



EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

Community Research

CIP

(Contract Number: **FP6/036455**)

Publishable Periodic Activity Report

Reporting period: January 2007 to December 2009

Date of issue of this report : **15/03/2010**

Author : S. Gadbois, Mutadis

Start date of project : 1st January 2007

Duration : 36 Months

**Project co-funded by the European Commission under the Sixth Framework Programme Euratom
Research and Training Programme on Nuclear Energy (2002-2006)**

Dissemination Level

PU	Public	PU
RE	restricted to a group specified by the partners of the [acronym] project	
CO	confidential, only for partners of the [acronym] project	

CIP Objectives

The CIP project took place in 2007-2009. It is part of COWAM, a ten-year participative European reflection on RWM governance. CIP is a research action gathering a wide spectrum of stakeholders from 5 European countries, interested in how society should manage the radioactive wastes that result from nuclear power production and medical, military or industrial applications. CIP set up a process allowing each national group to identify issues important for the good governance of RWM in their own context, and to conduct cooperative research into these issues.

CIP's objectives are to:

- Enable progress in the inclusive governance of radioactive waste management (RWM);
- Follow up and analyze national processes of RWM governance in the 5 European states;
- Support stakeholders, particularly local communities, directly in their engagement with the issues of RWM;
- Capture the learning from that experience for the EU-27, in the form of online reports and EU-level Guidelines.

Main results

The main results of CIP are :

- the conduct of 5 National processes (National Stakeholder Groups) within a European Framework over three years to address the governance of radioactive waste management in local and national contexts, in France, Romania, Slovenia, Spain and the UK
- the 5 individual reports of these National Stakeholder groups
- Research conclusions reported in 9 Research Briefs
- European-level Guidelines. The Guidelines represent the principal messages and ideas from CIP delivered to Europe-27, for the governance of RWM. They are meant to help prepare the way for more inclusive governance of radioactive waste management (RWM).

CIP is supported by the European Commission and by various national sponsors in 5 participating countries - France, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, UK - that are at different stages in setting up RWM management solutions.

All results are available at : <http://www.cowam.com/CIP.html>

Contractors

Partners involved in CIP are :

No.	Organisation name	Country
1	MUTADIS	France
2	SYMLOG	France
3	CEPN	France
4	INR	Romania
5	ARAO	Slovenia
6	Amphos 21	Spain
7	Westlakes	UK
8	Galson Sciences Ltd	UK
9	ICAM	France
10	IRSN	France
11	SCK.CEN	Belgium

CIP Themes and Topics

COWAM 2 (<http://www.cowam.com>) stakeholders found that RWM governance involves

- a *local* dimension: communities, their aspirations and their democratic processes
- an *institutional* dimension: organisations, formal instruments and procedures (often national)
- a *long-term* dimension: special constraints introduced by the very long time periods associated with RWM

Of different nature, these three dimensions are interrelated, and they are all essential to governance.

While different actors may be more specifically concerned with one dimension at a given time, inclusive governance of RWM will need to address all three. Across the five CIP countries, participants identified three major themes they wished to investigate:

- "Structuring local communities and developing local democracy for engagement in radioactive waste management governance". Research Briefs associated with this theme are:
 - *Contribution of Local Communities to Safety of Radioactive Waste Management*
 - *Participatory Assessment of Decision Making Process*
 - *The Local Partnership Approach to the Siting of a Repository*



- *Local Liaison Committee and National Association of Local Liaison Committees: French Experience*
- "Sustainable long-term governance of radioactive waste management". The research briefs associated with this theme are:
 - *Long-term environmental surveillance and health risk assessment*
 - *Practical governance of reversibility.*
- "Affected communities and sustainable territorial development programmes encompassing radioactive waste management". Research briefs associated with this theme are:
 - *Defining an Affected Community*
 - *Sustainable Territorial Development Associated with Radioactive Waste Installations*
 - *Community Support/Involvement Packages*

These were three avenues leading to issues that interested all the participating stakeholders – even if they had different viewpoints or positions.

Cooperative investigation was undertaken on the basis of the RWM governance questions identified by CIP participants in the 5 countries. This research effort in itself allowed the stakeholders (national, regional and local representatives of civil society or the State, as well as technical specialists) to test out an inclusive governance approach. They practiced a new style of relations to reframe RWM issues in such a way as to address the stakes, concerns, perspectives and goals of the different actor categories.

