



# SAFEGROUNDS

## Community stakeholder involvement

*A report prepared within the SAFEGROUNDS project, Version 2*

**D Collier**

**Faulkland Associates**



Classic House, 174-180 Old Street, London EC1V 9BP  
TELEPHONE 020 7549 3300 FAX 020 7253 0523  
EMAIL [enquiries@ciria.org](mailto:enquiries@ciria.org)  
WEBSITE [www.ciria.org](http://www.ciria.org)

## SAFEGROUNDS

### *Community stakeholder involvement*

Collier, D

CIRIA

CIRIA W16

© CIRIA 2007

RP718

<b>Keywords</b> Contaminated land, environmental good practice, ground improvement, ground investigation and characterisation, health and safety, <i>in situ</i> testing and instrumentation, nuclear, site management, sustainable construction	
<b>Reader interest</b> This guidance has been developed primarily for site owners, site operators and their contractors. It is also addressed to governmental and non-governmental organisations and other groups within the public	<b>Classification</b> AVAILABILITY    Unrestricted CONTENT        Guidance document STATUS          Committee-guided USER             Site owners, site operators, contractors, governmental departments, local authorities, regulators, NGOs and other groups within the public

<b>Version control</b>	
<b>Document title:</b>	SAFEGROUNDS <i>Community stakeholder involvement</i>
<b>Version and date:</b>	Version 2, 10 August 2005
<b>Primary author:</b>	David Collier, Faulkland Associates
<b>Prepared for:</b>	SAFEGROUNDS Learning Network
<b>History:</b>	Replaces Version 1, September 2002 The front pages were reformatted in February 2007 for consistency across the SAFEGROUNDS documents
<b>Status:</b>	SAFEGROUNDS good practice guidance document, prepared with the SAFEGROUNDS Project Steering Group This is a live document, subject to revision. Freely available web publication

Published by CIRIA, Classic House, 174–180 Old Street, London EC1V 9BP, UK.

This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information on the subject matter covered. It is sold and/or distributed with the understanding that neither the authors nor the publisher is thereby engaged in rendering a specific legal or any other professional service. While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the publication, no warranty or fitness is provided or implied, and the authors and publisher shall have neither liability nor responsibility to any person or entity with respect to any loss or damage arising from its use.

All rights reserved. This document is freely available to download, however if you wish to use any part of the document for reproduction elsewhere (such as the figures, text or technical information) for use in other documents or publications, please contact the Publishing Department for more details on copyright terms and charges at: [publishing@ciria.org](mailto:publishing@ciria.org) or tel: +44 (0)20 7549 3300.

## Preface

The Safegrounds website has had on it for two years a document entitled *Community Stakeholder Involvement* by David Collier. As part of its on-going programme, Safegrounds has decided provide resources for the updating of this document, taking account of recommendations and discussions within and among the Project Steering Group (PSG) members and of the more recent developments.

The updated version of the *Community Stakeholder Involvement* document is being prepared taking account of Safegrounds own process for development of documents for publication on the website. A draft description of this process was distributed to PSG members on 27 August 2004. It should be noted that this process is still not finalised, and indeed is a living object which may be continuously improved.

Draft 1 of the updated document was prepared by David Collier, now at Faulkland Associates, with input as noted above. Draft 1 was discussed at meetings of a subset of the PSG in meetings on 2 July and 14 July 2004. Draft 2 was produced by Enviro staff, taking account of the output from those meetings. Notes of those meetings are retained by CIRIA.

Draft 2 was distributed 1 September to PSG members. Discussion took place at the PSG meeting on 7 September. PSG members were invited to obtain wider comments from within their organisations and provide these by 8 October to: [emma.kerrigan@enviros.com](mailto:emma.kerrigan@enviros.com), and copy to [jeff.kersey@ciria.org](mailto:jeff.kersey@ciria.org) and [philip.charles@ciria.org](mailto:philip.charles@ciria.org).

Draft 2.1 was prepared by Enviro. It took account of further input from Paul Dorfman and Richard Bramhall. This Draft was circulated to PSG members for comment within each of their own organisations. The PSG members were invited to collate their organisation's comments and to send these by 19 November to [emma.kerrigan@enviros.com](mailto:emma.kerrigan@enviros.com), with copy to [jeff.kersey@ciria.org](mailto:jeff.kersey@ciria.org) and [philip.charles@ciria.org](mailto:philip.charles@ciria.org).

Draft 3 was prepared by Enviro in the light of the feedback on Version 2.1. The PSG reviewed this draft and further comments have been incorporated in this final version. To the best knowledge of Enviro, it incorporates all comments to the satisfaction of all PSG members.

## Executive summary

This document sets out guidance on *Community stakeholder involvement* in the management of radioactively contaminated land.

It complements guidance on related issues, notably, principles and good practice for the management of contaminated land on nuclear and defence sites, available at: [www.safegrounds.com/](http://www.safegrounds.com/)

The guidance has been produced in consultation with a range of stakeholders which make up the Safegrounds Project Steering Group.

The guidance starts with a discussion of the objectives of stakeholder involvement, the building of trust and how risk is understood in different contexts. A set of stages is then suggested for implementing a stakeholder involvement programme. This includes the practical issues of stakeholder selection, proposals for making the process useful and relevant to stakeholders so as to promote early involvement, and the level of involvement that may be appropriate in different circumstances. Tools and techniques are also suggested and examples of recent experience are provided, illustrating the relevance of the guidance.

# Contents

Preface .....	3
Executive summary .....	4
<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2 Purpose of stakeholder involvement .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3 The importance of trust .....</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1 Trust in the process .....	9
3.2 Trust in the organisation .....	9
<b>4 Communicating about risk .....</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1 How communities see risk .....	10
4.2 Credibility .....	10
4.3 How communities link issues .....	11
<b>5 Planning a programme .....</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1 General .....	12
5.2 Key stages .....	12
<b>6 Selecting stakeholders .....</b>	<b>14</b>
6.1 Types of stakeholders .....	14
6.2 Practical implications .....	15
<b>7 Involving the community .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>8 Campaign and community groups .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>9 Level of involvement .....</b>	<b>19</b>
9.1 Range of levels .....	19
9.2 Giving information .....	19
9.3 Consultation .....	20
9.4 Participation .....	21
<b>10 Some tools and techniques .....</b>	<b>22</b>
10.1 Newsletters .....	22
10.2 Project information centres .....	22
10.3 Opinion surveys .....	22
10.4 Focus groups .....	23
10.5 Public meetings .....	23
10.6 Surgeries/“open house” .....	23
10.7 Participative workshops .....	23
10.8 BPEO workshop .....	23
10.9 Strategic stakeholder dialogue .....	24
10.10 Community liaison groups .....	24

<b>11</b>	<b>Recent evaluations and guidelines</b> .....	<b>25</b>
11.1	The Dounreay BPEO evaluation .....	25
11.2	Some comments on cost/benefit issues .....	26
11.3	The ISOLUS evaluation .....	26
11.4	The BNFL dialogue evaluation .....	27
11.5	The NDA model .....	28
11.6	The Environment Agency/SEPA Guidance .....	29
<b>12</b>	<b>Benchmark programmes</b> .....	<b>31</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>Recommended reading</b> .....	<b>32</b>
13.1	Risk perception and communication .....	32
13.2	Consultation and stakeholder involvement .....	32
13.3	Internet resources .....	32

