



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
RESEARCH AND INNOVATION DG

Final Report

Project No: 604521

Project Acronym: EAGLE

Project Full Name: Enhancing educAtion, traininG and communication processes for informed behaviors and decision-making reLatEd to ionizing radiation risks

Final Report

Period covered: from 12/08/2013 to 11/08/2016

Start date of project: 12/08/2013

Project coordinator name:

Dr. Tanja Perko

Version: 1

Date of preparation: 30/05/2016

Date of submission (SESAM):

Project coordinator organisation name:

STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE

Final Report

PROJECT FINAL REPORT

Grant Agreement number:	604521
Project acronym:	EAGLE
Project title:	Enhancing educAtion, traininG and communication processes for informed behaviors and decision-making reLatEd to ionizing radiation risks
Funding Scheme:	FP7-CSA-CA
Project starting date:	12/08/2013
Project end date:	11/08/2016
Name of the scientific representative of the project's coordinator and organisation:	Dr. Tanja Perko STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE
Tel:	+0032 14 3328 51
Fax:	
E-mail:	tperko@sckcen.be
Project website address:	http://eagle.sckcen.be/en

Final Report

Please note that the contents of the Final Report can be found in the attachment.

4.1 Final publishable summary report

Executive Summary

Education, training and information to the general public are key factors in the governance of ionizing radiation risks. Communication about ionizing radiation with the general public has to be further improved, as highlighted also by the 2011 nuclear accident in Japan. An effort is needed to analyze the state of the art and the existing needs in education, training and information, and to coordinate the information and communication about ionizing radiation at European level. This was the objective sought by the EURATOM call Fission-2013-6.0.2: Education / training / information towards the public. The selected project was entitled EAGLE (Enhancing educAtion, traininG and communication processes for informed behaviors and decision-making reLatEd to ionizing radiation risks), and it was active 2013-2016.

The project set out to identify and disseminate good practices in information and communication processes related to ionizing radiation. For this purpose, the consortium reviewed national and international data, tools and methods as well as institutional work in order to identify education, information and communication needs and coordination possibilities at European level. The lessons learned from the nuclear accident in Fukushima also provided valuable input. The main goal of the project was to enhance public understanding of ionizing radiation and to facilitate a coordinated communication approach.

Moreover, EAGLE fostered a move towards the ideal of citizen-centered communication, including a participative component. The project brought together representatives of nuclear actors, users of ionizing radiation, authorities, mass and social media, and informed civil society. The project website contains the scientific reports and records of many rich interactions:
<http://eagle.sckcen.be/en/Deliverables>

Summary description of project context and objectives

EAGLE brings together representatives of nuclear actors, users of ionizing radiation, authorities, mass and social media, and informed civil society, from a range of European countries employing nuclear power or not. The following work packages were carried out in the three-year project:

- WP1 seeks to improve education, training and information (ETI) material employed in communication about ionising radiation by information sources (industry, experts, authorities, medical field) across EU member states. Tools were assessed through interviews with heads of nuclear institutions along with protocols and questionnaires given through Euratom national contact points. Upgraded ETI material, activities, and communication strategies were proposed as a coordinated European approach for practical implementation.
- WP2 engages members of information source institutions and practitioners/representatives of the social and traditional media in a series of national and international virtual dialogues (face-to-face and virtual). These dialogues considered information transfer and media handling, as well as the context of institutional, media and citizen discussion of ionising radiation and associated risks. The dialogue groups reviewed existing aids and produce practical guidance tools to improve communication for more informed decision-making.
- WP3 analyses education, training and information (ETI) from the point of view of the final recipients of information – EU citizens. Existing desk research for all EU Member states are analysed along with polls, interviews and the outcome of workshops conducted in select countries. The ‘mental model’ approach was employed to investigate potential differences between professionals and the public regarding social and cognitive representations of ionizing radiation risks, and identified means to better support informed public decision-making related to this topic.
- WP4 Stakeholder participants have the opportunity to comment and provide feedback on project products through two virtual workshops. Additionally, three pilot actions are implemented in three

countries to test, evaluate and upgrade communications products.

Description of main S & T results/foregrounds

Our deliverables include recommendations intended to help European actors in the field of ionizing radiation to move closer to a citizen-centered communication process, supporting better informed decision-making about ionizing radiation risks. These recommendations are formulated based on results from the EAGLE activities conducted throughout the entire project duration. They integrate EAGLE stakeholders' feedback and have been agreed by the EAGLE stakeholders, including the EAGLE advisory board. In addition, most of the work was peer-reviewed and published in different scientific journals. The recommendations will be published in a special booklet shortly after the end of the EAGLE project.

The recommendations are mostly addressed to source institutions (official communicators), and thereby reflect a standard of quality that other communication actors—media and civil society representatives—can ask for. In addition, EAGLE and its stakeholders recognized the need for establishing a European Platform for the integration of Social Sciences and Humanities in research related to Ionising Radiation in order to assist in responsible research and innovation in the field of ionizing radiation and, in this way, contribute to improved ionizing radiation risk governance. The EAGLE partners and stakeholders will continue the work towards establishment of the Platform after the EAGLE project and hope to receive support in this from the EC.

