



BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

PUBLIC INFORMATION MATERIALS EXCHANGE 2006

MONDAY 13 FEBRUARY 2006

WORKSHOP 1
MESSAGES FROM CHERNOBYL, 20 YEARS ON

**Expedition to the 30-km Chernobyl Exclusion Zone
and the utilization of its experience in education and communication**

Attila Aszódi

*Director, Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Institute of Nuclear Techniques, Hungary
E-mail: aszodi@reak.bme.hu*

Tamás Pásmándi

*Scientific Researcher, KFKI Atomic Energy Research Institute, Hungary
E-mail: pazmandi@sunserv.kfki.hu*

Judit Silye

*Regulatory and Technical Coordinator, Hungarian Atomic Energy Authority, Nuclear Safety Directorate, Hungary
E-mail: silye@haea.gov.hu*

The Paks Nuclear Power Plant is located in the middle of Hungary, about 40 percent of the electrical energy generated in Hungary is produced there. The four VVER-440/213 type units were put into operation between 1982 and 1987. Taking into account the designed lifetime (30 years), they should be shut down between 2012 and 2017. In technical point of view, to extend the designed lifetime of the units with twenty years can be considered as the especially important part of the life-time management. In terms of life-time extension, beside technical issues and nuclear safety, the public plays a very decisive role. The Chernobyl accident had serious impact on the public, therefore, enhancing the public confidence is a main task in respect of the future of nuclear energy. The Hungarian Nuclear Society (HNS) and the Hungarian Young Generation Network (YGN), which operates within the framework of the HNS has been put a lot of effort into it.

Between 28th of May and 4th of June, 2005, under the organization of the Hungarian Nuclear Society, a scientific expedition visited the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant site and the surrounding exclusion zone. Most of the participants were young Hungarian nuclear experts under the leading of more experienced colleagues. The main scientific goals of the expedition were the followings:

- Getting own experiences in a direct way about the actual state of the Chernobyl Power Plant and its surroundings, the contamination of the environment and about the doses.
- Gathering information about the state of the shut downed power plant and the shelter built above the damaged 4th unit.
- Further education of young nuclear experts by performing measurements in the field.

The Hungarian expedition successfully achieved its objectives performing wide-ranged environmental and dosimetric measurements and collecting numerous biological and soil samples. Within the 30-km exclusion zone, the influence of the accident occurred 19 years before can be measured clearly; however the level of the radioactivity is well manageable in the most places. The analysis of samples has been started in the International Chernobyl Center in Slavutich. The dosimetric measurements showed that no considerable exposure of anybody among the members of the expedition was occurred.

The expedition was used not only for environmental sampling and in-situ measurements: it was well documented with photos and video records for educational and PR purposes. Working in the field within the exclusion zone was an excellent occasion for intensive further education of young Hungarian nuclear experts which would considerably support the university lectures, since students normally do not have many of these kinds of opportunities. Furthermore, this experience will be applicable to communication as well.

The first-hand knowledge acquired during the expedition will help the authentic communication of the Hungarian Young Generation about the accident and its present-day consequences, which will be especially important in 2006, 20 years after the Chernobyl accident.

Beside the above mentioned objectives we intend to make a 25-minute documentary TV film and a 45-minute educational film for secondary schools. We plan to present these movies to the audience of the PIME conference.

WORKSHOP 2

CRISIS COMMUNICATIONS AND COMMUNICATING ON SAFETY

The International Nuclear Event Scale (INES): Enhanced reporting on nuclear and radiological events

Rejane Spiegelberg Planer

*Department of Nuclear Safety and Security, International Atomic Energy Agency
E-mail: r.spiegelberg-planer@iaea.org*

Incidents and emergencies of various types continue to occur despite improvements in nuclear and radiation safety. Low probability severe accidents can occur in nuclear power plants with serious widespread and long-term radiological and socio-economic consequences. More likely are events with limited, little or no radiological consequence that nevertheless may have safety or security implications or attract considerable media and public interest. They include incidents at nuclear facilities or situations where radioactive sources — used in almost all countries for medical, industrial and research purposes— are lost, found, stolen or damaged during use or transport.

Any incident in a nuclear facility or involving radiation sources or radioactive substances may create media and public concerns, sometimes resulting in rumours, psychological and social stress or even economic consequences. Timely and accurate responses to media and public concerns are key to avoiding confusing and non-relevant information that often circulates during incident or emergency situations.

By putting those events into proper perspective, the International Nuclear Event Scale (INES) can promote common understanding of the safety significance of those events among the scientific/technical community, the media and the public. Thus, it is an important tool for communicating the right message — the safety significance of events and its potential consequences — at the right time. While the vast majority of events will only be of interest in the region or country where the event occurs, some will attract international interest; therefore, participating countries have set up mechanisms for such communications, using INES, through the Nuclear Event Web-based System (NEWS).

Initially, INES was developed by international experts convened jointly by the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Nuclear Energy Agency of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development for communicating the significance of events at nuclear installations. Since then, INES has been expanded to meet the growing need for communication of the significance of all events associated with radiation, radioactive material and their transport.

Incident management routines – Implementation and practice

Anni Bölenius

*Press Relations Manager, Swedish Nuclear Fuel and Waste Management Co (SKB), Sweden
E-mail: sten.kjellman@sk.se*

The role of SKB's communications department is to support the siting process for a final repository for spent nuclear fuel so that trust and confidence of stakeholders can be maintained. SKB is planning to apply for a license for an encapsulation plant in 2006, and in 2008, for the final repository. Trust at both national and local level will be crucial throughout the application process.

SKB has recently revised its communication plan. This paper is aimed to give a general view about the approach that the company has chosen towards the field of public communication. It also presents more closely our routines concerning incident management.

The new communication plan is based on the observation that a company or an organisation which is depending on opinions and attitudes of external stakeholders is never stronger than the weakest link in the chain which consists of its *profile* (what it wants to be), its *identity* (what it really is) and its *image*. Using this basic approach the current situation has been analysed, and specific goals for each of these domains (profile/identity/image) have been defined. After that, we have defined how these goals should be reached.

Internal information, efficient incident management, crisis awareness and open media policy are key components in SKB's communications. Major projects like RWM benefit from being as open as possible towards media, but this is not always easy. Things sometimes happen at a operational facility which are not radiation problems but rather the question of how the incident might be reflected upon in the media

Even if an incident is small and not radiological, SKB applies a policy of openness which means that we often contact the media to tell them what happened. It is then necessary that any incident, no matter how small, is reported, judged and taken care of. SKB has established specific routines for incident management in order to ensure that information about incidents reach the communications department as early as possible. This is easier said than done as it involves all departments within the company. Creating hands-on routines which are implemented in the official company guidelines/steering documents is one way to create awareness of these aspects within the company.

Media training as well as efficient internal information within the company are important parts of a consistent incident management. SKB maintains an open media policy with many spokesmen within the company. If employees get information about what is going on, it will be stronger and more trustworthy when managing incidents.

Media trainings should not be considered only as practise for real- life situations but also as a part of internal sharing of knowledge and discussions about key issues such as policy of openness and the overall communication policy.

Examples from real incidents show that openness pays in the long run.

Communication activities over the Eurofab project

Julien Duperray, COGEMA LOGISTICS (AREVA Group), France
Fred Yapuncich, TRANSNUCLEAR Inc/PACTEC (AREVA Group), France
Rose Cummings, DCS Group, France

E-mail: Annabel Potot, apotot@cogemalogistics.com

To reduce the risk of nuclear weapons materials falling into the wrong hands, the United States and the Russian Federation agreed in September 2000 on the disposition of 68 metric tons of surplus weapons-grade plutonium, 34 tons from each side. Both countries are to dispose of their plutonium by converting it to mixed oxide fuel (MOX) to be used to generate electricity in existing reactors.