**List of tables**

<b>Table 7.1</b>	<b>Issues in making involvement programmes stakeholder friendly</b>	<b>17</b>
------------------	---	-----------

# 1

## Introduction

The SAFEGROUNDS guidance identifies specific points in the management of contaminated land on nuclear and defence sites where stakeholder input is necessary or desirable (SAFEGROUNDS *Good Practice Guidance for the Management of Contaminated Land on Nuclear and Defence Sites*, available at <<http://www.safegrounds.org>>). This paper provides additional information on good practice in stakeholder involvement in decisions relating to contaminated land and subsequently during project implementation. Its purpose is to help users design an effective stakeholder involvement programme, including remedial actions if relations with stakeholders run into difficulties. The structure is therefore generally organised to be consistent with the project planning process, with additional background information where necessary. Detailed practical advice on the selection and running of specific types of event is readily available from other sources and is not included here. A list of useful sources of information is given at the end of the paper.

The paper deals primarily with the involvement of stakeholders other than regulators, government departments and those from the site owner's/operator's own organisation. Its focus is the local community.

The intent of Principle 2 in the SAFEGROUNDS guidance on the management of contaminated land on nuclear and defence sites (Hill *et al*, 2002) is to ensure effective external participation, whether it is required by organisational policy or regulatory frameworks, to meet stakeholder expectations, or to improve decision-making. The increasingly positive approach to stakeholder relations on contaminated land issues is partly motivated by the sense that good governance as understood by the community and major shareholders requires it. Certainly, the primary drivers behind stakeholder involvement are overwhelmingly positive. The aim is to make better decisions, to develop approaches that can be implemented with community support, to improve transparency and to build trust. Stakeholder involvement is also important to risk management. As the Environment Council points out, it can “prevent, resolve or help manage problems caused by external opposition to projects”. Where something has already gone wrong, systematic involvement can re-establish effective communication and help resolve difficulties. Though not all conflicts can be prevented or resolved and there may still be disagreement on principles, it should still be possible to work together and mitigate the sources of particular dispute.

Adherence to Principle 2 does not mean that all stakeholders have to be involved in all decision-making steps for every contaminated land issue on every site. The presumption in case of doubt should be for inclusion, but the level of consultation and involvement should be proportionate to the technical and societal significance of the decision. Strategies need to be capable of commanding consensus support within the community, and therefore ought also to be proportionate to the local community’s perception of the need for involvement. Clearly, there is a need to build trust.

## 3

# The importance of trust

### 3.1

## Trust in the process

The validity of external participation depends crucially on the integrity of those running it and their responsiveness. Contributions should be objectively considered and there should be a genuine willingness to take a different course of action if new information or insights are provided. If involvement comes after the options have effectively been narrowed down to one, it will be seen as a closed process and, at best, there will be no ownership. The consultation will be seen as a sham and simply a means of legitimising a prior decision.

### 3.2

## Trust in the organisation

Community involvement programmes are unlikely to be effective unless a degree of trust can first be established. Relationships with stakeholders and the public need to be built up over time. It is not realistic to expect that the trust and credibility required for successful consultation will be established quickly, especially where the project is contentious and the debate polarised from the start.

Acceptable motives, realistic strategies and effective regulation are prerequisites for building trust, but perhaps the most important factor is openness. An open culture within the organisation is the ideal. Practical examples of openness in the context of a community involvement programme include: admitting mistakes, acknowledging uncertainty, and giving people the full picture.

Reliability is another important contributor to trust. That is, the confidence that the sponsoring organisation and the individuals working within it will do what they say they will do. Not only should the organisation be open and honest, but it should also be efficient and competent so that its promises mean something. Poor reliability can easily grow into a more general lack of trust.

### Example

A major nuclear consultation ran into difficulties. "Registration ought to be a simple matter and in this case the basic process functioned well enough. However a series of administrative problems created confusion and (pressure groups) in particular started to lose confidence in the (consultation) as a whole". The solution was to bring together pressure groups and project team members to identify the problems and their causes, and to work together to implement solutions. Progress was possible because of the teams' openness and desire to improve, and the pressure groups' constructive approach. Consensus is often possible on process, even where the parties seek different outcomes, if trust can be first established at a personal level.

## 4

# Communicating about risk

Although much is known about the differences between the way engineers and communities think about risk, communications between the two can still be fraught with difficulty and so the basics are summarised below.

### 4.1

#### How communities see risk

It is now recognised that a “top-down” model of risk communication is unlikely to resolve a wide range of environmental risk controversies. As a result, dialogue with the public is no longer seen as an “optional add on”. This shift has seen risk communication and policy practice move toward two-way dialogue between “experts” and the “community”.

Even allowing for the various biases that are at work in risk perception - such as the tendency to consider widely-reported events to be more likely than they really are - the general public’s ability to rank frequency of death from hazards is often not unrealistic. Where ordinary people part company from “scientific” risk assessment is that they factor in “quality” of hazard eg dread, familiarity and catastrophic potential. Different forms of death and disease are not feared equally.

It is a mistake to confuse people’s understanding of a risk with their acceptance of it. The level of acceptable risk is a matter of values and opinions. Any evaluation of options is therefore likely to have to explicitly incorporate underlying values and social factors such as fairness and the balance of benefit and risk. Steps that result in a fairer and more voluntary distribution of risk will be helpful.

A feeling that the things that can sensibly be done to reduce the risk have been done, and that there are effective monitoring and emergency response arrangements, is important to acceptability. Communities also tend to look for independent monitoring and open reporting of results, plus other indications that adverse findings will not be concealed, so that if things do not turn out as predicted, action will be taken. They also look for a design that allows for a change of plan if the unexpected happens, and the potential for effective countermeasures should there be a failure.

Motive is very important, and the corporate values of the sponsoring organisation will make a difference. It matters who stands to gain from a project, and whether they “deserve” that benefit. For example, it is becoming increasingly obvious that the public will tolerate certain types of risks if there is sufficient medical benefit but not if the only benefit is a corporation’s “bottom line”.

Any stakeholder programme has to deal with these risk perception and acceptability factors in an open and straightforward way if participants are to see it as addressing their concerns, which must never be dismissed as “unscientific”.

### 4.2

#### Credibility

The credibility of someone talking about risk depends only in part on his or her technical competence. It is also strongly influenced by how committed they appear to

be to stakeholder involvement, whether they understand and are sympathetic to the concerns being expressed, and whether their manner is open, honest and direct.

Independence and objectivity are also important considerations. Information from “biased” sources will tend to be distrusted, particularly where the organisation’s motives are primarily commercial or political. People place most weight on information that is clearly neutral and addresses all sides of the argument. For instance, independent peer review of the important subjective judgements underpinning the analysis may need to be carried out to underpin a comparison of options for a controversial project.

