

Unclassified

NEA/RWM/FSC/M(2010)1

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

06-Sep-2011

English - Or. English

NUCLEAR ENERGY AGENCY  
RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

## Forum on Stakeholder Confidence (FSC)

### SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 11TH SESSION OF THE FSC

14-16 September 2010, Issy-les-Moulineaux

*The 11th Session of the Forum on Stakeholder Confidence (FSC) took place in Issy-les-Moulineaux on 14 and 16 September 2010. An exceptional event, the "10-year Anniversary Colloquium", took place on 15 September at the OECD Headquarters in Paris. This summary record includes the minutes of both meetings as well as the two lists of participants (Annex 3), and the lists of materials supporting the agendas (Annex 4).*

Please send any queries regarding this document to [claudio.pescatore@oecd.org](mailto:claudio.pescatore@oecd.org)

JT03306551

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



NEA/RWM/FSC/M(2010)1  
Unclassified

English - Or. English

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

**SUMMARY RECORD**

**FOR THE 11TH SESSION OF THE FSC  
Issy-les-Moulineaux, France, September 14-16, 2010**

The 11<sup>th</sup> Session of the Forum on Stakeholder Confidence took place on 14-16 September 2010 and was chaired by Janet Kotra, the Chairperson of the FSC.

An exceptional open event - the "10-Year Anniversary Colloquium" - took place on Wednesday 15 September and adjourned with a reception at 18:30. Two venues were retained for the two parts of the meeting (the OECD NEA at Issy les Moulineaux for the regular meeting, and the OECD Conference Centre and Château for the colloquium.)

**TUESDAY 14 SEPTEMBER - DAY 1**

**INTRODUCTION**

9:30

**1. Welcome**

*FSC Chair; NEA Secretariat*

The Chairperson opened the meeting, welcoming visitors in the context of the celebration of the FSC's first decade. The visitors are from Poland, Romania, and Slovenia as well as from long-time NEA Member countries. Among the visitors were local representatives. The Chairperson pointed out that local civic life impacts the stakeholders we are most interested in. Experts new to our meeting were greeted as well. A large number of the visitors were scheduled to speak during the FSC-11 meeting or the 10-year Anniversary Colloquium.

**New members** of the FSC include David Brazier (Environment Agency, UK), Helen Burnett (EPA, USA), Sigrid Eeckhout (NIRAS/ONDRAF, Belgium), Reiko Nunome (NUMO, Japan), Meinert Rahn (ENSI, Switzerland) and Jay Redgrove (NDA, UK).

**2. Review and adoption of the Agenda**

*FSC Chair; NEA Secretariat*

**D**

NEA/RWM/FSC/A(2010)1

*The agenda was reviewed and adopted without change.*

**3. Approval of Summary Record of the FSC-10 meeting**

*FSC Chair*

**D**

NEA/RWM/FSC/M(2009)1

*No comments were received before the meeting. Approved.*

## NEA WORKING PARTIES AND PROJECTS

### 4. THE FSC

*FSC Chair; Rapporteur: NEA Secretariat*

#### 4.a Review of activities since the FSC-10 September 2010 meeting and the current Programme of Work

*NEA Secretariat*

<http://www.nea.fr/rwm/docs/2010/rwm-fsc2010-1.pdf> (current PoW)

The Secretariat gave an overview of FSC activities since the September 2009 meeting. In particular, the PoW was updated within themes.

#### 4.b Final Preparation for the 10-Year Anniversary Colloquium (next day)

*NEA Secretariat Colloquium Final Agenda*

The Secretariat and the Chair reviewed the goals and logistics of this exceptional, open event. Over 100 persons were expected for a full day of exchange, evaluation and learning. Special thanks went to the sponsors of the Colloquium: Nagra, SKB, Posiva and GNS.

### 5. Review of RWMC and its Working Parties

*NEA Secretariat Oral report with slides*

The Secretariat pointed out that the RWMC is requesting FSC support for several projects (see items 16 & 17). Findings of interest from the WPDD and the IGSC were briefly reviewed.

## IMPLEMENTING THE FSC PROGRAMME OF WORK

### 6. MEMORY

#### Topical Discussion under Theme 1 of the PoW

*Chair : J. Redgrove (NDA)*

Information you save for later review is important. It tends to disappear or become illegible even in the short term. There are lessons to be learnt here for both short and LT endeavours.

Information provided to stakeholders in the context of decommissioning is useful (now and later) also for professionals.

#### 6.a The RWMC Activities on Information and Memory Preservation

*NEA Secretariat Oral report with slides*

This year the RWMC held a topical session on memory that was prepared by a questionnaire: Why preserve data and memory? What are the time scales of interest? How to plan for information preservation and memory? What to “save”? What useful material is already available? Where efforts would be needed?

Issues identified in the responses from 9 countries included: How to best initiate planning and “future guarding” actions NOW? How to contextualize the preserved information? How to foster international consistency?

A literature review and agreed vocabulary will follow, along with longer term plans to be discussed by the RWMC in March 2011.

**6.b The “UK Nuclear Archive”**

*Elizabeth Gray (The Scottish Government, Env'tal Quality Directorate)* Oral report

This was not a fast project but an in-depth one carried out in partnership with the Highland Council. Not only Nuclear but also Council archives are to be kept in the same facility, so the two institutions co-design the building. Why is such a facility needed? 19 nuclear sites in UK are all owned and operated by different companies with different types of info collected in different ways, with differing quality and format. How accurate is info? For which tasks and persons is the info to be kept? Beyond the location and shape of the physical building, the project looks at info and KNOWLEDGE preservation. Broadening project aims, partly with the experience gained in UK in various other areas, participants are looking at how info has been stored and retrieved elsewhere.

Local communities want to know what kind of nuclear and non-nuclear material is stored in their locality. Most don't have packaged waste but “as is” waste. The archives will have to hold info for different periods and different needs, therefore it should be prepared for presentation in varying, quantitative and qualitative forms.

Dounreay finds during dismantling that records are not as full as hoped so they are photographing the building as it is stripped down to preserve a pictorial history of both its structure and dismantling. A question arises of “digital enhancement” of photos that may take place in our century! How faithful and trustworthy will these photos be?

Reliability of information is an issue, in general, for both regulators and local people. How can the info be validated for these groups? How can we trust info if it changes in time (as new knowledge comes in)? It will be important to ensure that methods and process of collecting information are clear and reliable, that presentation is widely accessible and understandable without expert help. Scotland is responsible for its own waste – having opted out of the UK MRWS process toward repository. Scotland developed photo series demonstrating that dismantling waste is, principally, contaminated building material. This has reached many people and improved their understanding of the management issues.

*The central issue thus is reflecting on how and why to preserve which info, rather than simply how the archive building should be constructed.*

Questions to Elizabeth Gray. We've talked about adding value to facilities, making into an asset not a liability, giving inherent value, attractiveness – Integrating history of facility into the history of the community (Highland Council archive in the same emplacement). How about archiving the history of the interaction between stakeholders and facility? Including the less than success stories?

Answers: the archive will be for all of UK. Physically located near Dounreay. Highland Council stores lots of clan history, references useful to people who no longer live there. Existing premises became too small. There has been an intermingling of community and nuclear histories through the site stakeholder partnership arrangements. This is a fortuitous coincidence, but shows engagement with local community in development of pan-UK archive. Increasingly there is a demand for Social History not just nuclear records. Lots of stakeholders are deeply involved in the site history– people didn't wear safety equipment at the time of construction. There are technical requirements for info to be stored but also a larger number of reasons for keeping knowledge, people will take different ideas from it.

Dounreay “golf ball” finally will not become a registered monument because it would be too expensive to be maintained. The memory however will be retained in the archive.

Many people or families do work at Dounreay, so all families are affected. The shared intent is to deliver a memory facility for the area but there is still discussion of how to do that in practice. Focus on today's info needs regarding decommissioning and on potential future use for that info.

## 6.c Swiss Literature Review on Markers

*Marcos Buser (Gutachten & Projekte, Zürich)* Oral report with slides

Swiss work on marker systems was presented, relying on a major review commissioned by the Federal Office of Energy (Stefan Jordi) and performed in the last 2 years. Marcos Buser is a geologist and sociologist, he recognizes a political dimension to the marker problem.

Question: You presented assumptions regarding advances in drilling technology and the deleterious ability to penetrate the disposal facility. Any assumptions made about developments in remote sensing technology?

Answer: No, but for this a different range of markers would be needed, to help follow geological processes like resaturation, diffusion in the repository. These are slow processes, whereas social ones are rapid. The effective risks reside in society, unpredictable and uncontrollable. If the cost of drilling goes down, more drilling will take place (example of geothermal resource draw in Switzerland). Growing conflicts on underground riches must be anticipated. We must face this question.

