

Reversibility and Retrievability

An International Conference and Dialogue

organised by the OECD Nuclear Energy Agency

14 to 17 December 2010

At the "Centre des Congrès" in Reims (France)

Provisional programme (updated 12 November 2010):

:

Day 1	Tuesday, 14 December 2010
7:00	Technical visit (limited to 40 people): Andra's Meuse/Haute Marne Underground Research Laboratory and Technical Exhibition Facility
7:00-20:00	Registration
18:00-20:00	Icebreaker
Day 2	Wednesday, 15 December 2010
8:00-9:00	Set up of posters for the duration of the conference
9:00-9:30	Session 1 - Welcoming addresses <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Luis Echávarri, NEA2. François-Michel Gonnot, Andra3. Dominique Ristori, EC4. IAEA (confirmed)
9:30-10:30	Session 2 - Setting the scene <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Claude Birraux (MP), Parliamentarian and President of the French Parliamentary Office for Technology Assessment (OPECST)<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ <i>Mr. Birraux will chair the conference</i>2. Claudio Pescatore, NEA: Coordinator of the NEA R&R project. "Personal Observations – and – findings from R&R Project".
10:30-11:00	Break
11:00-13:00	Session 3 - Country situations at policy level <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Government representatives (high-level civil-servants) or high-level country figures deliver 10-15 minute talks on:<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ what reversibility and retrievability mean in their countries➤ the main drivers in policy approaches (e.g. legal requirement, government policy, option taken independently by the implementer, no R&R at all, etc.)➤ the meaning of the words "disposal", e.g., final disposal, long-term management with a view to final disposal, etc., and "waste", e.g., when are the relevant materials classified as "waste"?➤ Countries/speakers:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Finland, Ministry of Trade and Industry – J. Avolahti▪ Switzerland, Ministry of Energy – M. Aebersold▪ Germany, Ministry of Environment – G. Arens▪ USA – Director of NRC's Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards – C. Haney▪ Belgium – National Implementing Organization – J.P. Minon▪ Sweden, Ministry of the Environment – A. Gerhardsson

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Japan, Nuclear Safety Commission - S. Shiroya
13:00-14:30	Lunch Break
14:30 -16:20	<p>Session 4 - Key messages from social and political science studies and groups <i>Chair: Dan Metlay</i></p> <p>This session covers a wide-ranging set of topics, several of which may be new to many of the attendees. Look for fresh ideas, different angles on the topic of R&R.</p> <p>Speakers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Luis Aparicio (Andra) on 'Results of the Nancy Conference of 2009' 2. Carl-Reinhold Bråkenhielm, (U. Uppsala, Sweden) 3. John Whitton (NNL) on 'UK National Stakeholder Group meetings' 4. FSC on 'comments on NEA draft-findings R&R report' (confirmed) 5. Sandrine Spaeter (U. Strasbourg, France): 'Economic theory in R&R' 6. Walter Wildi (U. Geneva, Switzerland): 'The EKRA studies and the formulation of the Swiss "long-term monitored disposal" concept' 7. Gerrit Rauws (King Baudouin Foundation): Belgium – on 'Indications from current dialogues'
16:20-16:50	Break
16:50-18:30	<p>Session 5 - Table discussions on Key messages from the social and political sciences</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Which message(s) from social and political science studies would you consider as (a) key message(s) worth remembering? Why? 2. Governance of RW has been made possible by the distinction of roles and the independence of actors taking part in the decision making process: evaluators, regulators, representatives of the interested parties and the public, operators... Is there any specific role to play in this process for the social sciences and humanities? 3. Which place for economics research in addressing the RWM issue? 4. Which lessons are to be taken from the specificities and commonalities among the various countries on these aspects (symbolic dimension, policy, local stakeholders' involvement etc.)?
18:30	Adjourn
Day 3	Thursday, 16 December 2010
8:45-9:15	<p>Reports on Day 1 sessions</p> <p>Brief reports from each table facilitator of Session 5 on their table discussions Possibly a report on Session 3</p>
9:15-10:00	<p>Session 6 - Perspectives on R&R from institutional players <i>Chair Prof. B. Grambow, Ecole des Mines</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The session will deal with the practicalities and consequences of providing for retrievability. • Can retrievability be an add-on or does it need to be taken into account from the beginning? Are there any challenges to the regulatory framework? What kind of implications for monitoring, institutional control and memory keeping? Over what time scales? What kind of organizational structure does reversibility imply? To what extent should one provide for retrieval of waste? • Speakers' organisations are encouraged to also prepare additional posters <p>Topic/Speakers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. USA - WIPP Waste Retrievability Experience and Lessons Learned (S. Wagner, SNL; R. Patterson, DOE)

