



Towards a Joint Programming on Radioactive Waste Disposal JOPRAD



Work Package 2

Engagement and commitment of Member States

JOPRAD Regional meeting report

3rd - 4th February 2016, Bucharest, Romania

CV REZ: L. Nachmilner, J. Miksova

JRC: G. Buckau, A. van Kalleveen

Andra: J. Delay, M. Garcia

Website : www.joprad.eu

Content

- 1 Introduction 3
- 2 Principal messages of the meeting..... 3
 - 2.1 Session 1 - Introduction to Joint Programming..... 3
 - 2.2 Session 2: Engaging Member States 6
 - 2.3 Session 3: Way ahead 6
 - WG1: Exploring the domain of technical activities covered by a Joint Programming..... 7
 - WG2: Exploring strategic and horizontal activities in Joint Programming..... 9
 - 2.4 Session 4: Conclusion..... 11
- 3 Summary of the meeting..... 12
- Annex I: Regional Meeting Agenda 14
- Annex II: Regional Meeting Presentations 16

1 Introduction

The overall objective of the Regional Meeting was to engage Member States with Less Advanced Programmes in the process of defining and implementing Joint Programming for deep geological disposal.

For that purpose, a set of explanatory presentations was delivered and two working groups created assessing the scope of technical activities and strategic activities JOPRAD shall deal with. The meeting was concluded by final discussion exploring how Joint Programming could be effective in supporting implementation of Member States Geological Disposal programmes (see the Meeting agenda in Annex I: Regional Meeting Agenda).

The meeting was organised by CV REZ in cooperation with local partner, RATEN ICN, in Bucharest on 3rd - 4th February 2016.

The meeting was opened by a welcome speech of the president of ANDR, Mr. Florian Tatar.

All presentations held during the Regional Meeting are given in Annex II.

2 Principal messages of the meeting

2.1 Session 1 - Introduction to Joint Programming

The introductory session focused on providing information about the JOPRAD project, its goals, structure, implementation tools, and anticipated outcomes; it consisted of 9 presentations.

In order to achieve the overall meeting objective, the following topics were addressed:

- Why Joint Programming (JP)?
- What are the benefits for the Member States?
- What could be the domain of activities covered by the Joint Programming?
- What is expected from Member State representatives for the implementation of the Joint Programming (Horizon 2020 EURATOM from WP 2018)?
- What are the means and tools to implement Joint Programming?
- How will Joint Programming be prepared and implemented?, and
- What is expected from the Member State representatives during the JOPRAD project?

Overview of European Commission (EC) support to R&D provided since 1975 indicated low involvement in EC project of newcomer countries and discrepancy in available national capacities/capabilities between more and less developed waste disposal programmes. Furthermore, there is a large diversity in geological disposal timescales, large diversity in engagement and participation in R&D, and a large diversity in receiving R&D funding support.

The main presentation in this session explained why Joint Programming is being proposed for future EC support (building EU research area through identification of synergies in national programmes), what it consists of, and what the anticipation from its introduction is. It is a natural development in the light of changing challenges with a Vision beyond those of individual Member States.

The technical scope of radioactive waste management was characterised as a matrix consisting of radioactive waste management lifecycle (from waste collection till its disposal) and facility lifecycle (from planning stage until its post-closure monitoring); mutual links were specified in general terms.

The aim of the JOPRAD Project is to study the feasibility of a proposal for the setting up of a “Joint Programming on Radioactive Waste Disposal”. The main actors in this process are:

- Waste Management Organisations (WMOs) as repository operators (organised within [IGD- TP](#)),
- Technical Support Organisations (TSOs) as expert capacity of regulators ([SITEX](#)),
- Research Entities (REs) which are not involved directly in the licencing process and which develop long-term R&D programmes in support to both of above (CNRS), and
- JRC-ITU as an EC entity, establishing and implementing Knowledge Management at a European level.

Key features of the JOPRAD project were described (timing, milestones, steps) and outcomes were described, as follows:

- A preliminary evaluation of a potential in-kind and financial commitment of Member States in activities of the Joint Programming through their identified “mandated actors”,
- A “Programme Document” focused on key priorities of WMOs, TSOs side, Research Entities and the Knowledge Management Programme, containing a long term perspective vision as well as activities to be implemented in the first Joint Programming phase, and
- A “Report - overall scheme of a JP” comprising a proposal for the implementation of this Joint Programming, including the legal framework.

