information committees attached to nuclear sites, with support from DG ENER European Nuclear Energy Forum (ENEF) Transparency group. The 3-year ACN programme allows civil society stakeholders and institutional actors to lay out an assessment and expectations in their own country and then present these and learn from others at the EU level. The first European round table centred on RWM. Particularly impressive are the sustained dialogue opportunities created in Eastern Europe (Ukraine, Bulgaria) and the important moral support that ACN has been able to provide to concerned stakeholders in weak democracies: Belarus and even as far as Central Asia.

In France the ACN National roundtables were convened by the High Committee on Transparency and Information on Nuclear Safety. Working Group 2 was piloted by Greenpeace and co-piloted by the Nuclear Safety Authority ASN and included representatives from IRSN and Andra as well as industry and civil society. It looked at the instruments of the formal French system of participation in environmental decision making: *public debate* and *public enquiry*, investigating their application at different levels for nuclear issues in France. Public debate has been used for

both overarching plans and localized projects but the working group found it has not provided sufficient opportunities for concerned publics to influence decisions. Public enquiry focusses on project level but often issues addressing the level of policy or plan need to be brought into consideration, which is not formally admissible. This formalistic separation of stages means that participation is fragmented over time and space – continuity in public understanding and in influence therefore cannot develop.

While each tool has its strong points in terms of generating and sharing information, the working group identified specific bottlenecks. The formal calendar of enquiry does not allow local information committees the time needed to understand and “translate” the dossiers and to mobilise the participation of residents. The working group recommended that the enquiry calendar and rules be modified such that the “people’s expert” IRSN could legitimately communicate with the local committees in technical detail. This was an example of a significant provision that the diverse stakeholders assembled in the ACN working group all supported.

Recommendations for improving implementation of the Aarhus Convention have been issued in France and other countries.

We note the upcoming meetings of the Aarhus Convention on Nuclear. Namely: the ACN European Round Table on nuclear safety (December 4-5th 2012) and the final ACN conference with the Aarhus UNECE Secretariat (March 2013).

7.g Discussion

The FSC has long implemented a concept of “safe space”, creating this notably with our National Workshops. Remarks confirming this have been recorded concerning workshops held in e.g. France, Germany...

[Testimonial received Oct. 8, 2012 from Wolfgang HILDEN, European Commission:]

“I regard the FSC country workshops as an essential tool which could help to start or restart discussions in a highly complex and controversial field, such as RWM. In fact, they have acted already as a kind of “safe space” as defined in the context of the EU RISCOP and ARGONA projects, namely as ‘an arena for dialogue where different stakeholders can move forward together to increase their understanding of the issues and also of their respective views without being felt like hostages for a certain purpose.’ During the FSC workshop in Germany (2004), participants in the round table debate stated that some of the participants talked to each other for the first time after 10 years, facilitated by the international context of the FSC. While FSC workshops finally will not manage to completely overcome a deadlock they can help to overcome misunderstandings, provide new insights for all involved and ideally kick off a new debate.”

As for obstacles to informed decision (example of the issue of rigid calendar in the public enquiry in France): the FSC could perform a taxonomy of these. What typically slows things down? What prevents the different stakeholders from actually entering and effectively influencing the process? What do they need, in terms of reassurance, enablement, resources, or new arrangements?

The FSC has written many flyers for knowledge consolidation and easier transfer. We will invite other project coordinators to take the FSC flyers up, as well as the FSC Glossary of terms.

It was mentioned that INSOTEC has performed a synthesis report of pertinent publications including those of FSC; this could be reviewed by the Core Group.

The FSC is present, albeit informally, in many of the EC and other projects outside to the FSC, because many of our members participate and input to these projects. It is also remarked that it is easier to integrate voluntary projects like ACN rather than EC-sponsored research projects with their contractual structure. More of these informal exchanges could be organized. For instance, the FSC could be invited to participate in the open workshops of these initiatives. It is a question

if more formal integration is needed, e.g., to be discussed with the EC.

What about the fact that EC-sponsored programs are finite in time? What continuity can be expected (compare with the ongoing FSC)? Several contexts mentioned that their reference groups have “lived on”, for example: the Czech Working group from the Argona project; the Romanian National Stakeholder Group from Cowam 2 and CIP.

SPECIAL COUNTRY UPDATES (1)

8 SPAIN

8.a Outcome of the stakeholder involvement process in siting the CTS

Mariano Molina, Silvia Rueda Sanchez (ENRESA)

On 30 December 2011, the Spanish Council of Ministers designated the municipality of Villar de Cañas in the province of Cuenca (Central Spain) as the site where a Centralised Storage Facility (CTS) for all HLW and Spent Fuel generated in Spain will be built. This decision is the final step of a site selection process that started in 2006 when the Government announced its intention to implement such a facility and opened to all Spanish municipalities the possibility of applying for being the hosting community.

(See slides for a detailed presentation of societal, procedural, territorial and political aspects of the decision.)

8.b Discussion

The Spanish Authorities and Enresa were careful throughout the ATC process not to introduce considerations about final repository plans, e.g., these were not included in the “information package” that went to potential volunteer communities. Enresa has stressed that future decisions on final disposal will require broad societal preparation and participation.

Note for the record that the host municipality has said (at this time) that they would like to take a final repository. The characterization criteria have not been finalized but the current host municipality said “*if we can, we will*”.

What happens if across the next 60 years no other solution is developed? Has there been discussion of ATC becoming a “default” solution? Reply: The Waste Directive gives no deadline but instead, it requires a plan for a sincere and frank decision process. The Spanish do not and will not have a ‘wait and see’ approach.

