



March 6, 2007

## ARGONA Project Questionnaire on Policy Making Structures

### **Background**

During the last decade the nuclear waste management (nwm) community has acknowledged the need for more transparency, stakeholder participation and community involvement in the decision making process. The amount of work already done in this area, both research and application in real programmes, is impressive, and a large “database” is now available. Knowledge has increased with respect to risk communication, various models of citizen participation, conditions for community involvement and transparency. The programmes have also become more communicative due to the requirements of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) at project level and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) at the planning and programme implementation levels. However, the progress in European programmes could be increased further still.

A grounding thesis for the ARGONA project is that participation and transparency are key elements in effective risk governance. The project therefore intends to demonstrate how participation and transparency can be implemented in nwm programmes in Europe, thereby testing this thesis. The project consists of a series of work packages, beginning, logically, with a description of the policy making structures that exist within the EU and in the participating countries. This questionnaire forms part of this initial work package.

More information on the ARGONA project can be found in Appendix 1 and on the ARGONA web site <http://www.argonaproject.eu> .

## **This questionnaire**

The questionnaire has a relatively free format for responding to the questions. Some questions require straight forward answers, whereas others may require more effort and some qualitative judgment. The questionnaire is divided into four parts. The first part is intended to provide the context within which decision processes take place, both with hindsight and looking to the future. The second part concerns the legislative framework at national, EU and international levels. The third part deals with current practices of public participation and the fourth part addresses the need for implementation of processes designed to enhance transparency and participation in the future, bearing in mind likely developments in nwm.

Of special interest to the project is an analysis of nuclear safety and environmental legislation as well as the roles of national authorities, local authorities and other stakeholders in developing participatory practices. Another aim is to analyze the need for novel public participation approaches, their prospects as well as their possible limitations, as compared to traditional minimal participation activities, such as receiving information, asking questions at public meetings and submitting written comments etc.

As already said there is a fairly free format for answering the various questions. Some questions may be answered by a single sentence, for others you may want to provide us with more comprehensive descriptions.

## **High level waste or low level waste?**

Different countries are at different stages of the management process for high level waste (HLW) and low level waste (LLW), whilst the definitions of the various categories of waste may differ. In some countries the focus is more or less entirely on HLW as LLW management solutions have already been implemented, In other countries even the siting of LLW facilities is controversial and is the main concern at present.

We have therefore chosen to leave it open to you to decide which category, or categories, of wastes your answers deal with, but we would be grateful if you could make this clear in the response. You may also decide to give us two responses; one for HLW and one for LLW, if you think it relevant. What is important is that we want to be forward looking – we are not primarily evaluating past experiences. We intend to be practical in the sense that we want to understand if there is a need for further initiatives towards participation and transparency. If this is the case, we hope to explore how that could be implemented within policy making structures, thereby raising the quality of decision-making.

**Time schedule and contact persons**

We would appreciate if you could send your response to us ***before May 15, 2007*** by completing and returning this electronic version to Mia Tiderman at [mia.tiderman@karita.se](mailto:mia.tiderman@karita.se) . If you have any queries about the questionnaire, please contact us by e-mail or phone:

Mia Tiderman, Karita Research  
E-Mail: [mia.tiderman@karita.se](mailto:mia.tiderman@karita.se)  
Phone: +46 – (0)70-533 55 50

Kjell Andersson, Karita Research  
E-Mail: [kjell.andersson@karita.se](mailto:kjell.andersson@karita.se)  
Phone: +46 – (0)8 - 510 14755

There is also a contact person in your country named in the cover letter to this questionnaire.

## ARGONA Work Package 1 Questionnaire

Name	
Organization	
Position	
Address	
Country	
Phone:	
E-mail:	

*Respondents will be listed by organization name in an appendix to the report that will be produced as a result of this survey. The individual responses will not be included in, or attached to, the report. There will be anonymity in the sense that no names of respondents will be given in the report text. Efforts will also be made to avoid the identification of individual respondents by arguments exposed in the text.*

We prefer that you complete the entire questionnaire (which the possible exception of section 2), but if you for any reason decide to answer only certain questions, your response would still be welcomed.

### 1. Context

1.1 Please inform on whether your response refers to high level waste management, low level waste management or both.

1.2 What were the key milestones/events in nuclear waste management in your country over the past 25 years? How were they relevant? Did these key events influence transparency/dialogue approaches in nwm? If so, please explain how.

1.3 What key milestones do you expect with regard to the governance of nuclear waste management in the next 10 – 15 years?

1.4 Who are the key players (e.g. institutions, companies, organizations) currently involved in the decision-making process? What are their formal functions and strategic roles at local / regional / national levels?

