



Lessons learnt from exchanges with stakeholders

The French Geological Repository Project

Dr G erald OUZOUNIAN
ANDRA, Director
Gerald.ouzounian@andra.fr

PRAGUE 25 & 26 November 2009



Summary

Acting on three fronts

- » National
- » Local
- » International

Consultation conditions

- » Clarity of the elements relating to the issue
- » Clarity of project risks and opportunities
- » Clarity of the decision-making process

Conclusion



Acting on three fronts

National

Local

International

PRAGUE 25& 26 November 2009

Radioactive waste originates from:

- » The production of electricity
 - » Medical activities
 - » Research activities
 - » Industrial activities (measurements, sterilisation, radiography, etc.)
- ↳ **Consequently, they concern all citizens.**

The issue must therefore be addressed:

- » By Parliament:
 - **Decision-making process for radioactive waste**
 - ↳ *Research Law of 30 Dec. 1991*
 - ↳ *Planning Act of 28 June 2006*
 - **Transparency and information**
 - ↳ *Law on Transparency and Security in the Nuclear Field of 13 June 2006*
- » At the public level
 - ↳ Public debate → *e.g., for waste, the EPR*

Prospect of a radioactive-waste repository in a territory

» **Local populations are directly concerned.**

For local-consultation purposes, exchanges between the project manager and the population may rely on:

- » Mayors;
- » The other elected officials and authorities of the communities;
- » The Local Information and Oversight Committee
 - Produces and disseminates its own information
 - Working groups
 - + *Local development*
 - + *Reversibility*
 - + *Local information*
 - + *Location of the disposal site*

Complex socio-political decision-making processes

Scientific skills and multiple techniques, outside competitive framework

- ↳ **Interest in sharing knowledge, practices and experiences.**
- » Consolidation of national management choices;
- » Transparent information on radioactive-waste disposal projects and programmes in the respective countries
 - European Nuclear Energy Forum;
 - High-level Group;
 - NEA (RWMC) or IAEA groups

Clarity of the elements to the issue

Clarity of project risks and opportunities

Clarity of the decision-making process

Radioactive waste exists, their characteristics and quantities are known and clearly located:

» National Inventory

Solutions exist or are being investigated:

» National Management Plan for Radioactive Materials and Waste

Project milestones (steps and deadlines) are specified:

» Development Plan for each waste category

Scientific and technical challenges are identified:

» Scientific Programme followed by the National Review Board

Funding is guaranteed:

- ↳ Research funds
- ↳ Securisation of long-term charges
- ↳ Public subsidy



Clarity of project *risks* and opportunities

Risk and nuisance control: identification, analysis, measures, control and follow-up (releases, transport, etc.)

- ↳ Safety report, relevant communication and information
- ↳ Reversibility and monitoring of facilities and of the environment, role of storage facilities, memory conservation
- » Supports for the dialogue on risk control
 - ↳ Role of CLIS
- » Technical supports
 - ↳ Rating scale (risks, effects, releases, etc.)
 - ↳ International comparisons
 - ↳ Exemplarity of existing sites (40 years of experience)



Clarity of project risks and *opportunities*

Opportunities

↪ Regional development (>100 year operation)

- Economic incentives pertaining to nuclear-power systems

- ↪ *High-level Committee at the national scale, direct commitment of the nuclear industry at the local scale*

- ↪ *Public Interest Group at the local scale for local amenities and support to local industry 20M€/y/district, increased to 30*

- Funded by a tax

- Local taxes

- Integration by the implementer of the disposal project in the region

- ↪ *Economy: participation in the local economic life (jobs, suppliers, contracts)*

- ↪ *Environment : site selection, fittings, monitoring and control, transportation, protection of the human environment*

At the national level

↳ *Law on Research of 30 December 1991*

↳ *Programme Act of 28 June 2006*

- Study of alternate solutions
- Stepwise process
- Assessment, consultation, decision-making mechanisms

▪ At the local level

↳ *Implementation by Andra of field programmes*

- Announcement of programmes
- Information on the evolution of the programmes
- Presentation of results
(*e.g.*, site-selection process in the transposition zone)



Conclusion

A radioactive waste repository project concerns all citizens

- It must be implemented with the involvement at all levels, and first of all including the local one

The 40 years of French experience is valuable

- » It cannot be transferred because of each of the cultural values
- » Since decision making process is complex, it can give guidelines from the governance of radioactive waste management point of view

ANDRA is open to share its experience for example with visits to our facilities and exchanges with the communities