



PLATENSO overview

**Building a platform for enhanced societal research
related to nuclear energy in Central and Eastern Europe**

Kjell Andersson, Karita Research

RICOMET Conference, Bucharest, June 1-3, 2016



PLATENSO partners

1	Karita Research AB	Karita	Sweden
2	SCK.CEN	SCK	Belgium
3	Center for the Study of Democracy	CSD	Bulgaria
4	Galson Sciences	GSL	UK
5	Institute of Sociology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic	SOU	Czech Republic
6	Nuclear Research Institute	NRI	Czech Republic
7	Energiaklub Szakpolitikai Intezet Modszertani Kozpont Egyesulet	EKL	Hungary



PLATENSO partners

8	Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe	REC	Hungary
9	Lithuanian Energy Institute	LEI	Lithuania
10	Collegium Civitas	CV	Poland
11	Nicolaus Copernicus University	NCU	Poland
12	Institute of Nuclear Chemistry	INCT	Poland
13	Univerza Ljubljana – Department for Psychology	UL	Slovenia



PLATENSO partners

14	Univerzita Mateja Bela v Banskej Bystrici	MBU	Slovakia
15	Institute for Research in Social Communication Slovak Academy of Sciences	UVSK SAV	Slovakia
16	Environmental Social Science Research Group	ESSRG	Hungary
17	Merience SCP	Merience	Spain
18	Faculty of Philosophy	UB	Romania
19	Institute for Nuclear Research	INR	Romania



the overall objective

To support nuclear power programmes in New Member States (NMS) by giving research on “social, societal and governance issues” a proper place on the agenda. This includes:

- a) Empowering relevant research institutions by building network for future interaction. For each participating country, one PLATENSO partner is National Contact (WP2)
- b) Giving guidance for future research (research strategies, WP5)
- c) Suggesting a framework, a platform, for sustainable research programmes in the area of social societal and governance issues (WP6)



Supporting work

To summarize lessons learnt about social societal and governance issues (WP1)

To deal with the science, politics and ethics of nuclear technology assessments (WP3)

To test suggested research strategies (WP5)

To provide a Virtual Information Centre (WP6)

Dissemination (WP7)

summary of lessons learned

This was done to provide input to the development of research strategies and to the formation of the social platform

Issues addressed

critical organizational matters about research independence and stakeholder involvement in research

governance and socioeconomic issues that should be important for the research strategies and the social platform

Data collection

The roles of research institutions in nuclear energy programmes

27 templates completed in 9 countries

Stakeholder involvement in nuclear programmes

8 templates completed in 4 countries

Governance Research

We had much information from COWAM projects, CiP, ARGONA, IPPA, InSOTEC, OBRA JRC/E-TRACK, NRC, IAEA documents.

There are several examples of implementation in NWM programmes, especially siting of repositories

There have also been many efforts to map participative processes, such as the IPPA Toolbox

Data collection

Socio-economic issues related to nuclear fission and radiation protection

8 socio-economic reviews were identified and some simple questions sent to relevant contacts in the countries identified as suitable sources, namely Finland, Sweden, Switzerland and the UK:

- *On whose initiative was the research programme carried out?*
- *What was the reason for the research? To help decision-making or to address public concerns?*
- *Were the project scopes developed through discussion, or were they decided by one party? If so, which?*
- *Who selected the researchers?*
- *Who managed the research?*
- *Who reviewed the results?*
- *Who paid for the research?*
- *Were the results useful to [the community]? What was done with them?*
- *Will further research be carried out to assess the validity of the results ?*

Data collection

Legal and political context

A series of questions were asked in a project meeting and afterwards and responses were received from Czech Republic; Hungary; Lithuania; Romania; Slovakia; Slovenia

some clear messages - problems

- Policy changes due to political moves and changes of personnel in relevant government departments
- Decision makers interpret public information as public involvement. Lack of transparency is regularly justified by the need for “national security
- The main justification for involvement is to respect the law. Very few policy-makers recognize that stakeholder participation represents the best way to build a sustainable decision or the need to share the responsibilities with others

Data collection

some clear messages – problems, cont.

- The time required to change from a non-participation mentality to an awareness of the usefulness of participation does present a problem.
- “The current practice is to minimise the involvement and transparency practices concerning nuclear issues.”

Conclusion

It seems to be a challenge for future research to find principles and concrete solutions as to how effectiveness and robustness of decision making processes can be secured whilst taking political realities into account. One possibility may be to create processes for stakeholder participation which aim not at finding solutions but at enhancing the quality of decisions through clarity and robustness

Some conclusions

Governance issues

There have been a large number of projects and implementation efforts in NWM programmes

It has been demonstrated that stakeholder involvement can make a difference (Sweden, Czech Republic)

However these experiences are mostly from the siting of NWM installations

Where is the rest of the nuclear sector?

Some conclusions

Governance issues

The Radioactive Waste Management Directive presents three phases of the decision making process - **policy making, national programme and its implementation in e.g. site selection**. The requirement for effective participation is valid for all of the phases.

Stakeholder participation has typically been implemented in the site selection phase but the issues dealt with have often covered earlier phases as well. This means that many methods of participation can be used more widely than have been to date.

