

# **Working method of the Workshop**

**Jacques LOCHARD**

First IRPA Workshop on Radiation Protection Culture  
14-15 December 2009, Paris

# The IDPA Method (1)

- IDPA is the acronym for **Identification, Diagnosis, Prospective and Actions**
- It is a **co-expertise method** developed by the Institute of Patrimonial Strategy of AGROPARISTECH to:
  - Develop **common understanding between different experts/stakeholders and expertises** (i.e. scientific, pragmatic, political expertise....)
  - Identify « **win-win situations** » for all the involved participants
  - **Identify processes of change**, commonly negotiated, which are satisfactory to all involved participants concerning the issue at stake

# The IDPA Method (2)

- A deontology of **free and constructive participation of each involved actor** considered as a co-expert of the issue at stake
- A **strategic “Issue” or “Question”** to structure the co-expertise process
- Each participant is asked to elaborate her/his reflection on the strategic issue/question on the four following registers:
  - **Identification of the issue**, the actors concerned and problems at stake
  - **Diagnosis of the actions engaged** so far
  - **Prospective** – Evolution of the situation, problems, and actions
  - **Action proposals**

# The IDPA Method (3)

- Participants are invited to express themselves as “**micro**” and “**macro actors**”, e.g. in both the perspective of their specific field of expertise and action and in the perspective of the global issue at stake
- **Two roundtables per register:**
  - a first one where participants express their expertise on the issue at stake
  - a second one, as an overall reaction to what has been expressed by the whole group of participants
- A **facilitation team** is responsible of running the co-expertise process and to preparing a synthesis **presented to, discussed and validated by the pluralistic group**

# **The strategic Question of the Workshop**

**What are the conditions and means  
for embedding radiation protection in the  
culture of organizations?**

# The four registers

- **Identification:** Main qualities and problems at stake. Involved entities and actors. Main issues structuring the situation. What is the strategic issue?
- **Diagnosis:** Who are the actors and which are the organisations involved? What is the effectiveness of the present engaged actions to respond to the issues at stake?
- **Prospective:** Time scale. Possible scenarios : positive, negative, present trend. What are the main threats and opportunities?
- **Actions:** Overall and specific objectives. Possible actions. What are the key factors for a process of change? What are the success criteria?

# Working method (1)

- About 10 participants per group
- 90 minutes per each “register”
- About 9’ per participant. Each participant is invited to speak. No discussion.
- First round (4’30” per participant) : personal view of each participant
- Second round (4’30” per participant): personal view taking into account the views expressed by all the others

# Working method (2)

- All groups must be defined in advance
- All groups go through the IDPA grid
- For each group there is a moderator and a secretary
- The moderator and the secretary prepare a PPT summarizing the key findings of each group to be presented in plenary session
- All participants discuss and validate the synthesis of the entire process

# Example of results of an IDPA process

- The following slides presents the output of one group that used the IDPA process to launch the preparation of the **IRPA Guiding Principles on Stakeholder Engagement in Radiation Protection** at the Salamanca Workshop in November 2005
- The strategic question to be addresses by the 4 groups was : **What are the Processes and Tools needed for Stakeholders Engagement in Radiological Protection?**

# Group 4

- Christophe Faucheux
- Yves Lecordier
- Rick Jones
- Jose Gutierrez
- Javier Herrero
- Diego Ortiz
- Agustin Perez
- Carlos Sancho
- Jose Luis Diaz
- Franck Hardeman
- Eugenio Gil

# Identification

- Public trust and confidence
- Reducing the gap between experts and SH
- Deficit in representative democracy
- Information, education
- Participation of society
- Neutrality of expertise
- Recovery from a negative image due to history
- Transparency, knowledge and adhesion
- Taking decision together
- Exercising vigilance in a democratic context
- Defining common interests
- Sharing responsibilities

# Diagnostic

- Difficulty to built at present compromises
- Lack of communication between experts and SH
- Difficulty for the experts to be understood
- Misuse (abuse) of the SH involvement concept
- Hidden agenda?
- Rigidity of the current decision making process
- Negative role of media
- Positive move but resistances
- Inevitable and irreversible but slow process with conflicts
- Opportunity to move towards a more positive situation
- “May be we were living on illusions”

# Prospective

- **Negative scenario**
  - Gap between experts and SH cannot be reduced
  - Lack of resources to support SH engagement
  - Blockages on new activities
- **Positive scenario**
  - Confidence is improving
  - Pluralism and co-expertise is developing
  - SH engagement is on the agenda of policy makers
- **Current trend**
  - Positive but still in a transition period
- **“Without SH engagement it will be worth than with SH engagement”**

# Actions

- To provide long term support and commitment to the SH engagement process
- To train the RP community to use the SH involvement process
- To diffuse the existing experience with SH
- To develop a code of conduct and a methodology on SH engagement
- To facilitate the access of SH to the reality of the problems
- To structure and regulate the SH involvement process at the national and European levels