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Current status of the GDF projects

FIN
- construction of URL/GDF (Onkalo) underway at Eurajoki since 2004
- planned entry into operation 2020

SWE
- 2000-2011: Oskarshamn and Östhammar in focus
- 2011: SKB chooses Östhammar for a GDF, Oskarshamn for encapsulation facility
- Planned entry into operation ~2022

FRA
- URL under construction in Bure (east of the country) since 2000
- Bure to host the GDF (Cigéo)
- Cigéo operational 2025
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FIN</th>
<th>SWE</th>
<th>FRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementer</strong></td>
<td>Private industry</td>
<td>Private industry</td>
<td>State agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National funds for radwaste</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management (ultimately from the industry)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NGOs and communities can apply for funds</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, e.g. for information and empowerment</td>
<td>Yes, through local liaison committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent technical oversight</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes: National Council for Nuclear Waste</td>
<td>Yes: national evaluation bodies, but also foreign experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Licencing</strong></td>
<td>Early parliamentary approval; government then approves construction and operation licence</td>
<td>Government decides, after approval by safety authority and agreement by host municipality</td>
<td>Government decides, after approval by safety authority and evaluation bodies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benefit packages in Finland, Sweden and France

Negotiated between the municipality and the nuclear industry: ear-marked funding, in the form of infrastructure development (Municipal property tax)

Added-value programmes: to provide value additional to that generated by the facility

- 75% - 25% sharing of funds
- Ex ante evaluation and ex post monitoring

Legally mandated (1991) economic “accompaniment” to the two départements:

- local & regional development purposes
- Use of funds decided at dept level
Key issues for benefit packages

- Municipal veto (and its timing)
- Institutionalisation: of local-national-industry relations and benefit packages
- Involvement of central government
- Degree of pro-activeness on the part of the municipality
- Direct cash payments to municipalities?
- Competition or cooperation between municipalities
- Independent expertise available to and used by municipality?
- Municipal tax revenue? (property tax in Finland)
Definitions

- Compensation schemes, benefit packages, “accompagnement économique” (econ. support...)

- Perceptions count as much as (or more than) “objective” definitions: “bribe”, “prostitution” or “just compensation”?

- Acceptance/acceptability or resistance?
  - Ownership, adhesion and consensus or resistance, conflict, and power?
  - Deliberative and/or agonistic democracy?

- Discursive framing of compensation: politics or market?
  - Ethics, justice, rights, responsibilities
  - Costs and benefits

- Voluntarism? “But do we have a choice?”
Three rationales/types of compensation
1. Mitigation (of real or perceived impacts)

- Engineering or *institutional*

- Institutional: *improve the ability and capacities of the local community to host the facility* (training, institution-building, construction of roads, housing, health services for workers)

- But also:
  - local involvement in decision-making
  - capacity building
  - development of local partnerships and local involvement support packages
2. Compensation (for real impacts and for accepting increased risk)

- To generate “a desired redistribution of the facility’s benefits and costs” (Gregory et al.) or
- “redistributing some of the benefits of the facility to those individuals who are directly impacted by its construction or operation” (Easterling and Kuhnreuter)
- Monetary or non-monetary: arguably the non-monetary ones are more effective at enhancing acceptance
- Two purposes:
  - offsetting the negative impacts of the facility, and
  - rewarding individuals for their responsible behaviour
3. Incentive (encouraging communities to become involved)

- “means of helping to achieve the best possible technical solution, one which might not otherwise be implemented because of social and political constraints” (Carnes et al.)
- assumes societal desirability of the project (framing and “strong legitimisation”, Stirling 2006); or
- seeking a mutually agreeable solution, without a priori assumptions of desirability (“weak legitimisation”, “fair process”)
- mitigation (ex ante), compensation (ex post, for actually incurred damage), and reward (for accepting the responsibility and taking the risk)
- presupposes mutual agreement on the nature, extent and existence of risk
- Encouraging the involvement in a siting process without binding commitment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Locally negotiated</th>
<th>Legally imposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td><strong>FIN</strong>: construction of infrastructure, agreed between industry and municipality</td>
<td><strong>FIN</strong>: local veto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SWE</strong>: SKB support to municipalities’ engagement and expertise</td>
<td><strong>SWE</strong>: local veto &amp; support to NGO and citizen participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FRA</strong>: Details of GIP projects “locally” negotiated</td>
<td><strong>FRA</strong>: GIP for improvement of capacity; CLIS for empowerment and expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td><strong>SWE</strong>: Added-value programmes also as a recognition for the fulfilment of ‘civic duty’</td>
<td><strong>FIN</strong>: property tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FRA</strong>: EDF, Areva, CEA projects of direct support (e.g. 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation biofuels, archives)</td>
<td>(<strong>FRA</strong>: GIP, to the extent that responsibility and ‘civic duty’ are rewarded; also the “dotations”, which are unconditional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive</td>
<td><strong>FIN</strong>: Vuojoki agreement</td>
<td><strong>FRA</strong>: GIPs also to incite local municipalities to engage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SWE</strong>: Added-value programmes: to provide value additional to that generated by the facility itself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Context: peripherality and dependence
“Peripherality”
(Blowers and Leroy 1994)

- geographical, political, economic, cultural, and social peripherality
- Borrows from core-periphery theories: relationships of political, economic and cultural domination and exploitation
- peripheral communities: “geographically remote, economically marginal, politically powerless and socially homogeneous” (Blowers and Leroy 1994, 203)
## Criteria of peripherality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FIN</th>
<th>SWE</th>
<th>FRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remoteness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic marginality</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerlessness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of acceptance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no (?)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental degradation</td>
<td>yes (nuclear industry)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compensations creating dependence?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions/Attributes</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Dependence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population &amp; demography</td>
<td>Population density and structure, demographics</td>
<td>Rate of population growth, Migration flows</td>
<td>Degree to which current service patterns are sustained by transfers from more prosperous regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic activity</td>
<td>Employment structure and diversity, Importance of primary industries relative to secondary and tertiary sectors, Unemployment rates</td>
<td>GDP and income per capita, Changes in rates of employment and output</td>
<td>Dependence of agriculture on subsidies, Dependence of business activity and investments on assistance from the public sector, Dependence of infrastructure development on national and international assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community &amp; culture</td>
<td>Presence of minority cultures and languages, Strength of regional identity</td>
<td>Changes in community identity, Impact of migration trends</td>
<td>Dependence of the survival of minority cultures and languages on external assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Creation of dependence?

- Irreversibilisation, introduction of the project through the backdoor (Bure URL to GDF)
- Bribe effect: FIN & SWE avoided this? FRA: “justified bribe”
- Eurajoki dependent on real estate tax revenue (up to 90% of this tax revenue comes from nuclear industry)
- Bure and surroundings: dependent on GIS funding that has flown in since 2000
- Oskarshamn & Östhammar: dependence on the value-added programmes
- Eurajoki & Oskarshamn & Östhammar: Dependence on nuclear industry?