



Reconceptualising stakeholder participation in Emergency Preparedness and Response

Bieke Abelshausen, Tanja Perko, Catrinel Turcanu
babelsha@sckcen.be

© SCK•CEN, 2018

Introduction

- Methodology
- Results
 - Participation throughout the decades
 - Participation & knowledge sharing
 - Participation in reality
 - Participation in EP&R
 - Guidelines and recommendations
 - Academic literature
 - Contradictions
 - Divergence
 - Motivation

© SCK•CEN, 2018

Methodology

- Mixed method approach
 - 2014 (Stakeholder Participation (SP) & Knowledge Sharing (KS))
 - 2015 (Chronological systematic review - SP)
 - 2016 (Realist review of SP & KS)
 - 2018 (SP in EP&R)
 - Conceptualisations and frameworks (models)
 - “Stakeholder”
 - “Stakeholder engagement”
 - Web of Science
 - (nuclear OR radiologic) AND (emergency OR accident) AND (stakeholder participation OR engagement OR involvement)
 - Document analysis (preliminary – non-exhaustive)
 - IAEA, ICRP, IRPA, OECD-NEA (n=13)
 - Academic literature (WoS) (n=2674)
 - » Abstract extraction from WoS database
 - » Search ‘stakehold**’ (n=35)

© SCK•CEN, 2018

Participation throughout the decades

- Conceptualisation of ‘participation’ from the 1960’s
 - Time influenced by powerlessness of the “have-nots”
 - Arnstein’s “Ladder of participation” (1969)
- Participation in the 1970’s
 - Political turmoil in US : Anti Vietnam War movement
 - confrontation politics by those outside
- Participation in the 1980’s – 1990’s
 - Link with development and sustainability
 - Institutionalisation of participation
- Participation in the 1990’s
 - EPA citizen involvement into environmental protection programmes
 - Move towards social participation, citizen participation and participatory methods
- Beginning 20th century
 - Shift of focus from conceptualisations to methodologies

© SCK•CEN, 2018

Results: Participation & knowledge sharing

- Divide between science and management
 - Science = "experts" & Management = "decision makers"
 - Need for bi-directional knowledge exchange and co-decision making
- "Stakeholder participation" is NOT merely a right, it is a reality
 - Passive participation
 - Active participation
- Stakeholder participation ≠ communication
- Stakeholder participation ≠ research methodology
- "Stakeholder participation" is NOT a tool for decision making
 - It is INTRINSIC

"Evolution towards co-management and co-decision making"

"Who are the stakeholders?"

© SCK•CEN, 2018

Results: Participation & knowledge sharing

- Address the lack of consensus
 - No consensus on 'who' has a "stake"?
 - 'who' AND 'what'
 - Consensus versus dissensus
 - Pragmatism
- What is "Stakeholder participation"?
 - No "one-size-fits-all" solution
 - No "fit-for-purpose" solution
 - Stakeholder participation REQUIRES contextualization

© SCK•CEN, 2018

Results: Participation in EP&R (International guidelines and recommendations)

- Contradictions in conceptualisations of “stakeholders” in International guidelines and recommendations
 - For example
 - International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP). 2016. ICRP Publication 126: Radiological Protection against Radon Exposure. Annals of the ICRP, 43 (3).
 - “[...] stakeholders [...] include individuals who have a personal, financial, health, or legal interest in policy or recommendations that directly affect their well-being or that of their environment.”
 - International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). 2007. Terminology used in nuclear safety and radiation protection. IAEA Safety Glossary. (P. 190)
 - “The term stakeholder has disputed usages and is misleading and too all-encompassing for clear use. In view of the potential for misunderstanding, **use of the term is discouraged** in favour of ‘interested parties’ or ‘concerned parties’, for example.”