Question: Your study sounds similar to the Sandia National Laboratory review – did you build on that?

Answer: No, the approach was different, but yes the conclusions are similar. Major difference: older studies put less weight on sociological aspects, including the semiotics and development of contextual (societal) change and the problem of “misuse”. No systematic approach to loss of information was found in the literature (HOW or the means of loss). There are many ways that should be considered. Experience from other fields shows this: Information about 4000 contaminated sites (non nuclear) in Switzerland was lost in 2 generations.

Timo Seppälä: We need to anticipate the next ice age. Markers will be cast away and info lost at the end of the day. It is false to say that we could maintain it beyond this time. Instead of trying to create markers, shouldn't we focus on what would be the consequences of intrusion?

## 6.d Discussion and way forward

**D**

*Session Chair*

*In 2009 the FSC decided to add “memory” to the PoW under theme 1. Let us hear members’ reflections as well as suggestions on future FSC contributions, e.g., to the current RWMC project. Consider the links with Themes 4 & 5 and transversal Themes 6 & 7 of the PoW.*

Jay Redgrove summed up the key questions raised: why have markers, why preserve memory, for which different needs, how to do it? Different streams of information need to be brought together. The pictorial record is needed for when even words are lost; we heard a cautionary tale about trust and confidence in the information itself.

Claudio Pescatore pointed out that memory is needed for safety, and distinctive community requirements will play a role. These issues and others may be addressed in a coming workshop.

Marcos Buser commented that bringing together the info we have is already challenging and further special challenges are faced with the long term. Calling attention to a repository may be inviting intrusion – both vertical and horizontal; more research is needed on motives for intrusion (mistaken and deliberate).

Eberhard Falck– need to build link between the IGSC & FSC on the issue of “intrusion”.

Johan Swahn (Swedish NGO): The documentary film by a Danish director called **Into Eternity** looks at Finnish and Swedish repository projects. I recommend it for reflecting about long term issues. My feeling is: yes, we need to look at the very long term but remember to look also at short and mid term. For example, Buser points to loss of info within 2 generations (regarding Swiss contaminated sites); it is probably the same in the nuclear field. The concept of checking

information availability at least every 30 years seems valid. Discourse about the very long term and our ability to address it, is not very credible to public.

Safeguards: Parallel efforts are made to control plutonium, and archives are needed for this too. Safeguarding is also considered in the concept of reversibility but certainly needs better understanding.

Marcos Buser also finds safeguards a very important question. We need coherent answers, this is not yet the case. In Switzerland we say we aim at a repository that needs no monitoring, but safeguarding would require monitoring. Need to clarify this seeming contradiction if we wish to store re-usable materials. Not credible and not sufficient if the system is not designed to take these conflicting ideas into a coherent account.

Siting issues – a strategy has been to site a facility somewhere where people have no interest in natural resources, but the fact is that the presence of infrastructure will create the interest.

Semiotics and iconography: we see but don't necessarily understand what is being communicated; even those very symbolic compositions of early photography meant to transmit a very strong message are no longer readable by ourselves.

Enrique Biurrun – Is there a totally different alternative to archiving information? Archives themselves are fragile. Unlucky event in Cologne: 700 years of archives survived occupation by Swedes, bombing raids in WWII, but the building collapsed with construction of metro line – much info lost. Czechoslovakia survived only a few decades; the former capital of Slovakia is now situated on the Czech side ; to obtain a certain vital document was only possible by tracing through individuals a private copy in private hands – in 10 more years this would have been impossible.

Marcos Buser: There are no radically different alternatives, but the problem is recognized in the sense that there is a search for durable and easily reproducible and spreadable materials. 20-40 archives worldwide to reduce the probability of loss. Mesopotamian archives survive in clay. Clay is a wonderful million-year material, if we can do it also with electronics that's great but clay or glass or special metals with engraving technology can preserve info over very long times.

Eberhard Falck– The IAEA looked into long-term (LT) stewardship of near-surface storage of mill tailings. A built archive, just the repository of info, won't work alone, we need also a living process that continues to generate information about the archive itself – that creates incentives to preserve it and to replace what is perhaps lost – constantly copying onto new media to make them remain readable with new current apparatus.

Ludo Jadoul – Another important issue is the transfer of knowledge so that info can be interpreted. Elizabeth Gray – yes, we must archive information for today's short term (decades) management needs regarding waste created now; and for LT needs retaining info and knowledge. Need to actively manage and maintain in the short term with a view to the LT.

Janet Kotra– people preserve info because they want and value it. **The FSC can address the need to develop reasons for desiring preservation of the info and knowledge.** Work is ongoing in other NEA groups and international organizations and the FSC can generate good practices recommendations and develop the meta language on archiving – highlighting what people find most useful as information and can interact with and will keep updated and interpretable over the rolling future.

Jo-Ann Facella- Info is socially created. If a community creates info it becomes unique and embedded in history of community itself. However we are talking also about supranational processes – how can these two necessary but quite different levels become integrated?

Janet Kotra – If we have internationally shared archives and national archives they serve as different means for information and memory preservation, catering perhaps to different types of specialists

and interested parties. We should encourage the development of good practices recognizing the value of input by the very local level. As international archives become available, knowledge of their existence should be distributed as widely as possible and incentives created to update both technical and local social detail. These archives will be a resource for future communities in particular for reconstruction of what might be lost.

**Decision:** There is interest in these topics in the FSC and memory issues are inscribed in our PoW. The Core Group will consider the way forward during their next meeting in early 2011.

## 7. EXPERIENCE IN STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT IN SELECTED CASES

### Topical Discussion under Themes 1 & 4 of the PoW

*Session Chair: Jo-Ann Facella (NWMO)*

#### 7.a Introduction

*Session Chair*

#### 7.b Treatment of Socio-Scientific Aspects in a Safety Case for a Geological Repository in Germany – Results of a Research Project

*Beate Kallenbach-Herbert (Oeko-Institut)* Oral report with slides

Safety involves not only technology but also organisation, personnel and the social environment in a well balanced way. Up to now in Germany there is no systematic concept or recommendation for treatment of non-technical issues in the safety case. The research project “*Consideration of socio-scientific aspects in a Safety Case for a geological repository in Germany*” financed by Ministry of Economics and Technology wanted to foster the exchange of scientific disciplines and support an enhanced understanding of repository safety.

“Socio-scientific aspects” in this context were defined as aspects which are not technical but have a bearing on safety.

The central result of the research project was a model for systematic description of safety relevant social scientific aspects in 4 levels of detail. Another finding was that from the point of view of the research team it is recommendable to consider safety relevant social scientific aspects in the safety case(s) for a nuclear waste repository as part of a comprehensive safety concept.

Using the safety case as a tool for stakeholder communication was not a key question in this research project. Nevertheless some aspects were tackled in the final project workshop which was held with external experts. One finding was that, especially in the early stages of a repository project, the safety case is of minor importance for communication or the development of public trust in the safety of the project and in the activities of the implementer. Other factors such as a clear framework with traceable steps, transparent decisions and clear competencies are of much higher importance.

#### 7.c Interplay Among Stakeholders for the Definition of the Detailed Geological Survey Zone in the Meuse/Haute-Marne (France)

*Sébastien Farin (Andra)* Oral report with slides

We learned about the detailed process of narrowing down meter by meter the precise emplacement of a future HLW repository, taking into account territorial stakeholder views.

During dialogue in 2009, the CLIS and the County Councils inter alia published opinions suggesting that as long as the top priority of safety is met, no part of the 4 zones presented as alternate scenarios should be excluded. Suggestions were made on further physical or social criteria and interests to be taken into account. The shared responsibility by the two involved counties could be symbolized by an access ramp touching the territories of both.

After development by Andra (and central approval) of a refined zone map, a new dialogue phase

was scheduled for Oct. 2010 to be followed notably by public debate in 2012.

**7.d Talking with Stakeholders About Substantive Issues – Retrievalability and Reversibility in the UK**

*Jay Redgrove (NDA) and David Brazier (Environment Agency)* Oral report with some slides

Traditionally R&R have not been at the top of the UK agenda. Recently the West Cumbria partnership has become interested, mostly through looking into safety concerns. The local communities are interested in the regulatory review.

E. Gray: Note for memory that Scotland does not share positions on RWM with England and Wales.

**7.e Sogin’s Engagement Process 2010: Focus on Involvement of Economic Operators As a Part of the Local Community**

*Pierfrancesco Baldassarri (Sogin)* Oral report with slides

In 2009 the Italian parliament decided to restore nuclear power production to the national energy mix. Sogin as plant operator was designated then in 2010 as responsible for siting and implementing storage facilities for associated waste. An in-depth stakeholder engagement process (Feb-Sept 2010) focussed, in this stage, on local companies and “economic operators” as key members of communities.