Communication recommendations related to mass media and social media in order to move towards mutual understanding

R1 Develop 'risk culture' throughout society to provide a solid basis for communicating about ionizing radiation risks. Risk culture means that people are aware of the existence of risks but also, of preventive and protective actions that are taken by the authorities, or that people themselves can take in some cases.

R2 Establish a more regular channel of communication on ionizing radiation risks rather than one that is concentrated on crisis reporting. This means organizing more regular exchanges between sources and the media. Networks and more elaborate structures and multiple partnerships can be built to establish trust over time. These channels can then be turned to in case of emergency.

R3 Engage in ongoing dialogue among the professionals involved in communicating ionizing radiation risks. Officials, specialists of radiological protection and nuclear safety and media professionals who participated in EAGLE want a continuing exchange and learning platform in the interest of building solid relationships, risk culture and public understanding.

B. Process of communication

R4 Adapt information delivery to the needs of the media. Journalists need rapid, clear responses from source institutions. Scientists and experts working at the source institutions must be trained to meet these needs. Bureaucratic obstacles should be lifted.

R5 Develop relationships with journalists through training and joint learning events. There are many ways to develop relationships and build respective competence: technical seminars, press trips, open door visits, and support for joint participation by journalists and sources in third party activities.

R6 Provide radiological protection trainings for journalists. Specific training – if possible including a simulation – will improve the protection of journalists themselves when reporting about radiological events (e.g. explosion of a radiological dispersal device), mutual understanding between journalists and emergency management, understanding of ionizing radiation concepts by journalists, and quality of information transfer in such events.

R7 Design press conferences and other media events to bring up the standard of reporting on complex IRR topics. Source institutions can organize press conferences and other media events in a way that maximizes understanding of the complexity of the topic, the dialogue between sources and journalists, and the quality of resulting reporting.

R8 Get to know the public's needs and perceptions. Up-to-date knowledge about public needs and perceptions, and also how people receive and understand information, should be checked as a first step in public communication.

R9 Develop direct ongoing communication with the public, on IRR and other risks, in many voices. For this, all available mass media and social media channels should be actively employed as well as live, face-to-face events. Create open and direct discussions during crisis and non-crisis periods, where members of the public can ask their questions.

R10 Participate in networks with active, empowered citizen communicators. A new type of public is

emerging: citizens who are active partners in communication as well as recipients. Sources can help build competence by entering the new discussion networks and forming partnerships.

R11 Contribute to the foundations of risk knowledge in the schools. The public should be given a better basis to understand IRR issues. This means developing risk culture already at the level of schooling. Sources should invest in programs targeting children and educators.

C. Ethical aspects

R12 Respect the different perspectives, needs, and roles of participants in the communication process. Source institutions, media, civil society organizations, and stakeholders in the general public have different concerns and are responding to different pressures. Find out what the other communication partners need to know and how they can best receive information and help from the source.

R13 Deliver information that helps people make a better-informed decision in their situation (don't pre-define the risk as acceptable for them or not; similarly, do not misuse inclusive public risk communication as covert industry promotion). A dialogue can take place about the different value assigned by different stakeholders to the benefits and costs associated with IR applications, with resulting planned or accidental exposures. It is an opportunity to pass on knowledge about IRR, and to develop risk culture – including safety culture among those applying IR.

R14 Admit that a nuclear accident can happen. When sources including government, authorities, and industry admit the basic fact that nuclear accident is a possibility, this similarly opens the way to dialogue and strengthens safety and risk culture on all sides.

R15 Admit scientific uncertainties related to health effects of ionizing radiation. Ionizing radiation exposures, especially low doses, are linked to high uncertainties as to health effects, modeling etc. Experts are not speaking with one voice on these issues. It is important to present balanced information showing the areas of doubt and uncertainties.

D. Institutional and organizational aspects

R19 Adapt public information on ionizing radiation risks to everyday life and observed needs of citizens. Communicators need to go out to the public to learn what the actual (potential) impacts of IR risks are. Information should be adapted to different societal groups (media professionals, general public, children...) and give examples of questions that could be asked by people to help fit the information to different decisions they must make.

R20 When delivering information about IRR, especially in times of crisis, be affirmative and responsive (not tentative and prudent). Be prepared to come out very fast with information to serve the media's need to be quick and reactive. Start by stating the important take-away message. Thoughtfully communicating uncertainty and "what we don't know" can come next.

R21 Translate and clarify content. Simplify, use metaphor, comparison, and familiar reference points setting information into context (without trivializing risk, or comparing involuntary risk with dangers that people face by their own choice). Help the public understand the meaning of legal radiological limits, and communicate even on doubt and uncertainty.

R22 Provide materials that suit media needs. Keep the institutional website and social media accounts up to date with useful resources clearly labeled for journalists, including media kits, newsletters and infographics. Offer narrative so that media can tell a story. Be aware of citizen journalism and support it in the same ways.

E. Channels

R23 Create and support online banks of information that journalists and other stakeholders can consult. These can be integrated with seminar events. Online content can be supplied with a "free to use" license so that journalists but also bloggers, civil society organizations, teachers, children can obtain easy to understand materials (such as video animations, infographics, photos) as well as links to relevant experts and opinion makers. An integrated model for an IRR information resource combines online and face-to-face components.

