

## **Views of SITEX.Network about the next EURAD SRA Update process 4<sup>th</sup> of June 2021**

*This position paper answers to a request from the EURAD Bureau on the 27<sup>th</sup> of April 2021. All members of the TSO College were invited to provide their views on the 9 questions identified by the Bureau in its request. The answers provided below were consolidated by the SITEX.Network.*

### **1 Confirm timescales and scope of future SRA updates?**

The current version of the [SITEX SRA](#) was published in 2016 in the framework of the SITEX - II EU H2020 project. It was used as an input in the JOPRAD EU H2020 project and in the development of the EURAD Joint Programme proposal. A revision of the SITEX SRA, coordinated by the SITEX.Network and involving the EURAD TSO College is planned before the end of 2021. This update will include:

- for each key topic of the SRA, an update of the topics where a common interest exists for future R&D, Strategic Studies or Knowledge Management. This update will consider the progress made and the evolution of the TSO needs since the last SRA version;
- topics where both social and technical aspects associated with radioactive waste management can be investigated in a combined manner. A specific SITEX.Network action is ongoing to identify and describe these topics.

### **2 Are there other SRA's or inputs that we need to consider?**

The pillars for the update of the [EURAD SRA](#) should be the needs of the 3 EURAD Colleges described in their corresponding SRA (or other documents, if relevant). Moreover, when possible (seen planning difficulties), potential needs emerging from current EURAD Work Packages (WPs) should be considered. Concerning the input from outside EURAD:

- seen the connection between the EURAD SRA Theme 2 and the ongoing [PREDIS](#) EU H2020 project, the SITEX.Network agrees that the SRA planned by PREDIS should also be considered as an input;
- the SRA on decommissioning as the output of the [SHARE](#) project (due end of 2021) will cover predisposal issues (and will be somewhat covered by the PREDIS SRA) but it might be a source of information for EURAD as well;
- the SITEX.Network is not aware of an important input for EURAD not already considered in the development processes of the above mentioned SRAs. However, the EURAD External Advisory Board could provide advice on this subject.

### **3 Confirm position on preferred scope of EURAD SRA update (e.g., remain the same, or change to expand, or reduce to exclude, etc.)?**

The scope of the current [EURAD SRA](#) is (see the description of the 7 themes in the SRA):

*“The SRA scope is structured by seven Scientific Themes. These themes are also used in the roadmap. Although all technical in nature, Theme 1 is an overarching theme, Themes 2-5 are predominantly focused on fundamental science, engineering, and technology, and Themes 6 and 7 include aspects more of an applied science and integration focus.”*

A priori, a change of this scope and the SRA themes seems not necessary. The SITEX.Network highlights the following:

- The scope of the SRA includes R&D, Strategic Studies and Knowledge Management about topics associated with long term and operational safety of radioactive waste management (decommissioning excluded).
- The EURAD SRA could cover all waste management steps. The future EC calls and strategy will affect the scope of the next EURAD Joint Programme implementation phases and thus how the EURAD SRA needs will be addressed. For instance, the future views of EC on EURAD and PREDIS are not known (e.g. will the projects be merged or continue to be complementary?). Overlaps between PREDIS and EURAD need to be avoided.
- Radioactive waste management, and in particular their disposal, is a complex issue including both technical and social dimensions (e.g., risk perception and management). Therefore, the SITEX.Network supports the integration of social science aspects in technical topics of the EURAD SRA.

### **4 Confirm position and potential future support towards knowledge management activities in joint programming (how do we want to manage knowledge management activities in the SRA)?**

The SITEX.Network supports the undertaken efforts by EURAD in knowledge management. The SRA update process should take these efforts and their results in consideration:

- The SRA update process has to be grounded notably on the developed Roadmap and first outputs of the KM WPs (e.g., SoK, list of already available courses...);
- Besides R&D and Strategic Study aspects, the updated SRA should provide a clear view on where are the next priorities in terms of Knowledge Management.