The programme of work towards establishing the Joint Programming was briefly described, consisting of two main steps:

- The JOPRAD project (2015-2017) - establishing the programme and the legal framework, and,
- The Joint Programming (2019- ...) - establishing the first work plan content and evolution.

Activities of the preparatory team were briefly introduced by their representatives.

The WMO working group focused on identifying key aspects of the [IGD-TP's Strategic Research Agenda](#) (SRA) that could be included in a common programme. Analysis of responses to a questionnaire resulted in proposal of 20 topics considered as suitable for Joint Programming. Each topic has been elaborated upon and potential projects have been identified.

A TSO's SRA is being developed in the framework of the SITEX initiative bringing together TSOs, REs & Nuclear Regulatory Authorities providing a technical and scientific background for supporting regulatory decisions. This Agenda is used as a basis for the identification of activities and topics that could be shared with WMOs and/or Research Entities in a Joint Programming. The joint activities are conditioned with considering conditions for preserving independency: it is of crucial importance that WMOs and TSOs use and interpret separately the results obtained during jointly managed research projects. TSOs need to develop and maintain their skills and expertise to fulfil their missions effectively, which shall be achieved through various types of activities, such as:

- Knowledge transfer activities,
- State-of-the art activities,
- Working group activities, and
- Experimental & modelling studies.

Compiling an SRA is a new task for Research Entities: until now they were working based mostly on contractual basis. The long term vision of the SRA requires that scientific understanding of safety relevant issues must remain credible, verifiable, up-to-date, shared by large scientific communities, open to civil society stakeholders at any given time in the hundred year lasting process. This goal can only be achieved if research on geological disposal continues to keep up with the evolution of worldwide leading edge scientific knowledge; thus, knowledge management (KM), education & training (E&T) activities, competence maintenance, etc., are an integral part of the process. The SRA is being developed in series of steps: the basic elements and research priorities have been identified and will be subjected to further assessment.

Based on the input from the three different types of actors, a 'Programme Document' will be drafted. The Programme Document will also contain the Knowledge Management Programme. Thereby, inputs from the present Regional Meeting are also used. The "Programme Document" will be used as an input for Mid-Term Workshop. For that purpose, it is presently discussed when and how to make the document available to the Member States for them to be able to make informed contributions to the Mid-Term Workshop.

The main objective of the Mid-Term Workshop is to ensure that the Programme Document and the proposed "Vision for Joint Programming prepared by the JOPRAD consortium meets the needs and objectives of the "programme owners" (ministries, national/regional authorities, etc.) and "programme managers" (organisations in charge of designing, implementing and operating R&D actions in the domain). This includes needs originating from the requirements of the Waste Directive and the associated actions to be carried out to support the corresponding national geological disposal programmes.

The forthcoming Joint Programming will cover the strategic and horizontal activities. In this sense the Knowledge Management becomes progressively important in order to ensure that the knowledge that has already been generated over the past decades of R&D remains accessible, and that growth in Knowledge is managed properly. This is true in order to be useful for on-going programmes and in particular for those Programmes where implementation is scheduled for decades into the future. Documentation of the State-of-Knowledge is accompanied by a series of activities, namely Education, Training, Strategic Studies, Guidance, Transfer of Knowledge between Programmes and Dissemination. A key issue is selection of topics for this Knowledge Management System. When Joint Programming scheduled to start 2019 (depending on whether a decision is made to continue with Joint Programming at the Mid-Term Workshop), the R&D topics selected will be accompanied by implementation of the whole set Knowledge Management System activities. In the coming years up to implementation of Joint Programming, some topics will be implemented, serving as pilots for learning-by-doing. These topics are selected based on priorities expressed by the Member States, including feedback from questionnaire and input from Working Group 2 of the Meeting.

2.2 Session 2: Engaging Member States

The session was introduced by two presentations comparing differences and commonalities in planning and implementing advanced and starting a deep geological repository (DGR) development programme. France and Romania were selected to represent both types of programme, respectively.

