



ARGONA **Arenas for Risk Governance**

Josefin Päiviö Jonsson, Swedish Radiation Safety Authority
Kjell Andersson, Karita Research

ARGONA End Users Conference
Uppsala, March 17-18, 2009



Participants

- | | |
|---|------------------------|
| 1 Swedish Radiation Safety Authority | Sweden |
| 2 Karita Research AB | Sweden |
| 3 Göteborg University | Sweden |
| 4 Nuclear Research Institute Rez plc | Czech Rep.
Republic |
| 5 University of Tampere | Finland |
| 6 DECONTA | Slovakia |
| 7 SCK.CEN | Belgium |
| 8 University of Lancaster | UK |

Participants

9 RAWRA	Czech Republic
10 Stockholm University	Sweden
11 Joint Research Centre	Netherlands
12 Galson Sciences Ltd	UK
13 University of Stavanger	Norway
14 Wenergy AB	Sweden

Historical background

**Problems in the siting of nuclear waste facilities
in many countries**

because of

**Expert dominance, narrow framing,
little public insight or influence ...**

Historical background

The need for public and stakeholder involvement and transparency became widely acknowledged

Processes of participation and transparency emerged, the EU launched research projects (COWAM I and II, RISCAM II, CIP, OBRA and ARGONA), CARL, the OECD/Nuclear Energy Agency launched the Forum for Stakeholder Confidence, etc.

Historical background

The new processes started to be used in practice – partly within EU projects

Platforms were established for stakeholders, especially local stakeholders, to meet, share experiences and reach common ideas and proposals.

Where are we?

There is a large knowledge base about governance which should be further implemented

A common demand for bridging the gap between research and implementation

Problems still remain and programmes are still criticized for a lack of real dialogue

We must look up for a backlash!

Where are we?

But how to implement the new processes is not self-evident.

There are legal, organizational, historical and cultural factors that set conditions. We have to understand these factors for an effective implementation

We must also understand how deliberative methods and the transparency approach relate to each other, and to formal decision-making in representative democracy



Why ARGONA?

The ARGONA project intends to demonstrate **how participation and transparency link to the political and legal systems** and how new approaches can be implemented in nuclear waste management programmes.



What is ARGONA doing?

What is ARGONA doing?

- ✓ Studies of the context within which processes of participation and transparency take place - to understand how the processes can be used in the real world
- ✓ Studies of theory – in order to build participation and transparency on a firm ground
- ✓ Case studies – to understand how different processes work
- ✓ Implementation – to make a difference, learn and demonstrate

Studies of context

Study of the organizational and legislative framework (Karita + JRC)

Questionnaire survey, use of existing documentation of legislation etc

Study of risk communication practices, cultural differences and other factors

(University of Stavanger + Galson Sciences, and others)

Interviews and focus groups in UK, Sweden, Slovakia



Theoretical developments

**Theory of democracy, participation and transparency
Introduced the concept of mediators**

(SCK.CEN)

Intellectual tools to describe, explain, compare and possibly improve the way risks are handled by democratic states.

Study of mediators of issues and mediators of process

(Göteborg University, Stockholm University and University of Lancaster)

A theoretical framework but also case studies, e.g. GM Nation in the UK

Mediation is intervening for achieving reconciliation and agreement between different parties, overcoming division and an absence of mutual understanding and perspective. Mediation is about establishing connections and building common knowledge. Therefore, mediation is a form of communication, and mediators are communicators of a kind. The work of mediation draws people and things closer together, structuring interactions between them and allowing for new combinations and alignments of people and things to emerge. Mediation is of crucial importance to be able to establish a final repository for spent nuclear fuel.

Case studies

Sweden

(Göteborg University, Stockholm University)

Up-stream and downstream engagement

Mediation by demonstration and mediation by dialogue

- ✓ SKB safety analysis
- ✓ SKB consultations
- ✓ The Dialogue – RISCO – Oskarshamn Model-
Transparency Programme series of initiatives

Case studies

United Kingdom

(Galson Sciences)

LLW facility siting process at Dounreay

- Dounreay LLW BPEO (Best Practicable Environmental Option)
Consultation 2003
- Various additional stakeholder meetings
- EIA scoping meetings

Finland

(University of Tampere)

The role of compensation



Case studies

Communicating safety analysis uncertainties (JRC)

- ✓ participate in the stakeholders' meetings
- ✓ identify main sources of uncertainty
- ✓ develop a format to communicate
- ✓ test the adequacy of the format



Implementation in the Czech Republic

Nuclear Research Institute (NRI) is the leader

RAWRA as ARGONA Partner
Czech stakeholders
Karita and Wenergy

I refer to Hana Vojtechova (NRI)



What have we learnt so far ?