R24 Television is a major IRR information channel for most Europeans, so source institutions should cooperate in the production of news and documentaries. Only a real collaboration between sources and media may produce a high standard of IRR information in documentary news, full-length documentaries, TV shows, etc. Sources should enter into collaboration with the various expert professionals and appropriately offer content and financial aid.

R25 Consider different types of spokespersons and mediators appropriate for your context. In some countries journalists prefer to deal with source spokespersons or press officers; elsewhere, they prefer to be placed into direct relation with experts, who should be trained to speak to the media. The source institution should also develop the ability to communicate directly with the public, for instance through social media. Trained "science mediators" translate, popularize and perform scientific

outreach.

R26 Introduce social media channels through traditional communication campaigns. Traditional time-limited communication campaigns engage publics and can introduce social media channels which interested people can use to stay in touch, continue discussion, and become in turn a communication channel that can redistribute source's content.

R27 Become part of relevant social media communities. Engage in conversations and discussions, identify and maintain contact with relevant influencers, nourish your networks and persevere.

R28 Foster multiple sources, a plurality of voices considering the issues and speaking to the public. Support citizen science and citizen journalism, and facilitate the activity of civil society organizations responding to citizen needs "on the ground". Whether part of organizations or acting independently, civil society volunteers are engaged persons, they render a service to their fellow citizens and can act as channels between authorities and the population – in both directions. Sources can be responsive to them, engage and support them with information, material resources, public-interest partnerships and events, including barcamps, hackathons, and other crowd-sourced endeavors.

Communication recommendations related to information sources in order to improve the education, training and information (ETI) material and activities about the effects of IR

R1: It is not advisable to prepare the ETI materials and activities on a common template in all EU member states.

R2: ETI materials and activities should be prepared for specific target publics (e.g. students, local population, politicians, journalists, teachers ...) and should respond to their interests and needs.

R3: ETI materials and activities should be regularly reviewed and adapted according to feedback from the target public. Preparation of the materials together with the public is very beneficial.

R4: ETI materials like leaflets, video-clips, annual reports, webpages, blogs, TV and radio broadcasts etc. are valuable but not sufficient communication tools; science-to-citizens approach and open discussions about facts and fears should be promoted as an efficient tool for communication about ionizing radiation.

R5: Employ internet-mediated encounters (e.g. webinar, online forum, platforms...) in order to enhance interaction with different groups of the population. Actively participate on a social media landscape.

R6: ETI materials and activities should communicate facts, not opinions, in order to empower the citizens to take informed decisions but not to dictate their decision.

R7: Information sources should consider and implement role division, and define the responsibility of information sources, educational system, media, policy makers etc.

R8: ETI materials and activities should support teachers' work but duplicating their work should be avoided.

R9: Information sources should show and explain what they are doing and what are the health and environmental risks from their activities. Justification of radiation activities must be presented to the public.

R10: The impacts of using the ionizing radiation should be put in the context of exposure to natural background radiation.

R11: Risks of using ionizing radiation in defined situations should be clearly described and the distinction between the risk and the actual danger in emergency situations should be explained.

R12: ETI materials and activities should address radiological protection aspects in parallel with nuclear safety issues.

R13: Radiation risks and radiation safety issues should be balanced and preferably presented together.

R14: Institutional communication culture should be constantly adapting to the actual communication landscape in order to support and facilitate all routine and emergency communication activities.

R15: Engagement in the ongoing dialogue among the professionals and public should be a routine procedure.

R16: Contribute to citizens' science projects by organizing or promoting projects about ionizing radiation, sharing information and verifying collected information.

R17: Support science correspondents by offering education and training related to IR topics including emergencies. In addition, some funds for scholars could be established in order to encourage knowledge gathering in a journalistic population.

R18: Establish "Science Media Centers" as a centralized scientific data service for journalists. Sources can foster this type of resource by becoming dues-paying members and by contributing

information and expertise. Similar “Science Education Centers” can be established for teachers.

Recommendations related to communication with the members of general public and informed civil society in order to support informed decision-making about IR

R1 The EUROBAROMETER survey should continue to address questions regarding the use of ionizing radiations and their potential risks in order to capture current population’s needs, changes and trends in the people perceptions. Based on this information, institutional sources, mass media, and all relevant decision makers can adapt their communication content in order to answer these needs.

R3 Availability of information for the whole population, at any time, using a large diversity of means and opportunities for the education and training should be a priority of the sources’ communication program. Scientific Museums, Science media communication, social media, scientific documentaries are only few ideas in this regards.

R4 Build confidence and maintain it during normal situation in order to use it during crisis should be the main strategic objective of any communicator (institutional source, waste organisation, nuclear power plant operator, journalists). It takes time, it needs proves and has to be continuously alive. It has to be based on professionalism, transparency and honesty.

R5 Risk communication in modern society should be seen as an important form of stakeholder engagement, based on dialogue and two-way communication rather than a simple provision of information. Communication has to be more than just an education and/or marketing process. it should be part of a real engagement with the public for a mutual understanding of reasons, benefits and risks, no matter what IR application is approached. Communication about IR should correctly balance the benefits and risks, and its content should be adapted to the target audience in order to be 100% accessible.

R6 Knowledge-based society requires involvement of citizens at a large scale, including local communities, teachers, students, mothers, volunteers, etc.