The Spanish Interim Storage Facility siting is an interesting case of 3-level governance. The FSC could follow up this process, with an invitation to Spanish stakeholders next year, to try to learn from the experience but also provide replies to questions. An additional possibility is to hold an FSC Workshop in Villar de Cañas in two years from now. Mariano Molina and Silvia Rueda will consult the Enresa management.

Small, densely populated countries with a limited range or availability of geological settings, like Belgium, Switzerland and Holland also need attention – the success stories from countries approaching isolated, small communities with economic difficulties are not directly helpful for those circumstances. Even for classical waste facilities there are large challenges. What alternatives can be identified for working in such contexts? This topic will be discussed by the Core Group.

TUESDAY 23 OCTOBER - DAY 2

IMPLEMENTING THE FSC PROGRAMME OF WORK (1)

9. LONG TERM ASPECTS AND STAKEHOLDER CONFIDENCE (Topical discussion under PoW Theme 5)

Erik Setzman (SKB)

9.a Status and findings of the RWMC project “Preservation of Records, Knowledge and Memory” (RK&M)

Claudio Pescatore

RK&M has produced a reference bibliography as well as a glossary that can be consulted online. A taxonomy was created of how records are lost or misused. Various other case studies are developed under RK&M. The aim of the project is to provide a Menu-Driven document allowing the user to identify strategic elements of an RK&M plan.

Oversight: This is an interesting concept that people should be aware of. In its new publication 122 on radiological protection in the context of geological disposal, the ICRP states there should be “watchful care”. The ICRP details the types of direct or indirect oversight that can be ensured at the various phases of the repository life cycle. After repository closure oversight can take different forms of implementation: monitoring for instance.

Present examples of implementing oversight include monitoring (e.g. radiological monitoring has been ongoing for decades, as have other types of environmental monitoring unrelated to the nuclear programme). The European directive on managing radioactive waste safely includes a requirement on a reporting system.

Sooner or later regulation and practice will routinely reflect an “oversight culture”; it is well that the FSC starts to reflect on this now.

ICRP also states that there is “never an intention to abandon oversight” i.e. it is important not to relinquish oversight, and to maintain the many ways in which it can be exercised. RK&M members too have shown that at present there is no interest to forget about the long term facility, unlike the strategy of years ago. There are many reasons to keep memory going. Memory also can save lives. In Japan there were tsunami stones informing people not to build under a given elevation. Those who built beyond this point, died. People trusted technology but this was not sufficient in many cases.

Some elements of safety around a facility are not “necessary”, not part of the technical safety case, but are part of the safety “story”: they contribute to assurance of safety, or of the ability to intervene, etc. This safety story idea is also filtering through into the technical fields, as demonstrated in the SKB licence application study. Preserving RK&M is not a safety requirement, but it is implicitly assumed in the Swedish safety case.

Oversight or watchful care has emerged as an important concept.

Agreement that the facility will not be abandoned. There are many reasons to retain memory.

Memory contributes to the safety story and can save lives.

9.b Secretariat study: Some reflections on physical monitoring

Lumír Nachmilner (NEA consultant)

L. Nachmilner has conducted a study for the NEA Secretariat on physical monitoring of waste

management facilities, providing a survey of definitions, purposes, practices, and problems. See slides for a very thorough presentation of what is being done, what is and is not feasible in terms of physical monitoring of a RWM facility, at its various life cycle phases.

Suggestions were provided on the physical monitoring study

9.c Secretariat study: Initial findings on local stakeholders' positions on monitoring and memory

Meritxell Martell (Merience)

Report of the first phase of the new NEA survey on 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.

- What are the confidence aspects of Monitoring and RK&M?
- How much do local communities require?
- At which periods and over what time scales? (see the RK&M definitions)
- What is being done now in national/local contexts to address these concerns?

The short online survey circulated to the FSC in July 2012 is part of this study.

9.d Discussion on preservation of records and memory, on oversight and monitoring

In the recent case of a safety concern arising during the routine inspection of a nuclear reactor in Belgium (potential flaws detected in the Doel reactor vessel in August 2012): it was a significant challenge to recover information dating back only 40 years to the time when the reactor was built. This clearly shows the need to keep essential data and moreover, to have them available at all times during the existence of the facility.

When you think about 100 – 1000 years into the future, monitoring is attractive as a memory strategy. The simple fact of monitoring maintains activity around the site. In the future there will be at least a discussion of whether the monitoring should be terminated.

Can lessons be learnt from the European Directive on how you record data? It may be premature at this stage to concentrate on how monitoring results are maintained. The current struggle in geological repository projects is to amass data. At this stage, no systematic monitoring programmes have been established. In later stages, results will likely be maintained on international platforms.

The public wants evidence that they will be safe after the closure = no radionuclides will emerge. The public doesn't necessarily understand that there are processes to be monitored to check whether the repository system is developing as predicted.

Technical society tends to agree with radiological monitoring because they predict that the results will always be negative (*'nothing is happening'*; *'no radioactivity is leaking'*). Still, you cannot be so convinced of your solutions that you can affirm *'there will never be any problem at any time'*. Nor can you point to technical limitations as a worthy reason to renounce monitoring. Of course a sensor will not be up to date in perhaps even 10 years but the discussion of monitoring and its technical requirements keeps memory alive and provides assurance to stakeholders that things are taken care of.

Regulators are aware that there is a critical challenge to face: reliability of and confidence in the results that monitoring will provide. There is a need to guard against false positives. This is a fundamental issue of the concept of statistical significance. Underground research laboratories

allow us to verify monitoring techniques and arrive at a certain level of stability of the results.