Differences are apparent in the more developed and established system of the programme administration in France, including: systematic planning and its regular update established system for the process control and supervision, political support, secured long term financing, sufficient national capacities and capabilities of main actors, involving stakeholders in decision making, well established organisational structure are the main features. All this allows for immediate nomination of mandated actors to join the Joint Programming initiative.

Romania is in the phase of strategic planning and mobilisation of human, technical and financial resources regarding the development of a geological repository. The roles of potential national actors are in the process of being defined, and R&D components on geological disposal are run by research entities. Nomination of mandated actors is challenged by the fact that the country does not have dedicated TSO. The roadmap towards DGR development is being formulated. At the current status of the programme the country relies on EU support and assistance. It also relies on transfer of knowledge from other programmes to build up its domestic capability to cover all scientific aspects of DGR development. Concerted EU action is preferable as it also ensures that the programme is affordable, i.e. it takes into account the available resources allocated for the purpose.

After these country perspective presentations participants were divided to two working groups focusing on technical and horizontal aspects of Joint Programming. The findings of their discussion were presented in the Session 3.

2.3 Session 3: Way ahead

The session was introduced by two presentations regarding potential funding schemes for JP.

The European Joint Programme ('EJP') under Horizon 2020 is a co-fund action designed to support coordinated national research and innovation programmes. It is funded by both EURATOM (max to 70%) and national public sources. It is eligible to specifically mandated research programme owners and managers and requires annual programming of joint activities.

Potential mechanisms are ERA-NET and EJP co-fund. Both have been compared and the selection of a preferential one will be subject of activities during the 2nd part of the JOPRAD project. Further discussion of this matter is anticipated during the Mid-Term Workshop.

Then, the participants were acquainted by the rapporteurs with conclusion of the working groups' debate.

WG1: Exploring the domain of technical activities covered by a Joint Programming

A set of topics was formulated and distributed to all participants prior the meeting:

- What are the scientific-technical topics to be addressed within a Joint Programming?
 - ✓ Which R&D areas do you see as common to WMO, TSO and RE?
 - ✓ How to ensure WMO vs. TSO independency of a joint R&D project?
 - ✓ How to implement JP for national programmes in different development stages (planning x siting in progress x development of documentation for the construction permit)? Are there different Strategic Research Agendas?
 - ✓ How to formulate JP for different concepts (different host rock, design/EBS, inventory)?
- What are the topics for which existing scientific-technical solutions can be prohibitively expensive for small programmes?
 - ✓ What are the main challenges in your national disposal programme?
 - ✓ How to set up a robust and reasonable repository development project?
- What is the urgency of R&D efforts relevant to particular scientific-technical solutions?
- Which scientific-technical solutions would be beneficial for minimising delays in the implementation of disposal?
- Shall we deal with topics not directly linked to scientific research (social, cross-cutting activities)? How to include social science R&D programmes?

The discussion then covered the following matters:

- The use of reports to the Directive 70/2011/EURATOM to formulate the SRA

Both EC and IAEA (Joint Convention) reports require overviews of national programmes but do not provide indications of national preferences. Vice versa, Joint Programming will not cover the whole width of national programmes. For selecting priorities to be implemented under Joint Programming, information is needed on plans of particular Actors.

- Commonalities of Research, Development and Demonstration (RD&D) actors need to be identified while respecting differences in their requirements/needs

SRAs are to be developed and compared to provide the basis for formulating the joint vision and selecting accompanying activities. The selection is being performed in relatively short time. The aim is to identify common interests, whereas national specifics without a common basis are left out.

- Environmental monitoring: shall it be included in JP because of implications for public acceptance?

Project [Modern2020](#) addresses partially the issue (while mostly dealing with facility monitoring); a monitoring project within Joint Programming is also expected.

- Joint Programming for national programmes that are in different stages

Common requirements for site selection should be elaborated. The national strategy is a basis for establishing a DGR programme

Most participants feel that predisposal activities are to be included (such as, spent nuclear fuel encapsulation, processing of different types of radioactive waste, extension of service life of storage facilities, processing waste with exotic and long lived waste).