R7 Continuous collaboration of mass media with institutional sources and scientists should create those links which can be immediately accessed during crisis for an efficient communication and information of the population.

R8 Early engagement of relevant stakeholders should be a formal part of the early planning of any activity related to ionizing radiation.

R9 Stakeholder engagement has to be an integral part of a decision-making.

R10 Mutual learning and transparency among all stakeholders, including scientists and lay people, is vital. A technocratic approach, where ‘experts know best and can decide for the people who do not understand the technical issues’ should be switched to a socio-centric communication based on public participation with which the gaps between experts and stakeholders can be bridged.

R11 Citizen Initiatives and engagement opportunities should be created.

R12 A trans-disciplinary approach in risk communication (collaboration with natural science, social sciences and humanities) is important in order to develop appropriate, responsible and value based risk communication.

R13 More opportunities for dialogue among natural scientists, researchers in social sciences and humanities, civil society organisations, and other stakeholders, such as provided by the RICOMET conference, should be created.

R14 In order to better focus ionizing radiation research, interactions with, and experience exchange among platforms and projects, are essential.

R15 The converging values and differences among the different groups of stakeholders should be identified.

R16 To enhance and promote SSH research in the field of ionising radiation protection, and to maintain and share the specific knowledge and expertise developed so far, a need was expressed for the establishment of: SSH research within the Strategic Research Agenda of technical radiological protection platform; and SSH networking activities. These should be self-sustainable after the completion of the projects participating at the RICOMET conference.

Recommendations related to a research in the field of communication

R1 Support a transdisciplinary research and development of nuclear technologies and applications.

R2 Establishment of the European Platform for the integration of Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH) in research related to Ionising Radiation (IR).

Potential impact and main dissemination activities and exploitation results

The EAGLE project results highlighted that areas such as medical, industrial and nuclear energy applications of ionising radiation research and development, as well as emergency management and rehabilitation, can undoubtedly benefit from the social sciences and humanities. This includes, among other aspects, enabling stakeholders to be involved in nuclear research policy. Shaping research and development pathways in socially desirable ways implies trans-disciplinary methodological approaches and activities to build strong societal justification.

The public declarations, published after the RICOMET 2015 and RICOMET 2016 conferences (<http://ricomet2016.sckcen.be/en> and <http://ricomet2015.sckcen.be/en>), appeal for implementation of responsible innovation in nuclear research and development with activities to promote the further integration of social sciences and humanities. The appeal resonates with the spirit of the European Research Area (ERA). In the working document Science, society and the citizen in Europe, emphasizing the “growing scepticism” and “hostility” of society towards advances in knowledge and technology, the European Commission argues that the relationships between science, technology and society “have to change because of the impact of science and research on competitiveness, growth and jobs and on the quality of life in Europe”. In the more specific context of the Framework Programmes, the European Commission states that “for Europe to become the most advanced knowledge society in the world, it is imperative that legitimate societal concerns and needs concerning science and technology development are taken on board” (Work Programme 2007, Capacities, Part 5, Science in Society).

Addressing the social, ethical and participatory dimensions of nuclear research and development offers great opportunities for the development of trans-disciplinary projects in the nuclear field and collaborations with partners from multiple disciplines that embrace a range of issues, dimensions and expertise. Such research and development, including what is commonly called ‘governance’ aspects, allows researchers from related fields of nuclear technology, radiological protection, safety and emergency response to assume their responsibility towards European society by responding to the expectations of both the authorities and the public.

The EAGLE project opened this topic in the field of risk communication, risk perception and ethics related to ionising radiation.

The most significant dissemination activities were two EAGLE conferences: Conference on Risk Perception, Communication and Ethics of Exposures to Ionising Radiation RICOMET 2015 and RICOMET 2016. The conferences were organised under the auspices of five Euratom Projects

- EAGLE: Enhancing Education, Training And Communication Processes For Informed Behaviors And Decision-Making Related To Ionizing Radiation Risks
- OPERRA: Open Project for the European Radiation Research Area
- CONCERT: European Joint Programme for the Integration of Radiation Protection Research
- PLATENSO: Platform for Enhanced Societal Research related to nuclear energy in Central and Eastern Europe
- PREPARE: Innovative integrated tools and platforms for radiological emergency preparedness and post-accident response in Europe

The conference continued the dialogue started by the EAGLE activities on communication, social and ethical issues, and encouraged stakeholder and public participation in nuclear science, technology and innovation.

The conference provided an opportunity for researchers in Social science and humanities researchers to meet technical platform representatives from NERIS, EURADOS, ALLIANCE and MELODI in order to discuss future research needs in the radiation protection field.

The conference involved a broad range of stakeholders: researchers from social sciences, humanities and natural sciences, radiation protection officers, practitioners in nuclear medicine, nuclear industry professionals, nuclear safety authorities, various project partners, policy makers (EC representative), NGOs and representatives of civil society.

