

## SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS

In conjunction with its 6<sup>th</sup> annual meeting, the WPDD in close co-operation with the FSC held a Topical session on “Stakeholder Involvement in Decommissioning” on November 14, 2005. The session was attended by 36 participants totally representing 14 NEA member countries and 2 international organisations.

Two keynote addresses were given at the Topical Session. In the first the former FSC Chairman, Yves Le Bars, talked on what is needed for robust decisions and how to bring all stakeholders into the debate. In the second keynote address Claudio Pescatore (via Torsten Eng) made a summary on what have been said on stakeholder involvement in decommissioning during earlier meetings of the WPDD. The main part of the session was then devoted to views from different stakeholders regarding their role and their involvement. This part was chaired by Steve Chandler from the FSC and contained viewpoints from local communities (Kävlinge in Sweden and Port Hope in Canada), authorities (Scottish Executive and CSNC) and operators (EDF from France and EWN from Germany). Case studies from the decommissioning of Dounreay in the UK and from Trojan and Main Yankee in the USA were presented in the end part of the Topical session followed by a summary and lessons learnt report by the rapporteur, Yves Le Bars. A detailed programme of the Topical session can be seen in Appendix 1.

### Outcome

At the Topical session it was emphasised that we have to adopt a shift in the decision making process. We have to design and implement a policy definition process with opportunities for dialogue and a well defined and recognized structure of the actors. It was acknowledged that the FSC decision making process (DMP) model is well known and documented in different OECD/NEA brochures and that this model underlines the necessity of a well defined step by step process, with an adapted structure of actors (industry, implementers, regulators, government, parliament, local authorities), and an opened behaviour of people involved.

There are specificities of the decommissioning and dismantling (DD) case regarding stakeholder involvement issues both on the local and national level. The local and national levels can't be seen as separate. Local decisions need national involvement, and subsequently debate at the national level.

At the local level, implementing DD is deemed to be easier than siting a radioactive waste (RW) repository mainly since the local community is already familiar with radioactivity and the often associated fears. On account of this, all countries (except France) try to site repositories in already “nuclearised” communities. However, two negative aspects in DD do not exist in RW management:

- DD represent the end of an energy production activity (with employment, resources and taxes), as a repository could trigger local development, with new industrial activities and resources for the local municipalities.
- As repositories for waste disposal do not yet exist, the local community could fear a forever waste storage.

At the national level, DD face specific concerns:

- It's compulsory to define specific decommissioning regulation, e.g. regarding clearance levels and methodologies of dismantling.
- An inventory of DD waste has to be published, even if uncertainties remain.
- Prioritization and planning of the decommissioning of all nuclear facilities are an important and sensitive issue.

The decision process needs an “engine” (the energy moving the system), and a driver (the organization in charge of over-viewing and driving the process, including taking care of the associated debates). In DD the engine of the process almost always seems to be at the national level: for example when phasing out of nuclear energy is a strong political position (Germany), or when the government and the industry want to demonstrate their decommissioning capacity before building new NPPs (France). The Port Hope case though shows another “engine” for the DMP: the local willingness to have a clean municipality, after years of nuclear fuel industry operation.

The decision process is often clearly defined, in steps. For example, in Port Hope the local/national agreement defines milestones and independent assessment as well as provides “compensations”. In the US we can see explicit priority criteria, as in GB and Italy.

The decision process needs a driver. The studied DD cases provide different driving actors: sometime it's industry, or the government, or a municipality or an agency.

The question “which organization carries the debate?” often has no simple answer. It must be a body in which a major part of the stakeholders has confidence: a municipality, a university, an agency, a specific new body, etc.

In DD the structure and roles of the actors is the second key factor for stakeholder confidence. At the Topical session the following interesting roles were identified:

- The municipalities, as local actors responsible for land use (Sweden, Canada) and for the wealth of their community, are expecting support and development projects associated with DD.
- The regulator plays an important role when it can advise the affected municipalities.
- Industry is a key component in the process, either when integrating all functions for DD (as EDF in France), or when it leaves a specific body to be totally (Spain) or partially (Belgium) in charge of DD. UKAEA has a specific position: the government wants to have Stakeholder engagement plan with a list of key topics to put in consultation.
- The government and parliament involvement is important but was not addressed in detail in the case studies presented at the topical session.

Following ideas for further improvement of the decision making processes in decommissioning projects were discussed at the Topical session:

- There is a need for stronger national policies regarding decommissioning (inventory, financing, political support to reach decisions): each country should try to describe in a better way its decision process and its steps (making the different deadlines understandable). The process should be made well known. Today two different approaches can be seen: one in which stakeholder involvement is the driving factor, but having in mind that different solutions can be adopted (Port Hope, UKAEA, Sweden); one focused on a technical approach (France, Italy) where there is a belief that a best technical solution exist. In a specific decision process these two approaches are

always competing. There is a need for further study cases in the future and FSC and WPDD should continue their fruitful co-operation.

- The 3 pillars of how to reach local confidence should be further emphasised in all decommissioning projects:
  - understanding of the different actor's commitment for safety;
  - creating an open dialogue environment; and
  - exploring development opportunities.

Mobilizing staff with an understanding of what is needed for a successful DD, including work in the stakeholder involvement field, is very important.