

2nd CIPAST Training Workshop
 17-21 June 2007
 Procida, Italy



ID Card of Case studies: “AcceptRis”

Title	How to design a participatory process about an industrial site and its project to implement an emerging technology (Carbon Capture and Storage –CCS), for stakeholders and including the “general public”.
Short description of the case	<p>Participants will address a number of questions regarding a participatory process about an emerging industrial technology, in order to obtain a general framing of the issue that allows to include all stakeholders’ views and ideas from the very beginning of the decisional process preceding the implementation of such an industry on a territory.</p> <p>Those questions are based, besides ethical aspects, on three main items: openness, inclusion, and pro-activity of a participatory process. Examples of the items to be addressed, besides the general role and liabilities of the diverse stakeholders to be determined, are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Who should initiate the participatory process (why, and how)? - Who should participate (and how to determine those stakeholders)? - What objectives should (and could probably) be pursued? - What rules need to be designed? - When such a process should start (and what should be the temporal shape, i.e. periodicity...)? - What form(s) the participatory process should take (from general information of the public via news letters to citizen or consensus conferences...)? - ... <p>The case is developed on the basis of an actual ongoing research project at INERIS on a potential CCS site in Southern France (SocECO2).</p>
Training objectives	<p>Participants will be reflecting on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The importance of the issue framing in the general design of a participatory process for emerging issues; • The multiplicity of possible roles and liabilities of the different stakeholders in an emerging technology related, potentially controversial, situation; • The importance of a clear definition of objectives and rules for the participatory process; • The importance of a temporal design taking into account local agendas; • The necessity of a sense-making adaptation of the general design to the implementation of the participatory process (method, communication forms and channels...). <p>Basically, three perspectives on a participatory process for emerging technologies are possible: the industrial, the regulatory, and the elected persons’ point of view. Those three specific actors could be initiator of a participatory process, whose objectives and design will probably differ according to the identity of the initiator. Participants are invited, in smaller groups of interest (one for each “main actor” or potential decision maker) to frame and design the participatory process for each of those potential participatory process initiators, and compare the results.</p>

Training method	<p>A short introduction to the general and French national actual context of CCS (advantages and disadvantages, industrial stakes, regulatory framework, results of surveys...) will be given. Then, the particular case to be considered will be considered (situational context). [30 – 45 minutes]</p> <p>Participants are then invited to split in groups of interest, at least one for each of the main possible groups of participatory process initiators (industrial, national regulatory services, local elected persons). They will discuss, frame and design a possible shape of the participatory process, based upon the adapted “real life” situation and the identity they chose (from objectives and rules’ definition to implementation). They will have to take into account especially the availability of resources (human, financial...), the different time-scales to be considered for all of the potential stakeholders to participate in the process, the informational and communicational aspects (message framing and design, choice of transmission channels, spokespersons...), and the way of evaluating the participatory processes’ outcomes. [3 to 4 hours]</p> <p>They will present their results in a final plenary session and compare with the other groups’ results. The main differences observed will be discusses (reasons and consequences – and what that implies for more general considerations on participatory processes, according to initiators identity). [1 to 2 hours]</p> <p>The case study author and CIPAST members will facilitate the session and assist the case study participants.</p>
Previous knowledge required	<p>Participants should have a fair knowledge of participatory processes (diverse methods, techniques and tools), and be used to reflect on legal, political, economical and/or geographical aspects to allow a real confrontation of different possible solutions, and a comparison of the decision making criteria retained and applied under three different identity contexts.</p>
Materials	<p>It is necessary to dispose of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plenary room (for the presentations and discussions), equipped with a laptop/computer and projector (PPT). • At least three rooms for the break out sessions in small groups. • One paper board per room/group. • One laptop/computer (to prepare the plenary session presentation).
Contacts, resources and further reading	<p>The Web-site of the French research project “SocECO2” (economics and sociology of the CCS industry): http://www.centre-cired.fr/forum/article435.html</p> <p>The Web-site TOTAL, with a dossier on CCS and the presentation of the project in Southern France (Lacq): http://www.total.com/fr/responsabilite-societale-environnementale/dossiers/captage/COE-engagement-Total/CO2-pilote-Lacq_11347.htm</p> <p>Further bibliography on CCS and public acceptance will be provided before the workshop.</p>
Contact	<p>Gabriela PFEIFLE, GESO/DRA - INERIS, France gabriela.pfeifle@ineris.fr Myriam MERAD, GESO/DRA – INERIS, France Myriam.merad@ineris.fr</p>