### 4.3 How communities link issues

The public rarely see decisions as independent of the wider context. They inevitably perceive decisions that form part of a wider programme, such as site restoration, as being linked and if they cannot see the wider picture they will be likely to feel either mistrust or frustration – probably both. An involvement process will therefore be successful only if the participants fully understand the context, eg how a decision on one element of a wider plan fits together with decisions on other elements and on the overall framework. Participants need to be aware if proposals may be overturned or modified at a later stage or if other bodies (eg regulators) might initiate their own separate consultation. Communities link issues and decisions that seem separate to industry and regulators. Also, people see little distinction between policy and its implementation.

Members of the public usually wish to make their views known on the overall merits of the project and of alternatives but are rarely in a position to make much contribution on the technical development of the proposal. Thus a programme that aims to involve members of the public by allowing them to comment only on technical detail will frustrate them. They frequently want to be heard on matters that concern them but that are ostensibly outside the formal scope of the consultation and may well also be outside the scope of the project team’s decision making. Exclusion and abrupt rejection of comment as “outside the scope of what we are here to discuss” is liable to provoke an angry reaction. Some flexibility is therefore required, and there needs to be a mechanism for passing on such comments and obtaining a response.

Many environmental debates actually represent conflicts over competing social values as well as disagreements over scientific and economic data. The public and wider stakeholder community provide a social peer review function. This is comparable with the technical peer review that is the usual consultation objective but these represent different sorts of processes. They require different, perhaps parallel, approaches. Some of the difficulties in recent UK consultations are a result of attempting to stretch mechanisms and information provision designed for technical consultation to accommodate a different type of stakeholder input.

There is also the challenge of integrating the technical, social and local democratic inputs. Unless the decision-making process is tailored to accommodate all three types of input, and agreed before the process starts, the hard-won social input from the general public may simply be put to one side.

## 5 Planning a programme

### 5.1 General

The key stages in planning and implementing a typical stakeholder involvement programme are outlined in Section 5.2 below. Each programme is however unique and needs to be tailored for its purpose and its audience. In general, the larger the scope and reach, the better defined and more formal the stages will be. In a smaller consultation they may be implicit or merged together. However, even then it will usually not be adequate to rely on written consultation alone.

Sponsors must be clear and honest with themselves as well as with the prospective participants about the reasons for involving them, freely offering opportunities for involvement but focusing on getting active and representative participation at key points, which may be earlier or at a more strategic level than has generally been the case up to now. They should not push for “broad involvement” simply for the sake of it, or design stakeholder programmes with “one of everything” because they are not clear what type of process they and the participants really need.

Early consultation is often the key to the success of an initiative, and to securing co-operation: omitting it may cause delay and expense later. The objective is usually to identify and involve the key players early, build trust and improve understanding of potential participants’ priorities and needs, thereby helping design a more effective consultation programme and encouraging participation. A key aim is to ensure that there are no surprises for either key stakeholders or the sponsor once the project enters the public domain.

It is important that the agenda for early consultation is not too circumscribed, so that others can have a part in developing it. It is helpful to let others who are interested know the likely timing of different forms of consultation as early as possible (and any later changes to it).

#### **Example: Early consultation on new waste strategy**

- new management strategy being considered for a radioactive waste stream
- possible approach and options discussed with local community liaison group before detailed work started
- LCLG identified potential problems and potential stakeholder issues that led to reconsideration
- potential for significant problems, and waste of time and effort averted.

Caution is raised concerning reliance solely for local representation upon LCLC and LCLGS. Part of the trust problem is that LCLC delegates can be regarded locally as having been enrolled, through long participation, into views overly sympathetic to the industry.

### 5.2 Key stages

The key stages in planning and implementing a typical stakeholder involvement programme are:

- 1 Define the purpose – what is the scope and purpose; how does it fit in with wider decision making and other initiatives; which stakeholders should be involved and what are their particular needs, and potential contributions.
- 2 Plan the programme – what mix of activities is required; how should the programme be promoted; what documentation needs to be prepared; who should be allocated to the programme project team; what resources and training do they need; are internal workshops required first; how will the programme be evaluated.
- 3 Review the plan – inform community of proposals; review the scope and design of the programme with some of those likely to be involved; test examples of any promotional and information material. Failing to show willing to inform and recruit as widely as possible may compromise all the subsequent steps.
- 4 Promote the programme – launch the programme; make media announcements if required; inform internal and external stakeholders; encourage and facilitate involvement by individuals and groups in the community; start stakeholder registration database; set out details of access to information and any outreach events.
- 5 Provide information – disseminate and make available key documents; organise poster displays, site visits, presentations to community groups, as required; if deemed necessary, set up library for participants, web site with supporting information, telephone help lines.
- 6 Consult – consult interested stakeholders; provide various means to comment; acknowledge and record comments; consider interactive outreach activities such as public meetings and “surgeries”, and use of surveys or questionnaires to canvas opinions.
- 7 Participate – hold meetings with stakeholders; answer questions; provide background information; consider facilitated events such as meetings, workshops and focus groups to explore specific issues in more depth; consider joint problem solving and group decision making methodologies or deliberative methods such as citizens’ juries; discuss proposed events with potential participants.
- 8 Extend participation –if necessary, involve community liaison groups; consider possibilities for joint working parties and “neutral” data gathering or monitoring.
- 9 Compile input to decision - assess comments and outputs from participative events; seek further clarification or new analysis as necessary; document process.
- 10 Feedback – provide feedback to participants on comments received and how they were taken into account, decision made, next steps etc.; inform stakeholders not directly involved in this specific programme.
- 11 Evaluate the programme – seek the views of participants; incorporate the lessons in internal guidelines; feedback to stakeholders.

## 6

# Selecting stakeholders

### 6.1

## Types of stakeholders

Stakeholders are constituencies, organised groups or individuals that have a direct or indirect interest in the decision. This may be, for example, because they are potentially affected, because they have a view on what the outcome ought to be, or perhaps because they are representative in some way of a wider constituency.

The focus of this paper is the local community, but other types of stakeholder also need to be involved if the external input to decision-making is not to be dominated by one perspective or set of interests. Stakeholders are much less likely to respond constructively in future if they feel unfairly excluded.

Internal or external stakeholders that have a reasonable degree of commonality of interest with the organisation in question are the most obvious category of stakeholder, and are sometimes referred to as “true stakeholders”. There are however other classes of stakeholder that are affected by the decisions an organisation takes or have a strong view on its conduct, even if their interests are very different.

Organisations require a “licence to operate” from a wider range of stakeholders. This is obvious in the case of regulators such as the Health and Safety Executive, where authority has been delegated by society. The right of shareholders to regulate the direction of a business is also readily appreciated. In practice however, organisations find that their ‘licence to operate’ can also be compromised or even withdrawn because they have lost the consent of the local community in which they operate, or they have lost the confidence of politicians and financiers.

Campaign groups often see themselves as having a “license to operate” or watchdog role, but they are also often significant as opinion formers able to influence other stakeholders. Failure to inform a local community of the existence of other groups with experience of similar issues or a national NGO with relevant expertise may undermine trust and waste time later on. The media are sometimes considered to be stakeholders, but are more often considered separately with other opinion formers, on the basis that there is usually no strong commonality of interest. They may have considerable influence on other stakeholders and may also be seen in turn as an indicator of a broader, unobserved, public mood.