Performance confirmation modeling: When you characterize and construct in real geological media you get real data. It is a duty to test there for confirmation/disconfirmation of the theoretical model represented by the safety case. This is important to enable a reply to stakeholders' question "*What if you are wrong?*".

You need to structure the inquiry to catch the mistake you may have made – not collect the data that support what you think you did. It's intellectual honesty: looking for mistakes while you are building and still have the chance to correct them. The public needs to know that you have the tests in place to check the validity of your own models.

The demand for monitoring is shaped by the manner in which the implementer has offered to share data and information from the very beginning. Some proponents simply say "*We will send the data to the regulator who will decide on public involvement in follow up of monitoring data*". In cases where the implementer has made stakeholders part of the data distribution list there has been less challenge and conflict created by the need to gain access to these data.

The regulator is working for the public good, not for the nuclear industry. This must be clearly formulated. The regulator prescribes monitoring and interprets results. If the regulator is clearly represented as working to protect the public health and interest, the meaning of monitoring will be clarified and it will play a stronger role of reassurance.

Teams in Belgium interpret the technical monitoring data to the public, i.e. demonstrating whether there is a negative impact. Such a "translator" or mediator may be a useful actor to include in the watchful care.

Monitoring has a potential for stakeholder involvement and contributing to memory keeping.

9.e Way forward

D

Which further activities should the FSC plan around these topics?

It is good to see that a large number of responses were received to Meritxell Martell's study on behalf of the FSC. We should see the result of the follow-up interviews; we can envision a topical session at FSC-14. The NEA monitoring studies will take the EC MoDeRn project results into account.

SPECIAL COUNTRY UPDATES (2)

10. SWITZERLAND

10.a Status of the DGR site selection process and stakeholder confidence

Pascale Künzi (BFE)

See slides for a detailed presentation of the status of the site selection process and regional participation according to the Conceptual Part of the Sectoral Plan for Deep Geological Repositories. This spatial planning document and its multi-layer consultation and decision process respond to the multi-level governance system in Switzerland for large projects.

The first of the three stages was completed on November 30th, 2011 with the decision of the federal council to confirm the six geological siting areas proposed by Nagra in 2008. The second stage is currently in progress, with the goal to select at least two potential sites per waste category. The bodies of participation (regional conferences) were installed prior to the end of phase one or at the beginning of phase two and are currently working on their tasks (e.g. discussion of the placement of the surface facilities).

In four of the six siting regions, German communities participate in the regional conferences.

Some of the challenges of local and regional involvements are the stigmatization of participants, the different state of knowledge amongst the participants (knowledge gap), the high work load, inclusion of opponents in the process (objective/constructive participation vs. opposition), the influence of higher levels (national, cantonal) and the fact that the process is pioneer work (learning while doing).

10.b Participation process in Switzerland: The implementer's first experiences

Philipp Senn (Nagra)

The presentation dealt with NAGRA's collaboration with bodies of regional participation under the sectoral plan. The task undertaken was to discuss proposals for the layout, location and access of the surface infrastructure for a future repository.

An "education module" was developed to introduce the principles of deep geological disposal to more than 500 members of the regional conferences. Building up technical and procedural know how on the part of conferences is necessary and leads to factual discussions.

Using the RWM Collective Statement adopted in March 2012 (*National Commitment, Local and Regional Involvement* – which distils major findings by the FSC), the presentation reviewed siting, dialogue and development principles and the precise way these have been implemented in the Swiss context. Lessons learnt from mistakes or frustrations were reported as well.

Some interesting facts include:

- The Swiss sectoral plan process foresees direct involvement of local authorities, but not cantonal authorities. Cantons are in charge of spatial and environmental planning and gave direct input of suggestions for the location of surface facilities. Some regional conferences appreciate that input while others don't.
- A working group on safety was sponsored by Nagra and invited critical experts and the regulator.
- There is great interest from civil society stakeholders to see how the pilot facility will work. The scheme for participation in that future operating phase is not yet set.
- A report published by a Swiss paper in October 2012 led to a significant decline of confidence and trust in Nagra. This shows how sensitively some of the actors respond and how easily the process or the reputation of an organisation can be affected.

10.c Discussion

IMPLEMENTING THE FSC PROGRAMME OF WORK (2)

11. THE GROWING ROLE OF SOCIAL MEDIA (Topical Session under PoW Themes 2 & 3)

Chair: Jay Redgrove (NDA)

Rapporteur: Timo Seppälä (Posiva)

11.a Results of the FSC survey on member organisations' use of social media

Rapporteur

Seventeen FSC members provided replies to the FSC informal survey on the state of use of social media. The minority who use social media platforms or SMPs - YouTube (7), Facebook (6), and Twitter (5) - started the use just two years ago or later. Those who do not use SMP's cite lack of human resources, the inability to control information, or feeling "unconvinced" of SMP's utility.

The main reasons for using SMPs include one-way broadcast of institutional content, and also to

support interaction with civil society stakeholders permitting them to set the agenda.

The rapporteur concluded:

- Organisations involved in the survey have limited experience of SMPs
- Target groups are vaguely defined
- Motivations for use of SMPs seem to be more operational than strategic
- SMPs are not used for recruitment purposes
- Monitoring of SMPs is slight.

11.b Panel on the growing role of social media and the impact on transparency

Jakub Macek, Masaryk University, Brno presented “An empirical viewpoint” based on the ongoing research of the department of Media Studies and Journalism. First describing online activism and the way NGOs and individual activists use social networking sites (SNS), Macek then highlighted a "practices" gap in the way SNS are used by activists on the one hand and by corporations and politicians on the other.