➤ Joint Programming for national programmes that consider different designs and host rocks

Grouping according to these parameters might be useful (Clay club, Granite club, Salt club, etc.), full overlapping of programmatic topics can hardly be anticipated. Among several countries having the same interest, it might be easier to find cooperative approaches than joint projects at EU level. It is advisable to identify issues that are difficult to achieve and are common for several partners.

Common problems include: developing RD&D methodology, modelling tools, standardisation of investigation methods and evaluation of gained results, procedures for data collection, etc.

➤ Topics for which existing scientific-technical solutions can be prohibitively expensive for small programmes

Joint effort for performing expensive RD&D tasks (SNF performance; joint designs for the same type of SNF, HLW; underground laboratory), and sharing knowledge regarding DGR engineering.

➤ Urgency of R&D efforts relevant to particular scientific-technical solutions

Prolonged storage of SNF: consider ageing management of SNF/HLW.

Criticality might become a problem in the case of failure of the system and thus needs to be addressed in the safety case.

➤ Scientific-technical solutions beneficial for minimising delays in the implementation of disposal

Currently, lack of knowledge regarding operational safety issues, (fire protection) as they are crucial for the DGR project, but they are difficult to predict in the long term. After the first DGR's are put in operation this will be checked and adequately treated.

Retrievability issues – early decision on the concept is needed in order to be adequately reflected in DGR design.

Selecting similar concepts eases joint efforts. Grouping countries according to disposal concepts is seen as beneficial.

➤ R&D involving societal issues is recommended for each national programme

The societal studies should be linked in a way or another to a national programme. If national programmes include these aspects, they could be considered in a Joint programme.

➤ Miscellaneous topics

Shared repository: this problem is out of the scope of Joint Programming as a political aspect, but some technical issues are relevant (e.g. disposal of different types of spent nuclear fuel/radioactive waste in a single facility) and, thus, should be studied.

Consider Safety Case as a common topic, everybody needs it, its scientific, methodological and regulatory background is similar for all disposal options, standardised format of a Safety Case would be beneficial.

Security: is it an aspect to be investigated?

WG2: Exploring strategic and horizontal activities in Joint Programming

The objectives of the 26 participants of Working Group 2 were to provide input and contribute to the development of the Integrated Knowledge Management System (IKMS). The overall IKMS as presented during Session 1 was discussed with respect to priorities for the individual components. The discussion and outcome of the Working Group 2 complements the feedback already received from questionnaires sent out to Regional Meeting participants and JOPRAD Member State contacts in advance.

The IKMS builds around the State-of-the-Knowledge Handbook where the state of Knowledge of different topics is documented and updated as feasible. This Handbook is accompanied by:

- Training & Education,
- Guidance,
- Dissemination,
- Strategic Studies, and
- Knowledge transfer between Programmes.
- The objectives in individual terms were:
 - Get feedback on the list of Components forming the accompanying activities around the Knowledge Handbook,
 - Provide interests for these Components, including the Knowledge Handbook topics, and
 - Discuss priorities in view of implementing certain topics before the R&D topics have the priority upon implementation of the Joint Programming.

The outcome can be summarized as follows:

1. The Knowledge Handbook;

- a. Focus on managing Knowledge by Experts for Experts (dissemination to, and involvement of a broader interested community is not a priority),
- b. Ensure quality management, including organization and update of the Knowledge, and
- c. When R&D is implemented, provide the full IKMS support.

A discussion concerning the appropriate WEB tool showed some interest in the WiKi tool.

2. Training & Education;

- d. Training will be built on linking with existing national and international structures suppliers of education and training, including forthcoming external activities (such as [PETRUS III](#), [ANNETTE](#),....),
- e. Specific Training is foreseen for R&D topics implemented under the Joint Programming,
- f. Specific Training is already being implemented for Planning of RD&D Programmes towards Geological Disposal (cf. [IGD-TP PLANDIS Guide](#)),

- g. When linking to existing structures and activities, proposals will be made to include desired Education and Training measures (interaction with ENEN or other suppliers, ...),
- h. There is room for additional topics, such as integrating Training with SITEX on the expertise needs for Safety Case review, and
- i. Request for competence management of Education and Training.