Before significant quantities of MOX fuel can be used in U.S. reactors, the performance of this European technology must be verified by the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). The construction of a U.S. MOX fuel fabrication facility is under way, but the United States does not currently have the capability to produce MOX fuel. The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) therefore made arrangements with the AREVA group to have four MOX assemblies fabricated in France from U.S. weapons-grade plutonium. In October 2004, 140 kilograms of defense plutonium powder were shipped from Charleston, South Carolina, to Cherbourg, France. Five months later, four lead assemblies, fabricated at COGEMA's Cadarache and MELOX sites in southern France, were transported back to the United States for loading in the Catawba nuclear station in North Carolina operated by Duke Power.

This transportation and fabrication operation, code-named Eurofab, brought us face-to-face with major communications issues, and all the more so in that special nuclear materials were involved against a backdrop of bilateral non-proliferation agreements. From the very beginning of Eurofab, we expected this project to be the object of much media interest – which certainly came true! – and the importance of a dedicated, multilateral communications policy was obvious to all partners. Nuclear opponents in the U.S. and France were mobilizing well in advance to thwart the operation. Early on, to provide the media and the general public with objective information and squelch misinformation, the parties set up a communications task force that took on several critical assignments, including developing and updating position papers on sensitive topics, monitoring media coverage, disseminating factual information, coordinating the information release policy, and organizing media events.

Through the Eurofab experience, this paper takes a look at the special aspects of communications on industrial operations when implemented in a sensitive geopolitical environment and involving multiple partners, each with its own communications culture. Eurofab showed that what might seem to be an unusual alliance – a communications group made of government and industry representatives from several countries – proved to be extremely efficient. We will especially focus on the lessons learned in the field of public acceptance.

WORKSHOP 3 **LOCAL COMMUNITY RELATIONS**

Communication strategy improvements of Nuclear Information Centre Ljubljana

Radko Istenič and Igor Jenčič
Nuclear Training Centre, "Jožef Stefan" Institute, Slovenia
E-mail: radko.istenic@ijs.si and igor.jencic@ijs.si

The Nuclear Information Centre in Ljubljana was established 1993 with the primary goal to inform the visitors about nuclear power and nuclear technology in general and about Krško Nuclear Power Plant. We have chosen schoolchildren with their teachers as our main target group. The number of visitors grew from the initial 4000 to about 8000 per year in the last few years (1/2 of an average generation of schoolchildren in Slovenia).

During the years and with the growing number of visitors we simultaneously adapted our communication strategy.

The mainstay of the visit remains a live lecture which has been thoroughly upgraded in the last year. Its backbone is a set of 20 slides with the branched menu of many additional slides so that we can cover almost any question.

The exhibition about nuclear technology was upgraded with the department about fusion showing the ITER development.

The publications that the visitors can freely take for later reference are an important part of our communication strategy. The bilingual (Slovenian/English) "Mini Encyclopaedia of Nuclear Technology", a colour magazine like 60 page booklet was completely renewed and updated. Fuel pellet mock up souvenirs with basic information about chain reaction and a nuclear power plant principle are available for every visitor.

To measure the opinion of youngsters about nuclear power and get a feed-back for our activities we also poll about 1000 visitors every year. The main results of the poll will be included in the paper.

Responses of local communities to their volunteering for LILW repository siting in Slovenia

Metka Kralj and Nadja Železnik
Agency for Radwaste Management (ARAO), Slovenia
E-mail: metka.kralj@gov.si

Siting of the LILW repository in Slovenia follows the mixed mode approach that combines the volunteering of the site or area by the local community, with the technical criteria of the site. There are 193 local communities in Slovenia. Already during the information campaign before the administrative start of the procedure three of them declared that they would not participate in the siting procedure. The invitation to participate was sent to the remaining 190 communities in December 2004. During four months of the bidding period, ARAO received eight applications and eleven refusals, while the other local communities did not respond.

The applications were sent by mayors and most of them applied with the consent of the municipality council. In one case only, the mayor applied without any consultation with the municipality council. In two cases the mayor did not support the application but had signed it under the insistence of the municipality council. The main incentive for participation of local communities was the compensatory yearly amount of 0.23 million EUR due to the limited use of the environment during site investigation and construction and of 2.3 million EUR yearly during operation of the LILW repository. The local decision makers understood it as a good development opportunity, while safety, environmental and health issues were more important for the public opinion. The public appreciated the procedure as a very democratic one because it was assured that the local community can withdraw at any time and with no obligations.

These circumstances are suitable for activities of civil initiatives – ad hoc civil society groups that arise in order to promote, defend or prevent some issues of public interest. Civil initiatives were active in half of the applicant communities. They organized press conferences and public meetings, collected public endorsement for the withdrawal from the procedure, and demanded a referendum. They requested that the mayors resigned, and in one case they even tried to charge the mayor with an illegal act.

The civil initiatives were successful in forcing mayors to withdraw the applications in two cases. It did not succeed in the local community that applied very early, published the application and linked the application to solving another local environmental problem, the waste from leather industry. It also did not succeed in the municipality in which the mayor refused to communicate with the public.

These civil initiative groups had a support in active environmental nongovernmental organizations. They were also associated with one of Slovenian green political parties. They actually showed much political interests and exploited the environmental issue to try to destabilize the local political leadership in communities and change the local decision making structure.

To pay or not to pay? The pitfalls of supporting nuclear regions

Marie Dufkova
Deputy Head of Communication, Czech Power Company (CEZ), Czech Republic
E-mail: marie.dufkova@cez.cz

In my contribution, I will discuss the problem of sponsorship of nuclear municipalities. Based on the example of the Czech nuclear power plants, I will show the advantages and disadvantages of giving money to the regions. CEZ won in some cases, but there were also some unfortunate decisions made by the company management which resulted in loss. I will provide the audience with the information on the current company strategy regarding support of nuclear regions. There are also important discussions in the Czech Parliament on the new law concerning giving money to nuclear municipalities. The amount of money is not only a matter of success.

International cooperation for solving radwaste disposal problems in the Leningrad region of Russia (dialogue for an optimal solution)

I. L. Rybalchenko and V. D. Safutin, *VNIPIET, Russian Federation*
C. Bergman, *SKI, Sweden*
H. Johansson, *SKB, Sweden*

E-mail: Igor Rybalchenko, rybalchenko@givnpiet.spb.ru

Joint activities of specialists from the Russian Institute VNIPIET, the Swedish Company SKB IC and the Swedish Nuclear Power Inspectorate, SKI, have been initiated to find an optimal solution to radioactive waste disposal problems in the Leningrad region of Russia.

At present, creation of a new facility for a permanent isolation of accumulated (and future) radwaste is urgently needed. It is not a simple task to find a disposal site in a densely populated industrial area, like that in Sosnovy Bor.

Two options for construction of the disposal facility are being considered: underground in a clay layer and a surface, above the ground. Technical and economical parameters of both concepts are being carefully studied, but final decision will also depend on public acceptance.

A special public information program has been developed for this project and is being gradually implemented step by step with the purpose to reach consensus between the industry, administration and public on all aspects of environmental, economical and organizational problems.

Positive results already achieved in this project:

- Practical international cooperation of expert organizations from Russia, Sweden and Germany has been established;
- Special public information program and procedures to coordinate these activities with stakeholders has been suggested.

Next steps to be taken:

- A Coordination committee should be formed, consisting of stakeholders and public organizations to monitor the development and provide peer review of the process. Russian and foreign experts should be participating in this committee;
- Activities on public information should be extended to gain finally full public support to the project. They should include — periodic information seminars, permanent expositions of the project at the Information Centers in Sosnovy Bor and in St. Petersburg and on a special web site, publications in mass media etc.

It is important to reach a real balance of interests between the industry, administration and public. Only this can lead to a full success of the project.

