

Appendices

Appendix 1. Itinerary for the Public Acceptance Week for Nuclear Energy FY 2018

Workshop on ‘Living just outside a hosting municipality of nuclear facilities – with opinion leaders from foreign countries’

Date and venue

Date: 22 January 2019

Venue: Maizuru Cultural Hall, Maizuru City, Kyoto Prefecture, Japan

Languages: Japanese/English/French (with simultaneous interpretation)

Timetable

12:00	Doors open and Registration
12:30–12:40	Opening Remarks: President and CEO, IEEJ
12:40–12:50	Opening Address: Executive Director, Disaster Prevention, Maizuru City
<i>Session 1: Strategies and activities for nuclear disaster prevention at municipality just outside a nuclear hosting region</i> (Moderator: Senior Economist, Manager, IEEJ)	
12:50–13:50	Provision at Kyoto pref.: Director, Nuclear Safety Division, Department of Citizen's Affaires, Kyoto Pref. Provision at Maizuru: Manager, Crisis Management and Disaster Prevention Division, Mayor Affairs Office, Maizuru City • Disaster prevention activity, nuclear safety plan • Municipal council • Emergency exercise • Briefing for residents Q&A
13:50–14:10	Coffee break
<i>Session 2: Policy Proposals</i> (Moderator: Senior Economist, Manager, IEEJ)	
14:10–15:10	Free discussion • Representatives from cities and towns next to nuclear hosting region • Opinion leaders from foreign countries • Participants from ERIA
15:10–15:20	Wrap-up of proposals
15:20–15:30	Closing Address: Senior Energy Economist, Energy Unit, Research Department, ERIA

CEO = chief executive officer; ERIA = Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia; IEEJ = Institute of Energy Economics, Japan; Q&A = question and answer.

**Workshop on ‘Living in hosting municipality of nuclear facilities – public meeting
with opinion leaders from three countries and Japan’**

Date and venue

Date: 24 January 2019

Venue: Shizuoka Country Hamaoka Course and Hotel, Omaezaki City

Language: Japanese/English/French (with simultaneous interpretation)

Timetable

12:30	Doors open and Registration
13:00–13:10	Opening Remarks: Senior Energy Economist, Energy Unit, Research Department, ERIA
13:10–13:20	Opening Address: Director General, General Affairs Department, Omaezaki City
<i>Session 1: Status of region hosting or introducing a nuclear facility and dialogue with stakeholder at each country; why nuclear power is important for the country and communities? Can we prepare for the accident safely enough?</i> (Moderator: Senior Economist, Manager, IEEJ)	
13:20–14:00	Delegate, Consultative Commission on Industrial Change, European Economic and Social Committee (Finland)
	Member, French Parliament (France)
	Employment, International Specialist (the UK)
	Former Representative, Omaezaki City Audit Commissioner
<i>Session 2: Reaching common understanding; significance of nuclear facilities in the local community, regulation schemes and risks</i> (Moderator: Senior Economist, Manager, IEEJ)	
14:00–14:50	Mayor, Municipality of La Hague (France)
	Mayor, Municipality of Flamanville (France)
	Mayor, Municipality of Östhammar (Sweden)
	Strategic Management Director, Growth and Business department, Municipality of Oskarchamn (Sweden)
	Vice-Chairperson, Omaezaki City Tourism Association
<i>Session 3: Policy Proposals</i> (Moderator: Senior Economist, Manager, IEEJ)	
15:00–15:20	Q&A and Wrap-up of Proposals
15:20–15:30	Closing Address: Managing Director, Chief Economist, IEEJ

ERIA = Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia; IEEJ = Institute of Energy Economics, Japan; Q&A = question and answer.

Workshop and wrap-up meeting on ‘How to improve PA for nuclear energy in referring to the experience in the respective countries’