Address of project public website and relevant contact details

<http://eagle.sckcen.be/en>

4.2 Use and dissemination of foreground

Section A (public)

Publications

LIST OF SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS, STARTING WITH THE MOST IMPORTANT ONES										
No.	Title / DOI	Main author	Title of the periodical or the series	Number, date or frequency	Publisher	Place of publication	Date of publication	Relevant pages	Is open access provided to this publication ?	Type
1	First International Conference on Risk Perception, Communication and Ethics of Exposures to Ionizing Radiation (RICOMET)—special section editorial 10.1088/0952- 4746/36/2/E11	P Allisy-Roberts , C Turcanu , F Hardeman	Journal of Radiological Protection	Vol. 36/Issue 2	Institute of Physics Publishing	United Kingdom	01/06/2016	E11-E14	Yes	Peer reviewed
2	Improved communication, understanding of risk perception and ethics related to ionising radiation 10.1088/0952- 4746/36/2/E15	Tanja Perko , Wolfgang Rasch , Jean-Rene Jourdain	Journal of Radiological Protection	Vol. 36/Issue 2	Institute of Physics Publishing	United Kingdom	01/06/2016	E15-E22		Peer reviewed
3	Overcoming the framing problem—a critical-ethical perspective on the need to integrate social sciences and humanities and stakeholder contributions in EURATOM radiation protection research 10.1088/0952- 4746/36/2/S1	Gaston Menskens	Journal of Radiological Protection	Vol. 36/Issue 2	Institute of Physics Publishing	United Kingdom	01/06/2016	S1-S7		Peer reviewed
4	Interdisciplinary perspectives on dose limits in radioactive waste management. A research paper developed within the ENTRIA project 10.1088/0952- 4746/36/2/S8	Karena Kalmbach , Klaus-Jürgen Röhlig	Journal of Radiological Protection	Vol. 36/Issue 2	Institute of Physics Publishing	United Kingdom	01/06/2016	S8-S22		Peer reviewed
5	A review of the Generic Design Assessment	John Whitton	Journal of Radiological Protection	Vol. 36/Issue 2	Institute of Physics Publishing	United Kingdom	01/06/2016	S23-S44		Peer reviewed

	t (GDA) Public Dialogue Pilot (2015) for new nuclear build in the UK: lessons for engagement theory and practice 10.1088/0952- 4746/36/2/S23	, Ioan Parry , Colette Grundy , Annabelle Lillycrop , David Ross		sue 2	Publishing					wed
6	The limits of public communication coordination in a nuclear emergency: lessons from media reporting on the Fukushima case 10.1088/0952- 4746/36/2/S45	Iztok Prezelj , Tanja Perko , Marie C Cantone , Eduardo Gallego , Yevgeniya Tomkiv , Deborah Houghton	Journal of Radiological Protection	Vol. 36/Issue 2	Institute of Physics Publishing	United Kingdom	01/06/2016	S45-S63		Peer reviewed
7	How did media present the radiation risks after the Fukushima accident: a content analysis of newspapers in Europe 10.1088/0952- 4746/36/2/S64	Yevgeniya Tomkiv , Tanja Perko , Deborah Houghton , Iztok Prezelj , Marie C Cantone , Eduardo Gallego	Journal of Radiological Protection	Vol. 36/Issue 2	Institute of Physics Publishing	United Kingdom	01/06/2016	S64-S81		Peer reviewed
8	Safecast: successful citizen-science for radiation measurement and communication after Fukushima 10.1088/0952- 4746/36/2/S82	Azby Brown , Pieter Franken , Sean Bonner , Nick Dolezal , Joe Moross	Journal of Radiological Protection	Vol. 36/Issue 2	Institute of Physics Publishing	United Kingdom	01/06/2016	S82-S101		Peer reviewed
9	Lay public mental models of ionizing radiation: representations and risk perception in four European countries 10.1088/0952- 4746/36/2/S102	Nadja Železnik , Marin Constantin , Nina Schneider , Claire Mays , Grzyzna Zakrzewska , Daniela Diaconu	Journal of Radiological Protection	Vol. 36/Issue 2	Institute of Physics Publishing	United Kingdom	01/06/2016	S102-S121		Peer reviewed
10	Satisfaction with information about ionising radiation: a comparative study in Belgium and France 10.1088/0952- 4746/36/2/S122	C O Turcanu , M-H El Jammal , T Perko , G Baumont , E Latré , I Choffel de Witte	Journal of Radiological Protection	Vol. 36/Issue 2	Institute of Physics Publishing	United Kingdom	01/06/2016	S122-S142		Peer reviewed