Communication prospects on Cernavoda NPP site - A balance stream between internal and external tools

**Teodor Chirica, Mihaela Stiopol and Stefan Pall, "Nuclearelectrica" SA
Luminita Stanciu, "Nuclearelectrica" SA / Cernavoda NPP**

E-mail: mstiopol@nuclearelectrica.ro, dchirica@nuclearelectrica.ro, spall@nuclearelectrica.ro and lstanciu@cne.ro

Nuclear power field is a very sensible one, depending on gaining public acceptance. Communication plays a major role in obtaining the trust of the public.

In general, when referring to communication, we have in mind the dialog with different levels of the public, including mass-media, and using different methods. This is called the external communication.

But a fundamental truth in respect to public relations says that "public relations start at home". This means that, in case the organization does not spread out the proper and coherent programs in connection with the society's needs and expectations, the internal information would not develop in a correct manner is the fact. This is called the internal communication.

Different messages from inside could bring about ambiguity among the members of the company and a false image of reality to the public in connection with its activities and results. Not acting as a single voice, which delivers the same coherent message, could result in a false image and induce ambiguity inside the community.

The paper deals with the above subject, trying to present the relationship that has to work between the internal and external communication and to lead to a good communication with the public, and finally to the acceptance by the public of nuclear power. The external communication will be useless unless the internal communication is well established. So, our main goal – gaining the public acceptance related to our activities – would not be fulfilled.

The paper will describe the "Communication, Public Relations and Image Program" of PR Office for 2005, highlighting the main objectives:

- a. Continuous increasing of the active role of PR Office to support the successful accomplishment of NPP's priorities, through **Internal Communication**.
- b. **External Communication** through an open, responsible, accurate and timely manner, with:
 - Public
 - Mass-media
 - External organizations
- c. **Effective actions** of PR Office in participating to **Community's life**.

The paper is also reflecting the experience "Nuclearelectrica" has gained in creating a balance stream between the two levels of communication.

WORKSHOP 4

TWO-WAY COMMUNICATIONS WITH SOCIAL STAKEHOLDERS (POLITICIANS, OPINION LEADERS, HOUSEWIVES, WORKING WOMEN, YOUNG GENERATION...)

Two way communication and outreach in the Japan Atomic Power Company

Junko Ogawa

President of WIN Global/WIN-Japan

Executive Communicator, Public Relations Department, The Japan Atomic Power Company, Japan

E-mail: junko-ogawa@japc.co.jp

The Japan Atomic Power Company (JAPC) is a nuclear power generation company founded in 1957 as a pioneer company of nuclear power generation in Japan. JAPC owns two nuclear power stations with two nuclear reactors in operation and one decommissioning reactor in Tokaimura village and Tsuruga city. The communication policy of JAPC is to form trust-worthy relationship with the public whenever an accident or troublesome incident may happen or not.

To accomplish such relationship JAPC has been making endeavor for years under every three years long term plans. The latest three years plan is newly established to carry out during from the year of 2005 thru 2007. The slogan of this newest plan is upkeep and reinforcement of relationship grounded on the achievement of former three terms of three years plan that had been developed in last 9 years. Namely, a compilation of our effort for the last decade.

The current three years plan consists of two poles. One is to create relationship with society and the other is network communication. Creating relationship with society means to establish information access routes between JAPC and surrounding people such as habitants, medias, shareholders as well as opinion leaders. Network communication aims at two ways or multiple communication with many networks which JAPC communicators have been forming in communities since 1998.

I would like to introduce several specific events and network and its operation in this paper such as examples below:

1. Angle mammy net – targeting young mothers who are tackling child rearing
2. Es education club – targeting elementary and junior high school students. Es mean energy, electricity and environment
3. JAPC Tokaimura village network- JAPC monitors alumni association
4. Terra Park(JAPC visitors house) association
5. Friendship roundtable dialogue in city community halls
6. Guest teacher activities

People who are engaging in the public acceptance work including us may commonly conceive that it is quite difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of communication activities exactly in figures. What matters is our continuous effort in such actions as keeping touch with community and keeping the public be informed, then to create familiar environment so that we can go forward our industry. We believe that a sound development of nuclear energy must be power for leading a prosperous future for human being.

Pioneering gender based marketing in Canada's nuclear industry to build support for nuclear power amongst women opinion leaders

Susan Brisette

Canadian Women in Nuclear

Change Leadership, Corporate Service, Bruce Power, Canada

E-mail: susan.brisette@brucepower.com

The nuclear industry is fairly unique in that public acceptance of our technology as a source of electricity generation is perhaps as important to our long term viability as is our ability to operate a complex technology safely, reliably, and cost effectively. In Canada, the majority of men support nuclear generated electricity while the majority of women oppose it. With women influencing as much as 80% of consumer dollars spent in North America, the lack of support for our industry by this influential demographic is being proactively addressed.

In early 2004, Bruce Power –Canada's only privately operated and North America's largest nuclear generating company - embarked on a pioneering gender based research program aimed at understanding women's attitudes towards nuclear power followed by a targeted campaign to change the views of women opinion leaders. The research methodology was innovative and focused on getting to the heart of what women believe and why. The results were startling . . . a third of the women opinion leaders who participated in the study rated their knowledge of nuclear power at a very low level 2 on a scale of 0 to 10. The vast majority felt their knowledge level was a 5 or less. Overwhelmingly, these same women's opinions could be changed in favour of supporting nuclear power through education.

The strategy and approach put in place as a result of the research was to host small gatherings bringing together research participants and other women opinion leaders with real women from the nuclear industry – all members of the recently formed Women in Nuclear (Canada) – in a uniquely female-friendly environment for dialogue and education. Using women to put a fresh face on the nuclear industry is helping to strengthen our industry's reputation. At the same time, this dialogue and outreach is creating opportunities for women in the industry to become more engaged in securing the long term success of nuclear power in Canada, to build their leadership and communication skills, and to be recognized for their significant achievements in our industry to date.

This presentation will highlight Bruce Power's approach and successes and identify how others can better engage a female demographic in building our industry's reputation.

U.S. Women in nuclear – A journey from vision to reality

Cheryl L. Boggess

*U.S. Women in Nuclear Representative on the Women in Nuclear Global Board
Westinghouse Electric Company, USA
E-mail: boggescl@Westinghouse.com*

Patricia Bryant

*Women in Nuclear Global Executive Board Member and U.S. Women in Nuclear Member
Consultant, USA*

U.S. Women in Nuclear (U.S. WIN), an affiliate of Women in Nuclear Global, is an organization of women and men in the United States who are working to promote and advance the positive uses and public perception of nuclear technologies. Since U.S. WIN was established in 1999, it has grown into a network of more than 1700 members who work primarily in the fields of the commercial nuclear power industry and the national research laboratories. Initial growth resulted from simple networking, team building, and focused member commitment building on the strength and sincerity of its objectives. U.S. WIN's continued growth and organizational stability will rest on these same fundamental concepts. U.S. WIN is driven by three objectives:

- To support an environment in nuclear energy and nuclear technologies in which women and men are able to succeed
- To provide a network through which women in these fields can further their professional development
- To provide an organized association through which the public is informed about nuclear energy and nuclear technologies

U.S. WIN focuses on knowledge sharing, education, and public outreach, and seeks to provide opportunity for growth and diversity for its members. In 2005, U.S. WIN members took a significant step to move the organization and its members to a new level. This paper looks back to the beginning of U.S. WIN and summarizes the actions being taken for moving into the future. The members of U.S. WIN plan to continue to build bridges within U.S. WIN membership, sponsoring corporations and the nuclear community by applying the concepts of member commitment, team building, and a simple communication network.

TUESDAY 14 FEBRUARY 2006

The King's College 'Future of Nuclear Power in Europe' study: Policies, perceptions and the communication of risk

Brooke Rogers

*Researcher, The King's Centre for Risk Management, King's College London
E-mail: brooke.rogers@kcl.ac.uk*

What do the public and policy makers view as the key barriers to introducing new nuclear power operations in Europe? How might these barriers be addressed, and can they be overcome? Set against the backdrop of an exploration of energy policy since WWII, the King's College study explored these issues across six work packages centred on public perceptions of risk and the effectiveness of risk communication in respect to civil nuclear energy. Issues addressed by the project include risk perceptions and nuclear stigma, security of supply, radioactive waste, economics, safety, non-proliferation and public perceptions of new technologies.

