



How to create a “safe space” for involvement in the site selection process

Kjell Andersson, Karita Research

Deliberation - Way to the Deep Geological Repository

Top Hotel, Prague, November 26, 2009

What is a safe space?

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.

Swedish site selection programme (1:2)

In 1992 SKB announced a new phased site selection process based on municipality voluntariness at all steps, 8 municipalities proposed for feasibility studies

Two municipalities in north Sweden said "no thank you" in referenda

Feasibility studies went on in six other municipalities, all with nuclear installations or municipalities close to these

Swedish site selection programme (2:2)

- In 2000 SKB proposed site investigations, including deep drilling in three municipalities
 - Tierp municipal council voted no
 - Östhammar and Oskarshamn voted yes with large majority
- In June 2009, SKB announced Östhammar to be the chosen site
- In 2010 SKB is expected to submit a licence application
Then follows a review process expected to be 3 years

The Oskarshamn model

Openness and participation

Everything on the table

The environmental groups - a resource

their members and experts give valuable contributions

The competent authorities "our experts"

the authorities visible throughout the process

Stretching of SKB and regulators to clear answers

"we build competence so we can ask the difficult questions", "we ask until we get clear answers"

Added value

Cooperation between Oskarshamn and Östhammar

It became more and more visible that both municipalities wanted the final repository - their role as "neutral transparency arenas" became difficult to maintain

Jointly they required "added value" for the one not to get the facility. **Added value agreement** initiative in 2007.

2009: Agreement with SKB: to the value of 2,0 billion SEK
75 % to Oskarshamn, 25 % to Östhammar

SKB consultations

The applications for permits to build a final repository for spent nuclear fuel must include an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and a consultation report

Altogether about 50 EIA consultation meetings have been held since 2004

The consultation report will account for the consultation procedure and how the resultant viewpoints were handled

"Success factors" (1:2)

Changing SKB attitude

- from technocratic to more dialogue

Communities with nuclear installations

- Local public in favour of repository siting

Real local and regional influence

- on the decision-making process
- on SKBs socio-economic studies
- on added value to BOTH municipalities

"Success factors" (2:2)

The transparency arenas (RISCOM Model)

- Organized by different bodies (government agencies and municipalities) adapted to different phases of the programme
- The organizers have done this for their own needs
- The stretching sent signals to SKB, believed to be useful for them



The ARGONA Project

A European Commission 6th research framework project

Start: November 1, 2006 End: October 31, 2009

14 organizations from 8 countries

Coordination: Swedish Radiation Safety Authority

Management: Karita Research, Sweden

Participants in Czech Republic:

Nuclear Research Institute (NRI)

Surao



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 has ARGONA done?

6 sub projects, called work packages
25 reports, published on the ARGONA web site

- ✓ **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**



Stretching

Central actors in a decision making process get together in a public arena to let their arguments be challenged in a structured way – a process for clarity and mutual learning

In the RISCUM Model, stretching is a means to get transparency – this needs to be organized in a "transparency arena"

this is how its done

1. Working group – ”pre understanding” and organization
2. **Reference group with stakeholders (e.g. industry, communities, academia, authorities, NGO:s) – Formal agreement**
3. The reference group discusses the activities – sets the principles into action
4. Knowledge building activities
5. **Hearings with stretching**
6. Documentation

This is the transparency arena – the ”safe space”



Implementation in the Czech Republic

Nuclear Research Institute (NRI) is the leader

SURAO as ARGONA Partner
Czech stakeholders
Karita and Wenergy

Hana Vojtěchová, later today

ARGONA conclusions (1:2)

- ❖ It is possible to "make a difference" – **time to implement!**
- ❖ There is a need to bridge the gap between research and policy. Research **gives guidance and provides pathways**
- ❖ **There should be a balance** between the force of legal instruments and an informal process offering creativity and flexibility
- ❖ Important to ensure **a safe space** for open and meaningful dialogue

ARGONA conclusions (2:2)

- ❖ A certain **degree of institutionalisation** seems necessary
- ❖ **National politicians** need to be more involved
- ❖ Involving the public and stakeholders **must be sincere** - if not they will feel manipulated and they withdraw
- ❖ **ARGONA has produced guidelines** for the application of approaches to participation and transparency.



How to discuss serious matters

A safe space

decision making processes

Early phase: issues need to be opened up to avoid a too narrow framing - different perspectives are needed

There is a "**closing down**" phase when decisions are to be taken – the implications of different alternatives should be transparent

You can arrange for a safe space in both these phases
Level of institutionalisation should be considered

forms of participation and dialogue

1. **Formal EIA consultations**
2. **Partnership model (Belgium)**
3. **Transparency arenas (ARGONA / RISCUM model in Czech Republic)**

The *partnership model* and the *transparency arenas* shall not be seen as alternative ways of action but as approaches that can be combined

Models of dialogue	Benefits	Risks and possible problems	Safe space?
Formal EIA consultations	Given rules Less demanding	Often late in process May not be enough	Yes, but space is small
Partnership	If partners reach consensus there can be a win - win situation	Some may decide not to take part Accountability ? Regulator?	No The aim is a joint solution
Transparency Arena	Understanding, clarity, structure trust increase between partners	Can be misused Needs careful organization	Yes If properly organized

Continuation of the RISCUM Reference Group in Czech Republic?

Czech partners: "The RISCUM Model proved to be a very suitable tool for starting a dialogue among all stakeholders in the area of NWM in the Czech Republic"

Big potential for a structured long-term process with major stakeholders, potential for improvement from the ARGONA exercise

Continuation of the RISCOT Reference Group in Czech Republic?

Key issues

A transparent selection process for participants

A degree of formalisation is needed – what is the best level of institutionalisation?

Needs to be trusted by all – not an instrument for “acceptance” but for mutual learning and dialogue