**7.f Discussion**

*Session Chair*

---

**8. COOPERATING WITH REGIONAL ELECTED AUTHORITIES (Topical Session under PoW Theme 4)**

*Session Chair: Mariano Molina (Enresa)*

*Session Rapporteur: Julia Kiss (Puram)*

---

**8a. Introduction**

*We heard about the roles and responsibilities of Regional Elected Authorities in FSC-10’s Topical Session. This year we have a ‘second round’ to focus on ways of co-operation with REAs on development in economic, social or cultural fields.*

**The Topical Session will be reported in Proceedings (alongside the companion session held at FSC-10).**

---

**8b. France Presentation**

*Sébastien Farin (Andra)* Oral report with slides

---

**8c. Spain Presentation**

*Mariano Molina (Enresa)* Oral report with slides

---

**8d. Sweden Presentation**

*Catharina Blom (Uppsala Regional Council)* Oral report with slides

---

**8e. Discussion in two subgroups**

*Session Chair and Rapporteur*

---

**9. SEEKING TRANSPARENCY (Topical Session under PoW Theme 2)**

*Session Chair: Claudio Pescatore (NEA)*

*Session Rapporteur: Helen Burnett (US EPA)*

---



---

*The FSC has chosen to explore the relationship between RWM organizations, particularly the interaction between regulators and implementers. Transparency is an important instrument in evaluating whether we can place trust and confidence in these actors.*

---

## 9.a Introduction and Overview of Country Responses to Questionnaire

*Theme 2 Leaders: Eva Simic (Swedish National Council) and Jay Redgrove (NDA)* Oral report with slides

Infodoc#1 « FSC Questionnaire on Transparency »

A questionnaire was sent to all members on 15 June, 2010, to be answered from their own organisational standpoint. It included sections addressing:

- Definitions of “transparency”
- Legal and functional requirements
- Existence of instructions and verifications regarding transparency
- Difference between “openness” and “transparency”.

Responses were received from 10 countries. Findings showed that:

- *All* of the participating organizations work actively with transparency
- Most of the organizations lack a *definition* of transparency
- The *meaning* implied in the concept varies across countries and organisations
- The *purposes* of transparency vary
- The *ways* to achieve transparency vary
- *Some*, but not all, organizations differentiate between openness and transparency.

Two main purposes of transparency were revealed:

- **governance oriented** – this concept of transparency aims at improving the decision-making process
- **public relations oriented** - this concept aims at improving *public trust* in the decision-making process.

In summary, the concept of transparency appears to be widely used among FSC members but is seldom defined in a rigorous manner. We should be aware of (and maybe reduce) the concept’s variability. We feel that it is important to be aware of the main driving force for transparency in a specific organization or area of activities.

## 9.b Sweden’s Transparency Programme: Lessons Learned, Evaluations and Planned Adjustments

*Eva Simic (Swedish National Council for Nuclear Waste)* Oral report with slides

The National Council initiated a Transparency Programme several years ago. Activities have included seminars, hearings and regular meetings with the central stakeholders in the Swedish NWM program. The reasons for this programme were:

- To increase the transparency in the decision-making process and the bases for decision.
- To contribute to providing the political decision-makers with the best possible bases for decision.
- To build knowledge through seminars and hearings.
- To strengthen the Councils role as an advisory body to the Government.

An evaluation of the programme on these criteria was performed by Umeå University. While the programme was successful in opening dialogue, it was not clear how the Council’s role had been reinforced. Lessons learned were that:

- It is difficult to work successfully with transparency without a very clear definition – the objective of the whole program rested on an unclear concept
- Some sort of quality assessment process is needed.

Work was undertaken to clarify the definition of Transparency, as well as the Council's role and mission:

“By transparency we mean not only openness, but also comprehensibility and accessibility. In other words, we strive to ensure that the arguments in the crucial issues in the nuclear waste field are comprehensible and that the information is easily accessible.”

### **9.c European Commission support to initiatives aiming at enhancing transparency and citizen participation**

*Jean Coadou (EC)* Oral report with slides

A 2008 Eurobarometer survey has shown that only 25% of EU citizens consider that they are well informed on radioactive waste, and 56% would like to be directly consulted and participate in the decision-making process regarding disposal.

The European Commission supports several initiatives aiming at increasing transparency and citizens' involvement in nuclear matters. Their context (including 2020 and 2050 energy goals, and a project for an EU Directive on RWM), history and content were reviewed.

### **9.d Current Work on Guidance for Transparency in Nuclear Regulatory Communication with the Public**

*Karina De Beule (FANC-AFCN, Belgium)* Oral report with slides

*Transparency guidance in the safety-regulations area is developed by the on-going work in the NEA/CNRA Working Group on Public Communication of Nuclear Regulatory Organisations, and in the Working Group on Transparency Activities of the European Nuclear Safety Regulators Expert Group (ENSREG).*

A background document on some of the activities so far is the report NEA/CORA/R (2008)4, <http://www.nea.fr/nsd/docs/2008/cnra-r2008-4.pdf>, summarising the results of several workshops.

The 2008-9 Eurobarometer reviewed in the last presentation says “Yes in my backyard” to nuclear installations, in the context of climate change. However, regulators know that we must be humble, this is not a “forever” statement. The current context of opinion must be understood and supported by transparency.

Regulators' contribution to this result could be interpreted as:

- Independence – from industry
- Openness – Swedish principle of public access to information including official documents (right to know)
- Transparency – making information accessible but also explaining, organizing meetings...
- Participation in decision making – through a consultation procedure, as per law (for which the implementer is responsible)

*(Note that these interpretations contribute to, but do not necessarily “map onto”, the definitions currently under development by the FSC)*

### **9.e Discussion in two subgroups**

*Session Chair and Rapporteur*

*Insights from each subgroup were reported on Day 3 by the Session Rapporteur.*

Debate on the questionnaire results took us back to the original FSC confrontation of concepts of ‘trust’ and ‘confidence’. This discussion reinforced some of our major findings, and sparked the idea of providing a glossary of FSC concepts as a useful service to new FSC members (as well as external stakeholders).

**WEDNESDAY 15 SEPTEMBER - DAY 2**

**The FSC 10-YEAR ANNIVERSARY COLLOQUIUM**

All presentations and write-ups are made freely available for download from the FSC homepage. See in annex the notes taken by guest Daniela Diaconu (INR, Romania). An article on the Colloquium was published in the NEA News <http://home.nea.fr/pub/newsletter/2010/28-2/NEA-News-28-2-7-updates.pdf>

**10. Theme 2  
Report from Topical Session (Item 9) subgroup discussions**

*Session Rapporteur* Oral report with slides

Transparency is about providing clarity, like a clear window onto the process in which an institution is engaged, making the process and its associated information visible and understandable. Openness can be compared to an open door, it is about giving and receiving info, an ability to “walk through” to take a different perspective and a willingness to make change if appropriate. Some points made in discussion included:

- Distinguish between transparency and using transparency to reach a goal; transparency should not be used as a means to an end, rather it should be a characteristic of any stakeholder involvement process
- Where trust and confidence exist, is the need for transparency reduced? Travelling by air implies trust without knowledge of how airplane works
- Objection: Confidence does not mean that there is not a need for transparency and openness – there is a need for checking and verifying to maintain confidence
- Need for public education about nuclear energy and waste management to help build familiarity and knowledge and, at best, confidence that managers are handling things correctly
- Transparency affects the behaviour of an organization - you cannot be trustworthy unless you are transparent
- Trust is built slowly and transparency is one way to achieve trust – this has been the FSC message for years
- Transparency can be built by putting a variety of tools into practice

Erik von Hove suggested that the FSC and others are in an “echo chamber” discussing transparency, but the discussions are not transparent nor do they, at this stage, often directly involve civil society stakeholders.

A way forward for the FSC is to use the good relationship with contacts that we have developed over the years and continue to look into public expectations.

**11. Theme 4  
Report from Topical Session (Item 8) subgroup discussions**

*Session Rapporteur* Oral report with slides

The discussion is reported in the Proceedings.

**12. PoW Themes 2 & 4: Way Forward. Plenary discussion.**

**D** *FSC Chair and Secretariat*

<http://www.nea.fr/rwm/docs/2010/rwm-fsc2010-1.pdf> (current PoW)

*Based on the preceding subgroup reports, which activities should be planned?*

When introducing the idea of a RWM installation: “95% of the questions stakeholders ask are not about safety, but how can they have confidence that their living environment will not be changed dramatically and forever.”