Date and venue

Date: 25 January 2019

Venue: Keio Plaza Hotel, Tokyo

Language: English

Timetable

08:30	Doors open and Registration
09:00–09:10	Opening Address: President and CEO, IEEJ
09:10–09:20	Welcome Address: Director, Office for Regional Relations for Nuclear Facilities, Nuclear Energy Public Relations Office, (METI)
<i>Session 1: Status of region hosting a nuclear facility or just outside a hosting municipality and Dialogue with stakeholder at each country; why nuclear power is important for the country and communities? Reaching common understanding</i> (Moderator: Senior Economist, Manager, IEEJ)	
09:20–09:30	Introduction: Introduce speakers by moderator
09:30–10:00	Employment, International Specialist (the UK)
10:00–10:30	Delegate, Consultative Commission on Industrial Change, European Economic and Social Committee (Finland)
10:30–10:50	Coffee Break
<i>Session 2: Reaching common understanding; significance of nuclear facilities in the local community, regulation schemes and risks</i> (Moderator: Senior Economist, Manager, IEEJ)	
10:50–11:00	Introduction: Introduce speakers by moderator
11:00–11:30	Mayor, Municipality of La Hague (France)
11:30–12:00	Mayor, Municipality of Flamanville (France)
12:00–13:20	Lunch Break
13:20–13:30	Introduction: Introduce speakers by moderator
13:30–14:00	Strategic Management Director, Growth and Business department, Municipality of Oskarchamn (Sweden)
14:00–14:30	Mayor, Municipality of Östhammar (Sweden)
14:30–15:00	Member, French Parliament (France)
15:00–15:20	Engineer, Senior Professional, Division of Nuclear Energy Study and Coordination, Office of the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Energy (Thailand)
<i>Session 3: Policy Proposals</i> (Moderator: Senior Economist, Manager, IEEJ)	
15:20–15:30	Report Result of Workshops at Maizuru and Omaezaki
15:30–15:50	Free Discussion, Wrap-up of proposals
15:50–16:00	Closing Address: Senior Energy Economist, Energy Unit, Research Department, ERIA

CEO = chief executive officer; METI = Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry in, ERIA = Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia; IEEJ = Institute of Energy Economics, Japan; Q&A = question and answer.

Appendix 2. Fiscal Year 2018

Public Acceptance Week Minutes

DATE	EVENTS	VENUE
21.JAN (MON)	Takahama NPP technical visit	Takahama NPP
22.JAN (TUE)	Workshop on ‘Living just outside a hosting municipality of nuclear facilities – with opinion leaders from foreign countries’ Press Conference	Maizuru in Kyoto Pref.
24.JAN (THU)	Hamaoka NPP technical visit Workshop on ‘Living in the hosting municipality of nuclear facilities – public meeting with opinion leaders from foreign countries and Japan’ Press Conference	Omaezaki in Shizuoka Pref.
25.JAN (FRI)	Workshop and wrap-up meeting on ‘How to improve PA for nuclear energy in referring to the experience in the respective countries’ Press Conference	Tokyo

NPP = nuclear power plant.

I. Workshop on ‘Living just outside a hosting municipality of nuclear facilities with opinion leaders from foreign countries’

Date: 22 January 2019

Venue: Maizuru Cultural Hall, Maizuru City, Kyoto Prefecture

Session 1: Strategies and activities for nuclear disaster prevention at municipality just outside a nuclear hosting region

Presentations:

1. Countermeasures for nuclear disaster in Kyoto, Nuclear Safety Division, Department of Citizen’s Affairs, Kyoto Prefecture
2. Nuclear disaster response by Maizuru City, Crisis Management and Disaster Prevention Division, Maizuru City

Session 2: Policy proposals

Free discussion amongst representatives from cities and towns next to nuclear hosting region, opinion leaders from European countries and participants from ERIA

II. Workshop on ‘Living in the hosting municipality of nuclear facilities –with opinion leaders from foreign countries and Japan’

Date: 24 January 2019

Venue: Shizuoka Country Hamaoka Course and Hotel, Omaezaki City, Shizuoka Prefecture

Session 1: Status of region hosting or introducing a nuclear facility and dialogue with stakeholder at each country; why nuclear power is important for the country and communities? Can we prepare for the accident safely enough?

Presentations:

1. Why nuclear power is important for the country and communities
2. The different existing tools in the French system that ‘introduce a nuclear facility and dialogue’
3. Nuclear and socio-economic development, international experience
4. Hamaoka NPP construction – from the viewpoint of local government

Session 2: Reaching common understanding; significance of nuclear facilities in the local community, regulation schemes and risks.

1. Intervention of LCI at La Hague
2. Flamanville, paradoxes and contradictions between local choice and national decisions.
3. Managing local dialogues and acceptance over long time frames
4. Gaining acceptance for nuclear waste management amongst local stakeholders
5. Experience of local residents of Hamaoka NPP

Session 3: Policy proposal

III. Workshop and wrap-up meeting on ‘How to improve PA for nuclear energy in referring to the experience in the respective countries’

Date: 25 January 2019

Venue: Keio Plaza Hotel, Tokyo

Session 1: Status of region hosting a nuclear facility or just outside a hosting municipality and dialogue with stakeholder at each country; why nuclear power is important for the country and communities? Reaching common understanding.

Presentations:

1. Nuclear and socio-economic development
2. Nuclear energy, the pros and cons, and the public

Session 2: Reaching common understanding; significance of nuclear facilities in the local community, regulation schemes and risks.

