

NERIS WG2 MEETING: EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

STAKEHOLDER KNOWLEDGE DATABASES

Tue 27th November, Oslo

Report from the Knowledge Database Session

Three short presentations on the topic were given prior the discussion.

1. Decision making processes and practices

Nadia Papamichail (The University of Manchester Boot Street East, UK) has presented that decision making process includes many issues:

- management (How to organize? Whom to invite?)
- people and skills (Do they have necessary skills? How do we teach them?)
- technology (Which tools do we use?)
- efficiency (How sustainable is the process? Would e.g. change of the government influence it's success?)
- information (Everything has to be put into context)
- outcome (How do we evaluate the result?)

The process of the decision making can be captured in the different ways: timeline, conceptual model, role-activity diagram.

2. A Knowledge Base to help build Good Practice in Stakeholder and Public Engagement

Simon French (University of Warwick, UK) stressed the need to move from exploratory action research to providing empirical basis, so stakeholder involvement and public participation processes can be designed as effective as possible. Knowledge base of existing experience has to be made in order to help choosing appropriate measures and assembling them into a process suitable for the purpose.

3. Nuclear or radiological emergency and post-accident recovery management and/or preparedness processes. *Criteria for Description and Assessment*

Gilles Heriard-Dubreuil (MUTADIS, France) proposed a list of criteria in order to facilitate

- a consistent description facilitating cross comparison
- an evaluation of the national processes considered in the NERIS activities

Criteria for process description include context, characterization of the process (stage of action, type of situation, actors involved, issues and dimensions considered), who did initiative come from, description of the process, methods, tools, resources, and expertise, outcomes of the process. Process evaluation criteria will help to assess successfulness of the process, roles of stakeholders, relations between stakeholders and framing of the issues, appropriation of emergency and post-accident recovery issues, resilience.

4 Group Discussion on Stakeholder Database

All the participants of the meeting were divided into three groups and given time to discuss a set of questions on the stakeholder knowledge database (for the list of participants in each group see attachments)

Questions addressed by the various groups:

1. Why and how to preserve the knowledge base of stakeholder engagement?
2. What elements need to be shared? What is meaningful? What is useful?
3. What is the goal?
4. Who is the audience?

Why?

The knowledge of experience needs to be preserved. People change jobs – valuable tacit experience is lost. The need is supported by available documents. The database should also enable a critical analysis and comparison of the different processes and procedures.

A structured form/template will/should:

- Enable comparisons to be made
- Allow evaluation
- Give a clear list of criteria so that people can see how their cases might fit
- Act as a source of reference if new processes are initiated
- Build a common culture and language at the local level – the database can also for them serve as an exchange of experience?
- Offer the opportunity to share experience on challenges, successes, lessons learned.

At the same time the template needs to:

- Recognise plurality in context and procedure
- Recognise flexibility, complexity, evolution

The ultimate goal would be to build societal resilience in the communities towards nuclear or radiological accident management. It is a societal challenge, not a research challenge on its own.

What should it contain? General Description

Basic and Organizational Information about stakeholder meetings: how many, how often, how long, cost

- Context –what, when, where, why, what questions, what issues, what background information existed?
- What methods and tools were used?
- What results were foreseen?

Possibly some “click on” criteria choices

What was the outcome? Process Evaluation Criteria

This needs to be more flexible. Perhaps with some guidance or examples,

- Who did the evaluation?
- How was it used in a wider process? Received by stakeholders, regulators etc.?
- Was there opportunity for evaluation by the stakeholders themselves?
- Did all the relevant actors participate? If no, why not?
- Did the outcome meet the initial objectives of the process?
- Did the process contribute to building common awareness of the reality at stake and the consequences?
- Did the process contribute to putting the consequences / earlier experiences in a wider context for a positive development of the society (long term decisions beyond the contamination management)?
- “In what way did it contribute to international interaction/harmonization?” – this is relevant both for early measures (like iodine tablets) and long-term measures (like changing food intervention levels).

General comments

- At what time does one evaluate? The responses will probably depend on who you ask and when.
- The key element is to create the conditions for dialogue, according to the context needed to adapt to the situation

Who is the target?

Different levels of access can be provided for different user groups.

Specific comments on context:

- Difference between accident/disaster (Fukushima vs. Europe)
- In Europe more an issue of planning (accident management and preparedness) and communication (also Europe's reaction after Fukushima)
- The context needs to be made relevant to the process (e.g. scenario based activities)

Inclusion of other stakeholder engagements processes?

- Experience from not only nuclear field, also other environmental issues
- Other nuclear processes (e.g., waste repository, NPP, decommissioning)
- Chemical risk management more widely available
- Integrated approach – those engagement processes using these (e.g., emergency preparedness). But it was pointed out that Fukushima is an integrated approach (in a way): Earthquake, tsunami, nuclear accident (and now nuclear power and economic consequences)

Proposed references/sources

US: Database of decision-making process Polnat

Russell Bradford studies.

General Conclusion

- Common agreement on the need to get started on the process of database creation
- Merge the "G. H-D/French" document and the "S. French/UK" documents to a shorter, simpler, more straightforward intro document and template
- This should comprise a short introduction and outline, a basic template, and some examples; further details and guidance can be given in background information

Once the template and two examples are completed, all NERIS partners can test by entering at least one example from their country.