Jaroslav Valuch, Standby Task Force, Prague, presented “An NGO viewpoint: Beyond Clicks and Likes”: “Updating FaceBook status with a photo of what you are eating for lunch, assisting in disaster recovery from your couch, mobilizing community to request transparency and accountability... ICTs in the hands of citizens are already proving to be an efficient weapon. So is the world finally becoming a better place to live? Or we are just witnessing the sneaky onset of lazy clicktivism?” Valuch, an offline and online activist, gave insight into the potential and the challenges of using modern communication tools for positive social change, identifying “communication literacy for the 21st century as the least painful way forward.”

Valuch presented crisis response as an example of a dynamic, socially meaningful use of SMPs. In natural or technological catastrophe, individuals input useful information through existing channels of communication. Crowdsourcing can be organised to collect critical information from the people actually in the field, from blogs, and so forth, and to reveal patterns that can support emergency or long term response. As an example, Sinsai.info built a real-time earthquake map, through Japanese citizens’ input of information into a GIS grid. The platform served to transform the information into analysis to visualise what was happening on the ground. The NGOs have been testing the platform to be ready for future crisis in other contexts, to help provide better response.

Adam Zbiejczuk, Charles University, Prague, delivered “**An experimental viewpoint**”: The monitoring of social media is important, but hampered by the limits of search engines in use in the SM platforms and also the sheer amount of not-to-the-point information contained in e.g. discussion forums. Journalists do however use the social networks in search for information. With the appearance of social media comes also a new type of journalism – using crowdsourcing. As described by Valuch, the activist approach to crowdsourcing enables people to become reporters.

Panel discussion: Two of the panellists essentially described the FSC members as simply demographically outside the social media culture, and warned members that we therefore have little hope of adapting.

NGO websites are treated today as news agencies, where people can go to learn more about environment or social issues.

Most companies confuse social media with a marketing channel. The telephone serves as an understandable example: while it can be used for marketing activities it is a communication vector.

Strategy – Advice to RWM institutions would be “first set your goals and then see how social media fit in”.

11.c General discussion

All opinions or information inputs are not equally valid. What about authentication? Where is the role of peer review for information uploaded to the web? How can legitimacy of authorship and reliability of information be guaranteed?

Twitter: setting up filters to select information... you can monitor the content and then you can use your channels to identify misinformation. You can also collect information from other sources.

11.d Way forward

D

Ideas for future activities in this area.

- Investigate what member organisations can expect from social media ?
- Investigate how member organisations might use SMP?
- Is it possible to use social media to make science fashionable?
- Could WMOs make use of crowdsourcing? Which issues could benefit?

We will keep social media on our agenda.

SPECIAL COUNTRY UPDATES (3)

12 GERMANY

12.a Relevant aspects of the draft law for the site selection process

Gabriela von Goerne (BMU)

A new law for selecting the site of the national DGR for HLW and spent fuel is in draft in Germany. The *Endlagersuchgesetz* (Law for the site selection process) was presented from the point of view of stakeholder confidence, including the dialogue process by which it was developed, as well as the specific articles that address societal concerns, right to participate, etc.

Gorleben is selected as potential disposal site for heat generating waste.

AKEnd recommendations never became reality. Talks were started in Nov. 2011 to address the stumbling point: consensus between Lander and Federal government is a requirement to start the site selection process, and it is difficult to find. Points of disagreement include: the role of Gorleben (is it in or out?), design of the process, including roles and tasks. At this date the Minister of Environment is doing what is possible to keep talks going.

The draft law was circulated on 18.10.2012 to the consensus group. This corresponds to step 1 of a 6-step process that is already delayed. No public involvement has taken place in step 1 as it is thought that this may prevent consensus. Public confidence is low.

The public will be given the necessary opportunities to participate in later steps. Chapter 2 of the law describes participation: an advisory committee will be established, to accompany the whole process and discuss results and procedures. A new institute is to be built to take care of all public involvement actions.

12.b Discussion

13 UK

13.a Status of the MRWS process

Jay Redgrove (NDA)

The UK Government's Managing Radioactive Waste Safely process is structured on 4 pillars: partnership with host community, implementation by the NDA, strong independent regulation and independent scrutiny by CoRWM.

The local partnership was formed by three local government structures expressing interest in the siting process: Copeland Borough Council, Allerdale Borough Council, Cumbria County Council and included members from other representative local groupings. They completed a lot of work (inquiry and deliberation) over the last 2.5 years. They surveyed the local population early in 2012 taking that information also into account as they drafted recommendations to the councils. The recommendations were delivered in July and the partnership published their final report in August 2012, it is available online.

This latest survey showed that the largest set of people in favour of taking part in the search for a geological disposal facility site is in Copeland – this is the area hosting Sellafield. The survey showed too that the more people say they know about nuclear and radioactive waste issues, the more favourable they are to advancing in the process.

The Councils have decided to defer their decisions as to whether to go farther in the process (Decision to Participate, leading to Stage 4 of Desk-based studies in participating areas) until the New Year in order to consider partnership report in more detail and to obtain further information from Government. As local elections will be held in 2013 that could be expected to have impact on deliberations.

The opportunity for any UK communities to express an interest (Stage 1) remains open. Shepway District Council in Kent (southeast corner of UK) considered this but in September 2012 they opted not to when 60 % of local people answering survey in early summer were unfavourable.

