

PREDIS Strategic Research Agenda (SRA) Extended User Community minutes

On-line meeting

Date: 05.05.2022

Time: 12:00 (GMT)

Chair: Alan Wareing (AW)

Secretary: Aaron Ellis (AE)

1. Overview of the SRA Development Process

Background to what we expect from the survey exercise- the Technical topics provide the 'What' which have been incorporated from what was adopted by the EURAD project, Drivers which will capture the reason 'Why' something is important have been provided by the SHARE project, these have been through an extensive peer reviewed process.

Online questionnaire was launch at end of March, following a period of internal refinement this was to capture the prioritised technical topics from the PREDIS End User Group (EUG), with the added option to provide up to 3 drivers for each of the topics. There was an opportunity for the community to present a number of 'sub areas' which would shape the detail or focus of the 'research needs' in the SRA. There was a short window provided at first then following feedback we opened that period up further. Presently we are not in a great position with respect to the capture of the actual 'research needs'.

Presented a list of the PREDIS EUG organisations and highlighted those that had provided input so far – request made to the remaining PREDIS EUG that were asked to input into the survey for their additional responses. At present the main responses so far have been from Waste Management Organisations (WMO).

Results obtained so far have provided the 'Top 4' leading topics which are Characterisation, Waste Acceptance Criteria, Conditioning and Packaging and Treatment and Processing.

'Sub areas' of detail are not providing the right level to define the 'research need' activities therefore more conversations and interactions will be required.

Drivers output provides the key drivers so far these have been -public trust, protection of citizens and the environment and improving performance, which could be expected from a majority WMO response.

2. PREDIS April Workshop Approach

We have summarised the 'sub areas' captured so far and made comparison with 'baseline' SRA ; that was drafted in the 1st year of the PREDIS project and presented that for the top 4 topics.

April workshop approach adopted was to have a number of breakout sessions both online and in person. It focussed on the top 4 topics and their 'sub areas'. We noted more discussion was observed and greater information and was collated during the in-person flipchart sessions.

3. Analysis of results

Using the survey results and breakout session information a number of mind maps have been collated.

Through a review of these mind maps it confirms that we can't have all of the sub-topics of the 'sub areas' and will need to understand the priority and importance of those.

Compared the Characterisation mind map with that obtained for another top four topic Conditioning and Packaging.

Summary of breakout session on Characterisation was provided. Able to tell the story and process for each topic. For example, the 'sub area' of in-situ characterisation that was raised – having the conversation about 'why' that is important, focus on the research areas that we had collated including obtaining source data etc. Timescale of importance is relevant too.

What are the gaps, what we have and what technology and techniques that are needed to close those gaps. We will start to look at next with the extended PREDIS user community. Specific conversations with individuals and organisations in the coming weeks. Will be an intense period of engagement

We will go back and see if there are any comments. Agree the best way forward best to gather this information. Suggestions for next steps of engagement in the SRA were sought from the audience.

TO (BASE) - I work for the German regulator and am surprised that there has not been more German stakeholders input into the survey, will there be an opportunity for other stakeholders to input into the survey?

There will be further questions and engagements, it would be wrong to ignore other views - watch this space with the next steps. In the next week or so the engagement will become wider.

Open up this forum look at some specifics, what process could we go through to understand research needs. How to best engage with the community?

The 'sub area' example of 'In situ' characterisation was summarised to prompt discussion – no response

Other topics - any comments or suggestions for the project team?

AB (NNL)- Broader stakeholders may have a different survey or input that should give us the targets for the focus groups.

We do need to understand priorities as we are not in a position to answer everything. Characterisation at the moment is the topic area where we really need to focus on.

TB (MCM) – Reflecting back on last Wednesday's Workshop session and presentation I thought we needed to differentiate where we have institutional knowledge within the PREDIS community to fill any local Knowledge Management (KM) issues is there a mechanism to do that, to have that exchange?

One country or organisation may have where the gap may lie, in another there could be technology or even a training course that is currently or planned to be available. Not everything will turn into a specific research topic for the SRA. How we identify the true gap or research need rather than a gap of knowledge in a particular area, that will have to come through dialogue.

Comments collated at the Workshop were reflected back to the audience

Intention is to analyse the results and follow up with possibly another slightly different questionnaire or set of questions, prioritise and pick the topics which may involve coming to you as a stakeholder. We can target this activity with those individuals who have raised certain points. Still have opportunity to fill in questionnaire and get back to us. This may trigger a further engagement.

BJ (NRG) - The research focus on why we need to characterise e.g. how regulators want to increase their knowledge is a side step to the technical research, e.g. to look at the bigger risks such as transport and storage, is this captured at the national programme stage? I would like to reflect the findings back to my organisation for further consideration.

Drivers for topics type of organisation, e.g. Government or research, may be different from the WMO, need to capture that in the SRA and play it back. Need to understand our stakeholders as all have different needs some will have national disposal programmes some will not. It has to meet people's needs.

Illustrated that this is a big ask, there is a lot to do and potential to get into enormous detail. We need to unpick responses and get into what is important. Context of 'why' and that should drive the 'when' or the priority. There are different needs across stakeholders. Not everything is research some will be KM sharing and training.

The online questionnaire still remains open and we invite all to provide a response noting their organisation and organisation type so we can distinguish the drivers from each area. Next few days and weeks we will frame and devise the next set of questions and engagements.

Link(s) to presented slides in TEAMS:

- ...