The FSC explored definitions of trust and confidence in the first workshop held in 2000. Trust is related to the behaviour of individuals and organisations, it has to be earned, and it is related to feelings of comfort and liking. Confidence is related with process dependability, based on evidence

that can be provided through transparency.

Many of the examples given in the discussion have to do with risk (on which different stakeholders have different views). We could choose pragmatic examples of risk in RWM and identify the confidence factors in our safety system (monitoring facilities...)

We should keep in mind that trust may not be generic; building trust on one basis may not be transferable to other things.

We should not over-define some terms. In English we tend to use these two words interchangeably. These topics tend to stray and evolve. They are not “canonical” but will take on new meanings as new stakeholders enter the process (including new FSC members).

#### **Decisions:**

- Our interest as members of the FSC: Development of trustworthy behaviour, profound not superficial. The FSC PoW emphasizes that we should focus for theme 2 on *how to make the organisations trustworthy, specifically in the relationship between regulator and implementer*.
- We should revisit our use of these important terms, look into our corpus of material to reaffirm our understanding or choose to redefine them. A Glossary Handbook could be written (reviewing definitions and ideas on major concepts since the inception of the FSC).
- The Core Group will take up the idea of future thematic activities in its meeting of early 2011.

#### **13. The 10-Year Anniversary Colloquium Debriefing: Identifying Main Messages and Stakeholder Guidance. Plenary Discussion.**

*Chair of the Colloquium stocktaking session or FSC Chair*

Minutes of the stocktaking session were provided. We have received very encouraging feedback on our reports and study areas. Stepwise Decision Making is our most popular report and yet there is still more to be learned in this area. The results of the online questionnaire consultation and the Colloquium discussion regarding the “way forward” will be further analysed and discussed by the Core Group.

### **FSC OUTREACH ACTIVITIES (part 1)**

#### **14. 2011 NATIONAL WORKSHOP & COMMUNITY VISIT 2011: SWEDEN**

**D** *FSC Chair, Secretariat, Swedish Hosts* Oral report; Room document

*Initial talks were held with Swedish colleagues to hold the next FSC Workshop in Sweden on 4-6 May 2011. A draft agenda is proposed.*

The FSC Workshop will follow on the SKB Stockholm Spring Talks and participants can attend both.

Agreed that the preferences of the regional and local stakeholders for the program of this short workshop must be given priority. Some questions of curiosity came up:

Interplay between national and local concern is very important for the FSC to consider. National NGOs: What is their position at this point in the process? They will be involved in the environmental courts throughout the next years. The deep borehole issue and copper corrosion are current objects of concern. NGOs do not consider that the consultation process is over. One of the local opinion groups to speak at the workshop has tight links (leader is on board of national organisation).

Would it be possible to look into the impact of the copper corrosion issue upon stakeholder confidence? There was much media attention for several months. SKB has dedicated a program to

clarifying the questions (having been criticised for their early handling of the issue). The local competence in both scientific/technical and socio/economic issues is a particular feature of the partnership relationships formed in Sweden and also in e.g. Belgium. It would be appropriate to look at the dimension of stakeholder confidence in scientific aspects, since this has been a central feature of the so-called *stretching* approach followed by the Oskarshamn local competence building organization (i.e., asking questions that oblige the implementer to examine assumptions, to clarify and justify these).

Where have former local groups disappeared to? Interesting to follow up the stakeholder involvement and the legacy of this experience of the community. Connection with the sustainability of interest and activation in the community over the decades. A: the Oskarshamn local group no longer has the same object, and “what happened afterwards” is probably connected with the Added Value program. Östhammar politicians and others are reinforcing to be able to perform the review.

Regarding the community visit we would be interested to meet with architects of surface buildings at Forsmark and members of the community with a role in designing and integrating this facility. Interactions among these actors and maturing of views.

Czech Republic offers to consider hosting a national workshop in eg Spring 2012. Recall that the November 2009 event including the Environment Ministry promised this. There is strong outreach in the CR to potential candidate communities.

**Decisions:**

- The opportunity to attend also the Stockholm Spring talks will be highlighted in the WS program and invitation.
- FSC members are encouraged to bring stakeholders – this can be a larger WS than usual
- It is requested that Swedish speakers provide issue papers before or at the workshop so that participants can be aware of the major points.
- The FSC Core Group will gratefully take into consideration the proposal by Czech colleagues, and aim to be able to announce a Czech Workshop, if decided, at the 2011 workshop.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>IMPLEMENTING THE FSC PROGRAMME OF WORK</b></p>
--

**15. BROADENING JOURNALISTS’ KNOWLEDGE BASE AND CONTACTS (Topical Session under the PoW Theme 3)**

*Session Chair: Timo Seppälä*

**The slide presentations are made freely available on the FSC website.**

---

**15.a Introduction**

*Session Chair with input by Eva Simic, Theme 3 co-leader*

**15.b STUK’s Course for Journalists: Objectives, Materials and Experience**

*Leena Hietanen (Information Officer, STUK, Finland) Oral report with slides*

STUK is acting as the “people’s expert” by giving journalists the key/basis to reading nuclear reports.

**15.c STUK’s Course for Journalists: A Participant’s Experience and Evaluation**

*Katarina Koivisto (Journalist, Hufvudstadsbladet, Helsinki) Oral report with slides*

*Hufvudstadsbladet (abbr. Hbl) is the highest-circulation Swedish-language newspaper in Finland*

Ms. Koivisto outlined the reasons why journalists in Finland need to know about radiation issues. It is useful to develop a relationship with experts who can reply to questions – simply and understandably. Ms. Koivisto gave frank feedback on how institutional specialists can improve their communication skills.

#### **15.d NEA Outreach to Media and Civil Society**

*Serge Gas (External Relations and Public Affairs, OECD NEA)* Oral report with slides

The NEA while a relatively small organisation may be more and more looked to by civil society as a resource for balanced information. Work is of relevance only if it is made accessible, and this is the Agency's ambition (with attention to clear communication and to opportunities provided by new media).

#### **15.e Media Needs in the International Context**

*Mathieu Carey (Journalist, NucNet, Brussels)* Oral report with slides

When reporting on the management of radioactive waste, journalists especially need access to the regulators and the scientific community. Where 'radioactivity' is concerned, radiation protection agencies must always be available.

These organisations can ask themselves:

- What is the current extent of your visibility and contact with local and national journalists? How often is this reviewed?
- Are there any reliable communication partners out there? Which outlets do you trust?
- To whom do these media outlets refer for 'authoritative' analysis, background, quotes or sound bites when writing about radioactivity or radwaste management?

Specific advice was offered on "what journalists like to find" on websites, etc.

#### **15.f Plenary Discussion**

*Session Chair*

The opportunity to dialogue with journalists was much appreciated. The need sometimes to come back to correct technical information was discussed, although it was recognized that "you cannot change the headlines" or the primary impression created.

The NucNet communiqué on the FSC 10-year Anniversary is annexed to these minutes.

## **FSC OUTREACH ACTIVITIES (part 2)**

### **16. REVERSIBILITY AND RETRIEVABILITY**

#### **16.a Update on the Draft R&R Report Including FSC Input**

*Secretariat, Jo-Ann Facella*

*The draft R&R report NEA/RWM(2010)10/PROV was sent on 13 August with a request for FSC input by 10 September. Once all comments are implemented, from the FSC and others, the draft report will serve as a discussion document for the Reims Conference. It will also be posted on the NEA R&R Project site (<http://www.nea.fi/rwm/rtr/>)*

Having “watched the progress of the thinking over time” and participated in lively debates within her home organization NWMO on these topics, Jo-Ann Facella made structured comments as below. (Subsequent to the meeting Jo-Ann wrote up her comments and these were incorporated into the FSC discussion document prepared by the Secretariat and reviewed by FSC members.)

“The R&R report is a good discussion basis. It reflects the facts that:

- R&R can no longer be viewed as technical concepts alone
- Need for these features emerged in the social sphere
- Indeed to some programmes R&R appear important for obtaining the social license
- They are a means to another end, but not an end in themselves. The need for or view on these tools can evolve over time

“The approach taken in the report is in tune with the best practice we have identified in the FSC

- Involve people, involve them early,...

“The paper is a good foundation: it attempts to put together technical and social considerations... The paper has evolved to acknowledge a multiplicity of trade-offs and the fact that there is no single best way to optimize against those trade-offs.

- Are all dilemmas well represented? Just asking the questions, is a good way to start. This builds confidence and brings the stakeholders into the dialogue and into decision making. There may be multiple ways to achieve safety vis-à-vis R&R.”

Janet Kotra: Finally, we have put to rest the false dichotomy of safety vs. retrievability.