Some conclusions

Governance issues

There are many challenges for stakeholder participation

- Lack of trust in Government bodies
- Lack of government interest
- Dialogue is seen as just another way of providing information
- Regulators often act as proponents of nuclear power
- Sometimes stakeholders don't want to participate

These challenges

- 1) **have to be addressed when developing research programmes in cooperation with stakeholders**
- 2) **are topics for research, thus part of research strategies and the social platform**

Some conclusions

Governance issues

Perhaps the **Arnstein legacy** is too idealistic and too rigid. **Instead** mapping participate processes as *consultation* (where the public and stakeholders are asked to give their views and concerns), *consensus shaping* (where the stakeholders jointly develop solutions) and *safe space* (where there is no intention to develop joint solutions with the implementer but which provides an active dialogue for clarification and awareness building) may have advantages:

- It clarifies better the links between the process and the actual political and/or legal decision-making process.
- It appears easier to use in assigning properties of a process, as it seems easier to understand if a process has been, or was intended to be, consensus shaping or a safe space
- It is a relatively easy question for a potential user to answer as to whether he/she wants a consensus shaping process or not.

Summary of lessons learned

Social and societal issues at the local and regional levels in example countries can feed into efforts in other countries and in areas other than NWM, although results can in most cases not be transferred. **Experiences have largely not been used and risk to be forgotten.**

In **the governance area** there are many experiences, but these tend to be in the **narrow field of siting controversial NWM facilities**. Research needs to become both **broadened** (to include all decision making phases and other types of nuclear installations) and more **tailored** to addressing specific conditions for different phases, experiences of the challenge of involving regulators and NGOs, and to link informal processes to legal systems.

Institutionalization of participatory processes should be considered

Special conditions for “NMS” need to be analyzed



Proposal for a Nuclear Energy Social Platform (NESP)

We want to bring nuclear issues into the general energy governance debate in a more deliberate and reflexive way without taking premature standpoints. The intention is that NESP, while being a platform for multi-disciplinary research, should be problem driven by needs appearing from current programmes and future challenges in the nuclear area.



Proposal for a Nuclear Energy Social Platform (NESP)

The aims are to:

- promote SSH studies related to decision making in nuclear matters of importance for governments, regional and local authorities, industry, NGOs and other relevant stakeholders
- give guidance for future research, especially EU research programmes
- provide an effective link between natural sciences, social sciences and the humanities
- boost education, training, knowledge sharing and information initiatives



Proposal for a Nuclear Energy Social Platform (NESP)

The detailed NESP work programme will be updated on a regular basis taking into account progress made in the on-going work areas and the needs of the participants. The initial topical work areas for NESP are open for discussion but tentatively it is suggested to implement four activities:

- *Eurobarometer surveys*
- *Decommissioning*
- *Nuclear waste management*
- *Development of Generation IV reactors with the ALLEGRO Project as a pilot case.*

Some possible issues for NESP

	Decomm.	NWM	Gen IV
Societal	Competence issues related to early or postponed dismantling International cooperation	Open vs closed nuclear fuel cycle National vs local interests Ethics	Benefits for society (local, regional, national and EU level) International cooperation Position of the country in the nuclear sector Ethics
Social and Socio-economic issues	Community vs. NP owners interests	Infrastructure, Image Tourism, added values	New jobs, local and regional development
Governance	Role of industry, state, local authorities	Organization of stakeholder involvement in different phases	Organization of stakeholder involvement in different phases (proactive!)
Radiation	Time aspect	Safety assessment, timing, risk perception	Safety assessment



Proposal for a Nuclear Energy Social Platform (NESP)

The NESP Working Group invites interested organizations to become engaged in the further development of the Platform, for example by taking part in the **Working Group** or by providing **Letters of Support**. Participation in the Working Group is not limited to PLATENSO partners. You are welcome to contact us for information, support, ideas for moving forward, etc. Our goal is to have a full draft Statutes Document before the end of 2016.



Proposal for a Nuclear Energy Social Platform (NESP)

Working Group:

Kjell Andersson, Karita Research, Sweden
kjell.andersson@karita.se

Marin Constantin, Institute for Nuclear Research, Romania
marin.constantin@nuclear.ro

Gaston Meskens, SCK.CEN, Belgium
gaston.meskens@sckcen.be

Todor Galev, Center for the Study of Democracy, Bulgaria
todor.galev@online.bg



PLATENSO summary

We were asked in the PLATENSO Contract DoW to:

Create a network of relevant research institutions with National Contacts	Done
To develop research strategies for social, societal and governance issues in NMS	Done
To propose a platform for nuclear related research in social societal and governance issues	Will be completed



PLATENSO summary

BUT without further progress;

The networks will become inactive and disintegrate

The research strategies will not be used

The platform will not become reality

Lessons learned will be forgotten



The national networks

From: A network of research institutions in CEE countries, Martin Ďurdovič and Jiří Vinopal, ISAS Czech Republic, PLATENSO Deliverable 2.2

“The external problem is the underdevelopment of the issue in some countries which usually includes the lack of research, low political interest and low public engagement. It was mentioned, that nuclear energy policy has been for decades a closed area for limited number of policy and STEM experts and that **the level of social and societal engagement with this topic have been very low.** “

“NCs (National Contacts) expressed frustration from lack of resources that would keep the network of SSH alive, involved and proactive. as was stated by one NC, it cannot be maintained on a level of a platonic or intellectual interest in the cooperation. “

Both national and EU funding will be needed.



NESP Platform

Should be authorized as an EU entity, needs Commission support

For this to happen, there must be a need expressed by nuclear agencies and/or government agencies.

Then, and only then, can PLATENSO results be of real use in the future



PLATENSO summary, cont.

PLATENSO has created national networks with National Contacts

PLATENSO has created research strategies for social, societal and governance issues in NMS

PLATENSO will deliver a proposal for a platform for nuclear related research in social societal and governance issues

However, there is no obvious way forward to implement these achievements, e.g. in Horizon 2020

The need for social, societal and governance research should be obvious

Actions need to be taken