3. Guidance;

- a. The broad set of existing Guidance will be referred to where accessible,
- b. Examples were made for Guidance on the need for competence in different Programmes during different implementation stages, and Guidance on Optimization and The Graded Approach, and
- c. There is a need for a working group specifically on this topic in order to elaborate upon the need for Guidance and mechanisms for identifying such need, and to propose a management structure.

4. Dissemination;

- a. Dissemination should focus on Expert to Expert mode, i.e. dissemination and communication to a broader interested community is not a key priority,
- b. Dissemination to other Expert Communities should be discussed,
- c. Dissemination of the need for and outcome of R&D to Policy Makers needs to be discussed, and
- d. Dissemination to the Public was discussed but without reference to workable activities.

5. Strategic Studies;

- a. Approach to shared facilities (pre-disposal and disposal facilities), including how the ERDO workgroup initiative can be translated into R&D topics,
- b. Strategies on how to involve Civil Society and possible social science R&D if directly linked to supporting such development, and
- c. Options for disposal of different Waste Inventories.

A Strategic Study on the specific needs of nuclear Member States with Less Advanced Programmes could be implemented in advance of Joint Programming.

6. Transfer of Knowledge between Programmes

It was agreed upon that this is an important topic, but how to implement it remains a question.

The overall outcome of the very lively discussion with respect to final remarks and way ahead was that there is a general support for the development of the IKMS, recognizing that there is further work to be done with respect to definition of activities and implementation priorities.

The outcome of the Working Group 2 discussions, already received and more to come through feedback from the questionnaire will be integrated in the further development of the IKMS.

The next key step is presentation of the Programme at the forthcoming JOPRAD Mid-Term Workshop.

2.4 Session 4: Conclusion

The final part of the meeting was devoted to the round table discussion chaired by Ch. Davies (EC) and J. Delay (project coordinator). As panellists, the following experts expressed their opinion regarding the listed topics below: J. Pacovsky (Czech Republic), F. Takats (Hungary), Ch. Poussard (France), M. Sepielli (Italy), C. Bucur (Romania), and L. Cizelj (Slovenia).

Final discussion topic was: How can the forthcoming Joint Programming be effective in supporting MS's Geological Disposal implementation programmes, including:

- How to attract Member States to contribute to the JOPRAD project and eventually participate in the Joint Programming?
- How can potentially mandated actors become involved in the different JORAD Working Groups?
- How are the participants to Joint Programming mandated?
- What is the potential support for Member States in implementing the Waste Directive?
- How to structure the decision-making process in setting RD&D and horizontal activities priorities?
- How can responsibilities and governance of the Joint Programme be agreed upon?
- How, in which phases and which activities can Civil Society be effectively regarded and/or involved?

Key ideas expressed by panellists and discussed in plenum can be summarised as follows:

- DGR development is an interdisciplinary issue which is not entirely reflected in the SRA (e.g. geotechnical RD&D topics are neglected),
- Entering a RD&D programme in early stages even with minority involvement of an institution will enhance constructing its own systematic and extensive research in longer horizon, therefore, it should be promoted whenever possible,
- National specifics need to be adequately considered while constructing JP,
- Member States should see the added values to be engaged in JP,
- Standardisation of RD&D activities was requested (procedures, methods, approaches, safety case format, technical aspects...),
- National commitment is needed to join in the joint programme,
- Newcomers are encouraged to get organised in an early stage of their Programme,
- Peer review might help small programmes in their planning and implementation,
- Small programmes have problems getting started - predisposal issues are common to all of them, thus, shared effort in this area may enhance this start,
- Request from countries with less advanced programmes for the transfer of existing European knowledge in R&D and management to be implemented in the generic Safety Cases using the national expertise. JOPRAD is an ambitious project, defining priorities & governance principles that from the very beginning are key aspects of its successful performance
- Sharing solutions of technical problems would be beneficial for everybody,
- Differences regarding mandated actors in particular countries shall not compromise the overall goal of JP,

- To invite the main stakeholders in decision making process, particularly the ministries representatives to participate in the Mid-Term Workshop, and
- Establishing national priorities is the first step towards defining JOPRAD priorities.