Results: Participation in EP&R (International guidelines and recommendations)

- Stakeholder participation
 - Divergence
 - “The active solicitation of the involvement of all stakeholders could be viewed as a means to promote the use of nuclear technology. That perception should be avoided; **promotion should not be an objective** of a comprehensive stakeholder involvement programme” (International Nuclear Safety Group (INSAG). 2006. Stakeholder involvement in Nuclear Issues. International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna)
 - “In the legal context, ‘stakeholder’ and ‘public concerned’ do not mean the same thing [...] [some stakeholders] **do not have the same rights as the public concerned under the Aarhus Convention.**” “Stakeholders” is not a surrogate term for the “general public.” In any project there are numerous stakeholders with varied interests, including policymakers, applicants, shareholders, the general public and special interest groups. (Nuclear Energy Agency - Organisation for Economic co-operation and development. 2017. NEA Workshop on Stakeholder Involvement in Nuclear Decision Making. Summary Report. OECD.)

Slide 7

AB1

Include section or artikel...

Abelshausen Bieke; 11-06-18

Results: Participation in EP&R (International guidelines and recommendations)

- Motivation for participation
 - Instrumental "Secure the end point"
 - To achieve project goals
 - To better understand complex issues
 - "More interactive participation gives interested parties ***the possibility of a better understanding of complex issues***. It allows them to develop their understanding of the issue, to debate, to state their position and, in some instances, to collaborate with the regulatory body." (International Atomic Energy Agency. 2017. Communication and consultation with interested parties by the regulatory body. IAEA Safety Standards for protecting people and the environment.)

© SCK•CEN, 2018

Results: Participation in EP&R (International guidelines and recommendations)

- Motivation for participation
 - Substantive "Achieve better decisions"
 - The Commission has also emphasized the ***promotion of autonomy*** through stakeholder involvement (e.g. ICRP, 2007a) and ***empowerment*** of individuals to ***make informed decisions***, whether, for example, confronted with contaminated land (e.g. ICRP, 2009b), to security screening in airports (ICRP, 2014b) to radon in their homes (ICRP, 2014c) or to cosmic radiation in aviation (ICRP, 2016). The system of radiological protection thus actively respects dignity and promotion of the autonomy of people facing radioactivity in their daily lives. (International Commission on Radiological Protection. 2017. Ethical Foundations of the System of Radiological Protection (Draft). Annals of the ICRP.)

© SCK•CEN, 2018

Results: Participation in EP&R (International guidelines and recommendations)

- Normative “The right thing to do”
 - Immanuel Kant (1724–1804)
 - “Kant argued that human beings possess a rational nature and have the capacity of self-regulation, which is called autonomy. Good will leads them to act according to their duty, or the moral law. Kant asserted **that one should not treat human beings merely as means to an end, but rather as ends in themselves.** This means that we should not sacrifice an individual to achieve “the greatest happiness of the greatest number”. At the same time, it means that we should respect every individual’s free choice.” (International Commission on Radiological Protection. 2017. Ethical Foundations of the System of Radiological Protection (Draft). Annals of the ICRP.)
 - ““stakeholder involvement” in the decision making process is based on **respecting each person’s human dignity**” (International Commission on Radiological Protection. 2017. Ethical Foundations of the System of Radiological Protection (Draft). Annals of the ICRP.)

© SCK•CEN, 2018

Results: Participation in EP&R (systematic literature review)

- Motivation for participation
 - Instrumental “Secure the end point”
 - Develop a framework for post-accident rehabilitation by involving national, regional and local stakeholders. The aim is to identify and involve relevant stakeholders in emergency preparedness to **improve the development and implementation of appropriate protection strategies** as part of the consequence management and the transition to recovery. (Gallego, E; Montero, M. 2016. Experience in Spain with local-national fora for better post-accident preparedness. RADIOPROTECTION Volume: 51 Issue: HS1 Special Issue: SI Pages: S31-S34)
 - Substantive “Achieve better decisions”
 - Stakeholders agreed on evolving a decision framing process within and between stakeholders that is inclusive and participatory, with open and two-way discussions, leading to relationships where issues can be identified, discussed and resolved, **resulting in sustainable decisions.** (Bohunova, J; Duranova, T; Jurka, P; Makovnik, M. 2016. Stakeholder engagement and involvement in nuclear emergency preparedness - the Slovak Republic’s experience in RODOS tool-driven workshops. RADIOPROTECTION Volume: 51 Issue: HS1 Special Issue: SI Pages: S39-S42)