This presentation will draw on the key findings from each work package. First, Key energy policy drivers will be identified and set within the context of varying governance approaches in selected countries across the EU. A brief exploration of the forces shaping nuclear stigma, as well as the role of public perceptions of risk and risk communication in forming, maintaining, or altering this stigma will be provided. This will include an analysis of the psychodynamic nature of risk perceptions, and the importance of uncertainty and trust in risk communication. Questions will include: If the public are willing to accept the large-scale risks of fossil fuels (e.g. oil spills) in relation to the benefits (e.g. energy with emissions), why are they less willing to accept the risks of nuclear power when linked to the benefits of emissionless energy and security of supply?

Second, public perceptions of the barriers to nuclear power will be discussed with a special focus on security of supply, radioactive waste, and safety. This will explore whether or not the level of public knowledge is sufficient to engage in an open debate with politicians, NGOs and industry about energy policy issues, such as security of supply and radioactive waste on national and international levels. The inherent differences in public, expert and policy maker dialogues and understandings of risk will be addressed and highlighted.

Finally, suggestions will be made for improving risk communication and stakeholder dialogue in order to overcome the pitfalls associated with nuclear stigma, thus informing an honest and open discussion about the true risks and benefits of nuclear power.

The power of positive branding

JoAnn Sperber

*Editor, Nuclear Energy Insight; Senior Writer
Nuclear Energy Institute
E-mail: jcs@nei.org*

The United States nuclear energy industry has launched an industry-wide branding program to communicate the benefits of reliable, affordable and clean nuclear energy. The program seeks to create a positive, easily recalled image in the minds of policymakers, the media, financial community and the public. This presentation will describe the U.S. nuclear energy industry's branding effort.

The program seeks to convey that "nuclear energy" is clean, reliable and affordable. In surveys, the American public has identified these attributes as important for any electricity generation plant.

These branding messages reach an audience both large and diverse, including policymakers, media, the financial community and the public. The program's goals are two-fold: to build strong recognition of the value of today's nuclear power plants and to emphasize the importance of building new reactors to address future electricity demand.

In 2005, NEI worked with senior communications advisers from the industry to implement a branding program at each company. The initiative features several elements: conventional avenues like print advertisements, television commercials and proactive outreach to government officials and the news media, as well as emerging online technologies.

One of those emerging technologies is a Web log, or blog. Launched one year ago, about 400 readers visit NEI's blog each day. Blogs are increasingly popular communication tools because they offer two-way dialogue on issues. Individuals post news items and opinions, with readers encouraged to respond by sending their own messages.

An increasing number of U.S. energy companies incorporate branding messages into their advertising campaigns and communications plans, reflecting the program's success. Additionally, more media reports, including editorials and opinion pieces, carry our branding messages.

The industry also delivers these messages to Wall Street. NEI briefs financial analysts twice a year and participates in financial conferences and other meetings with financial leaders.

Media representatives are another important audience for this branding initiative, evidenced last year by extensive coverage of nuclear energy in the United States, with an abundance of articles and broadcasts by major news organizations. Many of those broadcasts focused on the three branding messages: Nuclear energy is clean, reliable and affordable.

The United States faces a challenging energy future, but many policymakers, journalists and the public are interested in a solution that includes nuclear power. Branding is reinforcing — and helping increase — that support.

WORKSHOP 5

MY NEIGHBOUR DOESN'T LIKE NUCLEAR: RELATIONS BETWEEN "NUCLEAR" AND "NON-NUCLEAR" COUNTRIES

Austria's anti-nuclear crusade

Helmuth Böck

*Reactor Manager, University of Technology Vienna/Atominsttitut, Austria
E-mail: boeck@ati.ac.at*

After the First Geneva Conference on 1955 and the Atoms for Peace Movement also Austria followed enthusiastically the worldwide nuclear development by building 3 research reactors, further in 1972 Austria decided to build a 700 MWe Boiling Water Reactor at the site of Zwentendorf 40 km west from Vienna which was subjected to increasing anti-nuclear activities.

Therefore just before operation in 1978 the government decided a referendum on it's future operation. A series of public hearing before the referendum turned out to be a complete disaster as the experts wanted to present technical matters while the public opinion heated up by nasty media information was totally anti-nuclear which created an almost religious crusade against nuclear issues.

On top of this communication problem an important political aspect as placed: The Social Democratic Chancellor Kreisky put all his political strength into a positive vote for nuclear, in case of a negative result he would then resign. This brought all pro-nuclear but anti-Kreisky voters into one corner to vote anti-nuclear even if they had a pro-positive attitude and they saw a chance to get rid of Kreisky .As it is well known the referendum turned out negative, nuclear power was forbidden by law in Austria and Kreisky did not resign.

However the anti-nuclear groups and the media saw the result as their success without the political aspect behind and the anti-nuclear movement increased in the following years especially after the TMI-2 and the Chernobyl accident. By the end of the 80ies Austria's politicians, public and media were completely anti-nuclear.

At that time Eastern Europe disintegrated and Austria saw a chance to export its anti-nuclear politics to neighbour countries with Russian VVER reactors of various designs. The first case was Austria's fight against the continuation of work at the NPP Mochovce 1+2 in the Slovak Republic. Austria's media hysterically supported anti-nuclear groups, delegations were sent to Brussels, Austria's government created an advisory group of mostly anti-nuclear activists to support its policy. All these activities did not help, the two NPPs were put into operation and Austria stood alone in central Europe with its anti-nuclear policy.

The next target was the NPP Temelin in the Czech Republic with even more anti-nuclear activities, Brussels was again involved and a number of high level meetings seemed to solve finally this problem on a political platform. Both targets put a heavy burden on bilateral relations between Austria, Czech Republic and Slovak Republic as together with the nuclear discussion also other political issues dating back to World War II were brought into the discussion.

The paper will give a detailed insight on the roots and on the present status of Austria's anti-nuclear politics.

Cross-border cooperation between the Czech Republic and Austria

Jiri Tyc

South-Bohemian Daddies, Czech Republic

E-mail: jiri.tyc@cez.cz

The civic association "South-Bohemian Daddies" emerged six years ago (1999). The association was established spontaneously and includes several Temelin NPP plant staff members. The association aims to inform the general public about nuclear energy, to give facts and explain the nuclear power plant operation, giving factual information. The "Daddies" support nuclear power development, writes articles for the media, and contribute to education of the young generation. They organise more than ten discussion sessions per month at Czech schools, and regularly visit Austrian schools. The "Daddies" are not to be confused with the anti-nuke organisation "South-bohemian Mothers".

Cross-border cooperation between the UK and Ireland: Point of view from the UK

Louise Robson

Assistant Director Safety, EU and Emergency Planning, Department of Trade and Industry, UK

E-mail: louise.robson@dti.gsi.gov.uk

Sellafield Background

- Sellafield site is one of the largest nuclear engineering centres in the world. For over 30 years, BNFL has owned, managed and operated the plants on Sellafield site.
- Now managed and operated by British Nuclear Group, the main focus is on the decommissioning of historical liabilities.

Agreement on the exchange of information

- Both Ireland and the United Kingdom are parties to the International Atomic Energy Agency Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident. This Convention also provides that State Parties may also consider, where deemed appropriate, the conclusion of bilateral arrangements relating to the subject matter of the Convention.
- Ireland and the United Kingdom negotiated and concluded a bilateral agreement under this provision. It was signed by both Parties on 10 December 2004.

Visits and exercise observations

- The United Kingdom invited the RPII to visit Sellafield to assist it in evaluating the associated hazards in the context of emergency preparedness and to enable the RPII to better advise and inform both the Irish Government and the public.
- An Garda Síochána visited Sellafield at the invitation of the then United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority Constabulary in June 2004, now renamed the Civil Nuclear Constabulary (CNC).
- Delegations and individuals regularly attend nuclear exercises in the UK and Ireland.

