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**Proposal for an analysis grid**

**for the case studies to be elaborated in ENGAGE WP3.**

*The following set of questions has been identified in order to guide the analysis of the case studies and to facilitate the cross comparisons of results between case studies and countries.*

*It is not an exhaustive list of questions that should be answered, but a first guide for the reflexion and the construction of the analysis. Many other questions will certainly emerge in the course of the analysis and will be shared among the WP3 team;*

*Reminder: the objectives of WP3:*

1. *to investigate the* ***role and the potential benefit of building and enhancing radiation protection culture******for supporting effective stakeholder engagement and informed decision-making*** *in relation to radiation protection at the individual and collective level;*
2. *to identify* ***processes to build and transmit radiation protection culture****, adapted to the specificities of different exposure situations; and*
3. *to* ***elaborate guidelines/recommendations for building radiation protection culture*** *in view of supporting stakeholder engagement in the governance of radiological risk.*

**Characterisation of case study including type of actions, processes**

*This part is dedicated to a description of the actions/processes that will be studied and analysed from the point of view of RP culture dissemination processes.*

* Description of the context of case study
* Who are the ‘target’ stakeholders - what are the aims of RP culture for them?
* Which stakeholders initiated the implementation of the actions / processes?
* Was there any evolution of the actions with time - for which reason (eg lack of success for some actions, …)?

**Characterization of RP culture (elements / definition)**

*These questions will be answered in the course of the analysis. The objectives are to try to elaborate around the “definition” of RP culture and its characterization according to the exposure situation. It should help also to identify aspects that can influence RP culture such as organisational, societal, ethical or economical aspects.*

* Is RP culture based on an individual knowledge?
* Is it a collective knowledge?
* How is the individual knowledge shared with the ‘community’ around the individual, with others?
* Which knowledge: radiation effects, risks, actions to manage radiation risk situations, emergency situation actions, radiation hygiene…?
* Is it possible to make the distinction between scientific, practical and behavioural knowledges?
* What is the role of historico-societal culture and differences in individual behaviour (prudency, consciousness, impulsivity, etc.) linked to radiation protection and radiation hygiene?
* What are the specificities of RP culture within a broader health protection culture?

**Development of tools, methods & processes to build, enhance and transmit RP culture**

*This part is dedicated to the description and analysis of the RP culture dissemination process.*

*It should help to identify the elements of RP culture, the dissemination process, its specificities according to the target stakeholders.*

*It should also examine the efficiency of the processes as dissemination of RP culture and how it may have influence the practices, understandings, behaviours... of the target stakeholders regarding RP.*

*Finally, the question of the sustainability or dynamic of the process should also be investigated.*

* By which way(s) are “information”, or “elements of RP culture” disseminated to the target stakeholders? (leaflets, training course, awareness session, workshops, discussions,…)
* Which types of information was disseminated, which content?
* How was this “information” elaborated?
* Who participated to the elaboration?
* How were identified the needs and concerns of the target stakeholders?
* How are RP key questions addressed such as the risk associated with low doses, the management of uncertainties, ….
* Exploration of the ethical framework underlying RP culture dissemination processes (in connection with the ethical foundations of RP system – pub 138 of ICRP)
* Was there any specific role for “experts” in this process?. If yes, what was this role?
* Has specific ‘training’ be performed to support the experts in the development of RP culture?
* In which context are the RP issues addressed?
* Are RP issues addressed together with other risks, or other elements of the situations?
* Is the process giving the possibility to have access to more knowledge if necessary or asked by the stakeholders?
* Was there any evaluation of the efficiency performed in the course of the process?
* How was this efficiency evaluated? (see also evaluation of the level of RP culture below)
* Did this evaluation modify the process or some actions, … why and in which way?
* Is it possible to draw lessons on the reasons of efficiency (vs inefficiency) of some actions / tools / methods?
* Dealing with sustainability of the RP culture disseminations process, according to the situation, or the context, is a ‘one shot’ action sufficient or not? If not, what as (should be) implanted to provide a dynamic in the process?
* How to ensure the transmission of RP culture over time?
* How can the target stakeholders be actors of the dissemination around them, for other stakeholders?

**Evaluation of the level of RP culture**

*This question is directly linked to the evaluation of the efficiency of RP culture dissemination process, but it can also be addressed separately in a broader view not linked with a specific process*

* Is the level of RP culture evaluated in the process studied, how, by whom?
* Is the evaluation of RP culture used to evaluate the efficiency of the dissemination process, and maybe to change the process?
* According to exposure situations, how can be evaluated the level of RP culture?
* Is it the capability of target stakeholders to interact with RP professionals (or other actors)?
* Is it the capability to implement RP actions to protect themselves or others?
* Is it a willingness as well as a capability to be involved in RP decision making processes or to implement RP actions?
* Is it the capability to share common knowledge, to share common view?
* What can be the role of quantitative or qualitative evaluation?
* Is there any tools or methods which have been elaborated or could be elaborated to evaluate the level of RP culture according to the different situations or the different types of stakeholders?
* Is there any tools or methods which have been elaborated to present some major evaluation results/conclusions?

**Highlighting the role of RP culture**

*This is one key question for WP3, in the search to demonstrate the role and the potential benefit of building and enhancing radiation protection culture for supporting effective stakeholder engagement and informed decision-making in relation to radiation protection at the individual and collective level.*

* How has RP culture contributed to the improvement of the situation for which the dissemination process has been implemented (decision-making process, stakeholder engagement process, radiation risk management situation, health and well-being of the population, …)
* In particular, are any stakeholder engagement situations which have been improved by the dissemination of RP culture within the various stakeholders?
* What has been achieved when developing / building RP culture? (impacts on the level of exposures, the protection actions, the decision making-processes,…),…
* Are there also examples which can show that the lack of RP culture could be seen as an obstacle for the success of a stakeholder engagement process, a radiation risk management process or a decision-making process? For which reasons?

**Connection with the European RP research programme**

*ENGAGE Project takes place in the context of the European RP research programmes. It is thus essential to create links with the RP research platforms as well as the RP research roadmaps*

* How can the scientific programmes developed in various fields of RP research favour the building and dissemination of RP culture?
* Does these programme answer to some concerns identified by the stakeholders?
* Are there any recommendations to be given to the RP research platform?