© SCK•CEN, 2018

Results: Participation in EP&R (systematic literature review)

- Motivation for participation
 - Normative "The right thing to do"
 - Stakeholder engagement and acceptance has become the cornerstone of radiation regulations in recent decades, ***as well it should***. (Jorgensen, TJ .2016. THE NEW "NORMAL": STAKEHOLDERS AND RADIATION PROTECTION LIMITS IN A POST-9/11 WORLD. HEALTH PHYSICS Volume: 111 Issue: 2 Pages: 227-231)

© SCK•CEN, 2018

			Recommendations
	1969	Ladder of citizen participation	Sherry Arnstein 04
	1992	Ladder of children participation	Roger Hart 05
● Th	1996	Typology of participation	Sarah White 06
	1997	Degrees of participation	Phil Treseder 07
	1998	Wheel of participation	Scott Davidson 08
	2001	Active participation framework	OECD 09
	2001	Pathways to participation	Harry Shier 10
	2001	Clarity model of participation	Clare Lardner 11
● Ne	2001	Strategic approach to participation	UNICEF 12
	2001	Triangle of youth participation	Jans & de Backer 13
	2002	Youth participation in society	Jans & de Backer 14
ENG,	2002	Dimensions of youth participation	David Driskell 15
of ra	2003	Ladder of volunteer participation	Adam Fletcher 16
decis	2003	Youth engagement continuum	FCYO 17
	2006	Four Cs of online participation	Derek Wenmoth 18
	2006	Power law of participation	Ross Mayfield 19
●	2006	Levels, spaces and forms of power	John Gaventa 20
	2006	Four L Engagement Model	Tony Karrer 21
	2007	Participation 2.0 Model	New Zealand 22
	2007	Spectrum of public participation	IAP2 23
	2007	Engagement in the policy cycle	Diane Warburton 24
	2007	Online Participation Behaviour Chain	Fogg & Eckles 25
	2009	Key dimensions of participation	Driskell & Neema 26
	2009	Matrix of participation	Tim Davies 27
	2009	Pathways through participation	NCVO & IVR 28
	2010	Changing views on participation	Pedro Martin 29
	2010	Ladder of online participation	Bernoff & Li 30
	2010	Online participation across age	Rick Wicklin 31
	2010	Three-lens approach to participation	DFID-CSO 32
	2010	Behavior Grid	BJ Fogg 33



© SCK•CEN, 2018

Thank you for your attention!

© SCK•CEN, 2018

Copyright © 2018 - SCK•CEN

PLEASE NOTE!

This presentation contains data, information and formats for dedicated use only and may not be communicated, copied, reproduced, distributed or cited without the explicit written permission of SCK•CEN.
If this explicit written permission has been obtained, please reference the author, followed by 'by courtesy of SCK•CEN'.

Any infringement to this rule is illegal and entitles to claim damages from the infringer, without prejudice to any other right in case of granting a patent or registration in the field of intellectual property.

SCK•CEN

Studiecentrum voor Kernenergie
Centre d'Etude de l'Energie Nucléaire
Belgian Nuclear Research Centre

Stichting van Openbaar Nut
Fondation d'Utilité Publique
Foundation of Public Utility

Registered Office: Avenue Herrmann-Debrouxlaan 40 – BE-1160 BRUSSELS
Operational Office: Boeretang 200 – BE-2400 MOL



© SCK•CEN, 2018