RPII access to RIMNET

- The United Kingdom has in place a remote countrywide network of equipment that monitors radiation levels in the environment on an ongoing basis.
- Direct access for Ireland on an ongoing real time basis to the RIMNET information system was provided by the United Kingdom and is now in place.

Improved communication and co-operation between Irish and United Kingdom Regulatory Authorities

- A formal Arrangement for the Exchange of Information between the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and the Radiological Protection Institute of Ireland (RPII) regarding the regulation of the safety of nuclear installations was renewed by the RPII and the HSE in May 2003.
- Regular meetings between the RPII and the HSE supplement this arrangement.

Development of enhanced contacts

- The Contact Group, which meets twice yearly, plays a key role in communication and co-operation between both Governments.

Conclusions

- Communication is key.

Cross-border cooperation between the UK and Ireland: Ireland's point of view

Peter Brazel

*Assistant Principal, Nuclear Safety Section, Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government, Ireland
E-mail: peter_brazel@environ.ir*

Ireland's nuclear policy:

- Ireland's consideration of the nuclear policy issue
- Policy Drivers

The Sellafield nuclear plant from the Irish perspective:

- Outline of plant
- Discharges
- Safety record

Relationship between Ireland and the UK on nuclear issues:

- Relationship between Ireland and the UK
- The nuclear issue
- Experience

The international legal actions by Ireland in relation to Sellafield:

- OSPAR Convention
- United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS)
- Proceedings by the EU Commission against Ireland in ECJ
- Opinion of Advocate General

Improved co-operation between Ireland and the United Kingdom on nuclear issues:

- Provisional Measures Order under UNCLOS
- Package of Measures agreed under UNCLOS

Conclusions:

- The importance of co-operation and consultation
- Future developments

Communicating across borders between France and Germany: Testimony from Fessenheim NPP

Christelle Mutschler

*Public Relations Director, Fessenheim Nuclear Power Plant, Electricité de France, France
E-mail: christelle.mutschler@edf.fr*

The Rhine River forms the natural border between France and Germany, two major member countries of the European Union having opted for different energy programmes.

In France, nuclear energy accounts for 80% of electrical power generation. The bill passed in July 2003, setting the priorities of French energy policy, assured the future of EDF's power generation fleet by explicitly providing for the construction of an EPR reactor. Consequently, a project for the construction of an EPR reactor at Flamanville in Normandy is currently at the heart of a public debate. Germany has moved towards passing a bill whereby nuclear power generation would be eventually phased out.

Since its construction in the seventies, Fessenheim nuclear power plant – located in Alsace – has experienced opposition from three sides: Alsace, Germany and Switzerland. This opposition mainly takes the form of militant antinuclear actions where German citizens are widely represented, as well as demands to shut down the plant coming from neighbouring municipal councils strongly supported by the German press.

The Chernobyl accident has left an imprint in people's minds. German residents fear they will not be immediately informed should a nuclear accident ever occur at Fessenheim. This is why information and openness are absolute priorities in terms of communication.

In an effort to resolve this issue, information agreements have been set in place with the German public authorities ; meetings and visits are arranged at regular intervals ; a great deal of information is disseminated ; cross-border drills are organised. These measures are designed to foster open discussion between France and Germany. Even so, differences in the modus operandi of the public authorities and nuclear safety regulators, as well as differences in public opinion, make such initiatives difficult.

Despite the obstacles encountered by all our efforts to keep our German neighbours informed, EDF's communication strategy is still guided by an attitude of openness, receptiveness and perseverance.

WORKSHOP 6

BEST PRACTICES IN COMMUNICATIONS

Communication Excellence

D. McGarry, R.C.Hurst and R. Houghton

Institute for Energy, Directorate General Joint Research Centre, European Commission

E-mail: Darren McGarry Darren, mcgarry@cec.eu.int

Following the successful presentation "are we getting our message across" in PIME 2005 the authors have again taken a critical look at communications, and the barriers to communicating nuclear issues that are specific to this vital yet so poorly understood industry.

Science, and especially nuclear science, is not always easy to explain. How can we influence the pre-conceived, and mis-interpreted image of a complex, mysterious and therefore "dangerous nuclear industry? "How can we demonstrate that the nuclear industry is not fundamentally different, requiring special treatment compared to other energy sources?

With many arguments on our side, including the huge positive impact of nuclear energy on carbon emissions, and Europe's need to ensure security of energy supply, why are we still having such a difficult job convincing people of the advantages of nuclear energy?

In the current "comfortable" society it is difficult to raise energy awareness, and focus citizen's thoughts on problems that are not perceived as urgent. What is the influence of many TV commercials advertising the abundance of green energy? Are citizens becoming more or less aware of the imminent energy problems, and what role can we play to increase energy awareness.

The presentation will focus on the following key areas:

- Problems facing nuclear communicators
- The need and means to create a "level energy playing field"
- Learning from others via every day experiences, cross-fertilisation of ideas from different industries and sectors, for example what can we learn from the new emerging hydrogen economy, and how can the BBC help?
- Innovative means of 2-way communication
- Efficient and effective use of best practices

The theory and ideas presented are backed up with many practical and innovative communication examples from various sectors of the energy industry

AREVA dialogue and consensus-building policy

Virginie Ryan-Taix

Institutional Relations Department, AREVA Group, France

E-mail: virginie.ryan@areva.com

Sustainable development is a keystone of AREVA industrial strategy. Ten **sustainable development commitments** have been defined for the Group and formalized in a model called AREVA Way. Each entity must self assess its practices on each of these commitments, define improvement objectives, launch appropriate action plans and measure progress.

One of the 10 commitments is entitled **Dialogue and consensus-building**. Indeed, Dialogue is particularly relevant to us, especially in the nuclear sector.

In the history of AREVA, it has first been considered that talking with stakeholders was not useful, and even potentially harmful. We had a hard time getting rid off this culture of secrecy to enter into a phase of transparency. Today, we have come to a new era: **from transparency to dialogue**. Dialogue goes well beyond giving information: it implies listening to our stakeholders, and taking into account their expectations. These stakeholders are all the people who have an interest in what we are doing: associations and NGOs, elected representatives, neighbors, administrations...

The objectives of the Dialogue for AREVA are clearly defined:

- **Improving its corporate image / developing knowledge of the Group's activities**
- **Anticipating the risks** of reputation / operation (licence-to-operate)
- **Improving ourselves** thanks to the dialogue with external stakeholders: new ideas, new methods...

To give sense and formalize the Dialogue and consensus-building within AREVA, we have developed two innovative projects.

At the corporate level, a **Stakeholders Session**. This initiative consists in the consultation of stakeholders. It was divided into 2 phases: an initial session during which AREVA listened to stakeholders and a second session during which

AREVA answered the questions raised. Comité 21, reference authority in France for sustainable development, acted as an independent middleman and organized the process.

With regard to external stakeholders, Comité 21 chose 15 different organizations representing NGOs, social and economic agencies, national and international institutions. For AREVA, the group's main operational departments were asked to participate.

In 2005, Comité 21 has made a summary report of the *Stakeholders Session*, which includes a summary of the commitments AREVA undertook during the discussions. This summary is available on AREVA's website.

At the local level, we implement a methodology to better know our environment and precise our big issues and the expectations of our local stakeholders: *External Stakeholders Mapping*. At the beginning of 2006, we have already conducted the methodology on 14 nuclear or seveso sites. An independent party has interviewed more than 150 of our stakeholders.

These mappings will give us means to develop civil society relations and partnerships, thanks to local actions plans.