Meinert Rahm (upon reviewing these minutes): I would clearly differ: Nothing of what comes with including the option of retrieval adds to safety. However, many consequences out of including retrievability tend to reduce long-term safety. Accordingly, retrievability is a good tool to remain flexible and to allow adaption to a changing state-of-the-art, but is a bad tool, if the disposal concept is strongly modified and completely devoted to the purpose of retrieval (as e.g. in France).

Elizabeth Grey: I was very glad we discussed this at the FSC France Workshop at Bar-le-Duc. Most of what is said in this document is also applicable to LLW. Note that for some stakeholders it is all “radioactive waste”, without distinction. All stakeholders agree that “safety” is a priority, but “passive safety” raises concerns among local stakeholders.

---

## **16.b FSC Participation in and Contribution to the Reims Conference 14-17 December 2010**

**D** *FSC Chair, Secretariat* Oral report with slides

Infodoc#2 (Reims Conference status of preparations)

*The conference web site is: <http://www.nea.fr/rwm/rr/reims2010/index.html>*

All FSC members were invited to participate as individuals. The FSC participated officially with a paper and by chairing one session (Eva Simic).

---

## **17. ICGR-2011**

**D** *FSC Chair, Secretariat* Oral report with slides

Infodoc#3 (ICGR status of preparations)

*The RWMC is actively sponsoring the International Conference on Geologic Repositories to be held in Japan, 2-5 October 2011, on the theme of “NATIONAL COMMITMENT, LOCAL AND REGIONAL CONFIDENCE”. The RWMC is requesting that the FSC helps by providing a text that the RWMC could discuss, elaborate further and adopt at its March 2011 meeting.*

A “seed” document is under development compiling major principles from FSC work over the

---



---

years. This should be reviewed and augmented by FSC members.

---

## **18. TRANSVERSAL THEME 7: FLYERS and LEVERAGED REPORTS**

*FSC Chair*

**D**

### **18.a Flyers - General**

The “Identity” flyer was originally published in May 2008 and may need updating, this should be considered in 2011.

New flyers will be prepared regarding the reports “Stakeholder Involvement Tools” and “Symbolic Dimension”. (No organisation came forward to take this work in charge and so the Secretariat undertook it; H. Burnett of USEPA later volunteered to help carry this process forward.)

### **18.b 10-Year Flyer**

The flyer benefitted from FSC review in August and was presented and distributed at the 10-Year Anniversary Colloquium.

### **18.c Leveraged Reports**

Members should continue to be on the lookout for transversal reports that the FSC may augment and disseminate broadly (as we did with “Partnering”).

<h2><b>CLOSURE OF THE MEETING</b></h2>
--

## **19. Election of New Members to the Core Group**

*FSC Chair*

**D**

Jay Redgrove was elected to take the place of her colleague Elizabeth Atherton on the CG. Welcome to Jay, who first participated in the FSC at the France Workshop in 2009 and attends her first regular meeting today, but who has already been a very active contributor.

Overall CG composition was confirmed. Current members include: J. Kotra, Chair; J.-A. Facella, E. Simic, S. Farin, M. Molina.

## **20. Date of Next Meeting and Any Other Business**

**D**

*FSC Chair*

## **21. Brief Review of Main Items and Decisions**

*FSC Chair*

2. Approved Agenda FSC-11.

3. Approved Summary Record of FSC-10.

6. Interest in Memory confirmed, mandate given to CG to consider the way forward.

12. Reaffirmation of PoW orientations. Aim to produce a Glossary Handbook reviewing our definitions of major concepts and showing where we stand in the FSC.

14. Draft agenda for the Sweden workshop approved with amendments.

16. Agreement to input to the R&R final conference with an FSC paper.

17. Agreement to input to ICGR-2011 with a “seed” text to be reviewed by members.

18. Two new flyers (Stakeholder Involvement Tools and Symbolic Dimension) will be drafted.

19. Jay Redgrove elected and other Core Group members confirmed.

**20. Date of next meeting: 13-14-15 September, 2011**

## Annex 1:

### Notes on FSC-11 and 10-year Anniversary Colloquium by Daniela Diaconu, INR, Romania.

*NB: These notes do not constitute an official statement by the FSC but personal views by one participant, and they are presented as such. Remarks were received from M. Rahm and are reproduced in brackets.*

As a newcomer in the FSC meetings but familiarized with RWM governance aspects through the COWAM projects I found the events of 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> September an excellent opportunity to enlarge and deepen my knowledge and understanding of the ongoing processes in Europe and in the world in this sensitive area. I found out new meanings and approaches of different issues in waste management process such as repository marking, transparency and retrievability.

#### *Marker System*

The marker system is a way to preserve the knowledge and information on nuclear facilities (archives, data and/or photographs, recordings). Switzerland is (according to my knowledge) the first State where the Government prepares a program dedicated to the marker system for radioactive waste repositories. [*Rahm: In fact, it is required by law that the site of the repository has to be marked. The study of Marcos Buser has been the very first step.*] Romania does not discuss this problem yet. The system will be designed in order to transmit to future generations relevant and understandable information on the repository, taking into account the long-term challenge and unpredictable changes/evolution of the society from all aspects (including change of language, writing, technique evolution, etc.). This program should address coherent questions in order to design the system and will combine technical, geological and social aspects on a long-term scale.

Discussions on this topic pointed out that:

Remote sensors technology can be used in order to mark the repository level with sensors. Lateral intrusion should be also considered especially in Switzerland. [*Rahm: As a Swiss geologist, I do not understand the reasoning for this. If we talk about a repository in an area of high topography relief, I agree that this may become a problem. However, with one exception, all potential site areas are in regions of minor to moderate relief.*]

- Geologic processes are slow, while the social processes are fast so the risk comes from society. If drilling costs reduce, more drillings will take place and the risk will consequently increase.
- A possible solution could be to increase the value of the RWM facility to the community. This could help to keep knowledge alive. From community level it should be raised to national and transnational levels.
- Investigation of the probable ways leading to the loss of information could be useful in designing the marker system.
- An alternative to the marker system could be the scenario analysis that should demonstrate that only very few people could be contaminated.
- Ideally, repositories should not need to be monitored or a controllable system should be designed.

**Recommendation:** Knowledge preservation shall be part of the environmental monitoring program.

#### *Transparency*

Transparency is not only a local or national concern and it is a disputed issue not only in Romania. It became a European level question reflected in such EC initiatives as ENEF and 'Aarhus Convention in Nuclear' (ACN).

ENEF – European Nuclear Energy Forum – was created in 2007 and represents a frame for broad discussion among all relevant stakeholders on the opportunities and risks of nuclear energy. Its group on transparency elaborated recommendations on information, communication, participation and decision making and prepares a Good Practice of transparency. The two European Directives on information (2003/4/EC) and participation (2003/35/EC) as well as the ANCCLI initiative ACN created to monitor the

implementation of Aarhus Convention in European countries (including Romania) reflect also the interest of European authorities and civil society organisations in transparency.

The FSC questionnaire on transparency concluded that it is necessary to clarify the definition of the concept and the purpose of transparency work. Some organizations perceive traceability as more important than transparency. Openness comes together with transparency but it is perceived as either having the same meaning or one going further than the other.

FSC debates on transparency emphasized:

- There are many definitions and many structures dealing with transparency, each having its own interpretation, its own approach and this diversity can confuse people.
- There is a strong link between transparency and trust and most participants agreed that transparency facilitates trust.
- Trust is achieved by the quality and integrity of the actions.
- Nuclear energy is a more complex field and transparency requires a certain level of prior information or education of the local/regional authorities.
- Transparency can be also an added value in the governance process.

#### *Retrievability*

Retrievability is still a question of debate among the nuclear authorities from different countries. Largely debated in France in connection with the deep geological disposal, retrievability is perceived by population as an approach creating confidence [*Rahm: The fact that France has introduced the concept of retrievability in the disposal concept does not mean that the issue is “largely debated”. This somehow suggests that all countries which debate it largely, will end with including retrievability in their concept, and I strongly oppose to this statement*]<sup>1</sup>. Conversely, CoRWM in UK is in the favor of the final closure of repository and retrievability is not a request of the UK regulator.

#### *Cooperating with regional elected authorities*

Presentations made by representatives of France, Spain and Sweden gave me an update on the current situation of the ongoing radioactive waste management national program and participatory processes.

