

**RAPPORTEUR'S REPORT  
TOPICAL SESSION ON STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT IN DECOMMISSIONING  
PROJECTS, NOVEMBER 14, 2005**

**Yves LE BARS**  
CEMAGREF, France

Having heard all participants along this day, I would give three types of conclusions: the specificities of the decommissioning and dismantling (DD) compared with radioactive waste management; a first assessment of the decision making processes presented during this session, regarding the FSC criteria; and some others conclusions...

But before, I want to recall the shift we have to adopt in decision making process. It's not a problem of "more information is needed" for "public acceptance" It's not only an issue of stakeholder's involvement, and not only a question of confidence in decisions. But we have to design and implement a policy definition process with opportunities for dialogue, well defined and recognized structure of actors...

### **1. The specificities of the DD case**

First, at the local level, implementing DD is easier than having to site a radioactive waste (RW) repository, for one major reason: the local community is already very familiar with radioactivity and the often associated fears. On account of this, all countries (except France) try to site repositories in already "nuclearised" communities.

But two negative aspects in DD don't exist in RW management:

- DD represent the end of an energy production activity (with employment, resources and taxes...), as a repository could trigger local development, with new industrial activities and resources for the local municipalities
- and as nowhere final solution of waste disposal exists, the local community could fear a for ever waste storage...

Second, at the national level, DD face specific concerns:

- It's compulsory to define specific regulation, as clearance level or methodologies of dismantling (as in France, where the definition of non radioactive waste is the result of a mapping in the NPP).
- An inventory of DD waste has to be published, even if uncertainties remain on the real application of clearance level or mapping of NPP: funding and programming RW disposal routes and repositories need this inventory.
- Prioritization and planning are very sensitive issues: DD could last 20 to 100 years...
- And the national level is asked to define a local negotiation methodology, far and transparent.

Local and national levels can't be seen as separate. Many RWM programmes have failed not going forward in a well balanced local-national process: local decisions need national involvement, and subsequently debate at the national level.

## **2. HOW process/actors/behavior/ dialogue model is adopted by, and adapted to DD?**

The FSC DMP model is well known and documented in different OECD/NEA brochures: it underlines the necessity of a well defined step by step process, with an adapted structure of actors (industry, implementers, regulators, government, parliament, local authorities...), and an opened behavior of people involved.

2.1 The process needs an “engine” (the energy moving the system), and a driver (the organization in charge of over-viewing and driving the process, including taking care of the associated debates). In the DD cases the engine of the process seems to be quite always at the national level: for example when phasing out of nuclear energy is a strong political position (see Germany), or when the government and the industry want to demonstrate before their cleaning capacity before building new NPPs (see France)...

The Port Hope case shows another “engine” for the DMP: the local willingness to have a clean municipality, after years of nuclear fuel industry.

The process is often clearly defined, with steps.

For example, in Port Hope the local/national agreement defines milestones, and independent assessment, and provides "compensations".

In USA we can see explicit priority criteria, as in GB, or Italy. In Sweden there are future development projects with consultation...

The process needs a driver. The studied DD cases provide different responses: sometime it's industry, or the government, or a municipality or an agency...).

And to the question “which organization carries the debate?”, there is no simple answer. It must be a body in which a major part of the opinion has confidence in: municipality, university, an agency, a specific new body???

The limits of the studied DD cases regarding the DM process could be seen, as in RWM, in:

- the difficulty to coordinate national and local steps
- and also the number of local consultations, on different topic, at different stages, which could discourage stakeholders (see Spain, NRC, UK...)

The expectation of early involvement of local communities in the DD process could be helped by following the EIA directive.

2.2 The actors structure and roles for DD is the second key factor for stakeholder confidence. We have seen the following interesting roles:

- The municipalities, as local actors responsible for land use (Sweden, Canada) and for the wealth of their community, are expecting support and development projects associated with DD...
- The regulator plays an important role when it can advise the affected municipalities?
- Industry is a key component in the process, either when integrating all functions for DD (as EDF in France), or when it leaves a specific body to be totally (Spain) or partially (Belgium) in charge of DD. UKAEA has a specific position: the government wants to have Stakeholder engagement plan with a list of key topics to put in consultation.
- The government and parliament involvement has not too much been detailed in the cases.

In USA, a rather specific organization exists, with two expert bodies: NRC and EPA. But who is the driver of the process, and which organization carries the debate?

### 3. And in conclusion

We have to recognize that an important attention is already paid to SH involvement in DD, mainly centered on hosting communities, involving municipalities, with citizen advisory panels and other types of specific groups. We can conclude giving some ideas for improvement.

- 3.1 There is a need for stronger national policies (inventory, financing, political support to go to decisions...): each country could try to write out the process in which it is, its steps (making the different deadlines understandable), and make it well known...

We can see two different approaches: one in which SH involvement is the driving factor, but having in mind that different solutions can be adopted (Port Hope, UKAEA, Sweden...); one focused on a technical approach (in France, or in Italy...) where there is a belief that a best technical solution exist. These two approaches are competing in the process...

But it is always difficult to see how the game is played, on field! There is a need for further study cases...

- 3.2 The 3 pillars of the local confidence have been recalled in the day: first understanding the actor's commitment for safety, stating an open dialogue, and seeing development opportunities! We know that the level of fear regarding a specific risk strongly relates to the level of confidence given to the managing organization.
- 3.3 Mobilizing staff for a successful DD, like in RW management organizations, is sometimes difficult. But, at the end, everybody could be proud to have done something difficult for health and environment!