There are no final ARGONA conclusions yet. Several work package reports remain. In parallel we are working with the Final Report.

This presentation is based on existing deliverables and interaction with partners before this conference

This conference is part of the ARGONA Project and the documentation will be an ARGONA report, thus providing further input to the final phase of ARGONA.

Driving forces behind processes of participation and transparency (PPT)

Triggering events:	UK – Sellafield
Government initiatives:	UK – CoRWM consultations, Belgium partnerships
Laws and regulations:	Finland - EIA consultations Czech hearings UK – EIADR consultations

Driving forces

Spontaneous initiatives:	Sweden (Dialogue project, RISCOM, Transparency programme)
EU Research:	Sweden - hearings Czech Republic - now, COWAM

Driving forces

There is a mixture of driving forces for transparency and participation - Events, Laws and regulations, Spontaneous initiatives, Government initiatives, EU Research

Most countries have several of these driving forces but the mixes differ quite much

Degrees of freedom

Legislation does not restrict participation and transparency

There are opportunities for increased participation and transparency beyond formal requirements

Where we don't have legislative frameworks we don't need to wait for them before something can be done

There are many good examples of PPT that have been developed and used entirely without new laws or conventions

Clarification of complexity – how far can we come?

In the transparency arena the "RISCOM triangle" is made visible
by stretching – arguments are challenged and clarified

Issues are complex and actors are perplex - limitations on what
can be done in the arena

The RISCOM Model helps in bringing structure to complexity
But this may not be enough, there must also be reflection – how
can it be fostered?

The core of the problem

Are processes of participation and transparency (PPT) to be
used for getting "acceptance"?

or are PPT tools of their own for generating policy
recommendations? Even replacing representative
democracy?

or can governance be built on existing systems of
representative democracy?

then PPT should be built to support existing system

safety analysis

Difficult to communicate with technical tools (JRC work)

Sweden: *A split between safety analysis and public consultations* (Swedish case study).

Oskarshamn: “The authorities are our experts”

But Belgian partnerships dealt with technical issues

How can the “black box” be opened?

Dialogue

“Important to ensure *a safe space* for open and meaningful dialogue ... , exchange views and explain the positions among all stakeholders rather than to try to achieve consensus upon any terms” (NRI, presentation)

Dialogue processes

An outcome from the UK study (Galson Sciences)

Proposal: to create a "scoring matrix" where different dialogue processes are mapped according to a number of descriptors ("criteria")

Processes: consensus conferences, citizen juries, focus groups, RISCUM process

Descriptors: open framing, stretching capacity, consensus shaping,

Preliminary conclusions (1 :4)

- ❖ There should be more efforts to **map dialogue processes** with respect to "criteria" – to understand what works best in specific situations
- ❖ Decision-makers must understand better **how deliberation and transparency can be organized** to support them
- ❖ We haven't yet found the best way to communicate **safety analysis results**

Preliminary conclusions (2 :4)

- ❖ **There should be a balance** between the force of a legal process and an informal process offering creativity and flexibility
- ❖ Important to ensure **a safe space** for open and meaningful dialogue
- ❖ Differences in culture, legal requirements set conditions for dialogue approaches, but there should be **certain basic principles**

Preliminary conclusions (3:4)

- ❖ **Implementation is possible** across country borders
- ❖ **"let go" of business as usual** and control needs
- ❖ Politicians need to be more involved and political responsibility should be strengthened – **but how?**
- ❖ **Early ("up-stream") involvement** is important to avoid narrow framing and problems later

Preliminary conclusions (4:4)

- ❖ Involving the public and stakeholders **must be sincere** - if not they will feel manipulated and they withdraw
- ❖ We must **look up for a backlash** – going back to technocratic decision-making !

