

Unclassified

NEA/RWM/FSC/A(2012)1

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

12-Nov-2012

English - Or. English

NUCLEAR ENERGY AGENCY  
RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Cancels & replaces the same document of 12 October 2012

## Forum on Stakeholder Confidence (FSC)

### Agenda of the 13th Session of the FSC

22-24 October 2012, Prague, Czech Republic

*Minor corrections have been made to the agenda to accurately reflect the meeting.*

Claudio.pescatore@oecd.org  
Claire.mays@oecd.org

JT03330584

Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

*This document and any map included herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.*

NEA/RWM/FSC/A(2012)1  
Unclassified

English - Or. English

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

**AGENDA**

**FOR THE 13TH SESSION OF THE FSC  
HOTEL PRAHA, Prague, Czech Republic, 22-24 October 2012**

The 13<sup>th</sup> Session of Forum on Stakeholder Confidence will take place on 22-24 October 2012, and chaired by interim by Ms. Holmfridur Bjarnadottir. **The meeting will commence on Monday 22 October at 14:00, and adjourn on Wednesday 24 October at noon.** The venue is

**Hotel Praha  
Sušická 20, Prague 6  
166 35, Czech Republic**

*Note that on Wednesday 24 October luncheon will be served at the venue at 12:10, and that subsequently a bus will take participants to the site of the Czech Republic National Workshop and Community Visit (departure from Hotel Praha promptly at 14:15; passing by Prague Airport at approximately 14:35 to take other delegates by pre-arrangement).*

- D** : This symbol in the margin of certain agenda items indicates that a decision is to be taken.  
**I** : This symbol indicates that information is shared without need for decision.

The working language will be English.

---

*Electronic presentations should be named as followed:*

**Item X.y\_Presenter last name.ppt**

*Until Thursday Oct. 18, they should be submitted to  
[Lorella.pecorale@oecd.org](mailto:Lorella.pecorale@oecd.org) AND [Steinerova@rawra.cz](mailto:Steinerova@rawra.cz)*

*After that date they should be brought to the meeting on a virus-free USB stick*

Delegates are requested to bring their own print out of this agenda

---

**Contact persons during the meeting:**

Radioactive Waste Management Repository Authority - RAWRA

**Ivo Kaplán**

**Mobile : +420 777 177 889**

**Lucie Steinerová**

**Mobile : +420 724 041 711**

<b>MONDAY 22 OCTOBER - DAY 1</b>
----------------------------------

## INTRODUCTION

- 
- 14:00 **1. Welcome**  
*FSC Chair by interim; NEA Secretariat; Czech Hosts including Director General Ivan Jukl, Economic Section of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic*
- Special information on FSC governance** and acting Chair for this meeting
- Welcome to new FSC delegates and thanks to those who are moving on
- Our meeting in Prague is the first instance of a regular FSC meeting held outside Paris
- 2. Review and adoption of the Agenda** NEA/RWM/FSC/  
A(2012)1  
*FSC Chair; NEA Secretariat*
- D** *The agenda will be reviewed. Adoption by the FSC is required.*
- 3. Approval of Summary Record of the FSC-12 meeting** NEA/RWM/FSC/  
M(2012)1  
*FSC Chair*
- D** The FSC-12 summary record was circulated for comments and corrections in February 2012, and finalised accordingly. Approval by the FSC is required.
- 

## BRIEFINGS ON NEA WORKING PARTIES AND PROJECTS

- 
- 4. THE FSC**
- 14:15 **4.a Review of main activities launched or achieved since September 2011**  
*NEA Secretariat*
- I**
- Including Publications:*
- Updating the 2003 report of the Regulators' Forum – Introducing the concept of the "Safety System" which includes government, communities, implementers as well as safety regulators
  - The FSC Annotated Glossary of Key Terms – due out any day
- And Secretariat studies:*
- Monitoring and memory: See item 9
- 14:25 **4.b Last minute information on the FSC Czech Republic Community Visit and National Workshop**  
*Ivo Kaplan (RAWRA)*
- I**
- The 9<sup>th</sup> FSC National Workshop and Community Visit takes place directly after the FSC-13, in Karlovy Vary, and Lubenec (Certovka), under the high patronage of CR's Minister for Trade and Industry Dr. Martin Kuba.
- The local visit includes a public meeting. On request of the programme committee (including RAWRA, Mayors, NGOs and the pluralistic working group "Geological
-

Repository Deliberation”), international delegates will participate on panels at this public meeting and regarding safety/regulatory role expectations.