11	Looking for citizen-centered communication: dialogues between radiological protection or nuclear safety specialists and media professionals 10.1088/0952-4746/36/2/S143	Claire Mays , Jaroslav Valch , Tanja Perko , Irena Daris , Chiara Condi , Agnieszka Mi#ki ewicz , Grazyna Zakrzewska , Marin Constantin , Daniela Diaconu , Metka Kralj , Nadja Železnik	Journal of Radiological Protection	Vol. 36/Issue 2	Institute of Physics Publishing	United Kingdom	01/06/2016	S143-S159		Peer reviewed
12	The Aarhus convention in the nuclear sector—right to information versus nonproliferation? 10.1088/0952-4746/36/2/S160	Borut Stražičar , Metka Kralj	Journal of Radiological Protection	Vol. 36/Issue 2	Institute of Physics Publishing	United Kingdom	01/06/2016	S160-S174		Peer reviewed
13	The radiology informed consent form: recommendations from the European Society of Cardiology position paper 10.1088/0952-4746/36/2/S175	Clara Carpeggiani , Eugenio Picano	Journal of Radiological Protection	Vol. 36/Issue 2	Institute of Physics Publishing	United Kingdom	01/06/2016	S175-S186		Peer reviewed
14	Ethical challenges in social media engagement and research: considerations for code of engagement practices 10.1088/0952-4746/36/2/S187	Monika Gerner , Deborah Oughton	Journal of Radiological Protection	Vol. 36/Issue 2	Institute of Physics Publishing	United Kingdom	01/06/2016	S187-S192		Peer reviewed
15	Radiation risk perception: a discrepancy between the experts and the general population 10.1016/j.jenvrad.2013.04.005	Tanja Perko	Journal of Environmental Radioactivity	Vol. 133	Elsevier Limited	United Kingdom	01/07/2014	86-91		Peer reviewed
16	Public participation processes related to nuclear research installations: what are the driving factors behind participation intention	Turcanu, C atrinelPerko, TanjaLaes, Erik	Public Understanding of Science	23:3	SAGE Publications Ltd		01/07/2014	331-347		Peer reviewed
17	Information Sources as Explanatory Variables for the Belgian Health-Related Risk Perception of the Fukushima Nuclear Accident	Bart Vyncke , Tanja Perko , Baldwin Van Gorp	Risk Analysis	in press	Blackwell Publishing	United Kingdom	01/04/2016	http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com		Peer reviewed

	10.1111/risa.12618									
	Radiation perception in Europe	Nadja Zeleznik, Marin Constantin, Nina Schneider, Claire Mays, Grazyna Zakrzewska, Daniela Diaconu	Nuclear Engineering International				18/01/2016	http://www.neimagazine.com/fea	Yes	Article
	Mass and New Media: Review of Framing, Treatment and Sources in Reporting on Fukushima	Perko T*, Mays C, Valuch J and Nagy A	Journal of Mass Communication & Journalism				05/04/2016	http://www.omicsgroup.org/journal	Yes	Article
	How to Communicate about Radiological Risks? A European Perspective	Tanja Perko	Fukushima Global Communication Programme This working paper series shares research produced as part of the Fukushima Global Communication (FGC) Programme, a research initiative of the United Nations		United Nations University.		01/12/2015			Conference
	International conference: RICOMET 2016 Risk perception, communication and ethics of exposures to ionising radiation - Book of abstracts	Daniela Diaconu Tanja Perko Blanka Koron Marin Constantin Viviane Vanspringel	SCK • CEN - BA - 0076		SCK.CEN		30/05/2016		Yes	Conference
	International conference: RICOMET 2015 Risk perception, communication and ethics of exposures to ionising radiation - Book of abstracts	Tanja Perko Pavel Gabriel Lazarollma Choffel de Witte Blanka Koron Viviane Vanspringel	SCK • CEN - BA - 69		SCKCEN		11/06/2015		Yes	Conference

LIST OF DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES								
No.	Type of activities	Main Leader	Title	Date	Place	Type of audience	Size of audience	Countries addressed
1	Organisation of Conference	REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER FOR CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE -REC	Let's Communicate about Ionising Radiation	26/11/2013	Paris, France	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Industry - Civil society - Policy makers - Medias	51	Belgium, France, Romania, Finland, Poland, Slovenia, UK, Portugal, Austria, Czech R.
2	Oral presentation to a scientific event	UNIVERSITATEA POLITEHNICA DIN BUCURESTI	22nd International Conference Nuclear Energy for New Europe	12/09/2013	Bled, Slovenia	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Industry - Policy makers	50	EU Countries
3	Oral presentation to a wider public	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	COMET Kick-off meeting	29/08/2013	Ghent, Belgium	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Civil society	70	EU Countries
4	Oral presentation to a scientific event	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	FP7 OPERRA Meeting	06/09/2013	London, great Britain	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	7	Project partners countries
5	Oral presentation to a scientific event	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	EC Summer School on decommissioning and waste management organised by EC	09/09/2013	Ispra, Italy	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Civil society - Policy makers	100	EU Countries
6	Oral presentation to a scientific event	REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER FOR CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE -REC	ICEM 2013 -International conference on environmental remediation and radioactive waste management	08/09/2013	Brussels, Belgium	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Industry	40	EU Countries
7	Oral presentation to a wider public	REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER FOR CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE -REC	PLATENSO meeting	25/09/2013	Bratislava, Slovak Republic	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Civil society	25	Project partners countries
8	Oral presentation to a scientific event	REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL	PETRUS 3 Meeting	02/10/2013	Nancy, France	Scientific community (higher education)	20	Project partners countries