WORKSHOP 8

COMMUNICATING WASTE FOR THE NEXT GENERATION

The cooperation between TVO and schools

Sini Gahmberg

Information Officer, CSR and Communications, Teollisuuden Voima Oly
E-mail: sini.gahmberg@tvo.fi

The presentation tells about TVO's school cooperation, where TVO has a long tradition. The school cooperation covers diverse areas: student visits to Olkiluoto, borrowing electrochemical kits to schools, lectures by TVO experts, taking part in student and recruit fair, articles in student publications, editing a leaflet "Energy in Society" in physics schoolbook, a visiting week for 15-year old pupils called "Energy in western Finland", a virtual school and web pages about nuclear industry.

More attention is paid to classes of Eurajoki upper level of comprehensive school (*Eurajoen yhteiskoulu* in Finnish) and science and technology camps for 8-12 –years old children.

The school, teachers, students and the company benefit from the school cooperation. Benefits include for example: new contacts between the school and the company, added value in teaching and learning, combining theory and practise in teaching and positive publicity and image for the company. The school cooperation improves close region cooperation and students' interest in energy industry.

No time to waste

Miranda Kirschel

Corporate Affairs Manager, Nuclear Industry Association, UK
E-mail: miranda.kirschel@niauk.org

According to a MORI poll carried out in the UK in September 2006, the long-term management of radioactive waste is seen to be the main disadvantage of nuclear energy as a source of electricity. Based on a survey of 2,035 members of the general public in the UK, 57% felt that it was top of the list of disadvantages related to nuclear power, higher than the risk of accident, radiation or potential risk of terrorist attacks. How we communicate plays a crucial part in shaping Government policy and public perception, especially when it comes to a controversial issue such as nuclear power.

It is often felt that the public, politicians and the media, find it difficult to understand scientists and engineers and the jargon, techno-speak and acronyms that the nuclear industry has traditionally used. The UK is a prime example of this, with a legacy of relatively high volumes of waste, but no long-term management system in place. However if we consider that the UK has managed its waste safely for over half a century, and has a Government committee due to recommend a final disposal route in July this year, our cup appears half full. If we then look at the excellent progress in countries such as Finland, France, Canada and the US, where recommendations on radioactive waste disposal routes have been made, and in some cases, work is already underway, we have an even more positive story to tell. Being aware of the good news on waste, and communicating it, can have a major impact on how the industry as a whole is perceived.

Among YGN's members are young people working with companies engaged as contractors and manufacturers in the forefront of nuclear waste management. They are part of a highly skilled, professional workforce, and world class, cutting edge technology. If these people are trained to speak to politicians, the media, and to address schools and groups in the community, we have a better chance of getting our good messages across. Equally, keeping our excellent communicators in public affairs, press offices and community liaison positions abreast of success stories and ensuring they are given the right platforms is vital. Now is the best time to begin learning how to communicate effectively, if we are to expect people have confidence in the work we are doing and the success we achieving in the area of radioactive waste management.

Local partnerships: A way to achieve a sustainable solution for LILW

L. Wouters and E. Hoof

*ONDRAF/NIRAS, Belgium
E-mail: l.wouters@nirond.be*

A long-term solution for radioactive waste must not only be safe and technical feasible but should also be accepted by society. This assumption, as well as the failure of the formerly used top-down approach by ONDRAF/NIRAS led to a resolute change in the decision-making process. Only by involving stakeholders at the very start of the decision-making process, we will be able to evolve towards a sustainable solution for all radioactive waste that will need to be managed.

After a governmental decision in January 1998, ONDRAF/NIRAS was instructed to limit site characterisation activities for low- and intermediate-level short-lived waste to existing nuclear sites or to sites in volunteering municipalities. In order to make the decision-making process an open and transparent one, methods including management and dialogue structures, necessary to integrate a repository project at the local level, needed to be developed. With the help of university teams, open cooperation structure, called 'local partnerships' were created so that local stakeholders can co-decide on a long-term management solution. Involvement and co-decision making are central to this approach. Decision-making in a democratic environment is essentially a process of negotiation where various interests are weighed one against the other. Recognition of all factors involved is crucial in reaching a solution that is acceptable to all or at least to a majority of the parties concerned.

Four municipalities with existing nuclear facilities expressed an interest and three local partnerships were founded: the local partnership STOLA-Dessel in Dessel (1999), MONA in Mol (2000), and PaLoFF in Fleurus and Farciennes (2003). In view of the fact that any decision taken or advice offered by this partnership would be carried by the community at large, the representation of the local community needed to be as broad as possible. Not only local politicians, but also delegates from environmental, cultural, (socio)economic and other locally based organisations were invited to participate.

All possible aspects of a repository are being discussed with the aim to develop an integrated repository project. Each partnership receives an annual budget from ONDRAF/NIRAS in order to work independently and, for example, seek the (independent) expertise it needs.

By entering into dialogue with the local community, the concept-designers have an opportunity to better explain their project to the local stakeholders. Questions and reactions from the public, however, may force them to be more creative and to rethink certain aspects of their initial concept or project. The final outcome of this decision-making exercise is therefore supposed to be a mutual project, carried by both experts and local stakeholders, instead of an expert project forced upon an unwilling community.

Both STOLA-Dessel, MONA as PaLoFF considered the disposal of low- and intermediate-level short-lived waste acceptable, provided all their conditions are met, and have submitted their reports to their respective municipal councils. These conditions relate to various areas. The possible effects of a repository on health, safety and the environment are reflected in a number of concrete and strict conditions regarding to the disposal concept. Furthermore, the local inhabitants expect a disposal project will bring social, cultural and economic added value, which will benefit the future development of the municipality. Finally, they demand continuous participation in monitoring the file and explicit appreciation for the contribution made by the municipality for solving this important social problem. The municipal councils of Dessel and Mol pronounced themselves positively on the submitted files, the municipal councils of Fleurus and Farciennes will in a near future. It is for the first time in the history of the file of the long-term management of this type of waste that local communities declare their willingness to accommodate this waste permanently on their territory, admittedly under well-defined conditions.

Provided the current participation process is maintained and the discussions are extended to all stakeholders, ONDRAF/NIRAS is of the opinion that it should be possible to arrive at a sufficiently clear situation before the end of 2006, i.e. a situation in which the government can take a decision for one integrated project. This decision will mark the transition to a new stage: the stage in which the licence application files that are necessary to start the construction of the repository will actually be prepared. Only when all parties involved are in formal agreement with the municipality's conditions does the conditional candidature become definitive.

WEDNESDAY 15 FEBRUARY 2006

The French and nuclear waste

Philippe d'Iribarne

*Gestion et Société, France
E-mail: philippe.tribarne@wanadoo.fr*

Three different kinds of uncertainties:

- A lack of technical knowledge;
- We would be gods, not human beings, if we were able to know and master everything;
- How far is it possible to trust the people in charge?

When experts see themselves as supermen, they lose their credibility when issues for which people think they are competent are at stake.

Generally people don't know how nuclear waste looks like, its volume, how long radioactivity will remain.

They imagine a harmful and undying creature, ready to enter any place as soon as it finds an opening, a fissure to pass by; a creature able to stay in life during a time that challenge imagination. They think it's impossible to be sure that something terrible will not happen during such a time, even if we don't know what it will be.

What is to be done?

- Lock it up, *in saecula saeculorum* in a jail able to resist to any event, known or unknown. It is not credible. The earth is not able to protect: faults, cracks; glass is fragile, etc..
- 'Make innocent', 'get it rid of its radioactivity'; seems possible in the future, thanks to the progress of science.

Scientists are seen as competent and generally honest, but not aware of the limits of their knowledge;

Companies are seen as ready to be lax with safety measures;

The State is in charge of general interests, but politicians lack credibility.

Tchernobyl: the French State lied and scientists too.

Well informed people and people with a poor knowledge refer to the same ethical principles.

Most of the people are not afraid for themselves, but think they are not entitled to let a world to their descent with such a hazardous uncertainty.

We must make all that is possible to allow science to progress, in order to be able to solve in the future the problems that we cannot solve today.