- In **France**, the cooperative research allowed an exchange of views and knowledge on implementing reversibility, identifying major issues on which actors then expressed their expectations.
- In **Romania**, strides were made in empowering local stakeholders to participate in decision-making, now and in the long term. The group considered the role they could play in vigilance regarding the nuclear and waste installations, and potential health and environmental impacts.
- In **Spain**, stakeholders examined the economic development that should accompany the siting of a storage facility. Materials were developed to support mayors in talking with their community about technical and social concerns.
- In **Slovenia**, evaluating and developing the role of local actors in RWM decision-making was at the heart of investigations.
- In the **United Kingdom**, addressing the complex question of “defining an affected community” was highly pertinent in the current stage of the national siting process, and provided an opportunity for stakeholders to dialogue across borders.



Impact

Civil society and institutional actors have both complained of a “democratic deficit” in radioactive waste management (RWM). The deficit results from certain characteristics of traditional governance which is founded primarily on:

- A model of purely representative democracy, and
- A need to rationalize decisions proposed by technocratic structures (combining experts and public servants).

Traditional governance frameworks assign an essentially passive role to civil society. This model rests on the idea that the public interest is best defended by the State and a cadre of representatives acting “for” the population. In this perspective, civil society is not called upon to contribute actively to the safe management of radioactive waste.

However, there are several strong motivations to seek change and to create processes of decision with (rather than “for”) members of society:

- The UNECE Aarhus Convention, in particular, recognizes that wider participation can foster *better, more sustainable decisions*. The Convention also establishes citizens’ right to participate.
- The quality and safety of RWM over the long term depends not only on technical arrangements, but also on civil society’s vigilance and follow-up. Citizens have a vital contribution to make at every phase: in developing expertise, in taking decisions, and in monitoring the performance of waste storage installations both while they are active and after they have been sealed.

In the past decade or more, there have been tremendous efforts in many European states to develop citizen participation in environmental decision-making and particularly in RWM. Despite the trend, however, there is still dissatisfaction.

Typical *institutionalised participation* does not resolve the democratic deficit because it does not address the root causes of the deficit. Institutionalised participation, unsurprisingly, is not designed to transform traditional governance frameworks. Instead, it is meant to reinforce these frameworks’ efficiency and – as has been repeatedly seen in the history of RWM - to help overcome crises when decisions are contested or when decision-makers lose credibility or legitimacy. Institutionalised participation typically aims at informing civil society and at gathering input at designated times. The main objectives are to make decisions more acceptable, and to reassure civil society that an adequate job is done by mandated decision-makers. There is little notion that citizen participation might continue past those goals, and actually forms a vital requirement for the quality of RWM over time.

There are real challenges in *participative democracy* – how to organize it? How to ensure balance and quality? How to respect legislative structures and the “silent majority”? How to combine technical expertise and societal aspirations into a working management solution? While these challenges are great, they are worth addressing in the case of RWM, because safety over the long term will be improved if civil society can play its active role.

Resolving the democratic deficit implies transforming traditional governance mechanisms: creating the conditions for **inclusive governance of RWM**. Inclusive governance is aided by legal texts like the Aarhus Convention ensuring the right to information, the right to participation, and the right to seek justice. Inclusive governance relies too on the emergence



of autonomous categories of civil society actors, with the means to build their competence and influence in the processes of collective action.

Transforming patterns of governance faces many obstacles. Current institutionalized arrangements draw heavily on civil society without a guarantee of actual change in governance. The various types of RWM stakeholders continue to have very unequal access to information, to resources, and to power. Walls still separate the societal domain and the technical domain. Moreover, a profound transformation in governance cannot be decreed by even the most powerful actor: it will be a cultural change implying new learning, reorganisation, and testing over time.

The change-seeking process engaged in CIP is one response to the challenge of transforming RWM governance. In five national contexts, CIP set up and tested tools and methods of cooperative research, whose specific goal was to help prepare the transition to more inclusive governance in RWM. CIP proposes recommendations on constructing inclusive governance in the radioactive waste management area.

The lessons learned from the CIP process offer potential for other European actors who wish to support a transformation towards more inclusive RWM governance in their own context.

In the field of radioactive waste management (RWM) there are many "best practice" publications. What distinguishes CIP EU-level Guidelines from other recommendations is the setting in which this guidance has been developed. In each of the 5 participating countries - France, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, UK - CIP provided a *framework* for a diversity of stakeholders to cooperate, on an equal footing, in identifying and investigating what they saw as important issues in RWM governance. This cooperative research process itself was a way to prepare more inclusive governance.

CIP guidance focuses on societal and technical issues highlighted by the diversity of participants in their own specific *contexts* – with special consideration for the local level. The EU-level Guidelines like the other CIP reports present the specific knowledge contributions of National Stakeholder Groups and the Task Force of specialists who assisted them in this cooperative European research project.