NDA continues to develop their engagement strategy. They have drawn up stakeholder profiles as general categories to whom the RWM division should reach out to invite engagement. They have elaborated “topic engagement” plans for particular work areas, and for each one ask questions like: What are the key messages? Aims of the engagement? Needs of each stakeholder and level of engagement to target? What tools need to be developed/ used (report, meeting, workshop, briefing paper, etc). The aim is to use existing mechanisms, rather than add meetings to stakeholder's calendar.

13.b Stakeholder demands for confidence in regulator capacity and independence

David Brazier (Environment Agency, England)

The Environment Agency are one of several regulators in the UK. They (along with the safety regulator – the Office for Nuclear Regulation) participated as observers in the West Cumbria MRWS Partnership, answering questions if they were asked.

The WC MRWS Partnership's 2012 telephone poll (of ~3000 people) and written survey questionnaire formed a key part of the Partnership's last round of public and stakeholder engagement. The Partnership focussed its analysis of responses on the “quality of evidence and argument” in questionnaires rather than just reporting the sheer numbers.

In the written replies, Safety, Trust and Confidence were common words and themes. The Environment Agency's analysis of the written responses found people were evenly divided on

whether they trusted and distrusted the regulatory agencies. Post-Fukushima, concern was expressed for whether the UK regulator is properly resourced and skilled. The WC MRWS Partnership thus formally wrote to the regulators (Environment Agency and ONR) asking for assurances on:

- **capacity** - now and in the future - to properly regulate the development and operation of a potential geological disposal facility.
- **independence** . Meaning "... ability and willingness ... to refuse to grant an environmental permit that ... is 'borderline' or does not meet your requirements, despite what may be significant pressure from other authorities including a future Government."

Regarding social media, the Environment Agency routinely uses social media channels to communicate flood risk but is not actively engaged on the topic of geological disposal, because the siting process has yet to commence in any locality and there has been little public interest expressed so far in the role of the regulators.

[*Update by author:* Since April 2013, the EA is environmental regulator for England only, after Wales set up their own environmental regulator – Natural Resources Wales.]

13.c **CoRWM's continuing role and outlook on the process**

Prof. William Lee (CoRWM)

(Opinions expressed were Prof Lee's own.) The independent UK "Committee on Radioactive Waste Management" CoRWM has existed in three editions from 2003 (the milestone work of preceding editions was recalled by Prof. Lee). CoRWM's present role is to scrutinise Government and NDA plans and advise UK government and devolved administrations on long-term management of RW, including storage and disposal. Task groups are working on storage, disposal, Scotland, R&D, voluntarism and Public and Stakeholder Engagement (PSE). A new Chair and six new members arrive in Nov. 2012.

Analysing the relationships between CoRWM and the public and stakeholders highlights the need to find a balance between a reactive and a proactive stance. Issues that have arisen were e.g., providing information to the West Cumbria Partnership produced some complaints that independence was compromised.

CoRWM realised that report production was too slow and labour intensive; the committee were being pressed into service as "consultants" on various topics. Advice often was provided too late for Government needs. The work was less visible to Ministries, parliamentary committees and senior sponsor officials. The committee are considering how to raise their profile, clarify their role and terms of reference to identify where they can add best value to the RWM process.

13.d **Discussion**

(notes missing)

14. **USA**

14.a **Follow up on the report by the US Blue Ribbon Committee, with direct relation to stakeholder confidence**

Jose Cuadrado (US NRC)

The Blue Ribbon Committee was not a siting commission, and did not look at geological disposal sites. Its task was to propose a national strategy for the permanent disposal of high-level nuclear wastes. The proposal contains 8 key elements including: new consent-based approach to siting future nuclear waste management facilities, new organisation dedicated solely to implementing

the waste management programme and empowered with the authority and resources to succeed, access to the funds nuclear utility ratepayers are providing for the purpose of nuclear waste management, etc.

Most BRC recommendations are consistent with NRC regulatory activities. However, NRC cannot implement several BRC recommendations until statutory changes are made.

BRC recommendations: what do they mean for stakeholder outreach?

- recognises the importance of meaningful and comprehensive engagement (consent-based siting).
- The role of the implementing organisation (DoE or new organisation) in stakeholder engagement will necessarily evolve as a new process is designed and implemented.

DoE has been tasked to develop a strategy for the management of spent fuel and other nuclear waste – they have a draft strategy, under review.

Experience in the US identifies the following elements important for stakeholder confidence:

- Establishing fair, predictable, and transparent decision-making processes, with clearly defined roles and responsibilities for all participants;
- Providing meaningful and frequent opportunities for public to participate and interact with decision-makers;
- Ensuring communications with the public are specifically tailored to the audience (technical or non-technical), and;
- Ensuring that final decisions are based on an objective evaluation of all relevant information and evidence.

4.b Discussion

It could be interesting to compare the elements for a confidence-worthy nuclear waste management process identified by the BRC, against the FSC flyers. These could possibly be improved in consequence. We noted already at FSC-11 that the BRC cited our reports.

IMPLEMENTING THE FSC PROGRAMME OF WORK (3)

15	EARLY INVOLVEMENT (Exploratory discussion under several PoW Themes)	NEA/RWM/FSC (2012)1
-----------	--	------------------------

15.a *FSC Chair by interim*

Society needs to encourage institutions to be more open to bringing stakeholders into the discussion at the stage of considering options.

The FSC does not seek to be prescriptive, but to help participants to consider pragmatic alternatives that could facilitate their own practice.

Last year an exploratory session shared practical reflections on how countries have achieved early involvement. This year it seems fruitful to consider further:

- “Real-life” examples of conducting out early involvement and lessons learned from these attempts.
- The challenge of defining what the stakeholders mean by “early involvement” as compared to “involvement in general”.