		CENTER FOR CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE -REC				ion, Research) - Civil society		
9	Posters	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Melodi workshop	07/10/2013	Brussels, Belgium	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Industry - Civil society - Policy makers - Medias	300	Several countries
10	Oral presentation to a wider public	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	OPERRA risk communication and risk perception workshop on low doses	09/10/2013	Brussels, Belgium	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Industry - Civil society - Policy makers - Medias	44	EU Countries
11	Oral presentation to a wider public	REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER FOR CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE -REC	IAEA Training Course on 'Radioactive Waste Management'	20/10/2013	Manila, Philippines	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	25	EU, Asia, Africa countries
12	Oral presentation to a wider public	REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER FOR CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE -REC	IAEA Regional workshop on Element 5: Interaction between technical and social aspects in environmental remediation	02/12/2013	Vienna, Austria	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	20	EU, Asia Countries
13	Oral presentation to a scientific event	INSTITUT SYMLOG	NUSHARE (project event)	13/03/2014	Brussels, Belgium	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	100	Europe
14	Organisation of Workshops	INSTITUT JOZEF STEFAN	Radioactivity workshop for demonstrators of science centers	15/04/2014	Ljubljana, Slovenia	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	16	Slovenia
15	Oral presentation to a scientific event	UNIVERSITATEA POLITEHNICA DIN BUCURESTI	NUCLEAR 2014 International Conference on sustainable Development through Nuclear research and Education	28/05/2014	Pitesti, Romania	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	200	EU MS, Canada, Middle East

16	Organisation of Conference	INSTYTUT CHEMII I TECHNIKI JADROWEJ	International Conference on Nuclear Development and Applications NUTECH2014	21/09/2014	Warsaw, Poland	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	150	World
17	Oral presentation to a scientific event	UNIVERSITATEA POLITEHNICA DIN BUCURESTI	European Nuclear Society, Nuclear Education and Training - NESTET 2013	19/11/2014	Madrid, Spain	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Industry	100	Worldwide (audience from Europe, USA, Asia, Australia, South America)
18	Oral presentation to a scientific event	UNIVERSITATEA POLITEHNICA DIN BUCURESTI	7-th Annual International Conference on sustainable Development through Nuclear Research and Education (NUCLEAR 2014)	28/05/2014	Pitesti, Romania	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Industry		Europe
19	Oral presentation to a scientific event	REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER FOR CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE -REC	International Conference on Human Resource Development for Nuclear Power Programmes: Building and Sustaining Capacity, Strategies for Education and Training Networking and Knowledge Management	14/05/2014	Vienna, Austria	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	399	World
20	Organisation of Conference	REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER FOR CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE -REC	"Technical Meeting on Topical Issues in the Development of Nuclear Power Infrastructure "	03/02/2015	IAEA, Vienna, Austria	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	80	World
21	Oral presentation to a wider public	INSTITUT JOZEF STEFAN	Education of school children and youngsters about nuclear power and radioactivity	05/01/2015	ICJT Ljubljana	Civil society	950	Slovenia
22	Organisation of Workshops	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNEENERGIE	Training course on Preparedness and Response for Nuclear and Radiological Emergencies	17/03/2014	Mol, Belgium	Medias	32	International

23	Oral presentation to a wider public	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Hearing on Crisis communication with the public in case of nuclear and radiological emergency	12/02/2014	Brussels, Belgium	Policy makers	200	Europe
24	Oral presentation to a scientific event	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	PIME conference	19/02/2014	Ljubljana, Slovenia	Industry	300	World
25	Oral presentation to a scientific event	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	IRPA conference	25/06/2014	Geneva, Switzerland	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	1005	World
26	Oral presentation to a scientific event	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	2nd symposium on the Ethics of Environmental Health	17/06/2014	Budweis, Czech Republic	Industry	25	Europe
27	Oral presentation to a wider public	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	FANC personal meeting	19/05/2014	Brussels, Belgium	Medias		Belgium
28	Posters	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	IRPA conference	23/06/2014	Geneva, Switzerland	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	1005	World
29	Oral presentation to a wider public	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Training course "radiation protection and regulatory emergency"	04/08/2014	Mol, Belgium	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	50	World
30	Articles published in the popular press	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	article on energetika.net - Consensus about to build or not to build a nuclear reactor: it's not complex and it is necessary	23/12/2013	electronic (internet)	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Industry - Civil society - Policy makers - Medias		Slovenia, World
31	Articles published in the popular press	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	article on nucnet.org	14/02/2014	electronic (internet)	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Industry - Civil society - Policy makers - Medias		World
32	Organisation of Conference	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	RICOMET 2015	15/06/2015	Brdo, Ljubljana, Slovenia	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Civil society - Medias	120	world

33	Articles published in the popular press	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Report on public views across EU on education and information in the post-Fukushima context	24/07/2016	electronic (pdf file)	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	20	27 EU MSs, all European Union Member States
34	Articles published in the popular press	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	The SCK•CEN Barometer 2013, open report	15/01/2014	Mol, Belgium	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	100	Belgium
35	Articles published in the popular press	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Summary of Institutions Involved in Risk Communication, Risk Perception, and Ethics of Radiation Protection	10/12/2014	Brussels, Belgium	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	100	Austria, Belgium; Bulgaria; Croatia; Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Greece, France, Germa
36	Oral presentation to a scientific event	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Synergies between research areas: Preliminary results from the OPERA eSurvey. Sixth International MELODI Workshop	08/10/2014	Barcelona, Spain	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	40	Members from NERIS., EURADOS, ALLIANCE and MELODI
37	Oral presentation to a scientific event	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Long-term European research programmes in radiation protection: Selected results from OPERA e-Survey.Sixth International MELODI Workshop	09/10/2014	Barcelona, Spain	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	100	Members from NERIS., EURADOS, ALLIANCE and MELODI
38	Oral presentation to a scientific event	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	What is wrong in our communication related to ionizing radiation? Identifying a better way. The Fourth Regional European IRPA Congress	24/06/2014	Geneva, Switzerland	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	700	World
39	Oral presentation to a wider public	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Communication about decommissioning and waste management; Resent cases, Operational Issues in Radioactive Waste Management	09/09/2014	Ispra, Italy	Industry	60	European Countries

