Evaluation and charter for fruitful interactions

11.04.2024 • Alexis Geisler-Roblin

Context : Until now, in EURAD 1, a charter of commitment.

In order to ensure fruitful discussions in mutual respect, it was suggested to elaborate terms of
reference that will be agreed by all the participants in the MODATS Task 2.5 workshops. These terms of reference establish a set of prerequisites to attend the workshops, notably based on elements of the procedure for establishing the group of CS representatives involved in EURAD that have been validated by the EURAD PMO and Bureau.

1- The participants in the MODATS workshops will have to **support the EURAD vision** hereunder and commit to contribute constructively to the exchanges that will take place in EURAD, respecting the goals of EURAD described hereunder: ….

2- The participants in the MODATS workshops recognize that the objective of the workshops is to **foster a common understanding** of the different viewpoints among the different categories of actors on the management of uncertainties associated with the different dimensions of monitoring of geological disposals of radioactive waste and how it relates to safety.

3- It i**s not intended to reach a consensus.** Rather, the discussions during the seminar will seek to allow for a nuanced understanding of the issues at stake and a better understanding of the arguments of the various participants, without prejudice to their position with regard to a particular option.

4- The seminar will promote the clarification of the implicit elements leading each actor to establish his choices and preferences, while creating a **climate of mutual listening** and respect for the views of each participant. The discussion will be based on a freedom of expression of views. The plurality of categories of participants, or at least a plurality of views, experiences and professional profiles, is therefore desirable to foster an in-depth discussion that takes into account a wide range of issues.

5- The animation of the workshops will require **pluralistic and transparent governance,** i.e the organisation of the seminar and the facilitation of the discussions will be done by a pluralistic team gathering representatives of different categories of actors (WMO, TSO, RE and CS).

6- The participants agree to the **non-diffusion** of the elements presented and discussed during the workshops without the explicit agreement of the task 2.5 coordination team.

EURAD vision:

"A step change in European collaboration towards safe radioactive waste management (RWM), including disposal, through the development of a robust and sustained science, technology and knowledge management programme that supports timely implementation of RWM activities and serves to foster mutual understanding and trust between Joint Programme participants"

EURAD goals:

● "Support Member-States in developing and implementing their national RD&D programmes for the safe long-term management of their full range of different types of radioactive waste through participation in the RWM Joint Programme;

● Develop and consolidate existing knowledge for the safe start of operation of the first geological disposal facilities for spent fuel, high-level waste, and other long-lived radioactive waste, and supporting optimization linked with the stepwise implementation of geological disposal;

● Enhance knowledge management and transfer between organisations, Member States and generations."

Objectives of the charter for Fruitful Interactions (for discussion)

Having a document able to answer these questions :

What **framework** of interaction shall be put into place in order to apply the Aarhus convention in scientific research programmes such as EURAD ?

What are the **conditions** of engagement in a pluralistic dialogue, in order to aim a fruitful interactions ?

Content of the charter for Fruitful Interactions

Interactions with Civil Society in EURAD or similar programmes shall

1/ CS participants are involved in EURAD in the perspective of the UNECE Aarhus Convention which reinforces the requirements of Public access to information and participation in decision-making. Civil Society (CS) participants have specific concern on RWM safety, they shall **not be considered as research partners.**

2/ Such interactions in a program research rely on articulated expertise : **Triple wing model.**

3/ Such interactions with civil society contribute to **Shared culture for Safety and Security,** as a shared, dynamic, reflexive and active realization of the best safety methods and standards. This culture is an assembly of characteristics and attitudes in organizations and individuals which establishes that, as an overriding priority, nuclear safety issues receive the attention warranted by their significance.

4/ Such interaction contribute to the **Intergenerational Stewardship Culture**, as a conscious attitude from organizations and individuals regarding the continuous temporal responsibility brought up by RWM, and thus an attitude of vigilance in uncertainties enabling an appropriate governance.

5/ Such interactions contribute to a **dynamism of Fruitful Interactions**, that can be evaluated by non-exhaustive criteria such as : legitimacy, methodology, postural changes, personal unity, expertise function, meaning of the repository, territory, shared complexity addressing the long term.

Reformulation of the criteria for Fruitful interactions evaluation

Legitimacy, methodology, postural changes, personal unity, expertise function, meaning of the repository, territory, shared complexity addressing the long term.

Criterion 1: An interaction is fruitful if there is no permanent or recurrent questioning as to the **legitimacy** of the actors taking part in the cooperative process or research, on the ground that they are not trained or competent enough, or that they belong to an institution or an organization that is supporting other different positions.

Criterion 2: An interaction is fruitful if the **inquiries or researches** are conducted by a variety of actors, are not restricted in an exclusive manner to a single type of research (eg : scientific inquiry) and can open up to some other types of research (eg : moral and social inquiry) that are concerned not only with facts or models, but with values and norms.

Criterion 3: An interaction is fruitful if, along the cooperative process or research, it can be shown that the actors are not keeping to their initial position without any reservation and are then capable of **modifying their own perspective** by taking into consideration the contributions of the other actors.

Criterion 4: An interaction is fruitful if the actors does not view themselves or are **not viewed by the other actors as individuals** that are exclusively defined by their official or professional function or activity (eg : he or she is an expert of radio-nucleides working for the wastes agency ; he or she is an activist from an environmental association) and can then articulate several aspects of his/her personality or his/her social role (eg : a worker, a professional, a citizen, a parent...).

eurad

Reformulation of the criteria for Fruitful interactions evaluation

Legitimacy, methodology, postural changes, personal unity, expertise function, meaning of the repository, territory, shared complexity addressing the long term.

Criterion 5: An interaction is fruitful if the **expertise is pluralistic** in the sense that it is not only scientific, but also moral, legal, environmental or social, and subsequently, in the sense that it is not only special, but also general as regards the capacity of linking up the various aspects and dimensions of a complex problem.

Criterion 6: An interaction is fruitful if the examination of a problem and the exchanges between the actors that it entails can, beyond the sole technical aspects of the building, the monitoring or the maintaining a wastes repository, address the crucial issue of its (existential, cultural...) **meaning** for/in the life of the people.

Criterion 7: An interaction is fruitful if it is admitted by the actors that, far from being a neutral installation, a repository has a deep impact on the meaning that the people give **to a territory** and then to the life they can experience on it (eg : modification of landscape, traffic and transportation of materials, security and safety measures...).

Criterion 8: An interaction is fruitful if the actors are able to address the various aspects and **dimensions of a complex problem** (eg: scientific, legal, moral, environmental, social...) and are also able to share this understanding of the complexity so that it finally constitutes a common ground or background.

Criterion 9: An interaction is fruitful if, despite the urging achievements or decisions that need to be made in the RWM in the present, it never neglects the core stakes of the **long-term management, justice and responsibility towards future generations.**