Why not to bury the waste? It makes sense only if we don't intend to forget it, like a dead dog. We must be ready to react in case of unexpected events and keep the waste available to be able to make it harmless when it is technically feasible.

To transmute, or recycle would be the best.

To store on the ground. One advantage: no risk to forget the waste. But it leads to an easier access for malevolent people, less time to react in case of emergency and deterioration of environment.

Public opinion in the United States

J. Scott Peterson

Vice President-Communications, Nuclear Energy Institute

E-mail: jsp@nei.org

Several factors are converging to strengthen public support for nuclear energy and broaden support for new nuclear power plant construction:

- Growing populations and their demand for a more electricity-intensive lifestyle.
- Limitations in energy supply.
- Rising cost and supply volatility of oil and natural gas.
- Devastating geopolitical effects of over-dependence on fossil fuels.
- Concern about climate change and air quality.

Rarely has the industry had such a splendid opportunity to communicate the benefits of nuclear energy to solidify public support for nuclear energy where it exists, and to increase support in countries where nuclear energy is an emerging option for electricity production. One could argue that the conditions have never been more favourable for the industry to be proactive in its public communications.

Public support for nuclear energy has been growing steadily in the United States. Moreover, the industry's interest in new reactors is coinciding with growing public concern about climate change and the need for new electric sources that promote energy security and fuel diversity.

Those in favour of nuclear energy as one way to produce electricity reached a record-high 70 percent in 2005. The industry is communicating to these audiences the benefits of nuclear energy to continue building momentum for new nuclear plants: federal government policymakers, financial analysts and investors, the media and in the case of building new nuclear plants, the people living next to existing plants.

In August 2005, the Nuclear Energy Institute surveyed nuclear power plant neighbours—adults selected at random from within the 10-mile radius of U.S. plants. The survey included 18 persons at each of the 64 nuclear power plant sites for a total of 1,152 interviews. The findings include:

- 87% have a favourable impression of the nearest nuclear power plant.
- 60% have a very favourable impression of the plant, compared with just 3% who have a very unfavourable impression of the plant—a 20-to-1 margin.
- 76% of nuclear power plant neighbours would find it acceptable to add a new reactor at the nearest nuclear power plant site.

NEI invested in public opinion research to develop our messages. The research included congressional staff interviews, focus groups and national surveys. Public support increased most by adding new ideas about nuclear energy's benefits to the way people view nuclear energy

This program is being coordinated with U.S. companies in the nuclear energy business so that there is coordination and localization of the message. NEI's member companies in the U.S. have taken on the responsibility to multiply the impact of these communications by adopting the messages in their own communications.

Scrutinising the promise and problems of nuclear energy

Burton Richter

*Professor Emeritus, Stanford Linear Acceleration Centre, Stanford University, USA
E-mail: brichter@slac.stanford.edu*

Nuclear energy is having a renaissance driven by both old fashioned supply and demand, and environmental concerns. Oil and gas prices have exploded and show no signs of returning to the levels of only a few years ago. Coal is not in short supply, but the pollution it generates has severe economic and health consequences. Concern about greenhouse gases and global warming has caused the environmental movement to begin a reassessment of the role of nuclear in the world's energy portfolio.

The full potential of nuclear energy will be achieved only if governments and the public are satisfied that it is safe, that the radioactive waste can be safely disposed of, and that the risk of the proliferation of nuclear weapons is low. The first criterion has been met with designs that are inherently safer than current LWRs, primarily through design simplification, reducing the number of critical components, and advanced control and monitoring technologies. Operating safety has to be assured through good practices and a rigorous, independent inspection process.

The second criterion, waste disposal, is a problem where the science and technology (S&T) communities have the primary role in a solution. I believe that it is solved in principle, but those principles have not yet been fully reduced to practice. I will report on where we have gotten and what needs to be done.

The third criterion, proliferation resistance, is one that the S&T communities cannot solve on their own. The best that S&T can do is to make proliferation difficult, and to make sure that any attempts are discovered early. The rest can be handled only by enforceable international agreements. I will discuss the difficulties and possible solutions to the problem.

POSTER PRESENTATIONS

A specificity of the local community as a stakeholder of the international assistance programmes tackling the nuclear legacy in North-West Russia

E.M. Melikhova and **I.I. Linge**

Nuclear Safety Institute of Russian Academy of Sciences (IBRAE RAS), Russian Federation

E-mail: Elena Melikhova, e_mel@ibrae.ac.ru

At present there are large international programs addressing security and environmental safety of nuclear/radiation hazardous objects in the North West Russia. Apart from a number of bilateral projects, financial and technical support is provided through the TACIS program, the NDEP Nuclear Window and the Multilateral Environmental Program in the Russian Federation.

In accordance with a western approach, these programs assume early and meaningful engagement with the stakeholders, including the local and wider public. But a formal transfer of the public communication procedures does not seem to be very productive. The local media and authorities tend to ignore Rosatom's public meetings addressing health and environmental safety issues, NPP lifetime extension etc.

One may point to maladministration, excessiveness of technical terminology and a lack of openness on the Rosatom's side. It is true, to some extent. However, the main reason lies deeper. It is a lack of actual public interest. When asked of radiation, the inhabitants respond that they feel anxiety and need more information and knowledge. However, more advanced interviews and the media analysis suggest that radiation issues are not among their actual information needs. To illustrate the point we will refer to the results of a survey performed in 2003, and a media study performed in 1997-1999 by Zykova et al. in the Murmansk Region.

The public indifference reflects a declarative nature of environmental values in the Russian public. We will refer to the sociological surveys that have revealed that concerns and dissatisfaction with environmental status are no more than conformist response to the interviewer's questions. Ecological issues meet certain sympathy with the public but they do not take first positions in the hierarchy of actual vital priorities.

In such a case, to have well-informed public one needs to put certain efforts into environmental education and enlightenment of the population. In fact, most advanced environmental NGOs in the region came to the point long ago, for instance, Bellona-Murmansk declares ecological education as one of its main goals.

Thus, it seems reasonable to revise the Public Consultations and Disclosure Plan developed for NDEP Nuclear Window and PR-strategies for other international programs in order to add relevant educational components. The education task is difficult and long-term. And the nuclear community could joint its efforts in solving this task with most constructive environmentalists. Such joint efforts are of common interest and for the benefit of the local public.

Barriers to effective public communication on nuclear issues in Russia

I.L. Abalkina and E.M. Melikhova

Nuclear Safety Institute of Russian Academy of Sciences (IBRAE RAS), Russian Federation

E-mail: Elena Melikhova, e_mel@ibrae.ac.ru

In the former USSR environmental issues emerged on the agenda in late 1980s and became the platform for many "protest" movements. It was also the time when Chernobyl theme began to be heavily exploited. Since then environmental movements started the tradition for being highly politicised and standing in opposition to government and industry. Against this background attempts of the nuclear industry to pursue public dialogue were perceived with suspicion.

As economic difficulties sharpened, environmental issues have been losing their significance for the public, though still declared among major concerns. It is a "good form" to declare one's opposition to nuclear power. But these declarations fail when economic benefits are at stake. Public opinion polls show that people are in favor of nuclear energy if the region experiences energy shortages. Election campaigns also demonstrate that declarations of "green" ideas do not lead to electoral success.

Legal and institutional barriers also remain a significant obstacle to effective communication. While legislation declares public access to information and industry's responsibility for providing environmental information, ways to implement law provisions are not concretized.

As a positive change, nuclear authorities declare transparency and openness to public dialog. Major documents include communication on radiation risk issues as one of the priorities in nuclear industry. However, for communication activities to mature, various internal documents are to be developed, personnel appointments to be made, and funds to be allocated. This needs time and effort, and it is not surprising that these activities usually stand last among other priorities such as safety improvements.

Institutional barriers also appear significant. For example, EMERCOM of Russia is responsible for providing the public safety in emergencies. Thus, PR departments at the nuclear facilities focus mainly on communicating safety issues under normal maintenance and exclude emergency communication issues. Without higher-level documents to pursue emergency communication, nuclear facilities face difficulties to allocate resources for these activities.