A draft introduction that scopes this tentative project was provided by the Secretariat. Agreed that the draft demonstrated that early involvement is considered a very important topic and obligation

in various fields (environment, social development) and it could be interesting to gather more insight and experience from these fields.

There are different phases in a waste management programme and this can impact what people consider to be “early”. One aspect is the framing: in early decision making phases it’s important to avoid a narrow framing and instead, get all issues on the table (generic stage, method). Later as the programme moves on and you leave the stage of alternative options and go for selecting a site, a new set of stakeholders is identified and the need for their involvement becomes evident – along with their desire to influence decisions that now lie upstream. Handling this dynamic requires an understanding of the different role of stakeholder involvement in the different phases.

Every decision step requires early involvement, but also requires a justification to show why and how previous decisions were made and by whom. This is facilitated if at each point attention is given to identifying the framing of the decision, and gaining agreement on that framing. Legitimising site selection processes is a strong example of that.

Because program phases or the sequence may last longer than individuals’ careers there is a challenge in how to manage the information and how to manage staff changes in the organisation to preserve knowledge.

How can a decision taken at a given step remain robust enough to survive across decades? You cannot keep revisiting the process all the time. “Robustness” is indeed a good word, implying that the decision should be adequate for a whole variety of possible conditions.

Regarding requirements on early involvement, participation, etc.: To what extent do people working in the field consider that that they are applying national laws or international agreements? Do organisations care about the Aarhus convention? Is conformity only a concern for government officers?

Some consider that a national Freedom of Information Act is more influential in this light than the Aarhus convention. However, the convention is a shared, international standard and it also creates participation rights.

15.b Way forward

D Could the FSC perform a survey on this topic, and develop a publication?

- *Many observations were made. The subject of early involvement or upstream engagement is obviously an important one to this group.*
- *A practical proposal was agreed to. Namely, to review the various cases in which governments and organisations have been taken to court both within and beyond waste management for failing to comply with requirements on stakeholder involvement, with focus on the Aarhus Convention. We should engage the NEA Legal Department. Furthermore we can plan to invite someone from the UNECE Aarhus Secretariat and/or the Compliance Committee when a topical session is planned.*

WEDNESDAY 24 OCTOBER - DAY 3

IMPLEMENTING THE FSC PROGRAMME OF WORK (3)

16. AFTER FUKUSHIMA: INSTITUTIONAL DISCOURSE ON RWM; STAKEHOLDER CONCERNS (Topical discussion under POW Themes 2 & 3)

Holmfridur Bjarnadottir

FSC-12 agreed to keep the door open to understanding potential relationships between the Fukushima disaster and its remediation, and stakeholder confidence in RWM in our diverse contexts. While it remains too early to draw any conclusions, this may be a fitting time to review stakeholder input received by FSC member organisations, and institutional discourse on RWM. The session includes a historical perspective regarding other nuclear accidents, survey input from the RWMC, an NEA-CRPPH report of stakeholder dialogue in Fukushima Prefecture, and a local example of collecting stakeholder concerns for transmission to regulators and operators. Discussion is framed by PoW Topic 2 (*Changing Dynamics of Interaction among RWM Institutions and Stakeholder Confidence*) and Topic 3 (*Media, Internal and External Communication, and Stakeholder Confidence*).

16.a Brief on some international RWM statements in response to Fukushima

Mariano Molina

The IAEA Joint Convention has a review process every 3 years and a session took place in Spring 2012. For the first time, public involvement was integrated in the discussion. Among the contracting parties to the Convention, the legal and regulatory frameworks of many of them are not prepared for addressing these concerns and need to evolve.

Three countries recognised that their regulatory body was not independent and Fukushima provided lessons on this. Independence also leads to better access of the public to understanding the role of the regulator and safety of the system.

Site selection process was previously not an area of particular interest. In the latest Joint Convention, it is considered crucial. The public is pivotal in this process.

Emergency preparedness and response plans for nuclear facilities must be updated. Particular attention was paid to the issue of safety of spent fuel stored on-site in pools. It was commented that for many local stakeholders, Fukushima provided their first occasion to realize that spent fuel might be stored in their area.

16.b Nuclear accidents and institutional discourse on RWM: A retrospective study

Holmfridur Bjarnadottir (Swedish National Council for Nuclear Waste)

The Council's annual "State of the Art" report to Minister of the Environment includes in 2012 a review of how various accidents have influenced nuclear power development, standards, legislation, etc. as well as political discussion in several countries. Remarkably, over time there seems to be little effect on institutional discourse on RWM.

Fukushima has influenced the nuclear power debate, and distinct changes in energy policy have taken place in Italy, Germany and Switzerland. Safety evaluations/stress tests were performed in the nuclear countries (Europe, Japan, and IAEA members). No policy effects were seen in Sweden. However the Swedish Government decided that the central interim storage facility for spent nuclear fuel (CLAB) should also be stress-tested.

"The events in Fukushima have not had any direct effects on the debate about nuclear waste in

Sweden. SKB submitted its applications to the Swedish Radiation Safety Authority and the Land and Environment Court on 16 March 2011, as planned. According to SSM, the spent nuclear fuel already exists and must be managed and disposed of in a safe manner, and the events in Japan do not alter the perspectives for SSM's evaluation of SKB's applications."

The 2012 State of the Art report containing the "global survey" is available in English:

http://www.karnavfallsradet.se/sites/default/files/sou_2012_7.pdf

16.c Results of a Questionnaire proposed to the RWMC

Claire Mays (NEA Secretariat)

In Summer 2012 the RWMC performed a member survey on questions from the FSC. Replies were received from 11 members in 7 countries.