A community cannot be treated as a single entity. Relationships between the site and the community are complex and all the different types of stakeholder described above are contained within it. The people who live around the site and the community groups, and local authorities that speak for them, have a wide range of inter-relationships and perspectives. In reality, there is no such a thing as “the community view” and this has to be born in mind in reading the sections that follow.

In practice, the stakeholders and stakeholder groups who should be considered include those whose support for the project will help it go ahead smoothly and those whose opposition will delay the project, obstruct it, or reduce its viability. The starting point is normally those who may be, or would think they may be, affected by the project, their representatives and the site local liaison group. Beyond that, programmes may look to include people and groups influential in the area, those with an interest in a particular outcome and also stakeholders that have been involved in the issue in the past.

The full range of stakeholders does not need to be involved on every project. The scale of involvement generally reflects the nature and extent of the perceived potential impact, and the project's importance as a precedent. The presumption in case of doubt should be for inclusion, but the level of consultation and involvement should be proportionate to the technical and societal significance of the decision. Strategies need to be capable of commanding consensus support within the community, and therefore should also be proportionate to the local community's perception of the need for involvement.

For example, where there is significant potential off-site impact or interest in a contaminated land management decision, the views of a wider range of external stakeholders should always be sought before a preferred option is selected and submitted for regulatory approval. The emphasis for smaller projects may be on information provision and consultation may be limited to the local community. There will also be contamination issues that have little or no significance for stakeholders and where quick action is a priority, for instance clean up of a small spillage. It may then be appropriate simply to include it in routine reports to the local community liaison group.

The application of BPEO-type processes is a major theme in the SAFEGROUNDS guidance (Hill *et al.*, 2002). The degree to which external stakeholders are brought into the process and the balance between local, regional and national involvement again depends on the potential impact and significance of the project.

An important issue in some projects will be the transport of radioactive waste. This is likely to prove an emotive topic and accordingly needs to be handled with great care. Communities along the proposed transport route may need to be informed and invited to participate. Some would go further, and say that they should always be invited. Certainly, communities at the "receiving end" should be involved if there is any significant change to existing arrangements.

People and organisations in the community need to be quite strongly motivated to participate in consultation or decision making. It takes a great deal of time and effort – often unpaid - and it can be an intimidating experience for non-technical members of the community. The successful involvement programmes are those that are “stakeholder friendly”, designed to improve the benefits people get from participation and lower the barriers to involvement (see table below). The relevance of the programme to them personally is explained, they feel that they have something useful to contribute, and they feel that their involvement has the potential to affect the course of the decision-making process in a meaningful way.

Consultation on safety, environment and the introduction of new technology has tended to be dominated by institutional stakeholders and pressure groups. There are good reasons for this. Such organisations are usually equipped to provide technical comment at a level the sponsors of the programme will find useful, and they understand the decision-making and regulatory process.

In contrast, members of the public usually wish to make their views known on the overall merits of a project or course of action but only rarely can they make much contribution to the technical debate unless local issues are involved. However sponsors are nowadays increasingly carrying out broad-based public consultation and making more effort to reach “ordinary people” and factor their views into the decision. Lay members of the public are also capable of making reasoned and reasonable contributions and their involvement is often particularly important in contaminated land projects. Members of the public also increasingly feel that they have a right to information and to be consulted on a wide variety of issues. One consequence of the growing recognition of the benefits and importance of consulting the general public is the wide variety of approaches and facilitated workshop techniques that have been developed specially for this purpose. Only those with strong prior views tend to respond readily to opportunities for participation, so active measures generally need to be taken to recruit a more representative cross-section.

Where there is less experience of involvement, there may need to be an initial capacity-building stage to strengthen and provide resources to community institutions to allow them to participate fully. If people are being asked to participate in decision-making, time may need to be spent to bring them up to speed on the issues – ideally using briefings from a “neutral” source. The pool of individuals who understand group decision-making processes and are equipped to participate in future will be enlarged with each consultation.

Long-term community liaison groups already exist for many nuclear sites and are an obvious channel for communication. They could play a key role in helping to scope the community involvement programme and documentation package and then drive the information agenda more actively than if there were no community focus. At defence sites where there is no such group, it may be necessary to set one up. This is best done well in advance, to give time to build up trust between it and site management, and between it and the wider community.

There is always the potential for conflict between the role of local elected representatives and other groups who may be perceived as speaking for the community. Nevertheless, it is clear that more than one local stakeholder group may need to be recognised. These issues need to be dealt with sensitively.

**Table 7.1**

*Issues in making involvement programmes stakeholder friendly*

Issue	Points to note
Competing demands	It takes time and commitment to participate properly, and there are many competing demands. Try to make participation as easy as possible.
Access	Carefully consider access to consultation documents and outreach events. Take into account the needs of the disabled.
Time	Aim to allow sufficient time within the programme for participants to prepare for events and to read and comment on documents.
Awareness	People have to be aware of the programme to participate. Think about informing and encouraging people through a co-ordinated promotion campaign.
Information	Try to present a range of information, taking account of the format and level of detail required by different participants.
Public speaking	The stress of speaking in a meeting deters many from participating. Surgeries and exhibitions are more flexible and less intimidatory.
Access to the Internet	The Internet gives people access to a wide range of information and opinions from all sides of the argument. But not everybody has access, so a web site on its own is not enough.

The participation of campaign groups is important to an effective and credible programme for both practical and democratic reasons:

- they can help develop the format of a stakeholder involvement programme on the basis of their experience, and provide feedback during it
- some pressure groups can provide critical scrutiny of documentation and make a technical contribution to participatory decision making
- consultation with pressure groups gives their supporters - who may include a significant proportion of the people taking an active interest in the project - an organised channel for expressing their views
- it is fair to assume that the pressure groups represent their membership directly, but not the general public. They are, however, one channel by which evidence of public opinion might be communicated
- even their critics usually recognise that their involvement is an important safeguard.

Different groups have different approaches, make different judgements on the same information, and may have very different long-term agendas. However they probably have one thing in common – there are too many different calls on their scarce technical resources. They therefore need to be convinced that the issue is relevant and that they can have an impact. As far as possible, consultations should be co-ordinated to keep the demands on participating stakeholders to a reasonable level.

Where subject matter and/or the documentation is complex, where there is little authoritative third party analysis in the public domain, and where community involvement has a high priority the case for providing reasonable levels of financial or other support should be considered carefully. Local campaign or community groups in particular may need practical support, a contribution to expenses, and help in securing access to independent sources of information and advice.

Pressure groups have the right to choose whether to participate in a community involvement programme. If they do choose to participate, it arguably implies acceptance of certain responsibilities. Namely, to behave with integrity and separate protest from participation so far as practicable, and to recognise the difficulties inherent in any programme and help avoid problems rather than exploit them unfairly.

## 9

# Level of involvement

### 9.1

## Range of levels

At its simplest, stakeholder involvement may mean little more than keeping local people informed about activities on site, including safety and environmental issues and future plans. Consultation by contrast is a two-way process, whereby the organisation asks individuals and groups for their views and then takes them into account in decision making. Where more involvement is appropriate, members of the community may even participate directly in the analysis and decision making. Ultimate responsibility for the decision usually remains with the sponsoring organisation, but an objective of participation is often to reach a degree of consensus between the organisation, the community and other stakeholders on the way forward. Any one of these – information, consultation or participation – may be on-going, or it may be a “one-off” activity focused on a specific issue.