#### *FSG 10-Year Anniversary Colloquium 15 September 2010*

#### *Building a Durable Relationship between Host Community, a Facility, and Major Institutional Players with Quality of Life in Mind*

- Repository implementation faces a contradictory social situation: a higher economic development of society (offering opportunities for a happy life) but at the same time much loneliness and more empty existences than ever before. FSC understood this paradox and the need of a balance between the two aspects and established instruments giving value to radwaste disposal (according to Erik van Hove – Univ. Antwerpen).
- Politicians should be mediators between research and population; waste management is a democratic issue and the democratic system is questioned (according to Catarina Blom- Uppsala Regional Council-Sweden).
- Repository should bring more quality of life, Belgium’s experience showed that it is very important to involve people, but they must be searched out and extra tools should be used; essential conditions are communication, correct information, extra-safety planning, new jobs in new industry; repository should be a profit for the next generations and local funds should be negotiated in this regard (according to Mayor Kris van Dijck – Dessel).

<sup>1</sup> Note by C. Mays : To judge the type and breadth of debate in France and review the history of the introduction in the disposal concept of reversibility and retrievability, see the Proceedings of the FSC National Workshop held in France in 2009 :

**Recommendation:** Social costs to future generations should be also considered from ethical and safety points of view; regulations should also take into account the problem of future generations

*Partnering for Long – Term Management of Radioactive Waste*

- COWAM projects investigated and proved the capacity of social groups to create competence in assessing the repository impact and to analyze its strategic involvement in their society (Claire Mays).
- Aarhus Convention could support society to engage in this project (Serge Gadbois – Mutadis).
- It is necessary to be proactive, to provide information not to wait to be asked (Elisabeth Gray – Scottish Government).
- Experience of different partnerships from Belgium, France, Hungary, Slovenia, UK showed there are common concerns: not negotiable are safety and security, benefits of the community, correct information, access to knowledge, there are similar expectations and frustrations regarding the institutional processes.
- Distinction should be made between nuclear energy and waste.
- Safety culture shall be maintained and transmitted to the next generations.

*Joint Assessment: “The FSC National Workshops and Community Visits in Retrospect: Their Meaning and Impact”*

- The 7 host country presentations briefly provided the 10 years’ history of the FSC in parallel with the inclusive governance evolution in Europe. The retrospective of the workshops and visits was an illustration of the problems debated in correlation with the major concerns of different countries, at different moments in time.
- Two independent analyses presented in the FSC colloquium certified the quality, value and the right orientation on the development of a governance culture among the RWM stakeholders (Martin O’Connor – University of Versailles; Javier Lezaun, Oxford University).
- The analyses of the FSC from the point of view of social science revealed positive aspects such as openness in the definitions of different terms, the emphasis on trust, a strong commitment to flexibility and a particular understanding of the future (especially the political future of the society).
- An interesting remark on reversibility and retrievability from social science point of view: reversibility is perceived as a political control over the technical aspects, while retrievability is perceived as having both political and technical connotations, suggests a power over something that otherwise, symbolically, is released in the world and impossible to recover.
- The outside and independent analysis on the procedures followed by FSC along the 10 years pointed out that the resulting documents explore a large range of methods, engaged a broad spectrum of problems and addressed the main characteristics of the process: patience, long term dimension, costs, people, and skills. The FSC procedures and publications provide an excellent source of education since everything is very well documented, representing multiple learning pathways, and giving solutions to a class of sensitive problems and to contradictory aspects of the problems.
- The review of publications made available on the website recommended for the future to avoid a “soothing” voice and making net demarcations in this problem (waste vs. rest of energy questions, future vs. past).
- **Conclusion** was that trust and confidence are linked to the partnership sharing risk.

*Emerging Topics and Issues – Looking Forward*

- Looking to the future of FSC, a list of topics was proposed to be investigated in its further work, all of them showing the plurality of sensitive social aspects accompanying the radioactive waste

management process and the FSC commitment to their in-depth investigation. Among the 57 suggestions there are topics closely related to some of current Romanian concerns: step wise approach, knowledge maintenance and transfer, participation fatigue, expectations on participation process, stability of decision making process.

**Recommendations:**

- The FSC activity should remain focused on RWM and partnership in siting process, and not dilute it including other energies related problems.
- Importance should be given to the academic part and to the symbolic dimension of this process.
- A better understanding of the step-wise process is needed; it should be a continuum and in this context reversibility concept becomes important.
- Participation of political scientists in debates could solve the necessary link between participation and transparency, on one side, and political decision making process on the other side.

If I would look for the motto of this Colloquium, I would say that it was “**appropriation of repository by host community**”.

*I can conclude that:*

The presentations and discussions in panels gave me an insight on the large and productive activity of the Forum as well as on different approaches on public involvement in decision making processes in countries either having already a history (as Finland, Sweden, France, UK, Spain) or just paving now the way toward a democratic process in RW disposal implementation (Poland, Italy).

All presentations reflected the need of dialogue and transparency, the need of a democratic frame, the need to understand the people’s fears and requirements on the authorities.

According to the national contexts, different methods for public participation have been applied with more and less positive impact.

It was stated that waste management is a political issue and needs a frame to foresee for the future how different actors can participate in the dialogue (as I’ve seen also in Romania).

Within the FSC frame, the dialogue extended to the national scale in some NEA Member States.

Many ideas found out during the two days of FSC meeting could be applied to the Romanian context through the Romanian contribution in the FP 7 project IPPA - Implementing Public Participation Approaches, starting in January 2011.

*Acknowledgements:*

My participation at the FSC was made possible by the generous support of the NEA following my contacts with Claire Mays. I would particularly like to thank Claudio Pescatore and Hans Riotte of the Division on Radiation Protection and Waste Management for this opportunity and Lorella Pecorale for her kind assistance.

## Annex 2:

### FSC 10-year Anniversary Colloquium “Emerging topics and issues – looking forward”

Summary of final session and earlier discussions during the day, reported by Erik Setzman (SKB)

#### Plenary discussion

Katarina de Beule suggested that the FSC should widen its field of work from radioactive waste management (RWM) to alternative and renewable energy solutions.

Elizabeth Gray stated “Let us not dilute our topic, FSC should stick to RWM”

María del Carmen Ruiz Lopez – FSC is a working party for the RWMC. We can learn from other fields but our identity is in relation with that committee and that field. Impressed with what the FSC has done. Take a session for self evaluation, reflection and outside evaluation too on different aspects and take stock of all the issues we have addressed. Then we will get a better understanding and become able to see the way forward.

Gaston Meskens had never suggested that FSC should address energy policy but a new forum for that would be useful. “It’s weird to talk about something without talking about the origin of the thing”. FSC could raise a voice to propose a proper consultative exercise including this in the frame. Industry has an interest in separating them.

Mariano Molina promoted transfer of knowledge for FSC but was not sure in what direction. Let us be humble and try once again to use cross fertilization and learn from other conflictual fields and “nasty people”.

Martin O’Connor – Wicked problems are those that have no simple solution. Engage with difficult people as long as they are committed to their task. Wicked energy policy problems are not the task of this forum.

Kjell Andersson – Achievements in RWM of participation and transparency are way ahead of in nuclear energy in general and probably even in other areas. People with different perspectives, not necessarily nasty people, may continue to contribute to improving FSC work.

Hans Riotte pointed out that we should bring into the picture that we are dealing with governance periods that go far beyond mandate periods and think more about how that affects our processes to support decision making processes over different mandate periods. Link transparency and partnerships to formal decisionmaking processes in society. Involve political scientists as well as the sociologists.

Jo-Ann Facella – Implementer has to be able to figure out what to do, take high level discussions and operationalize in a meaningful way, striking the right balance probably unique in each country.

Erik van Hove was distinctive about the importance of not losing the FSC success in involving non professionals and personal stakeholders in dialogue and local visits with in depth discussions.

#### Final words

Claudio Pescatore – Lots of gratitude to the social and political scientists looking at siting of unwanted facilities. The academic input is very important to the FSC future. The symbolic dimension is very important as well as durable relations. Stepwise decisionmaking and participation are somehow integrated but maybe not fully understood. Reversibility concept is very important in this perspective.

Lawrence Kokajko (invited to speak by Claudio Pescatore): This meeting is thoughtprovoking and enlightening. My first meeting and hopefully not my last. Many topics well worth the investment but if you take even one of those Programme of Work themes you have a lot of work to do. Compliments to Janet Kotra, who keeps us in line, a dedicated and committed civil servant.

Janet Kotra – We have struggled together and created a very credible corpus. Bringing calm to overblown rhetoric, listening to voices of those not often heard goes to the essence of what we are. Great value of personal relationships, trust and confidence will give ability to make progress in the future.

### **Summary of emerging topics and issues for the FSC**

#### Topics from the session

Reflection, self and outside evaluation  
Linking transparency to decision making  
Durable relations  
Symbolic dimension  
Relation to nuclear energy  
Knowledge transfer/cross fertilization  
Importance of local visits and workshops  
Reversibility  
Need for priorities

#### Other topics from the anniversary

Long term preservation of information  
Memory keeping  
Making safety cases understandable  
Cooperating with regional authorities  
Seeking transparency  
Broadening journalists knowledge  
Trust and confidence building

Reported by

Mr Erik Setzman,  
Swedish Nuclear Fuel and Waste Management Co,  
chair of session

using notes by Claire Mays

Supplement: Slides of Beate Kallenbach Herbert summarizing emerging topics and issues from earlier sessions during the day.