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

---

14:35 **5. REVIEW OF RWMC AND ITS WORKING PARTIES**  
*NEA Secretariat*

---

**SELECTED INTERNATIONAL INPUT**

---

14:50 **6. THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON GEOLOGICAL REPOSITORIES (ICGR)**

*Michael Siemann (NEA Secretariat)*

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

The FSC earlier provided a “seed paper” on the conference theme *National Commitment, Local and Regional Involvement*. This was revised and adopted by the RWMC as a collective statement (March 2012).

---

**7. RELEVANT EUROPEAN-LEVEL PROJECTS**

*FSC Chair*

---

15:00 **7.a InSoTeC – including Czech Republic participation**

*Zdenek Konopasek, Karel Svacina (Charles University, Prague)*

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

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

---

15:20

*Coffee Break*

---

15:45 **7.b IPPA**

*Kjell Andersson (Karita Konsult)*

IPPA (Implementation Implementing Public Participation Approaches in Radioactive Waste Disposal; 2011-2013) is an EC-sponsored project involving 17 organizations from 12 countries, including some FSC organisations and contacts. In the framework of the

IPPA project, the RISCOS Model and other novel approaches to public involvement are being implemented in Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland, Slovenia and Romania. The main goals of the implementation are to aid the current processes of RWM in the selected countries, to establish a “safe space” for stakeholders, and to provide guidance for future processes by creating schemas for how implementation can be organized and executed. The implementation is also viewed as an excellent opportunity to further test and evaluate the approaches used. [www.ippaproject.eu](http://www.ippaproject.eu)

16:10 7.c **IPPA – Work of the Poland Reference Group**

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

16:25 7.d **IPPA – Work of the Romania Reference Group**

*Daniela Diaconu (Institute of Nuclear Research, Pitesti)*

---

16:40 7.e **ACN - Aarhus Convention and Nuclear**

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

The Aarhus Convention & Nuclear (ACN) roundtables were initiated by ANCCLI & DG ENER. This program allows civil society stakeholders as well as institutional actors to bring their assessment and expectations to the EU level regarding the practical implementation of the Aarhus Convention in their country and also to grasp the existing practices in other EU countries. Recommendations have been issued for France and other countries.

International rendez-vous include: the IPPA-Regional Environmental Center (REC) seminar in Hungary (September 2012), the ACN European Round Table on nuclear safety (December 4-5th 2012) and the final ACN conference with the Aarhus UNECE secretariat (March 2013).

16:55 7.f **Discussion**

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

[Testimonial received Oct. 8, 2012 from Wolfgang HILDEN, European Commission, who cannot attend FSC-13 but will be at the Czech Republic Workshop:]

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

- Which interactions, what kind of information sharing could take place between the FSC and these European projects or programmes? At a minimum: propose a presentation of the FSC; pass on the FSC flyers.
-

---

## SPECIAL COUNTRY UPDATES (1)

---

### 8 SPAIN

---

17:15 **8.a Outcome of the stakeholder involvement process in siting the CTS**

*Mariano Molina, Silvia Rueda Sanchez (ENRESA)*

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

---

17:35 **8.b Discussion**

17:45 *Adjourn*

**Dinner “on one’s own”**

*Delegates may use public transport or taxis to reach the old town centre of Prague if they desire*

**TUESDAY 23 OCTOBER - DAY 2**

## IMPLEMENTING THE FSC PROGRAMME OF WORK (1)

---

9:00 **9. LONG TERM ASPECTS AND STAKEHOLDER CONFIDENCE (Topical discussion under PoW Theme 5)**

*Erik Setzman (SKB)*

---

9:05 **9.a Status and findings of the RWMC project “Preservation of Records, Knowledge and Memory” (RK&M)**

*Claudio Pescatore*

....Collective Statement, Glossary, meetings, workshops, subgroups... The central role for Oversight. Launch of Secretariat studies as per items 9.b & c

9:25 **9.b Secretariat study: Some reflections on physical monitoring**

*Lumír Nachmilner (NEA consultant)*

Reflections on what is being done, what is and is not feasible in terms of *physical* monitoring.