1. LCI: Local Information Commission
2. Flamanville, paradoxes and contradictions between local choice and national decisions.
3. Managing local dialogues and acceptance over long time frames.
4. Gaining acceptance for nuclear waste management amongst local stakeholders
5. The different existing tools in the French system that ‘introduce a nuclear facility and dialogue’
6. Policy and public understanding for nuclear power plant in Thailand

Session 3: Policy proposal

Findings:

- Workshop at Maizuru: A municipality which is in PAZ/UPZ of Takahama NPPs in Kyoto Prefecture
 - Emergency preparedness and response system introduced by Kyoto Prefecture, Maizuru City, and five other neighbouring municipalities
 - Some issues raised in the evacuation planning:
 - Limited infrastructure and human resources
 - Utilise everything existing: buses, buildings, voluntary staff from residents (Jichi-kai in Japanese), volunteers in fire departments, which work in cases of natural disasters
 - Support and advice from experts on radioactivity and nuclear safety
 - Sustainable cooperation between municipalities in wide regions
- Workshop at Omaezaki: A hosting municipality of Hamaoka NPPs within PAZ
 - A long history of Hamaoka (now Omaezaki) from the beginning stage of planning to today, and in the future was introduced. Most of the residents had not been informed of nuclear issues – there was not an active involvement at the beginning.
 - Fukushima Daiichi accident caused a HUGE disturbance amongst residents in hosting municipalities. They had to face big difficulties in daily activities.
 - ‘We live within 5kms from Hamaoka NPPs. We want to continue living in the future as well.’

IV. Implications

- Authorities and/or experts – safety authorities, for example – should be well-equipped with expertise and trusted.
- Incorrect information and images on prejudice destroy the life and heart of local residents in hosting municipalities. They have ‘accepted’ and lived together with nuclear facilities for decades, actively participating in the decision-making process (as the successful cases in France and in Sweden).
- Information disclosure and sharing by websites, smart phones, etc. would be effective.
- Asymmetry of information and of recognition exist between hosting municipalities and areas remote from the facilities. Hosting municipalities have achieved economic development.
- Securing proper funding for emergency response and securing safety on radioactive waste management is also important for gaining trust.

V. Policy proposals

- National government should be responsible for its role – defining the basic energy policy and comprehensive rules for safety regulation, emergency preparedness and response, and long-term radioactive waste management.
- Policymakers should be responsible for predictable and transparent decision-making process and for steady progress of the operation, actively inviting stakeholders in the schemes – residents, business sector, public sector and media.
- Education on energy security and risks is crucial, however, and should be consistent with the basic objectives of policy development. This would make it widely known that nuclear energy is beneficial for environmental protection, jobs, and the wealth of all people.
- CLI (Local Information Commission) or similar schemes in other countries – e.g. the Oskarshamn model – could be the models for stakeholder involvement. How can it practically work? That is the issue to be developed further. Mutual respect is the basic principle as the starting line.

Appendix 3. Q&As at press conferences

I. Maizuru City

Q: *The prefectural and city governments have their own plans and information systems in place, and our lives depend entirely on those plans and systems. I would like to hear from the representatives of Europe – what do you think about this situation and how do you foresee the future of nuclear power in Asia?*

A: To be brief, the basic idea is the same in France. How to put it into practice is left to the discretion of each municipality.

Q: *In Japan, municipalities are responsible for evacuating the public whilst the government takes the responsibility in France. What do European people think about this?*

A: Risks do not exist in isolation. They are prevalent. So, I personally think the government should be responsible. While consistent risk-avoiding measures would reassure municipalities, they are considered ‘straight-forward authoritative approaches’ from the viewpoint of the participatory democracy, which leaves no room for public discretion. This could compromise the independence of each municipality. In fact, the heads of municipalities located more than 15km away from nuclear facilities tend to be indifferent. In France, meanwhile, most nuclear power plants are located in small cities.

A: Restarting nuclear power plants is not much of a problem in France, but there are plans to build and operate new reactors, which should be approved by the Nuclear Safety Authority (ASN). In addition, a local crisis management centre should be set up beforehand, whilst participation drills and public opinion collection are prerequisites for approval.

A: The government on behalf of municipalities authorises the restart of nuclear power plants in Sweden. Decisions on evacuation procedures, meanwhile, are made by municipalities in close liaison with the government.

A: In spite of the hosting municipalities’ heightened interest, there are cases where neighbouring municipalities oppose the restart of nuclear power plants. For that matter, regional cooperation is needed to assure safety.

A: The Fukushima accident shed light on a serious problem, that is, the asymmetric nature of information. Specifically, power companies and the government were well-informed whilst the public and municipalities were not. Following the accident, however, information sharing has become compulsory. In fact, relevant information is collected and disseminated on a regular basis. This improvement can be attributed to the accident.

Q: *A system like CLI will probably be needed everywhere, but is it workable in the ERIA member countries?*

A: That is exactly the point. Whilst situations differ from country to country in Asia, newcomers can learn best practices from nuclear power countries including Japan. For example, we have received a lot of input from the Kyoto and Maizuru municipalities regarding various issues including responsibility sharing. As the power and size of the government are unique to each country, there may be no common approaches, but we still should share ideas.

