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SPECIFIC CULTURAL AND POLITICAL CHALLENGES IN CROSS-BORDER PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
First results from a literature review on cross-border public participation

1. Research project HÉrüber
2. Challenges and success factors for cross-border public participation procedures
3. Specific cultural and political framework conditions in neighbouring countries
4. Outlook
The research project HErüber analyses specific risks and obstacles, as well as cultural and political framework conditions for transboundary public participation.

Work packages
- Literature review
- Legal Analysis
- Case Studies
- Needs in neighbouring countries
- Synthesis and recommendations
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The research project HErüber is commissioned by the Federal Office for the Safety of Nuclear Waste Management (BASE)
Challenges for cross-border public participation procedures

Risks and obstacles of public participation in the search for a nuclear repository
- Acceptance of the search procedure is a prerequisite for the acceptability of the repository site
- Complexity
- Constellations of actors
- Lack of knowledge and knowledge asymmetries
- Politicisation / Conflict

Risks and obstacles of transboundary public participation
- Unequal opportunities for foreign and domestic stakeholders
- Procedural uncertainties
- High time and resource requirements
- Language barriers
- Different competences in transboundary public participation and interdependencies with regional competences and networks
- Low interest of the foreign public
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Success factors for...

... public participation in the search for a nuclear repository

• Ensuring fairness of the procedure
• Countering complexity
• Deal with changing actors constellations

... transboundary public participation

• Clarity of the process / Good explanation of the process, roles, tasks and responsibilities
• Early participation for all
• Planning appropriate resources and flexibility
• Quality translation and interpretation

• Use of clear language, detailed graphics and maps
• Willingness to communicate and cooperate
• Sensitive handling of intercultural differences
• Measures to activate the foreign public
Specific cultural and political framework conditions in neighbouring countries

- **Political framework** = democratic structure, legal prerequisites and institutional setting

- **Cultural framework** = norms, traditions, meanings and attitudes of different social groups in a specific region or national context

**Neighbouring countries** differ as well regarding collaborative decision making processes → long tradition vs. no or little experience

**National contexts** differ internal, e.g. with regard to participation and attitudes towards nuclear facilities
Influence of political culture on participation

Five dimensions of culture

(Source: https://geerthofstede.com/; Enserink et al. 2007)

Relevance for participation:

→ high power distance = rather top-down decision making
→ collective orientation = more participatory processes
→ traditional role models = less participation
→ strong catholic influence = less participation
Neighbouring countries with high requirements for participation and rather critical attitude towards nuclear facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Switzerland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>participation</td>
<td>long tradition in participatory processes (e.g. consensus conferences); role models not so important</td>
<td>long tradition in early stakeholder-participation with consensus orientation; role models not so important; power distance little</td>
<td>lots of guidelines for participatory processes, some direct democratic elements institutionalised</td>
<td>half-direct democracy model with plebiscites on all political levels; early information of public and referenda common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude</td>
<td>early societal resistance against nuclear energy, three decommissioned research reactors, no commercial reactor</td>
<td>early and strong societal resistance and rather negative attitude towards nuclear facilities; small-scale nuclear programme</td>
<td>high risk perception of and strong opposition towards nuclear facilities; no commercial and only one research reactor</td>
<td>ambivalent attitude towards nuclear facilities; five commercial reactors, but decision to opt out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>towards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nuclear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Neighbouring countries with diverse participation experiences and rather positive attitude towards nuclear facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Czech Republic</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>participation experience</strong></td>
<td>ambivalent: tradition of social movements, at the same time until 1980ies centralized characteristic and traditional top-down decision-making (power distance)</td>
<td>still young democracy (since 1992) with little importance of participatory elements (power distance)</td>
<td>strong role models and high uncertainty avoidance as well as power distance; participatory elements less important</td>
<td>high power distance and uncertainty avoidance and as well strong role models; little participation experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>attitude towards nuclear facilities</strong></td>
<td>risk perception of nuclear facilities less marked; 58 commercial reactors</td>
<td>6 commercial reactors, rather nuclear friendly attitude, oppositional groups marginalized</td>
<td>up to date no commercial reactor; regionally diverse attitude (e.g. negative in cross-border region to Germany)</td>
<td>ambivalent attitude and ongoing controversy regarding site selection; risk perception less marked; 7 commercial reactors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Potential border regions

Sub-areas pursuant to § 13 Site Selection Act (StandAG)
Outlook

Work package 3: exploration of challenges and success factors of cross-border participation towards three case studies

- Swiss planning procedure on deep geological disposal (CH)
- EIA for the extension of the nuclear power plants in Dukovany (CZ)
- SEA for the revision of Maritime spatial plans (DE)

Work package 5: requirements for cross-border participation in potential regions

- Five cross-border regions will be analysed regarding participation requirements
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