9:40 **9.c Secretariat study: Initial findings on local stakeholders’ positions on monitoring and memory**

*Meritxell Martell (Merience)*

Report of the first phase of the new FSC survey on local communities’ ideas, concerns, initiatives, requests, demands for the preservation of memory of the RWM facility

(including monitoring of the physical processes and impacts related to the facility), and the relationship to confidence in RWM.

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

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

---

9:55 **9.d** **Discussion**

---

10:15 **9.e** **Way forward**  
**D** Which further activities should the FSC plan around these topics?

---

10:20 *Coffee Break*

---

## SPECIAL COUNTRY UPDATES (2)

---

### 10. SWITZERLAND

---

10:45 **10.a** **Status of the DGR site selection process and stakeholder confidence**  
*Pascale Künzi (BFE)*

11:05 **10.b** **Participation process in Switzerland: The implementer's first experiences**  
*Philippe Senn (Nagra)*

11:15 **10.c** **Discussion**

---

## IMPLEMENTING THE FSC PROGRAMME OF WORK (2)

---

11:30 **11. THE GROWING ROLE OF SOCIAL MEDIA (Topical Session under PoW Themes 2 & 3)**  
*Chair: Jay Redgrove (NDA)*  
*Rapporteur: Timo Seppälä (Posiva)*

---

11:35 **11.a** **Results of the FSC survey on member organisations' use of social media**  
*Rapporteur*

11:45 **11.b** **Panel on the growing role of social media and the impact on transparency**  
*Each panellist speaks for approx. 8 minutes, then the panel interacts in response to the presentations and to questions from the Chair and Rapporteur*

### **An empirical viewpoint**

*Jakub Macek, Masaryk University, Brno*

Online activism and the way NGOs and individual activists use social networking sites - and, consequently, a "practices" gap in the way SNS are used by activists on the one hand and by corporations and politicians on the other. Based on the ongoing research of the department of Media Studies and Journalism.

**An NGO viewpoint: Beyond Clicks and Likes**

*Jaroslav Valuch, Standby Task Force, Prague*

"Updating status about your lunch, assisting in disaster recovery from your couch, mobilizing community to request transparency and accountability. ICTs in the hands of citizens are already proving to be an efficient weapon. So is the world finally becoming a better place to live? Or we are just witnessing the sneaky onset of lazy clicktivism?"

Valuch, offline and online activist will give insight into the potential and challenges of using modern communication tools for positive social change, identifying "communication literacy for the 21st century as the least painful way forward."

**Social Media Communities**

*Adam Zbiejczuk, Charles University, Prague*

12:20 **11.c** **General discussion**

12:35 **11.d** **Way forward**

**D** Ideas for future activities in this area.

12:40

*Lunch*

**SPECIAL COUNTRY UPDATES (3)**

**12 GERMANY**

14:00 **12.a** **Relevant aspects of the draft law for the site selection process**

*Gabriela von Goerne (BMU)*

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

14:15 **12.b** **Discussion**

**13 UK**

14:30 **13.a** **Status of the MRWS process**

*Jay Redgrove (NDA)*

14:45 **13.b** **Stakeholder demands for confidence in regulator capacity and independence**

*David Brazier (UK Environment Agency)*

15:00 **13.c** **CoRWM's continuing role and outlook on the process**

*Prof. William Lee (CoRWM)*

15:25 **13.d** **Discussion**

15:40 *Break*

**14. USA**

16:10 **14.a Follow up on the report by the US Blue Ribbon Committee, with direct relation to stakeholder confidence**  
*Jose Cuadrado (US NRC)*

16:25 **14.b Discussion**

### IMPLEMENTING THE FSC PROGRAMME OF WORK (3)

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

16:40 **15.a FSC Chair by interim**

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

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

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

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

**A draft introduction** that scopes this tentative project has been provided by the Secretariat together with this agenda.