A: The media also plays a major role in this respect. Although the public is increasingly divided, responsibilities should be shared amongst many people beyond their interests. In the UK, for example, the media takes part in community briefing sessions. They also participate in training programmes as independent members. Each one of us should be a responsible player.

II. Omaezaki City

Q: *Is this meeting intended to discuss how we should promote nuclear power worldwide?*

A: Strictly speaking, no. Some countries may or may not opt for nuclear power. The choice is theirs. We are not going to involve the latter in these discussions. It is a topic that should be discussed amongst them. What matters is not to persuade opponents but to understand how they feel. We need to build consensus, though the nuclear power option may eventually be scrapped. In any case, we should strive to improve communication.

Q: *Whilst two representatives from Omaezaki made presentations today, why didn't anyone from the opposition participate in the meeting today?*

A: Everyone was welcome to take part in this meeting. We never turn anyone down. We asked the municipality to recommend people that have long-established expertise in power generation, not necessarily supporters.

Q: *What recommendations will be made today?*

A: The key thus far is to provide all stakeholders with information in a timely manner, gather various opinions, create a fool-proof system to share information with those who have safety concerns, and continue communication efforts based on mutual trust. Europe's long-established experience in this particular field has been very informative.

Q: *What are the themes for Maizuru?*

A: Although we're not a hosting municipality, we are within the UPZ and PAZ. So, we have an evacuation plan in place. At the same time, we were briefed on issues such as how the neighbouring municipalities communicate information to the public, and evacuation and/or information sharing drills held in Kyoto and Maizuru, with nuclear emergency officials of the two municipalities taking part in them.

Q: *Are the policy recommendations intended for existing power plants or the ASEAN countries?*

A: They are intended for policymakers in the ASEAN countries. The findings gathered in Japan on building public consensus on nuclear power may be useful for the ASEAN countries.

Q: *Nuclear disasters can be prevented, according to one of the opinion leaders. As the Hamaoka nuclear power plant is said to be located right above a massive epicentre, a major earthquake could result in significant damage. Can they really be prevented?*

A: I think this question concerns hazards and risks. This issue was discussed by the French parliament. We should assess hazard and risk levels. For example, what if a plane crashed into a nuclear power plant, or what if two planes crashed into it, with an earthquake taking place at the same time? The worse the scenario, the greater the hazard. So, we should take measures against realistic hazards. We visited the Hamaoka nuclear power plant this morning, where there are many countermeasures in place. Whilst earthquakes can strike at any time, we do not necessarily live in an earthquake-free area. We just prepare for them. The same is true for nuclear power plants.

C: Presentations by the municipal representatives demonstrated what they are doing.

III. Tokyo

Q: *Are there plans to build nuclear power plants in Southeast Asia?*

A: Currently, there are none in Southeast Asia while there were some in Malaysia, Thailand, the Philippines and Viet Nam, but none have been carried out. Whilst two plants are under construction in Bangladesh, which is not a member of ERIA, there are none in other Asian countries.

A: Of the ASEAN+6 (China, Japan, India, New Zealand, Australia, and Republic of Korea), India, China, and Republic of Korea have already introduced nuclear power. Viet Nam, Thailand, and some other Asian countries have research reactors. We have plans to build some new plants, but concerns have been growing amongst the public since the Fukushima accident. Nuclear power is definitely one of the options as it is clean, cost-effective, and has economic advantages. However, we are in a dilemma brought about by the accident. That being said, we were able to share information on location planning and experience through the workshop, and the project has been meaningful in addressing public concern.

Q: *Did the Fukushima accident have an impact on the nuclear power plants in those four countries?*

A: Those plans were behind schedule even before the accident due to problems related to land acquisition, selection of technologies, costs, etc. So, it is not necessarily due to the Fukushima accident. In fact, it was not until 2016 that Viet Nam scrapped its plan. The major causes were the country's immature industries and infrastructure, a lack of public consent, economic circumstances, and overall ill-preparedness.

- A: The Fukushima accident is certainly one of the causes, but the biggest cause is the demand from society. Local communities were not well informed, and no information was provided on safety issues.
- A: Construction and replacement plans are not progressing as intended in some European countries. It is generally said to be due to the Fukushima accident, which, however, is not a direct cause. A drop from 75% to 50% in France took place well after the accident. Vattenfall applied for a licence to construct a new plant in Sweden in 2012. Finland is working on a new plan, following the Olkiluoto nuclear power plant. Attributing everything to the Fukushima accident is too short-sighted.
- A: Ambitious nuclear power projects are underway in China and India, whose energy policies centre on renewable energy, improved energy efficiency, and nuclear power. The Fukushima accident has resulted in providing more information on safety issues and encouraging discussions amongst stakeholders.