### **5 Confirm position on governance and inclusivity arrangements for the EURAD SRA update (e.g., remain the same as before, establish consensus view between College organisations, or suggest a change?)**

As mentioned in §1, the three pillars of the EURAD SRA should stay the needs of the 3 Colleges. Each College has different needs owing to the specific roles their members play at the national level (in their national programme for radioactive waste management). Thus, the R&D, Strategic Study and Knowledge Management priorities of each College could be

different. The governance for the EURAD SRA update process should respect these differences and allow identifying and taking benefit of the commonalities.

According to the SITEX.Network, to be efficient and fair the process should:

- Be a stepwise process, transparent and with a clear timeline and governance;
- Be steered by a committee that moves the process forward, and communicates to the wider community to get inputs, then decides and moves on;
- Foresee regular interactions with the Colleges;
- Be documented (e.g., by position papers from the Colleges);
- Be open to new ideas and needs that fit in the scope of the SRA;
- Foresee a review of external bodies (at least the EURAD EAB);
- Be less complex and resource demanding than the development of the first EURAD SRA. It is expected that the update will necessitate less resource than for the SRA foundation;
- Be validated (and foresee a validation of its output) by the EURAD GA following §6.2.4.3 of the Consortium Agreement:

*Vote for specific decisions on prospective issues*

*For decisions on prospective issues according to 6.2.5.2, each Chair of the Colleges of the General Assembly shall express to the Secretary its position taken with its own internal rules. The decision is taken when the three Colleges adopt the same position. [...]*

## **6 Civil Society organisations can bring in their views via the SITEX SRA, and Waste Producers can bring in their views via the PREDIS SRA. Do you agree with this?**

The SITEX SRA update will consider the views of the Civil Society. The SITEX.Network agrees that Waste Producers can bring in their views via the PREDIS SRA.

## **7 Confirm position on goals of the EURAD SRA update?**

The EURAD SRA update will be a key input to guide the second implementation of the EURAD Joint Programme. SITEX.Network expects the following:

- the revised SRA will provide a clear view on the current common needs of the Colleges that could be addressed jointly within EURAD and that are not addressed by ongoing or planned projects;
- the SRA update will consider:
  - how the needs of the Colleges have evolved since its previous version;
  - new results and knowledge available since its previous version;
  - emerging sciences (or sciences which are becoming more mature) which could help to address the needs of the EURAD Community. E.g.: Big Data management, Artificial Intelligence;
- the SRA update will be a self-standing document (not a document only mentioning changes compared to the previous SRA version);

- the SRA update will allow identifying the common needs by category of actions: R&D, Strategic Study and Knowledge Management;
- the goal of the SRA is not to discuss the practical implementation of the projects that will answer the common needs (interested organisations, budget...). Such information will have to be developed later, for instance in the framework of the EURAD-2 proposal or EURAD-2 2<sup>nd</sup> wave, if any.

### **8 Confirm preferences and ideas on the overall process to update the EURAD SRA?**

Before starting the SRA update process, it is important to:

1. find a consensus between the Colleges about the goal of the EURAD SRA update ;
2. develop a SRA update process which is clear, fair and accepted by all the Colleges (see §5);
3. this process should include a realistic estimation of the resources to be committed by the different EURAD bodies. These resources should be proportionate with the goal of the SRA update and available.

The ranking method to categorize the topics in the first EURAD SRA (in High, Medium and Low levels of common interest) was based on a statistical evaluation of the interest in the 3 Colleges. This method was complex to implement. Moreover:

- the use of statistics makes that we could lose the meaning/reason behind the common level of interest characterizing a topic;
- there is a risk that all things are “ranked high” if there is not enough diversity in answers.

A new methodology to categorize the topics should be developed, more qualitative and based on the information we really need to decide about the implementation of new WPs (e.g., based on the return of experience from the EURAD-1 2<sup>nd</sup> wave development). For example: putting topics in highest-to-lowest priority order.

### **9 Confirm preferences and ideas on the type of documentation needed?**

As mentioned above, the coherence with the EURAD roadmap (and other founding documents) is important. The SRA should:

- give a clear view of the common needs by theme and category of actions (see §7);
- not go beyond the description of the common needs (i.e. information about the implementation of possible projects answering to the needs in the SRA is out of the scope).

A description of what is not included in the SRA seems not necessary in the SRA document. However, we could keep track of this information in a separate internal EURAD document.