17:00 **15.b Way forward**

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

17:10 *Adjourn*

#### Dinner “on one’s own”

*Delegates may use public transport or taxis to reach the old town centre of Prague if they desire*

### WEDNESDAY 24 OCTOBER - DAY 3

### IMPLEMENTING THE FSC PROGRAMME OF WORK (3)

9:00 **16. AFTER FUKUSHIMA: INSTITUTIONAL DISCOURSE ON RWM; STAKEHOLDER CONCERNS (Topical discussion under POW Themes 2 & 3)**  
*Holmfridur Bjarnadottir*

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

9:05 **16.a Brief on some international RWM statements in response to Fukushima**

*Mariano Molina*

Strong positions on spent fuel management and stakeholder confidence were heard at the Joint Convention review in Spring 2012.

9:15 **16.b Results of a Questionnaire proposed to the RWMC**

*Claire Mays (NEA Secretariat)*

In Summer 2012 the RWMC collected replies to the following questions proposed by the FSC:

- Have concerns or requests been expressed by your RWM civil society stakeholders, in response to Fukushima? What types?
- Have measures been adopted in your RWM context in response to the Fukushima accident? At *National-Regional-Local level*?
- Has your RWM organization prepared a post-Fukushima position, statement or public information document?
  - If yes (or under preparation), what has been the process to prepare this document?
  - What questions were asked inside your organization when developing this document?

9:30 **16.c Nuclear accidents and institutional discourse on RWM: A retrospective study**

*Holmfridur Bjarnadottir (Swedish National Council for Nuclear Waste)*

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

9:45 **16.d ICRP Stakeholder dialogues in Fukushima Prefecture**

*Claire Mays on behalf of the NEA CRPPH*

The CRPPH supported and attended several successful stakeholder dialogues organized by the International Council on Radiation Protection in the Fukushima Prefecture. These identified many aspects influencing stakeholder confidence as the recovery efforts

continue. This brief report reviews major areas of concern expressed by civil society and highlights any connection with RWM.

10:00 **16.e Supporting local commissions in gathering and elaborating safety concerns**

*Ludivine Gilli (IRSN)*

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

10:15 **16.f Discussion**

10:30

*Coffee Break*

---

## SPECIAL COUNTRY UPDATES (4)

---

**17. CANADA**

---

10:55 **17.a Status of Canada's development of geologic repositories for the long-term management of nuclear waste**

*Marcia Blanchette, Natural Resources Canada*

The overall objective of the Port Hope Area Initiative (PHAI) is the cleanup and long-term management of approximately 1.7 million cubic metres of historic low-level radioactive waste within the adjacent municipalities of Port Hope and Clarington. In January, 2012, the Minister of Natural Resources announced that the Government of Canada is investing \$1.28 billion over 10 years to clean up low-level radioactive waste in the Port Hope area. The investment will fund two major projects, the Port Hope Project and the Port Granby Project. Each project involves the construction of a new long-term waste management facility and supporting infrastructure, the cleanup and restoration of contaminated sites, to be followed by monitoring and maintaining the facilities for the long term. On October 24, 2012, the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) will hold a one-day public hearing to consider Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL)'s application to amend the current 5-year licence for the Port Hope Long-Term Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management Project. A 10-year license to implement the Port Granby Long-Term Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management Project was issued in 2011.

11:10 **17.b Discussion**

---

## STOCKTAKING

---

11:20 **18. Some ideas gathered during the topical discussions**

---

---

## CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

---

11:35    **19.    Core Group membership: Elections, review and confirmation**

*NEA Secretariat*

**D**

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

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

The Secretariat and Core Group are making the following nominations:

Chair - Homfridur Bjarnadottir

Vice Chair – Jo-Ann Facella

CG Member – Silvia Rueda Sanchez

***Central criteria for role of Chair:***

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

***Task components:***

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

The **Vice Chair** complements the Chair in terms of continental representation, stakeholder role, and seniority. The Vice Chair is the “first choice” for delegation, and is ready to step in with authority to lead or represent the group.

11:45    **20.    Feedback on this meeting and review of main items and decisions**

*FSC Chair, NEA Secretariat*

---

12:00

*Adjourn to Lunch*

---

***Following lunch, a bus will transport delegates and luggage to Karlovy Vary (approx. 2 hours’ ride). Please complete your check-out from the hotel in good time. The bus will leave Hotel Praha promptly at 14:15. It will make a stop at the airport to pick up delegates arriving from abroad and continue to the Czech Republic National Workshop and Community Visit, based in Karlovy Vary.***