The different parties often start with different understandings of the level of involvement proposed and with different perceptions of what is fair and appropriate. These differences may prove difficult to resolve. The key thing is therefore to set out the purpose and relevance of the programme openly and honestly and to ensure that everybody is absolutely clear from the outset what is proposed.

The stakeholder involvement process should never be an end in itself. Rather, it should be an integral part of decision-making and management processes. It only has meaning if all parties have this intent. The aim is to secure agreement for a stakeholder involvement programme that meets the aspirations of both the organisation and its stakeholders, but also one that takes account of the balance of cost and benefit and can be delivered in a timely and cost-effective manner.

### 9.2

## Giving information

A public information process is intended solely to provide information to stakeholders. This usually means the local community but if national NGOs are to be constructively engaged they should routinely be provided with information to enable them to maintain an overview. Stakeholders may seek clarification, but they are not being invited to contribute to the decision-making process. A local information programme will almost always be required for a major project dealing with contaminated land. Typically an information programme covers things such as plans, progress, events, public safety and environmental performance. Local programmes should offer people the option to obtain more information or become more closely involved and should include information relating to NGOs and CBOs with relevant expertise and experience. Tools available include newsletters, web sites, outreach events etc. Information on individual projects will often be part of a wider programme. Early, accurate and complete communication is a key element in building trust.

As a minimum, it is important that education and information provision form part of all participation programmes. The need for a greater level of participation must then be determined in each situation. It is not important to achieve the highest possible level of participation, just the level that is most appropriate. Techniques at the lower level of participation may also be used to support techniques at a higher level; for example, the provision of information would support methods of consultation.

#### *Using Web Pages to disseminate information*

Information provision takes many forms, including local newsletters and presentations to local community liaison groups. The Internet also offers new opportunities. The Australian Government's radioactive waste web site is at: <[http://www.radioactivewaste.gov.au/managing\\_australia's\\_radioactive\\_waste/managing\\_australia's\\_radioactive\\_waste.htm](http://www.radioactivewaste.gov.au/managing_australia's_radioactive_waste/managing_australia's_radioactive_waste.htm)>. The UK ISOLUS site is at [www.nucsubs.org.uk/](http://www.nucsubs.org.uk/). For an example of community level information provision, see <[www.oztoxics.org/research/3000\\_hcbweb/index.html](http://www.oztoxics.org/research/3000_hcbweb/index.html)>.

Poor information provision is a common cause of complaint in consultations and lack of usable information is often the main barrier to understanding and participation in a stakeholder programme. Access to the right information, at the right level of detail and at the right time is the key to effective stakeholder involvement.

Good communication requires the consultation sponsor to look at the information needs from the perspective of a range of potential participants - from the least informed, least educated member of the community to the technically competent professional organisation. Common sense suggests that it is not likely to be effective if the sponsor merely circulates scientific or legal documents drawn up for other purposes and other audiences. The information should be presented in digestible forms but without oversimplifying the facts and issues. Some local people may not be able to read technical English, in which case translation becomes an issue. No single document is likely to fulfil these requirements, and therefore a suite of documents may need to be provided.

Project sponsors generally provide only limited additional information on request. Typically, information is released to allow detailed comment on the data and analysis, but there is no obligation to provide information needed to conduct alternative analyses. This can be a major source of contention and stakeholders frequently complain that documents are being unnecessarily withheld. Sponsors therefore need to think through in advance which supporting documents they are able to release and discuss the options with stakeholders likely to be involved.

## 9.3 Consultation

Consultation programmes seek input from stakeholders to support and inform the decision-making process. The sponsor typically provides information to the local community and other stakeholders and makes it possible for them to submit comments or ask questions about proposals. Consultation is a regulatory requirement in some contexts. Consultations offer large numbers of people the opportunity to comment on a proposal or options. They allow for community peer review of proposals and may identify new technical issues that need addressing. They also help sponsors understand stakeholder views and concerns, so they can be taken into account in decision making and risk communication. However they are limited in that there is usually little scope for contributing to identifying solutions or for taking part in the decision-making process.

## 9.4

### Participation

Participative decision making allows stakeholders to take an active role in the decision-making process rather than simply providing comment on proposals. They are involved in shared analysis and agenda setting, even though the responsibility for the final decision lies with others.

A commitment to participation implies recognition of the benefits of consensus, even if there is no specific prior commitment to it. When talking about consensus it is essential to be clear about what is meant. One meaning is “unanimity” ie each party must positively support the decision. More frequently however, it is used to describe a situation where a sufficient fraction of the participants positively support the decision. Others simply consent to it - even though they may not prefer it personally - because they consider it tolerable, or the best solution or agreement that can be achieved under the circumstances.

The more complex the issue and – in most cases – the more controversial it is, the more likely it is that a higher level of participation will be expected by stakeholders, required to develop understanding in the community, and necessary to get the quality of input being sought. The more participative the process, the more rewarding it generally is for all parties but there are limits to the contribution stakeholders can be asked to make.

Participative processes cannot easily reach large numbers of people and so usually need complementing with other initiatives to communicate with and gauge the opinion of the wider community.

#### *A BPEO Example: Decommissioning AWE's Pangbourne Pipeline*

- focus was local community and owners of land above pipeline
- environmental options panel convened, including external stakeholders
- panel participated throughout BPEO study
- explanatory leaflets issued locally and through Internet
- identified “representative” stakeholders and canvassed views - prior assumptions about non-acceptability of some options proved incorrect
- BPEO only one input. Discussions with individual stakeholders continue
- BPEO available though EA's public register
- implementation strategy leaflets issued locally and through Internet.

## 10

## Some tools and techniques

Inviting written or telephone comments is always an option, but there are a range of additional techniques available that can be used as part of a stakeholder involvement programme. Some examples are described below with a brief indication of their advantages and disadvantages in various contexts.

As noted above, the mix of information, consultation and one-off or extended participation techniques has to be designed according to the context. A simple clean-up of a pipeline spill may, for instance, only merit a mention in a newsletter and community liaison group meeting. However at the other extreme, major site remediation programmes or repository projects may require a much more sophisticated programme including participative techniques such as the workshop-based formats described here or more in-depth deliberative approaches. Further information is available – see “recommended reading” in Chapter 14.

Where opinions on matters connected with the proposal are polarised and where reliance is placed on national NGOs or pressure groups it has to be noted that the techniques listed here have much more serious resource implications for those organisations than for the bodies which conventionally participate (eg Environment Agency).

### 10.1

#### Newsletters

Written material used to convey information might involve a series of publications. Newsletters provide ongoing contact and information can be updated. They are a flexible form of publicity that can be designed to address the changing needs of the audience. They are useful to support liaison groups and have potential for feedback. Care should be taken in establishing the boundaries of distribution. The disadvantage is that not everyone will actually read a newsletter.