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. EC work within ESDRED project (Jean Michel Bosgiraud) 3. Sweden - SKB presentation (E. Setzman)
10:00-10:30	Break
10:30-11:45	Session 6 [cont'd] - Perspectives on R&R from institutional players <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. UK NDA (B. Breen) 5. Japan NUMO (H. Tsuchi) 6. France Andra (Confirmed) 7. Belgium FANC (W. Blommaert) 8. Germany DBE (Jürgen Krone)
11:45-12:10	Session 7 - Additional questions to the speakers from the audience
12:10-13:30	Lunch Break
13:30-14:30	Session 8 - Expectations expressed by local stakeholders and NGOs <i>Chair: FSC Chair or FSC representative</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Speakers: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Bure CLIS (France) (confirmed) 2. Councillor Knowles of Cumbria County Council (UK) 3. Martin Donat, Atomausschuss Lüchow Dannenberg (Germany) 4. Johan Swahn, MKG - NGO Office for Nuclear Waste Review (Sweden)
14:30-16:00	Session 9 - Table discussions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Continued discussions on expectations on R&R expressed by local stakeholders ➤ Which lessons are to be taken from the national specificities in the expectations of the local stakeholders regarding R&R? ➤ Opportunities and limits for improving local participation in RWM within a stepwise decision making process and in the long term: assessment, monitoring, financial provisions, memory, ... ➤ Which place for local stakeholders in the setting of the policy agendas related to RW at the national and international levels?
16:00-17:00	Break <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Posters should be removed before 6:00PM
17:00-18:30	Session 10 – Optimal choices and duties to future generations <i>Chair: Michael Sailer, Oeko-Institut (1h30)</i> <p>In 1969, the United States National Academy of Sciences, in its report to Congress titled <i>Technology: Processes of Assessment and Choice</i>, observed that: “Other things being equal, those technological projects or developments should be favored that leave maximum room for maneuver in the future. The reversibility of an action should thus be counted as a major benefit; its irreversibility, a major cost.” Should this principle or one variant of it be informing the implementation of a geological disposal facility? Which are its strengths and limitations?</p> <p>Panelists:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prof. Pierre Berest, LMS, Ecole Polytechnique, Paris 2. Prof. Carl-Reinhold Bråkenhielm, Univ. Uppsala (Theology) 3. MP Bertrand Pancher, Leader of “Decider Ensemble” 4. Prof. Erik Van Hove, Univ. Antwerp (retired)
18:30	Adjourn
18:45	Departure for conference dinner by bus from Conference Centre

Day 4	Friday, 17 December 2010
9:00-9:30	Reports on Day 2 sessions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reports from the facilitators on the table discussions of sessions 9
9:30-11:15	Session 11 - Panel on “The Place of R&R in Regulatory Policy” <i>Chair: Carmen Ruiz, CSN</i> A panel discussion. There are two aspects to regulation: the process (which overlaps to some extent with policy), and safety requirements. Process: How does the stepwise regulatory process relate to the overall stepwise decision making process? Are they the same, or distinct? Is a stepwise regulatory process sufficient? Safety: some regulators may say that they are indifferent to whether R or R is present (unless, of course, it is a legislated requirement) as long as the basic safety requirements are still met. Is this really true? Are the current regulatory (safety) requirements predisposed in one way or the other, i.e. do they bias the discussion? Are regulators’ views similar to society’s ones, or to implementers’ ones, or distinct from both? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Panellists: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D. Schultheisz (USA - EPA) • H. Umeki (Japan - NSC) • M-P Comets (France- ASN) • P. Hufschmied (Switzerland-ENSI) • R. Paltemaa (Finland – STUK)
11:15-11:30	Break
11:30-12:00	Session 12 - The International Retrievability Scale, Presentation (<i>J.-N. Dumont, Andra and R&R Working Group</i>) and Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A presentation on the R-scale is followed by a discussion in plenary session (leaflet distributed to participants in advance). This is an opportunity to get feedback from a wider audience, further refine the scale and the leaflet.
12:00-13:30	Lunch Break
13:30-14:45	Session 13 – Stocktaking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sessions’ rapporteurs recap their sessions. ▪ Conference chair (<i>C. Birraux</i>) recaps the discussions, key points made, and the most important areas where answers revealed either consensus or divergence. This information will be documented and will be used to update the NEA R&R project report.
14:45	Closing of the Conference
15:00	Adjourn – End of the Conference