Lack of communication skills from the nuclear industry side is, perhaps, one of the most critical issues. There are plenty of examples on how not to communicate on nuclear issues. Mistakes found on NPP Internet sites provide examples how nuclear facilities may provoke further errors in mass media.

It may seem surprising but nuclear industry often fails to trade its own successes. Industry rarely uses the opportunity to do extensive media coverage of positive events or to exploit events that may attract media attention.

Economic issues enjoy much more public interest and priority when comparing to environmental concerns. Positive changes in public communication could be expected if positioning nuclear energy in terms of economic benefits.

Public relations in the field of radioactive waste management

Elena M. Yakovleva

General Director, RADON-PRESS Information Agency, Russian Federation

E-mail: yakovl@radon-press.ru

In present-day Russia, radiation safety is a hot political topic. After the Chernobyl accident public trust of the nuclear energy industry quickly turned into radiophobia. For years the industry remained very close, guarding any kind of information from public eye, which only further damaged the reputation of nuclear power plants' operators and added to the general feeling of insecurity. After the political changes of the 1980s and 1990s, people began to take an active part in shaping the state policy, and it became harder for the industry to ignore the communities' opinion and implement the so-called "top-down" approach. Russian economy and defence largely depend on the use of nuclear energy and radioactive materials; therefore, if we don't want the nuclear projects and programs to stall, we must supply the public with relevant information that would raise the credibility of the industry and assure people of the safety and high professionalism of the nuclear enterprises.

The RADON-PRESS information agency carries out the informational policy of the Russian state unitary enterprise "MosNPO Radon", which has managed radioactive waste and ensured radiation safety in Moscow and the Moscow region for over 40 years. The agency disseminates radioecological information and is based on the principles of efficiency, reliability and transparency. It supplies information on radiological topics to national and regional mass media, involving leading Russian and foreign scientists as experts and authors.

RADON-PRESS publishes a full-color bilingual (Russian-English) magazine, the *Safety Barrier*, writing on the problems of radioecology and radioactive waste management. The magazine covers the scientific and industrial activities of MosNPO RADON and its departments, and also examines the issues of radioecology in Russia and abroad. It gives space to the materials on radiation safety and radioactive waste management policy and strategy, including scientific, technical, economic, legal and societal approaches to solving these problems. For over a year, the magazine has been distributed among the state executive bodies, in the RF State Duma (Parliament) and the Moscow city Duma, in Russian and foreign research institutions and companies working in radioecology, radwaste management and radiation safety. In 2006, a subscription to the magazine will be opened.

What is the Forum for Nuclear Cooperation in Asia (FNCA)?

Junko Ogawa

*Executive Communicator, Public Relations Department, The Japan Atomic Power Company, Japan
E-mail: junko-ogawa@japc.co.jp*

The Asian region is one of the regions, which enjoys the highest economic growth rates in the world. To sustain such growth in the face of limited resources and the need to protect and preserve the environment, the region can benefit from effective utilization of nuclear science and technology.

The Forum for Nuclear Cooperation in Asia (FNCA), consisting of nine Asian countries - Australia, China, Indonesia, Korea, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, Viet Nam and Japan - is an effective mechanism for enhancing socio-economic development through active regional partnership in the peaceful and safe utilization of nuclear science and technology.

Framework

The following points are the basic framework of cooperation.

1. Ministerial Level Meeting (MM):
Ministerial level representatives responsible for nuclear research, development and utilization attend to discuss nuclear policy or cooperative measures. Senior Officials Meeting (SOM) is attached to MM as a preparatory meeting.
2. Coordinators Meeting:
One FNCA Coordinator was appointed for each country, and these Coordinators discuss introduction, modification, termination, coordination, evaluation, and so on, of cooperative activities.
3. Cooperative activities for each project.

Project review of the FNCA Public Information of the nuclear energy

In order to develop the applications of nuclear science and technology for the sustainable societal and economic growth, public information (PI) activities regarding nuclear science and technology is considered indispensable to enhance the public understanding.

The major objective of the PI Projects is to enhance the understanding and acceptance of peaceful use of nuclear energy and radiation among the populace in FNCA member countries. In order to implement this idea, a variety of projects have been created and evolved since the initiation of the PI Project in 1999: (1) the FNCA Newsletter (1999-); (2) the FNCA Website (1999-); (3) Dialogues with the Mass Media (2000-); (4) the Regional Speakers Bureau (2001-); (5) Training of Nuclear Communicators (2004-).

In addition, A Joint Cross-National Questionnaire Survey was carried out in a time period from 2002 through 2003. The joint survey produced, for the first time, very useful information regarding the understanding and the attitudes held by 1,000 high-school students in each of seven FNCA member countries toward science, technology and use of radiation. It is expected that PI Projects should contribute for promoting the effective communication with the people by means of interpersonal communication, mass communication, and communication via new electronic media such as the Internet.

Social acceptability assessment in the context of identification of potential sites for LILW repository in Slovenia

Nadja Železnik¹, Metka Kralj¹, Marko Polič² and Drago Kos³

¹ Agency for Radwaste Management ARAO, Slovenia

² University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts, Slovenia

³ University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences, Slovenia

E-mail: Metka Kralj, metka.kralj@gov.si

Amendment to the *Act on Ionizing Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety* (2003) prescribes that the site for the LILW repository in Slovenia has to be authorized by 2008, and the repository has to be in operation by 2013. The administrative procedure for site authorization started in November 2004 with the 1st public conference. This procedure runs in parallel with the siting procedure in order to save the time and insure that the authorized site will be publicly accepted. The siting procedure follows the mixed mode approach, combining site or area volunteering by the local communities, and the technical screening of the volunteered sites or areas.

In December 2004, ARAO invited 193 local communities in Slovenia to participate in the procedure. The call for applications finished after four months and eight local communities volunteered. Two of them resigned due to the opposition of the interested public, and the third because no suitable site could be identified on its territory. According to the administrative procedure of preparing the detailed plan of national importance for the LILW repository, only three potential sites can be taken into account. A pre-feasibility study was performed in the first half of 2005, and three the most promising sites were selected. The study comparatively assessed the potential sites from the technical, safety, economical, environmental, spatial, and social point of view.

The social acceptability assessment was performed on the level of the local community. Objective parameters (demographic data, industrial and market conditions, education level) and subjective parameters (personal standpoints of opinion- and decision-makers, municipality council support, reports and comments in local media) have been assessed.

The results had been presented in two matrices and a methodology for their evaluation was developed. Objective and subjective parameters had the same weight and the local communities were appointed integrated ranks from 0 – not acceptable to 3 – very acceptable. We did not exclude any of the local communities on the basis of the social aspects.

Social acceptability was the highest in the local community that is hosting the nuclear power plant. The second on the list was the industrial local community near the capital town in Slovenia which volunteered with the condition that an industrial repository of toxic waste would be remediated during the siting procedure of the LILW repository. Local communities from rural areas either withdrew from the process very early, or had low public acceptability.

ARAO is going to established local partnership with the three local communities most promising from the social aspect and having a suitable potential site for the LILW repository. This will facilitate further negotiations on the repository siting.

Expedition to the 30-km Chernobyl Exclusion Zone and the utilization of its experience in education and communication

Attila Aszódi

*Director, Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Institute of Nuclear Techniques, Hungary
E-mail: aszodi@reak.bme.hu*

Tamás Pásmándi

*Scientific Researcher, KFKI Atomic Energy Research Institute, Hungary
E-mail: pazmandi@sunserv.kfki.hu*

Judit Silye

*Regulatory and Technical Coordinator, Hungarian Atomic Energy Authority, Nuclear Safety Directorate, Hungary
E-mail: silye@haea.gov.hu*

Images of the expedition to the Chernobyl Exclusion Zone: follow-up of the presentation in workshop 1 on Monday 13 February.