### 10.2

#### Project information centres

Project “information centres” have proved valuable on many projects where consultations have strong links to a particular community. Documents, reports, data, and information - including those from third parties - are made available for interested participants to use. An information centre may be housed on site, in a local library, or it may be an on-line “virtual” library.

### 10.3

#### Opinion surveys

Sending out a document to selected organisations and individuals for comment may help collect representative views, but favours those with more time to respond, may miss key groups, and can fail to get people really thinking through the issues and practicalities of proposals. Also, the balance of opinions expressed by those who self-select to respond to consultation initiatives or self-selecting surveys may bear no relation to the balance of opinions in society more widely. It is unwise to assume that opinions from a self-selected audience are representative of society at large. Interviews and questionnaires may therefore be required.

## **10.4 Focus groups**

Focus groups or forums are meetings of invited participants designed to gauge the response to proposed actions and gain a detailed understanding of people's perspectives, values and concerns. They provide a quick means of gauging what public reaction to a proposal is likely to be. The disadvantages are that selection of group members may exclude some sectors of the community, groups require facilitation and support to them is time consuming.

## **10.5 Public meetings**

Public meetings bring together interested and affected parties to present and exchange information and views on a proposal. If run well, they can provide a useful way of meeting other stakeholders and allowing people to hear a range of views. They demonstrate that the proponent is willing to meet with other interested parties. However, whilst appearing simple, they can be one of the most complex and unpredictable methods, and may result effectively in no consultation. Unless care is taken to represent all views, the public is likely to be dissatisfied and mistrustful. Even if such care is taken, the format may be too superficial to allow wide differences of opinion to be resolved.

Large public meetings can be intimidating and tend to discourage meaningful dialogue between the public and sponsor. Smaller informal meetings and separate meetings with specific groups of stakeholders are therefore commonly included in programmes.

## **10.6 Surgeries/“open house”**

In the open house model, interested parties are encouraged to visit the site or some other convenient venue on an informal basis to find out about a proposal and provide feedback. This can be an effective way of informing the public and other interested parties. People can visit at a convenient time, view materials and ask questions at their leisure.

## **10.7 Participative workshops**

Workshops with a limited number of participants can be used to provide background information, discuss issues in detail and solve problems where there is a demand. They can provide a more open exchange of ideas and facilitate mutual understanding. They are useful for dealing with complex, technical issues and allowing more in-depth consideration, and can be targeted at particular groups – typically the more technically focused stakeholders and local authorities.

## **10.8 BPEO workshop**

Participation is arguably less a function of the event format and more dependent on attitudes and the weight given to different views in the decision-making. However some group decision-making and deliberative techniques are in regular use as part of stakeholder involvement programmes. One example is the BPEO workshop.

A typical BPEO workshop is a facilitated event that brings a range of stakeholders together as an options assessment panel. Its aim is to increase understanding, and explore different perspectives on the options available and on the factors and

weightings used to rank them. It informs and helps make the decision-making process more transparent, but the aim is not generally consensus. Involvement is required at the option selection/screening stage as well as at the weighting stage. Such workshops may assist in making the BPEO process more transparent, but the final choice may be modified by other factors known at the time or emerging subsequently. Transparency, and maybe additional involvement, is required here also.

## **10.9 Strategic stakeholder dialogue**

Many activities could be described as dialogue. In this context, strategic stakeholder dialogue means an inclusive process that brings stakeholders together to address broader or strategically important decisions. Typically, corporate strategic stakeholder programmes run over 12 months or more to explore shared and different interests, and to build on common ground to reach an understanding or consensus. They are appropriate where a range of stakeholder groups, perhaps including industry and NGOs, need to be involved to address otherwise intractable issues and promote culture change.

## **10.10 Community liaison groups**

Long-term community liaison groups already exist for many large industrial sites and are an obvious channel for communication. They may be a regulatory requirement, eg for nuclear-licensed sites. They are a public demonstration of commitment to openness and respect for neighbours. They can give early warning of difficulties and can be used to test reaction to possible changes. They are likely to have a key role in helping to scope project stakeholder involvement programmes, particularly the more complex or potentially controversial ones. However, a number of NGO's and CBO's have questioned the relative representiveness and accountability of the make-up of a range of current UK nuclear-licensed site liaison groups.

### **Project liaison groups**

Where there is no standing local liaison group a project liaison group may be set up as a channel of communication and focus for consultation. They are common in some industry sectors, including the construction industry. They are relevant also to contaminated land projects, but most of the nuclear experience to date in this sector has been in the US.

# 11

## Recent evaluations and guidelines

Evaluations of the Dounreay BPEO, ISOLUS and BNFL strategic dialogue stakeholder programmes have recently been issued and the conclusions of the DTI's consultation on the NDA's approach to stakeholder involvement have now been published. Some of the main conclusions are set out below to inform future initiatives.

In addition, the Environment Agency and SEPA have recently released their guidance to inspectors on the interpretation of BPEO<sup>1</sup> and we understand that the HSE's guidance is likely, when completed, to be broadly consistent. The summary checklists from that document are also included below.

### 11.1

#### The Dounreay BPEO evaluation

UKAEA is now seeking to implement the Dounreay Site Restoration Plan and has been assessing alternative means of dealing with different waste streams. When the evaluation was carried out, three preliminary BPEOs had been completed and reviewed by stakeholder panels. Most panels were one day events repeated with a group of internal stakeholders and an external stakeholder group.

The evaluation<sup>2</sup> supported the stakeholder panel model and identified many positive features in the programme, but concluded that they now needed to be matched with something equivalent that provided for input at the "attributes and options" stage.

The evaluation also called for a documented stakeholder strategy. A proper strategy document is essential to communication and the management of any stakeholder programme, but especially a complex multi-strand one such that being developed by at Dounreay. The sponsor and participants need to be clear what the objective and preferred approach is in respect to different types of stakeholder for different types of issue or project, and how it all fits together. The sponsor then needs to be able to communicate this to key stakeholders in particular, which one might anticipate will include the NDA. On a more prosaic note, without a strategy it is impossible to make sensible budget and resource projections.

The evaluation acknowledged the wide range of stakeholder activities undertaken at Dounreay and that UKAEA was in many ways leading the way in this area. To consolidate what had been achieved to date, it suggested:

- wider and more frequent dialogue with key stakeholders concerning matters of strategy, principle and policy
- a more structured and involved project-level process for engaging with technically focused stakeholder groups
- a mechanism for addressing issues arising that have a national significance.

---

1 Guidance for the Environment Agencies' Assessment of Best Practicable Environmental Option Studies at Nuclear Sites (EA/SEPA February 200).

2 Evaluation of the Dounreay BPEO Stakeholder Programme, Faulkland Associates, July 2004. To be made available via <<http://www.ukaea.org.uk/dounreay/index.htm>>.

## 11.2

### Some comments on cost/benefit issues

The Dounreay evaluation report also addresses cost/benefit issues. The treatment of cost/benefit issues as part of stakeholder events is the subject of considerable debate within the nuclear industry, amongst campaign groups and within the professional stakeholder involvement community. It is clearly a matter of huge importance in decision making, but uncertainty about how to deal with the potential for conflicting approaches and conflict between cost/benefit and other principles means that it is sometimes not dealt with transparently.