**Annex 3:**

**Participants list for Forum on Stakeholder Confidence (FSC) 11th regular meeting  
14 and 16 September 2010**

**Belgium**

**Karina DE BEULE** *Federal Agency for Nuclear Control*

**Ludo JADOUL** *FANC*

**Canada**

**Marcia BLANCHETTE** *Radioactive Waste  
Natural Resources Canada*

**Jo-Ann FACELLA** *Social Research and Dialogue  
Nuclear Waste Management Organization*

**Czech Republic**

**Helena ČÍŽKOVÁ** *Radioactive Waste Repository Authority*

**Ivo KAPLÁN** *Radioactive Waste management Authority*

**Jana SIMKOVA** *IG Alpbach Forum Prague*

**Finland**

**Leena HIETANEN** *STUK*

**Katarina KOIVISTO** *HBL*

**Timo SEPPÄLÄ** *Posiva Oy*

**France**

**Eberhard FALCK** *Université de Versailles St. Quentin-en-Yvelines*

**Sébastien FARIN** *Andra*

**Serge GADBOIS** *Mutadis*



**Germany**

**Enrique BIURRUN**

*DBE Technology GmbH*

**Beate KALLENBACH-HERBERT**

*Nuclear Engineering and Plant Safety  
Oeko-Institut*

**Sophie KUPPLER**

*Institute for Technology Assessment and Systems  
Analysis at Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT)*

**Hungary**

**Julia KISS**

*PURAM*

**Italy**

**Pierfrancesco BALDASSARRI**

*SOGIN*

**Giuliano BUCETI**

*ENEA - FPN Department*

**Paola MAODDI**

*SOGIN*

**Japan**

**Yoshiko AOYAMA**

*Japan NUS Co. Ltd.*

**Reiko NUNOME**

*NUMO*

**Mitsuo TAKEUCHI**

*Nuclear Waste Management Organization of Japan  
(NUMO)*

**Poland**

**Andrzej CHWAS**

*Department of Nuclear Energy  
Ministry Of Economy*

**Grazyna ZAKRZEWSKA-TRZNADEL**

*Institute of Nuclear Chemistry and Technology*

**Romania**

**Daniela DIACONU**

*Institute for Nuclear Research Pitesti*

**Slovenia**

**Vladislav KROSELJ**

*Agency for RadWaste Management*

**Nadja ZELEZNIK**

*Agencija ARAO*

**Spain**

**Mariano MOLINA MARTÍN**

*Enresa*

**Natalia MUÑOZ MARTINEZ**

*AMAC*

**María del Carmen RUIZ LOPEZ**

*Consejo de Seguridad Nuclear*

**Sweden**

**Holmfridur BJARNADOTTIR**

*Swedish Nuclear Power Inspectorate*

**Catharina BLOM**

*Uppsala Regional Council*

**Josefin Päiviö JONSSON**

*Swedish Radiation Safety Authority*

**Lucie RIAD**

*Uppsala Regional Council*

**Erik SETZMAN**

*Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB, SKB*

**Eva SIMIC**

*Swedish National Council of Nuclear Waste*

**Johan SWAHN**

*MKG*

**Switzerland**

**Marcos BUSER**

*Gutachten&Projekte*

**Markus FRITSCHI**

*NAGRA*

**Stefan JORDI**

*Swiss Federal Office of Energy*

**Meinert RAHN**

*Eidgenössisches Nuklearsicherheitsinspektorat  
ENSI*

**United Kingdom**

**David BRAZIER** *Environment Agency*  
**Elizabeth GRAY** *The Scottish Government*  
**Javier LEZAUN** *Saïd Business School, University of Oxford*  
**Jay REDGROVE** *Nuclear Decommissioning Authority*

**United States**

**Helen BURNETT** *US Environmental Protection Agency*  
**Janet KOTRA** *US Nuclear Regulatory Commission*

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS**

**European Commission**

**Jean COADOU**

**FORATOM**

**Christian TAILLEBOIS** *Director  
External Relations, Member Services  
FORATOM*

**IAEA**

**Mamoru MAEOKA** *International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)*

**NucNet**

**Mathieu CAREY**

**OECD NUCLEAR ENERGY AGENCY**

<b>Serge GAS</b>	<i>Head of Section NEA/RE</i>
<b>Wei-Whua LOA</b>	<i>Consultant RPRWM Division</i>
<b>Claire MAYS</b>	<i>Consultant RPRWM Division</i>
<b>Ikumi MORIGUCHI</b>	<i>Consultant RPRWM Division</i>
<b>Claudio PESCATORE</b>	<i>Principal Administrator RPRWM Division</i>
<b>Hans RIOTTE</b>	<i>Head RPRWM Division</i>

**Participants list for Forum on Stakeholder Confidence (FSC) 10-year Anniversary Colloquium**

**15 September 2010**

**Belgium**

<b>Anne BERGMANS</b>	<i>University of Antwerp</i>
<b>Nick BERGMANS</b>	<i>MONA</i>
<b>Paul BERTELS</b>	<i>STORA</i>
<b>Rudy BOSSELAERS</b>	<i>NIRAS/ONDRAF</i>
<b>Karina DE BEULE</b>	<i>Federal Agency for Nuclear Control</i>
<b>Evelyn HOOFT</b>	<i>ONDRAF/NIRAS</i>
<b>Ludo JADOUL</b>	<i>FANC</i>
<b>Geert LAUWEN</b>	<i>STORA</i>
<b>Cécile MASSART</b>	<i>Artist</i>
<b>Willy MELIS</b>	<i>STORA</i>
<b>Gaston MESKENS</b>	<i>CEN/SCK</i>
<b>Carlo MEYNANTS</b>	<i>STORA</i>
<b>Paul MEYNANTS</b>	<i>STORA</i>
<b>Herman SANNEN</b>	<i>STORA</i>
<b>Jantine SCHRÖDER</b>	<i>CEN/SCK</i>
<b>Joost SOMMEN</b>	<i>University of Antwerp</i>
<b>Bie VAN DE VLOET</b>	<i>STORA</i>
<b>Kris VAN DIJCK</b>	<i>Municipality of Dessel</i>
<b>Erik VAN HOVE</b>	<i>University of Antwerp</i>
<b>Jef VERREES</b>	<i>MONA</i>

**Canada**

**Marcia BLANCHETTE**

*Radioactive Waste  
Natural Resources Canada*

**Jo-Ann FACELLA**

*Social Research and Dialogue  
Nuclear Waste Management Organization*

**Czech Republic**

**Helena ČÍŽKOVÁ**

*Radioactive Waste Repository Authority*

**Ivo KAPLÁN**

*Radioactive Waste management Authority*

**Jana SIMKOVA**

*IG Alpbach Forum Prague*

**Finland**

**Timo SEPPÄLÄ**

*Posiva Oy*

**France**

**Jean COUDRY**

*CLIS*

**Marie-Claude DUPUIS**

*ANDRA*

**Eberhard FALCK**

*Université de Versailles-St.Quentin en Yvelines*

**Sébastien FARIN**

*ANDRA*

**Serge GADBOIS**

*Mutadis*

**Benoît JAQUET**

*CLIS*

**Yves LE BARS**

*YLB Conseils*

**Jean-Marie MALINGREAU**

*CLIS*

**Martin O'CONNOR**

*Université de Versailles-St.Quentin en Yvelines*

**Germany**

**Beate KALLENBACH-HERBERT**

*Nuclear Engineering and Plant Safety  
Oeko-Institut*

**Sophie KUPPLER**

*Institute for Technology Assessment and Systems  
Analysis at Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT)*