The EC representative briefly summarised meeting highlights in the following statements:

- Knowledge management is a central issue of the project, it is well established,
- Predisposal issues should be sufficiently regarded,
- Flag the gaps identified and incorporate them adequately in the programme,
- Not only national benefits are followed, EU added value shall be respected as well (commonality principle), and
- Decision makers shall be involved in Mid-Term Workshop.

3 Summary of the meeting

- The meeting was attended by 67 representatives of 17 countries and the EC,
- The rationale for the EURATOM Research and Training Programme to evolve towards Joint Programming was communicated,
- The way towards establishing Joint Programming in the field of radioactive waste management was communicated, i.e. implementation of the JOPRAD Coordination and Support Action,
- The way forwards in order to implement Joint Programming, presumably starting 2019, was communicated, with the key hold-point being the forthcoming Mid-Term Workshop 7-8th September 2016, in Prague,
- The role of the three Strategic Research Agendas from Waste Management Organizations, Technical Support Organizations and Mandated Research Entities was explained,
- The development and role of Integrated Knowledge Management System integrating different activities was presented,
- The role of Civil Society in the Research and Development was discussed,
- The benefits for Member States to engage early in the process was conveyed, and
- The different possibilities for engaging in the process were communicated.

It was concluded that Joint Programming will be a useful and effective tool for supporting National Waste Management Programmes, and to respond to the needs of different Programmes with their different implementation levels as well as implementation schedules.

Key Messages of the Regional meeting can be expressed as:

- Interest is there from the different actors in the Member States and at the EC,
- The Member States and their Actors are informed about Joint Programming,
- The Member States and their Actors are informed about how to get involved,
- The Member States and their Actors should get organised and join the development,
- “Get on the Bus” and be in the process already at the on-set of the process, and
- BE POSITIVE!



Annex I: Regional Meeting Agenda

JOPRAD Regional Meeting



3rd – 4th February, 2016

Marshal Garden Hotel, Bucharest, Romania

AMETIST Room

Final Agenda

3 rd February 2016 Session 1: <u>Introduction to Joint Programming</u> Chairs: A. van Kalleveen / D. Diaconu			
	Time	Speaker	Presentation title
1.1	09:30	Official Host Country representative: Florian Tatar/ Ion Constantin	Welcome
1.2	09:40	J. Miksova	Objectives of the meeting
1.3	10:00	Ch. Davies	Why Joint Programming?
1.4	10:30	L. Nachmilner	Overview of activities in radioactive waste management and the role of Joint Programming
1.5	11:00	J. Delay	JOPRAD – objectives, structure, outcomes
11:30		Coffee break	
1.6	12:00	J. Delay	Joint Programming: establishing and updating the programme and implementing the first work plan
1.7	12:20	R. Kowe	JOPRAD - establishing the programme; views of the waste management organisations
1.8	12:35	F. Lemy	JOPRAD - establishing the programme; views of the technical support organisations
1.9	12:50	Ch. Bruggeman	JOPRAD - establishing the programme; views of the research entities
1.10	13:05	G. Buckau	JOPRAD - establishing the programme; strategic and horizontal aspects
13:20		Lunch	
3 rd February 2016 Session 2: <u>Engaging Member States</u> Chairs: Ch. Serres/ J. Pacovsky			
2.1	14:30	Ch. Poussard	Preparing for Joint Programming - the French approach in identifying mandated actors
2.2	15:00	I. Turcu	Preparing for Joint Programming - the Romanian approach in planning & developing Geological Disposal
15:30		Coffee break	
2.3	16:00	Working Group 1 (WG1) Chair: F. Takats Rapporteur: L. Nachmilner (Room: Panoramic 2)	Exploring the domain of scientific-technical activities covered by the Joint Programming <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the scientific-technical topics to be addressed within the Joint Programming? - What are the topics for which existing scientific-technical solutions can be prohibitively expensive for small programmes? - What is the urgency of R&D efforts relevant for particular scientific-technical solutions? - Which scientific-technical solutions would be