Some may fear that economics will have too dominant a role, others that large sums will be wasted to no good purpose. In part, this may be linked to different perceptions of the level of risk from radioactive materials, but it is much more complex than that and there are varied views about how to decide what to spend. Some seem to reject cost/benefit and “value of life” calculations on principle, or because they suspect manipulation, others see them as the only rational way to allocate resources. Most people fall somewhere in between.

What would be of concern is if, out of concern to avoid difficult debate, the financial basis of the decision making were not properly explained or open to discussion. If one is seeking input at the values and principles level, or even to some extent looking at weightings, participants do not really have to come to terms with the practical implications of the costs. This is perfectly understandable - desirable even, because it confuses the messages. However, if the sponsor is seeking deeper stakeholder involvement in the decision making process cost/benefit issues have to be addressed in a more sophisticated way.

Clearly, the site and the nation do not have an endless supply of money, and if very large sums are spent reducing minimal risks in one place they are probably not available to reduce much larger risks in another. People do understand this – it is after all their everyday experience of life - but there are no easy answers and it takes careful process design and facilitation to maintain constructive engagement and allow people to participate in discussions on cost/benefit issues in a way that recognises the strong link with issues of values and trust, but without letting those links dominate unduly. The evaluation concluded that more work was required in this area.

## 11.3

### The ISOLUS evaluation

The ISOLUS Consultation Steering Group commissioned a limited evaluation of the second stage of consultation in the ISOLUS Project to help it carry out its “process guardian” role and to help identify process learning points. The second stage programme included a National Stakeholder Forum, “drop in” exhibitions and public meetings, a citizen’s panel, local discussion groups and web-based discussion groups.

The evaluation was positive about what had been achieved and the learning points draw upon areas where the programme was successful as well as where there were difficulties. The report includes useful comments on the different techniques and types of event and also the following observations that reinforce some of the important generic principles discussed above<sup>3</sup>.

---

3 Consultation on ISOLUS Outline Proposals: A Limited Evaluation, Fred Barker, February 2004. Available at <<http://www.lancs.ac.uk/users/csec/isolus2/ciop%20consultation%20evaluation.pdf>>

- if key stakeholder groups do not feel comfortable with the overall decision-making process and the place of consultation within it, they will challenge that process, rather than focus on the content detail of the consultation. This suggests that a wider range of stakeholder views should be taken into account in developing the overall decision-making process
- the siting component means that local stakeholders are likely to respond strategically in a detailed national review of the pros and cons of interim management proposals. Although deliberative processes can be designed to enable areas of consensus to be maximised, and reasons for remaining disagreements to be clarified, this is likely to take longer than a couple of two-day meetings
- in a deliberative event involving stakeholders it is necessary to ensure that information is, or can be made, available to participants about linked processes. This might be achieved through the advance provision of written briefing material, verbal presentations in the early stage of the event, or by having a relevant expert on hand during the course of the event to provide explanations as necessary
- consideration needs to be given to the best way of securing expert input to future engagement processes and individual deliberative events. A preferred approach is likely to entail securing expert advice that is perceived to be independent by the widest possible range of stakeholders. Such advice is most likely to be secured from an academic institution or professional consultancy, rather than from any expert associated with a specific stakeholder sector
- the siting of a new radioactive waste management facility will almost inevitably cause strong local feeling. It is anticipated that representatives of the local communities around the sites being considered might wish to have significant input to the design of the siting process.

## 11.4 The BNFL dialogue evaluation

A report on the BNFL dialogue has been published at:  
[www.the-environment-council.org.uk/docs/](http://www.the-environment-council.org.uk/docs/).

The evaluation aimed to assess the BNFL National Stakeholder process to date, including areas such as: process strengths and weaknesses, use of resources, evidence of impact/change, unexpected consequences, key lessons and future applications.

The key conclusions are:

- the BNFL national stakeholder dialogue has been successful in using dialogue processes to bring together and develop trust between organisations and individuals who were previously in conflict. It has facilitated a process in which a wide range of views have been brought to a range of key issues, from which, through collaborative negotiation, solutions have been developed in a systematic way and recommendations made to the company
- the process has used some key tools which have emerged as prerequisites for success, as does the clear and shared understanding of the roles of the key players within the process
- a further key to the success of the dialogue's processes has been the willingness of stakeholders and facilitators to learn and respond to learning. The dialogue has therefore inevitably been a flexible one, evolving in response to the emerging needs of both the industry and the dialogue itself

- the dialogue has been least successful in incorporating the views of other stakeholders previously involved (or not involved in the process at all), feeding back company responses to recommendations, and evaluating and therefore demonstrating the impact of the process
- learning points emerging from the evaluation process have been developed for application both now and beyond the life of the current dialogue.

It should be noted that a significant number of BNFL dialogue participants have voiced concerns about core aspects of the dialogue process that have not found expression in the evaluation.

## 11.5

### The NDA model

The DTI has consulted extensively on the appropriate approach to stakeholder engagement for the NDA once it assumes its responsibilities. The current model is consistent with the principles discussed above and integrates strategic and project based involvement at both local and national level. It will be subject to further development by the NDA but the approach set out in the current DTI report<sup>4</sup> commits the NDA to:

- involve stakeholders as fully as possible in all matters related to legacy management
- ensure the timely input of local and national stakeholder views, advice and recommendations into NDA and licensee decision making
- ensure that communities affected by work carried out at the NDA's sites can input into the development of site clean up plans
- build stakeholder and public confidence
- provide effective liaison and interaction between national and local levels of engagement and between sites
- clarify upfront what it expects from engagement and ensure that stakeholders clearly understand the level of involvement they can expect from the process, how they can expect to influence the NDA and to understand clearly the structure in which they are participating
- ensure there are no surprises
- explain and help stakeholders understand each others perspectives
- to clarify the reasons for disputes and seek resolutions where possible.

The organisational arrangements to deliver these objectives are also to be confirmed, but the main elements seem unlikely to change significantly. There will be:

- a local stakeholder forum to provide views to a national stakeholder forum
- a national stakeholder forum to provide advice to the NDA
- a co-ordination group to ensure that processes are in place to deliver effective engagement
- specific national issue groups, to look at broader issues facing the NDA
- specific local issue groups, to look at issues affecting particular local or regional communities.

---

4 Currently available at <<http://www.dti.gov.uk/nuclearcleanup/ach/ndaarrangementsforse.doc>>.

## 11.6

### The Environment Agency/SEPA Guidance

Guidance<sup>5</sup> has been produced by the Environment Agency for England and Wales in collaboration with the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA). It is primarily intended to support the Agencies' assessment of BPEO studies relating to the authorisation of radioactive waste disposal at nuclear sites. It recognises that the flexibility of the BPEO concept allows for the application of a range of different approaches at the detailed level, depending on the context in which the BPEO study is made.

It therefore does not specify a precise approach to be followed. Instead, it summarises the key considerations associated with the design and implementation of BPEO studies that would be taken into account in a regulatory assessment of the adequacy of the particular methodologies that may be used by individual operators. Components of the regulatory assessment include:

- the validity of the process and methodology
- the competence of the team carrying out the BPEO study
- the data used and those significant judgements, whether explicit or implicit, that have affected the outcome of the BPEO study
- the extent of any associated stakeholder input or consultation
- the documentation of the results.

