REFLECTING ON THE IGD-TP: RESULTS OF INSOTEC ANALYSIS
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.
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 regarded mostly as a technical challenge.
Stakeholder engagement in ETF

- 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.
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).
THANK YOU
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