1.5 Are there any missing actors? If yes, what should their functions / roles be in the process?

## 2. Legislative framework

This part of the questionnaire is intended primarily for responsible bodies (government, authorities etc.) to answer. However, other stakeholders may comment on legislative issues if they so wish.

Since the ARGONA project has compilations of legislation available, you need not describe the national legislation, EU Directives or international conventions to which you refer in detail, but please provide the names and relevant sections of the legislation. As this study focuses on how the legal framework is implemented with regard to participation and transparency, it is more important to focus on key features in the legislative framework than to make your response totally comprehensive.

### National legislation

- What are the requirements with respect to participation and transparency?
- Are there any guidelines given with regard to how the legislation should be applied?
- Does the legislation provide opportunities for increased participation and transparency beyond formal requirements?
- Does the legislation restrict participation and transparency in any way?
- Has the legislation been applied to nwm? If yes – please inform on the relevant cases.

### EU Directives

- As you understand it, what do EU Directives require with respect to participation and transparency?
- Are you aware of any guidelines explaining how the Directives should be applied?
- Do the Directives provide opportunities for increased participation and transparency beyond the formal requirements?
- Do the Directives restrict participation and transparency in any way?
- Have EU Directives affected the legislation and/or practice of participation and transparency in your country? If so, what have been the results?

### International conventions

- As you understand it, what do international conventions require with respect to participation and transparency?
- Are you aware of any guidelines explaining how the conventions should be applied?
- Do the conventions provide opportunities for increased participation and transparency beyond formal requirements?
- Do the conventions restrict participation and transparency in any way?
- Have the international conventions affected the legislation and/or practice of participation and transparency in your country? If so, what have been the results?

### 3. Current practice

3.1 How is public participation promoted or ensured in relation to nwm in your country? Please give examples, e.g. legislation, practice or research initiatives.

3.2 How is transparency promoted or ensured in relation to nwm in your country? Please give examples, e.g. legislation, practice or research initiatives.

3.3. Which “publics”, stakeholder groups, and perspectives are involved?

3.4 What are the rationales for the participation and transparency practices being used?

3.5 What are the key mechanisms of participation? (local committee, partnerships, focus groups, round tables, forums, RISCUM model...)

3.6 Who took the initiative for using these mechanisms? On what basis?

3.7 Please give your views and observations on how participation and transparency approaches are being applied in your country!

### 4. The future - implementation of participation and transparency

4.1 Should there be more participation and transparency in the nwm programme in your country. If so – why?

4.2 Should current practices for participation and transparency in nwm be changed? If so – how? And what are the reasons for change?

4.3 If you have answered yes to question 4.1 and/or 4.2 – should measures be taken within the existing legal framework or should the framework be modified in order to encourage better practices?

4.4 Who do you expect will take initiatives towards better participation and transparency practices?

4.5. How will new initiatives towards better participation and transparency practices be promoted, e.g. through legislation, voluntary practice, other?

4.6 Do you think there are obstacles that hinder, delay or stop good ideas for future implementation of participation and transparency practices? Please explain these obstacles!

Thank you for answering the questions!

We would appreciate if you could send your response to us **before May 15, 2007** by completing and returning this electronic version to Mia Tideman at [mia.tideman@karita.se](mailto:mia.tideman@karita.se) .

## Appendix 1

### Brief summary of the ARGONA Project

The ARGONA project consists of a series of work packages, beginning, logically, with a description of the policy making structures that exist within the EU and in the participating countries. This questionnaire forms part of this initial Work Package 1.

The project will define and analyse the three arenas of transparency (as defined by the RISCUM Model, or otherwise), deliberation (which draws on a notion of procedural legitimacy), and representative democracy (Work Package 2). The project will then investigate how the approaches of transparency and deliberation relate to each other and also how they relate to the political system in which decisions, for example on the final disposal of nuclear waste, are ultimately taken.

The project will also study the role played by *mediators*, who facilitate public engagement on nwm issues and *the conduct of the conduct* of public consultations (Work Package 3). The latter expression refers to the communication of models used for deliberation and transparency. This work package could therefore be said to deal with both mediators of issues and mediators of process.

In Work Package 4 the project will explore different meanings of risk, and investigate how good risk communication can be developed while taking cultural aspects into account. This links to Work Package 2 by investigating what risk communication means in the deliberative and the transparency arenas respectively, and to Work Package 3 by studying the consequences of this for the various mediators. In Work Package 5 the project will test and apply approaches to transparency and participation within different cultural and organizational settings, by making explicit what it would mean to use different approaches to participation, such as consensus conferences, lay people's panels and focus groups, as well as applying the RISCUM model.

Finally, in Work Package 6, all the ARGONA partners will develop guidelines for application of different approaches with the intention of increasing participation and awareness in decision-making.

More information is found on the project web site <http://www.argonaproject.eu> .