The Guidance identifies the factors that lend confidence to the appropriate application of the analytical framework of BPEO studies as including: the experience of those that have carried out the study; the quality management arrangements that have been applied; and the extent of stakeholder involvement and review. Well-written submissions that provide a transparent account of the logic, explain assumptions, and provide sufficient information to confirm the validity of data used in support of the study are also key factors for the effective use of a BPEO study as a part of the decision-making process.

It says that assessors will expect BPEO documentation to include a clear description of how the BPEO study was developed and undertaken, including key decisions, dates and information sources. The composition and competence of the project team that carried out the study should be recorded, and stakeholder inputs to the process – as well as their effects on the outcome of the study – should be clearly identified. The operator's approach to monitoring the validity of assumptions made in the study against unfolding reality, and the implications of this for strategic planning outcomes, should be described.

The detailed guidance presented establishes and develops some key overall principles that affect the way in which individual BPEO studies can be tailored to meet specific requirements. However, it also identifies a number of general considerations that assessors will expect to see taken into account in the presentation of all BPEO studies and a checklist is included (reproduced below).

---

5 Guidance for the Environment Agencies' Assessment of Best Practicable Environmental Option Studies at Nuclear Sites. EA/SEPA February 2004.

## Environment Agency/SEPA criteria for BPEO assessments

### *General*

- evidence for consideration of stakeholder involvement and consultation requirements
- records of stakeholder inputs at different stages of the study
- evidence of stakeholder verification of their inputs to the study.

### *Definition of purpose and scope*

- clear statement of objectives and logical translation into study scope
- explanation for the way in which policy/regulatory and other constraints are factored into the BPEO study
- logical structuring and consistency in individual BPEO studies undertaken as part of site-wide strategic process.

### *Identification of options*

- evidence for a systematic, comprehensive identification of candidate options
- records of (and reasons for) any options introduced at later stages in the study.

### *Screening*

- clear explanation for choices of screening criteria, including relevant stakeholder inputs
- evidence of the logic applied in the screening process
- selection of attributes
- evidence of principles used to generate a comprehensive list of study attributes
- transparency in the presentation and description of study attributes
- records of (and reasons for) any attributes introduced at later stages in the study.

### *Options analysis*

- clear explanation of the “scoring” scheme used in the analysis
- description and explanation of judgements made in the analysis
- logic underpinning assumptions and data selection, including:
  - unambiguous supporting material for study of the projected impacts of options
  - substantiated evidence of assumptions relating to cost data
  - clear explanation of any assumptions regarding cost discounting
- evidence for systematic and realistic consideration of the implications of uncertainty.

### *Use of weighting factors*

- overall clarity in the explanation and treatment of weightings within the BPEO study
- identification of the BPEO and integration into decision-making
- evidence of qualitative reasoning used to interpret the results of the options analysis
- systematic presentation of arguments, including factors outside the scope of the BPEO study, leading to identification of a preferred option.

The following are offered as “benchmark” stakeholder involvement programmes for typical applications. Every situation is different and the history, local situation and wider context will affect the appropriate scale and scope of involvement. Not that the programmes do not list all activities required.

Benchmark programmes, illustrating a typical mix of scope, stakeholders, tools and techniques.

In all cases:

- check for factors that might indicate additional measures are appropriate
- anticipate, support and comply with regulatory requirements for notification, provision of information and consultation.

A “routine” operational local contamination or clean-up issue with no impact on the community and unlikely to cause concern.

- in many cases, it will be sufficient simply to notify the local community liaison group at the next routine meeting.

A contamination or clean-up issue with the potential to generate significant local interest and debate.

- raise with local liaison group as soon as practicable and seek their advice on the appropriate level and scope of stakeholder input
- invite key local stakeholders (including local authorities) to provide input on issues to be taken into account and potential options
- keep local community and local stakeholders informed
- consider external input into option selection eg BPEO panel
- consider event or other means of providing public with information
- invite local stakeholders to provide input on implementation issues
- make arrangements for on-going feed back of monitoring results.

A contamination or clean-up issue with strategic significance, likely to involve stakeholders at national level.

- raise with local liaison group as soon as practicable and seek advice on the appropriate level and scope of stakeholder input
- plan and make resources available for a significant stakeholder programme, co-ordinated with other consultations as necessary
- develop stakeholder, communication and (if required) training programmes. Make backgrounds and project specific information available (typically through website and links)
- initiate “front end” stakeholder programme to explore issues, perspectives, strategic implications and options with local and national level stakeholders. Pass on to third parties as appropriate
- integrate external stakeholder input explicitly into option selection
- initiate stakeholder programme to review option selection and implementation issues
- make arrangements for on-going feed back of monitoring results.

## 13

## Recommended reading

This section contains recommended reading and references giving more information on different aspects of stakeholder involvement programmes and the tools and techniques used.

### 13.1

#### Risk perception and communication

UK Government Department of Health

*Communicating About Risks to Public Health: Pointers to Good Practice*

Available from: <[www.doh.gov.uk/pointers.htm](http://www.doh.gov.uk/pointers.htm)>

Covello, V T, McCallum, D B and Pavlova, M T (eds) (1989)

*Effective Risk Communication: The Role and Responsibility of Government and NGOs*

Plenum Publishers, USA (ISBN: 0-30643-075-4)

House of Lords (2000)

*Science and Society*

Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London

Office of Science and Technology and Wellcome Trust (2001)

*Science and the public: a review of science communication and public attitudes toward science in Britain*

Public Understanding of Science 10 pp 315-330

Lundgren, R E and McMakin, A H (1998)

*Risk Communication – A Handbook for Communicating Environmental, Safety and Health Risks*

Battelle Press, USA (ISBN: 1-57477-055-1)

Flynn, J, Slovic, P and Kunreuther, H (eds) (2001)

*Risk, Media and Stigma – Understanding Public Challenges to Modern Science and Technology*

Earthscan Publications Ltd (ISBN: 978-1-85383-700-8)

Slovic, P (2000)

*The Perception of Risk*

Earthscan Publications Ltd (ISBN: 1-95383-528-5)

### 13.2

#### Consultation and stakeholder involvement

Hance, Chess and Sandman (1988)

*Improving Dialogue with Communities*

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (ISBN: 978-0-87371-274-3)

*Participation works! 21 techniques of community participation for the 21st century*

New Economics Foundation, London 1999

Suskind, McKearnan and Thomas-Larmer (1999)

*The Consensus Building Handbook*

Sage Publications, USA (ISBN: 0-76190-844-7)

## 13.3

### Internet resources

<a href="http://www.epa.gov/stakeholders/">www.epa.gov/stakeholders/</a>	US Government stakeholder resources
<a href="http://www.dest.gov.au/radwaste/">www.dest.gov.au/radwaste/</a>	Australian Government Radwaste site
<a href="http://www.llrwo.org/en/porthope/index.html">www.llrwo.org/en/porthope/index.html</a>	Port Hope Area Initiative, Canada
<a href="http://www.riskworld.com/">www.riskworld.com/</a>	Website with a wide range of risk management and communication links