WMOs, R&D and a regulator (5 replies) noted *concerns or requests expressed by their RWM civil society stakeholders in response to Fukushima*. (A European operator reported calls for accelerating geological disposal whereas an Asian operator reported calls for a long term storage solution.)

Eight participants *identified national measures adopted in their RWM context in response to the Fukushima accident*. Stress tests were mentioned (RWM facilities being classified as low priority). As well, the creation of a ministry-level Nuclear safety and security commission in Japan was mentioned.

Only 4 members reported that *a post-Fukushima position, statement or public information document was prepared*. These mainly concerned stress test reports. No post-Fukushima RWM fact sheets or information document appeared to be planned. On the other hand, internal documents were prepared to help Andra staff be ready to answer questions on how external threats (earthquake, fire, power failure, etc.) are taken into account. In this way it could be commented that the Fukushima accident "stretched" Andra (with reference to the RISCOP terminology).

The Japanese WMO mentioned that "the technical documents for safety considerations regarding natural events (earthquake, tsunami) in geological disposal are being prepared". As for questions that were asked to help prepare that document, "it seems very difficult for the people to understand the long-term safety of geological disposal due to unforeseeable natural events in the far distant future".

16.d ICRP Stakeholder dialogues in Fukushima Prefecture

Claire Mays on behalf of the CRPPH

The CRPPH supported and attended several successful stakeholder dialogues organized by the International Council on Radiation Protection ICRP in the Fukushima Prefecture. Funding or support are also provided by ASN, IRSN, and NRPA (Norway).

The dialogues bring together panels of the main stakeholders (30 persons), and include presentations and inputs of both local and international experience (Chernobyl, Norway and Belarus).

The dialogues have identified many aspects influencing stakeholder confidence as the recovery efforts continue.

The 1st dialogue (Nov. 2011) uncovered major areas of concern expressed by civil society: safety of foodstuffs, local decontamination efforts including what happens to the waste – where can it be stored, potential health effects, conditions that would allow returning to evacuated villages. A statement was published recognizing that this is a long-term situation for the local people and

highlighting their need for knowledge, self-efficacy, solidarity, continuing dialogue and international feedback.

The 2nd dialogue (Feb. 2012) included 2 new civil society organisations as partners and was hosted by the Mayor of Date City (80 km north of Fukushima Dai-ichi; widespread exposure is under 20 mSv/year). The area was not evacuated but families fled. Decontamination is ongoing. The dignity of elderly people and of young marriageable people is at risk from stigmatisation. The conclusions called for support for local civil initiatives, and it was agreed that the dialogues themselves should be reinforced and extended.

Of particular interest to the FSC:

Social media - The real-time reporting of the dialogues by a young “tweeter” is a moving demonstration of how important these exchanges of ideas, information and positions may be for the residents. See <http://chirpstory.com/li/15643>

- Monitoring – Belarus residents told of how important for confidence it was for them to check the radiological quality of foodstuffs with their own hands, “not just get info from checking authority”. Date City area farmers and the agricultural association spoke of how they monitor rice, fruit, as much as they can (and are considering delivering the resulting information to consumers). Personal monitoring for farmers is also considered important.
- Local involvement – The direct involvement of the affected individuals in both reflection and action, was repeatedly identified as vital to safety and quality of life during the recovery process.
- Preservation of memory – The 3rd dialogue (July 2012) revealed that the memory of the accident and of the resulting day-by-day situation must be kept alive in order to sustain individuals’ sense of control over their fate.
- Symbolic dimension – At the 3rd dialogue “preservation of the traditional and popular activity of picking *sansais* (mountain vegetables) in the Prefecture was claimed as a symbolic food nourishing the cohesion of the Fukushima community”.

16.e Supporting local commissions in gathering and elaborating safety concerns

Ludivine Gilli (IRSN)

In April 2011 the Local Information Commissions (CLI) of France’s Manche *département* decided to review safety questions regarding their 3 nuclear installations: EDF’s Flamanville NPP, the Areva reprocessing site and the LILW near surface repository operated by Andra. Between January and March 2012, 225,000 local residents received the list of questions and could add to them. The IRSN supported this review with technical training seminars and dialogue.

The risk governance context in France is being influenced by both public demands and legislation. CLI have existed since the early 1980 but the 2006 law clarifies their mission: every nuclear installation has to have a CLI, to monitor the facility and inform the public on nuclear safety and radiological protection matters. The operator and the Nuclear safety Authority are responsible for monitoring but the CLI is an added level of oversight. Members of CLI are volunteers; 50% from among elected officials and at least 10% from each of the categories ‘NGOs, nuclear operators unions, qualified persons’ (medicine, nuclear or other professional knowledge...). There are 31 CLI members of the national federation ANCCLI with whom IRSN has formed a partnership.

IRSN rose quickly to the public demand for information after Fukushima, particularly the request for “public expertise” helping to understand the operators’ stress test reports. Three seminars

were organized with ANCCLI from Sept. 2011-Jan 2012.

- The first seminar was held for 80 CLI representatives on 14th September, just hours before the operators' stress test reports were due (Sept. 15th): this meant that once they got the reports, the CLI could read and study the data more easily. Topics raised included seismic and flood risk, loss of cooling source, loss of energy supply, crisis management. CLI personnel showed their high engagement and resolve.
- The second seminar in late November for 25 people from several institutions discussed in detail some serious work done by some CLI/ANCCLI, and the IRSN's own analytical report. This had already been made public - again very fast, in mid Nov 2011. A sign of appreciation is that Greenpeace requested a meeting with IRSN to discuss their own report in Feb. 2012.
- The final seminar in Jan 2012 (80 persons including 60 CLI and High Committee on Transparency and Information on Nuclear Safety) the Safety Authority's report.