			beneficial for minimising potential delays in the implementation of disposal?
		Working Group 2 (WG2) Chair: D. Diaconu Rapporteur: A. van Kalleveen (Room : Safir)	Exploring strategic and horizontal activities in the Joint Programming <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - State of the art/ handbook - Training and Education - Guidance - Documentation, communication and dissemination of information - Strategic Studies - Knowledge Management - Developing and maintaining competence and skills - Know-how transfer between programmes (different status of national programmes)
18:30		Adjourn	
20:00		Dinner	
4th February 2016 Session 3: <u>Way ahead</u> Chairs: G. Buckau/J. Miksova			
3.1	09:00	A. Iatrou	Funding schemes under consideration
3.2	09:30	J. Delay	H2020 ERANET Co-fund vs EJP: Preliminary analysis of the pro and cons of the two instruments
3.3	10:00	Rapporteur of WG 1 L. Nachmilner	Summary of findings of WG1 discussion
3.4	10:30	Rapporteur of WG 2 A. van Kalleveen	Summary of findings of WG2 discussion
11:00		Coffee break	
4th February 2016 Session 4: <u>Conclusion</u> Chairs: Ch. Davies/ J. Delay			
4.1	11:30	Final discussion: Chairs: Ch. Davies + J. Delay Panellists: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ch. Poussard - F.Takats - M. Sepielli - T. Žagar - J. Pacovsky - L. Cizelj - C.Bucur 	Final discussion: How can the forthcoming Joint Programming be effective in supporting Member States Radioactive Waste Management Programmes, in particular Geological Disposal, including questions such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to attract Member States to contribute to the JOPRAD project and eventually participate in the Joint Programming? • How can potentially mandated actors become involved in the different JORAD Working Groups? • How are the participants to Joint Programming mandated? • What is the potential support for Member States in implementing the Waste Directive? • How to structure the decision making process in setting RD&D and horizontal activities priorities? • How can responsibilities and governance of the Joint Programme be agreed upon? • How, in which phases and which activities can Civil Society be effectively regarded and/or involved?
4.2	13:00	L. Nachmilner + G. Buckau	Summary and conclusions of the meeting
4.3	13:20	Ch. Davies/J. Delay	Closure of the meeting
13:30		End of the Meeting	

Annex II: Regional Meeting Presentations

Session 1 - Introduction to Joint Programming

- 1.2 [Objectives of the meeting](#), J. Miksova (CVREZ)
- 1.3 [European Commission perspective on Joint Programming - Why and What](#), C. Davies (EC)
- 1.4 [Overview of activities in radioactive waste management and the role of Joint Programming](#), L. Nachmilner (CVREZ)
- 1.5 [JOPRAD – objectives, structure, outcomes](#), J. Delay (Andra)
- 1.6 [JOPRAD - Establishing and updating the Joint Programme Implementing the work plan](#), J. Delay (Andra)
- 1.7 [JOPRAD - establishing the programme; views of the waste management organisations](#), R. Kowe 'RWM)
- 1.8 [JOPRAD - establishing the programme; views of the technical support organisations](#), F. Lemy (Bel V)
- 1.9 [JOPRAD - establishing the programme; views of the research entities](#), C. Bruggeman (SCK•CEN)
- 1.10 [JOPRAD - establishing the programme; strategic and horizontal aspects](#), G. Buckau (JRC - ITU)

Session 2: Engaging Member States

- 2.1 [Preparing for Joint Programming - the French approach in identifying mandated actors](#), C. Poussard (DGEC, France)
- 2.2 [Preparing for Joint Programming - the Romanian approach in planning & developing Geological Disposal](#), I. Turcu (RATEN-ICN)

Session 3: Way ahead

- 3.1 [European Joint Programme and ERA-NET Co-fund Actions under Horizon 2020](#), A. Iatrou (EC)
- 3.2 [H2020 ERANET cofund- vs EJP Preliminary analysis](#), J. Delay (Andra)
- 3.3 [Outcomes of Working Group 1-Exploring the domain of scientific-technical activities covered by the Joint Programming](#), L. Nachmilner (CVREZ)
- 3.4 [Outcomes of Working Group 2 - Exploring strategic and horizontal activities in the Joint Programming](#), A. van Kalleveen (JRC - ITU)

Session 4: Conclusion

- 4.1 [Session 4: Questions for panellists](#)
 - > [Italian participation in JOPRAD](#)
- 4.2 [Summary & Conclusions](#), L. Nachmilner (CVREZ), G. Buckau (JRC - ITU)