

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT IN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT IN THE UK

Lynda Warren and Bob Morley



OUTLINE

- New style governance and public and stakeholder engagement
- Failure of the old approach to decision making
- A new beginning – the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely programme
- The role of the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management
- The wider nuclear agenda
- Conclusions – will it work?

THE RISE OF PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

“drawing together a clear plan for stakeholder engagement is crucial to the success of the project”


Prime Minister's Strategy Unit



WHY THE CHANGE FROM GOVERNMENT TO GOVERNANCE?

- Concerns that large transnational corporations were out of control of shareholders and national laws
- Concerns over standards in the public sector
- Interest in subsidiarity and multi-level governance within Europe

PUBLIC GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLES

- Democratic decision-making
 - Public and stakeholder engagement
 - Openness and transparency
 - Accountability
 - Partnership working
 - Respect
- 

PUBLIC GOVERNANCE LEGISLATION

Aarhus Convention

- Access to information
- Public participation in decision-making
- Access to justice in environmental matters

European Directive 2003/35/EC

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN YOU DON'T ENGAGE

- Nuclear Industry Radioactive Waste Management Executive (Nirex) set up in 1982
- Sellafield selected as preferred option for Rock Characterisation Facility in 1991
- Planning permission for RCF denied in March 1997

Failure of the Nirex Programme

- “there has been an over-reliance on the nuclear industry to change public views, to formulate ... policy and gain public acceptance of it.
- Past approaches ... characterised as ‘decide, announce, defend’ have not worked”

House of Lords

The MRWS Programme

- House of Lords Science & Technology inquiry – *The Management of Nuclear Waste* – 1997-99
- Consultation Document *Managing Radioactive Waste Safely* published in September 2001

The MRWS Programme

A Staged Process

- the consultation
- generic options assessment
- government decision
- consultation on implementation
- implementation

Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM)

Terms of Reference








- to oversee a review of options for managing solid radioactive waste in the UK
- to recommend option or options that can provide a long-term solution, providing protection for people and the environment

CoRWM's Governance Role

Terms of Reference:

- ensure review was carried out in an open, transparent and inclusive manner
- process of review had to engage public and give opportunity to express views
- Other stakeholder groups had to have opportunity to participate
- Objective was to arrive at recommendations which could **inspire public confidence**

CoRWM's Guiding Principles

-  Be open and transparent
-  Uphold public interest by taking full account of public and stakeholder views in decision-making
-  Achieve fairness with respect to procedures, communities and future generations
-  Aim for a safe and sustainable environment both now and in the future
-  Ensure efficient, cost-effective and conclusive process
-  Uphold principles and practice of representative democracy at appropriate levels of government throughout the implementation process
-  Enhance well-being in short and longer term

CoRWM's PSE Programme

- PSE 1 Nov 2004 – Jan 2005
 - inventory, long list of options, screening criteria
- PSE 2 April 2005 – June 2005
 - proposed short list, assessment criteria, participatory processes for options assessment, implementation
- PSE 3 Oct 2005 – Feb 2006
 - options assessment
- PSE 4 May 2006
 - draft recommendations, ways to increase public confidence


CoRWM's PSE Methods

- Discussion Groups
- Nuclear Site Stakeholder Round Tables
- Open Meetings
- Citizens' Panels
- Discussion Guide
- Schools Project
- National Stakeholder Forum
- Bilateral Meetings
- Consultation Documents
- Web-based engagement

CoRWM's Stakeholder Categories

- Those with a technical knowledge of radioactive waste
- Those with no detailed knowledge but a remit to uphold the well-being of society
 - those with no public appointment but with an interest such as
 - those living in vicinity of nuclear facility
- NGOs
- Members of the public

PSE INFLUENCES ON CoRWM

- Inventory
 - Participatory processes
 - Ethical issues
 - Long and short list of options
 - Screening and assessment criteria and weightings
 - Specialists' judgments
 - Preferences for options
 - Implementation
 - Draft recommendations
- 

CoRWM's Recommendations

Integrated package of recommendations including:

- Geological disposal coupled with robust programme of interim storage
- Flexible and staged decision making process of implementation
- Continuing PSE
- Community involvement based on principle of an expressed willingness to participate (voluntarism)
- Community Packages to support willingness to participate

The MRWS Consultation Exercise

➤ Consultation Document

- Sub-surface screening criteria
- Staged process
- Voluntarism
- Partnerships and Packages

The MRWS Consultees

Notification sent to

- 646 Members of Parliament
- 60 Welsh Assembly Members
- 410 Local Authorities in England & Wales
- 108 Northern Ireland Assembly Members
- 26 Northern Ireland Local Councils
- 172 other stakeholders
- 4000+ CoRWM contacts

MRWS Consultation Responses

181 responses received

- Central Government (2)
- Local Government (33)
- Regulatory Bodies (3)
- Nuclear Industry (15)
- Research, educational and academic institutions (8)
- Industry (general) (1)
- Non-governmental Organisations (29)
- Professional Bodies (7)
- Consultancy (10)
- Individual members of the public (72)
- Others (1)

CoRWM'S NEW REMIT

- Scrutiny and advisory role
 - Must continue to inspire public confidence
 - Relevant public and stakeholder engagement as required
-
- Establish programme of PSE
 - Scrutinise and advise on plans for PSE by others

PROBLEM SOLVED OR PROBLEMS AHEAD?

- Move from generic option to site selection
- The overseeing role
- New build complications

POTENTIAL PITFALLS

- Misinformation – deliberate or inadvertent
 - Continued conflation of new build and legacy waste and CoRWM's views on each
 - Lack of ministerial understanding of issues (intermittent storage)

SOME PSE PITFALLS

➤ White Rabbits

- Confusion between getting on with it and running before you can walk
 - Pre-engagement information
 - 3 days to decide geological screening criteria
 - Changes to governance without consultation

SOME PSE PITFALLS

➤ Headless Chickens

- Too many new issues
 - Changes to NDA structures
 - New build along comparable timescales
 - New planning regime
- The Scottish Problem

SOME PSE PITFALLS

➤ Stick-in-the-muds

- Government policy will not change
- How has consultation influenced policy?
- Where's the evidence?
- Why did Government consult?

IS PSE UP TO THE CHALLENGE?

- Engagement for the right reasons – not spin
- Staying the course – danger of losing nerve
- Ensuring continuity and consistency – how to adapt to change
- Who has the real power – someone has to make the decision

Some Golden Rules

- Only consult when you can answer the following questions:
 - Who?
 - Why?
 - What?
 - When?
- Then consider **How?**

CONCLUSION

- PSE is only a management tool
- Trust in a process does not mean trust in the outcome
- PSE does not make for pain free decision-making
- PSE doesn't make the decisions