The next collaboration between IRSN and ANCCLI is paving the way for France's 2013 HL and LL Waste Disposal Public Debate. While the post-Fukushima activities were reactive, the new initiative is proactive: engaging stakeholders ahead of time, helping to build capacity upstream to contribute to a more fruitful debate.

6.f Discussion

The general observation is that Fukushima has not had an important effect on RWM discourse. Issues on seismic effects have been raised however in Japan and other countries. In a couple of countries the effect has been to increase support for current spent fuel management programmes.

Interesting presentations showed people's concerns and expectations, and institutional actions under difficult post-emergency conditions. Fukushima is providing stimulus to empower stakeholders; in France the IRSN is carrying forward their experience on assisting CLIs in the wake of Fukushima to the upcoming national public debate on HLW and MLW disposal.

SPECIAL COUNTRY UPDATES (4)

17. CANADA

17.a Status update on the Port Hope Area Initiative Long-term management of low-level radioactive waste

Marcia Blanchette, NR-CAN

The overall objective of the Port Hope Area Initiative (PHAI) is the cleanup and long-term management of approximately 1.7 million cubic metres of historic low-level radioactive waste within the adjacent municipalities of Port Hope and Clarington.

The waste is the result of refining of ore in the 1930s. In the 1970s the most urgent material was removed. As explored in the 2002 FSC Canada National Workshop, the local communities met with Natural Resources Canada in the 1990's to initiate a way forward in managing the legacy waste. The legal agreement reached in 2001 indicated that government would perform the clean-up and municipalities (Port Hope and Port Granby) would host the waste. The decision process included EIA and regulatory review. The municipalities were provided with a veto they could exercise after EIA.

In January 2012, the Minister of Natural Resources announced that the Government of Canada is investing \$1.28 billion over the coming 10 years to clean up low-level radioactive waste through the Port Hope and Port Granby projects. Each project involves the construction of a new long-term waste management facility and supporting infrastructure, the clean-up and restoration of contaminated sites, to be followed by monitoring and maintaining the facilities for the long

term. On October 24, 2012, the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) will hold a one-day public hearing to consider Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL)'s application to amend the current 5-year licence for the Port Hope Long-Term Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management Project. A 10-year license to implement the Port Granby Long-Term Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management Project was issued in 2011.

Confidence factors in this process included an independent municipal peer review team that supported the local decision makers in their frequent meetings with the Port Hope Area Initiative (government office).

A small-scale sites resurvey at Port Hope allows 4,800 home properties to be checked by exterior and interior monitoring and sampling. Participation in the first wave was very high thanks to good communication. 10% of properties will require remediation.

The challenge remains to ensure that overall the project can mitigate effects. The municipalities are looking for a removal of stigma. End use planned for the storage site is to provide passive recreation (walking trails) and active recreation (soccer fields).

An annual survey is performed to check level of confidence (it is seen to be related to level of knowledge and understanding).

Health studies show there has been no health impact. Not everyone agrees with this assessment.

17.b Discussion

STOCKTAKING

18. Some ideas gathered during the topical discussions

Chairs and Rapporteurs of items 9,13,18 and others

[The input was reflected in the decisions reported in red.]

CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

19. Core Group membership: Elections, review and confirmation

D *NEA Secretariat*

The previous Chair, Janet Kotra has retired; and Core Group member Mariano Molina has moved to other functions in his institution. This leaves two positions open in the Core Group. Current members include: Janet Redgrove, Holmfridur Bjarnadottir, Jo-Ann Facella, Sebastien Farin.

Core Group membership duties include an active role in arranging topical sessions and taking leadership in FSC themes, and presence at CG meetings (by telephone or in person). Each CG member should assess carefully commitment to this role and arrange for availability for the coming year.

The Secretariat and Core Group make the following nominations:

Chair - Holmfridur Bjarnadottir

Principal Vice Chair – Jo-Ann Facella

Central criteria for role of Chair:

Availability, freedom & budget to travel, “non-partisan” stakeholder role, liberty of expression, and an advanced national programme.

Task components:

The **FSC Chair** represents the FSC on the world scene. Guarantees the best operation of FSC Regular Meetings and Workshops (our two “rendez-vous” with members and stakeholders). Works closely with the Secretariat and Vice Chair plus thematic leaders to develop programme themes and to foster the fit between meeting agendas and PoW priorities. Makes sure that all members are actively involved and express themselves (as scheduled speakers or rapporteurs, or as meeting participants). Puts authority behind requests for between-meeting involvement (contribution to reports, surveys or Country Updates). Seeks to develop contacts and links with other groups, organizations and sectors, notably at external meetings.

The **Principal Vice Chair** complements the Chair in terms of continental representation, stakeholder role, and seniority. The Vice Chair is the “first choice” for delegation, and is ready to step in with authority to lead or represent the group. She is tasked particularly with fostering FSC visibility and external relations, by seeking to develop contacts and links with other groups, organizations and sectors, directly or by delegation.

The role nominations and the standing CG membership were confirmed.

The FSC delegates were asked for (self-) nominations to complete the CG. The standing CG will identify new candidates over the course of coming months.

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

FSC Chair, NEA Secretariat

See decisions recorded item-by-item in red.

DATE AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

FSC-14 (Regular Meeting) will take place 17-19 September 2013 at the NEA headquarters in Issy-les-Moulineaux.

*The FSC-13 meeting was followed immediately by the
Czech Republic National Workshop and Community Visit, based in Karlovy Vary.*