ANNE BERGMANS (UA)
MERI MARTELL
(MERIENCE)

REFLECTING ON THE IGD-TP: RESULTS OF INSOTEC ANALYSIS

IGD-TP EF3. Working Group 2. 29 Nov. 201

A Euratom FP7 research project

- Social and technical processes are inextricably bound together.
  - Anything technical is inherently social
  - Any given social issue likely to have a technical component.
- Radioactive waste management is a combined social and technical activity.
- Focus of InSOTEC is on making explicit this interplay (*exploring the relationship between socio-political and technical processes*) and what 'outcome' is produced through that interaction.

IGD-TP as a Technology Platfor

- ETPs are industry-led fora to define agendas of research priorities in a specific technological area.
- ETPs acknowledge limited involvement of societal actors in detailed aspects of R&D strategies.
- In some cases, ETPs become "clubs" or "closed shops".
- NGOs often under-represented, their participation is just cosmetic, seen as a factor of legitimacy.
- **IGD-TP**: implementation of geological disposal

Stakeholder engagement in ETF SOTEC

- No best model, depends on context, nature of the problem or question at hand.
- From the theory of knowledge co-production, 3 scenarios can be applied to the IGD-TP along a spectrum of involvement:

  - *Deficit or public education model;*
  - *Public debate model;*
  - *Co-production of knowledge model.*

  - They all have advantages and disadvantages.

Deficit model

- Expert driven
  - IGDT-TP mainly involves RWM agencies, academics and science providers.
- Scientific knowledge is considered opposite to lay knowledge.
- One-way communication and information provision
  - Web publication of SRA and DP; although some attempt was made towards a form of consultation.
- Stakeholders as recipients of information.
  - Knowledge currently dominated by IGD-TP.

Public debate model

- Limited consultation processes
  - IGD-TP: Exchange Forum and web; consultation on SRA
- "Selected" stakeholders more actively involved
  - Cf. IGD-TP members
- Consultation oriented to convince others of own assumptions and values. Interaction with those sharing the same values and assumptions.
  - IGD-TP often presents ready-made solutions to pre-defined problems.
  - Few opportunities for harmonising and combining

Model of co-production of knowledge **inSOTEC**

- ☐ Continual and organised stakeholder involvement contributes to building trust.

- ☐ Proactively seeking stakeholder involvement (e.g. resources available).

- ☐ Joint activities to develop a common knowledge base through negotiation and mutual adjustment.

- ☐ Engagement tools that allow open up for a process of new issue formation.

- ☐ Stakeholder empowerment and possible wider support.

Reflections

- Current approach: *intermediate* between deficit and public debate model.
- Consultation processes do not result in constructive relationships, do not build ownership.
- Very concrete vision: clarity but limits involvement.
- Concept of Technology Platform might be misleading and hamper initiatives of stakeholder involvement:
  - Should focus more on mission and problem solving aspects rather than technological issues (European Research Advisory Board, 2004).

ANNE BERGMANS (UA)
MERI MARTELL
(MERIENCE)

THANK YOU

Questions

- **How to start a dialogue?**
  - With who (local, European, social scientists, ..)
  - What are reasons to get involved or not to participate (vision, urgency, technology/science, language, funding, legal)
- **Framework**
  - Which ways: Exchange Forum, workshops, ICT tools, ..
  - Identification of expectations and concerns
  - Setting rules of participation and commitment