**Asta VON OPPEN**

*Bürgerinitiative Lüchow-Dannenberg (NGO)*

**Hungary**

**Julia KISS**

*PURAM*

**Sajó GUYLA**

*Municipality of Váckisújfalu*

**Ilona ZSEBICS**

*Municipality of Bátya*

**Italy**

**Pierfrancesco BALDASSARRI**

*SOGIN*

**Giuliano BUCETI**

*ENEA - FPN Department*

**Franco MALERBA**

*Permanent Delegation*

**Paola MAODDI**

*SOGIN*

**Japan**

**Yoshiko AOYAMA**

*Japan NUS Co. Ltd.*

**Reiko NUNOME**

*NUMO*

**Mitsuo TAKEUCHI**

*Nuclear Waste Management Organization of Japan  
(NUMO)*

**Korea**

**Bongsoo KIM**

*Permanent Delegation*

**Poland**

**Rafal FRAC**

*Permanent Delegation*

**Andrzej CHWAS**

*Department of Nuclear Energy  
Ministry Of Economy*

**Grazyna ZAKRZEWSKA-TRZNADEL**

*Institute of Nuclear Chemistry and Technology*

**Romania**

**Daniela DIACONU**

*Institute for Nuclear Research Pitesti*

**Slovenia**

**Vladislav KROSELJ**

*Agencija ARAO*

**Nadja ZELEZNIK**

*Agencija ARAO*

**Spain**

**Fernando GONZALEZ HERMOSILLA**

*Análisis e Investigación*

**Mariano MOLINA MARTÍN**

*Enresa*

**Natalia MUÑOZ MARTINEZ**

*Consejo de Seguridad Nuclear*

**María del Carmen RUIZ LOPEZ**

*Consejo de Seguridad Nuclear*

**Sweden**

**Johan ANDERBERG**

*SSM*

**Kjell ANDERSSON**

*Karita Research*

**Holmfridur BJARNADOTTIR**

*Swedish Nuclear Power Inspectorate*

**Catharina BLOM**

*Uppsala Regional Council*

**Josefin Päiviö JONSSON**

*Swedish Radiation Safety Authority*

**Lucie RIAD**

*Uppsala Regional Council*

**Erik SETZMAN**

*Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB, SKB*

**Eva SIMIC**

*Swedish National Council for Nuclear Waste*

**Johan SWAHN**

*MKG*



**Switzerland**

**Marcos BUSER**

*Gutachten&Projekte*

**Meinert RAHN**

*Eidgenössisches Nuklearsicherheitsinspektorat  
ENSI*

**United Kingdom**

**David BRAZIER**

*Environment Agency*

**Elizabeth GRAY**

*The Scottish Government*

**Javier LEZAUN**

*Saïd Business School, University of Oxford*

**Jay REDGROVE**

*Nuclear Decommissioning Authority*

**John WHITTON**

*UK National Nuclear Laboratory*

**United States**

**Helen BURNETT**

*US Environmental Protection Agency*

**Lawrence KOKAJKO**

*US Nuclear Regulatory Commission*

**Janet KOTRA**

*US Nuclear Regulatory Commission*

**James RUBENSTONE**

*US Nuclear Regulatory Commission*

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS**

**European Commission**

**Jean COADOU**

**FORATOM**

**Christian TAILLEBOIS**

**IAEA**

**Mamoru MAEOKA**

**NucNet**

**Mathieu CAREY**

**OECD NUCLEAR ENERGY AGENCY**

<b>Janice DUNN LEE</b>	<i>Deputy Director-General</i>
<b>Serge GAS</b>	<i>Head of Section NEA/RE</i>
<b>Wei-Whua LOA</b>	<i>Consultant RPRWM Division</i>
<b>Claire MAYS</b>	<i>Consultant RPRWM Division</i>
<b>Ikumi MORIGUCHI</b>	<i>Consultant RPRWM Division</i>
<b>Claudio PESCATORE</b>	<i>Principal Administrator RPRWM Division</i>
<b>Hans RIOTTE</b>	<i>Head RPRWM Division</i>
<b>Keiichiro WAKASUGI</b>	<i>Consultant</i>
<b>Uichiro YOSHIMURA</b>	<i>Deputy Director, Safety and Regulation</i>

## Annex 4:

**List of written materials made available  
For the 11<sup>th</sup> Session of the FSC  
14 and 16 September 2010**

ITEM	TYPE	NUMBER	TITLE	AUTHOR
03.	OLIS	NEA/RWM/FSC/A(2010)1	Proposed Agenda	Claudio Pescatore
03.	OLIS	NEA/RWM/FSC/M(2009)1	Summary Record of the FSC-10 meeting	Claudio Pescatore
04.a	OLIS	NEA/RWM/FSC(2010)1	Review of activities since the FSC-10 September 2010 meeting and the current Programme of Work	Claudio Pescatore
04.b	OLIS	NEA/RWM/FSC/A(2010)2/ REV1	Colloquium Agenda	Claudio Pescatore
04a+0 4b	Presentation		Update since September 2009; The 10-year Anniversary Colloquium	Claudio Pescatore
05.	Presentation		Review of the RWMC and its working parties	Claudio Pescatore
06.a	Presentation		The RWMC Activities on Information and Memory Preservation	Claudio Pescatore
06.c	Presentation		Swiss Literature Review on Markers	Marcus Buser
07.b	Presentation		Treatment of Socio-Scientific Aspects in a Safety Case for a Geological Repository in Germany – Results of a Research Project	Beate Kallenbach
07.c	Presentation		Interplay Among Stakeholders for the Definition of the Detailed Geological Survey Zone in the Meuse/Haute-Marne (France)	Sébastien Farin
07.d	Presentation		Talking with Stakeholders About Substantive Issues – Retrievability and Reversibility in the UK	David Brazier
07.e	Presentation		Sogin's Engagement Process 2010: Focus on Involvement of Economic Operators As a Part of the Local Community	Pierfrancesco Baldassarri
08.b	Presentation		France Presentation	Sébastien Farin
08.c	Presentation		Spain Presentation	Mariano Molina
08.d	Presentation		Sweden Presentation	Catharina Blom
09	Presentation		Seeking Transparency	Claudio Pescatore
09.a	Infodoc #1		Introduction and Overview of Country Responses to Questionnaire	Eva Simic/ Jay Redgrove
09.a	Presentation		Results from transparency questionnaire	Eva Simic
09.b	Presentation		Sweden's Transparency Programme: Lessons Learned, Evaluations and Planned Adjustments	Eva Simic
09.c	Presentation		European Commission support to	Jean Couadou

## NEA/RWM/FSC/M(2010)1

			initiatives aiming at enhancing transparency and citizen participation	
09.d	Presentation		Current Work on Guidance for Transparency in Nuclear Regulatory Communication with the Public	Karina De Beule
10	Presentation		Seeking Transparency Report	Helen Burnett
12	OLIS	NEA/RWM/FSC(2010)1	PoW Themes 2 & 4: Way Forward	Claudio Pescatore
14	Room document		2011 National Workshop & Community Visit 2011: Sweden	Swedish Hosts
15.b	Presentation		STUK's Course for Journalists: Objectives, Materials and Experience	Leena Hietanen
15.c	Presentation		STUK's Course for Journalists: A Participant's Experience and Evaluation	Katarina Koivisto
15.d	Presentation		NEA Outreach to Media and Civil Society	Serge Gas
15.e	Presentation		Media Needs in the International Context	Mathieu Carey
16.a	OLIS	NEA/RWM(2010)10/PROV	Update on the Draft R&R Report Including FSC Input	Claudio Pescatore
16.b	Infodoc #2		FSC Participation in and Contribution to the Reims Conference 14-17 December 2010	Claudio Pescatore
17	Infodoc #3		ICGR-2011	NUMO
18.a	Flyer		10-Year Flyer	Claudio Pescatore

**List of written materials made available  
For the 10-year FSC Anniversary Colloquium  
15 September 2010**

ITEM	TYPE	NUMBER	TITLE	AUTHOR
	OLIS	NEA/RWM/FSC(2010)2/REV1	10-year Anniversary Colloquium of the FSC	Claudio Pescatore
	Presentation		Presenting the FSC and its 10-Year Anniversary Colloquium	Janet Kotra
	Presentation		The FSC: Spread of Knowledge	Yves Le Bars
	Presentation		The FSC: A Contribution to Understanding Between Technicians and Civil Society	Cécile Massart
	Presentation		FSC Lessons: Are They Specific to Radioactive Waste Management?	Fernando Gonzales-Hermosilla
	Presentation		Introductory talk: Betting on Technology, on Economics, and/or on People?	Erik Van Hove
	Presentation		Introductory talk: Inclusive Governance – Is it here? How far does it reach?	Gilles Hériard-Dubreuil
	Presentation		Developing and Sustaining Partnership	Nadia Železnik
	Presentation		The FSC Framework – Feedback and analytic view	Martin O'Connor
	Presentation		Host Country Perspectives	Marcia Blanchette
	Presentation		Surfing the FSC	Javier Lezaun
	Presentation		Forward-looking perspectives from the day's discussions and presentations	Beate Kallenbach
	OLIS	NEA/RWM/FSC(2010)2	10-year Record of Learning - Factual List of Activities and Investigated Topics, and of People Who Contributed to Them	Claudio Pescatore
	Press Release		10 <sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Forum of Stakeholder Confidence	Serge Gas
	Flyer		Ten-Year Evolution in Public Involvement in Radioactive Waste Management	Claudio Pescatore