			and Nuclear Decommissioning. 6th International Summer School 2014					
40	Oral presentation to a wider public	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Acceptance of nuclear energy Selected projects and results. delegatie van EDF, CNPE Chooz	04/09/2014	Mol, Belgium	Industry	20	France
41	Organisation of Workshops	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Social Values in Stakeholder Communication: How to communicate about ionizing radiation? 2nd Symposium on the Ethics of Environmental Health, Budweis, Czech Republic	16/06/2014	Žeské Budějovice, Czech Republic	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	50	World
42	Oral presentation to a scientific event	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	The Fourth Regional European IRPA Congress, Interaction and Communication with Society: An underdeveloped Aspect of Radiation Protection	24/06/2014	Geneva, Switzerland	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	1000	International
43	Oral presentation to a wider public	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Interaction and Communication with Society, meeting with FORATOM and president of Japan Atomic Industrial Forum Hattori Takuya	07/11/2014	Brussels, Belgium	Industry	8	Europe, Japan
44	Oral presentation to a wider public	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Ionizing radiation? Let's communicate, PIME 2014	17/02/2014	Ljubljana, Slovenia	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Industry - Policy makers	150	Europe
45	Oral presentation to a wider public	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Media communication in nuclear emergencies: Solutions. Hearing on Crisis co	12/02/2014	Brussels, Belgium	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Industry - Policy	100	Europe

			mmunication with the public in case of nuclear and radiological emergency			makers		
46	Oral presentation to a wider public	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Media communication in nuclear emergencies: Gaps and problems. Hearing on Crisis communication with the public in case of nuclear and radiological emergency	12/02/2014	Brussels, Belgium	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Industry - Policy makers	100	Europe
47	Oral presentation to a wider public	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Public perception on ionizing radiation and related communication in Europe. NUCLEAR 2014, Pitești, Romania	29/05/2014	Pitești, Romania	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Industry - Policy makers	100	International
48	Articles published in the popular press	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Joint research towards a better radiation protection—highlights of the Fifth MELODI Workshop; Journal Article	28/11/2014	Journal of Radiological Protection (International) - ISSN	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	44	International
49	Web sites/Applications	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Dissemination of the information PR EPARE: Quality of the media information during an emergency in the perspective of the Aarhus Convention, Third Party Report	28/02/2015	Brussels, Belgium	Policy makers	47	Europe
50	Web sites/Applications	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Workshop 6.3. Contribution of the media to the quality of public information in the context of emergency	16/06/2015	Brussels, Belgium	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Industry - Civil society - Policy makers	47	International
51	Articles published in the popular press	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Mass and New Media: Review of Framing, Treatment	05/04/2015	Journal Article; Mass Communication & Journalism	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Industry	100	International

			and Sources in Reporting on Fukushima		(International)	ustry - Civil society - Policy makers		
52	Oral presentation to a wider public	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Radiological risks: How they are communicated by and to educators and trainers; 6th EUTERP Workshop Legislative change in Europe: the implications for training in radiation protection - Rising to the challenge	01/10/2015	Athens, Greece	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Industry - Civil society - Policy makers	100	Europe
53	Oral presentation to a wider public	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	For an improved coordination of citizen-centered communication on ionizing radiation risks; 6th EUTERP Workshop Legislative change in Europe: the implications for training in radiation protection - Rising to the challenge	02/10/2015	Athens, Greece	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Industry - Civil society - Policy makers	100	Europe
54	Web sites/Applications	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	OPERRA 1st periodic report	05/03/2015	Brussels, Belgium	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	100	Europe
55	Oral presentation to a scientific event	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Radiome contribution to CONCERT. EPIRADBIO final meeting & Radiome project	26/03/2015	Regensburg, Germany	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	50	Europe
56	Oral presentation to a scientific event	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	EAGLE Advisory Board meets Management Committee	14/01/2016	Brussels, Belgium	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	11	Europe
57	Oral presentation to a scientific event	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	EU Scientific Seminar 2015 on "Risk Communication"	18/11/2015	Luxembourg, Luxembourg	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	70	Europe

58	Organisation of Workshops	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Atomic Reporters workshop, Rotterdam	29/02/2016	Rotterdam, Netherlands	Medias	25	europe, israel, ukraine, pakistan, belarus, india, iran/canada, japan, georgia, egypt, russia/europe
59	Web sites/Applications	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	Priorities for radiation protection research: analysis of the OPERRA stakeholder survey. Preliminary report prepared for the MELODI Workshop	15/10/2014	Brussels, Belgium	Scientific community (higher education, Research)	50	European and International organisations
60	Organisation of Conference	STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE	International conference RICOMET 2016	01/06/2016	Bucharest	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Civil society - Policy makers - Medias	100	International
61	Oral presentation to a scientific event	ARAO - Agencija za radioaktivne odpadke	EUTERP workshop	30/09/2015	Athens	Scientific community (higher education, Research) - Civil society	50	international

Section B (Confidential or public: confidential information marked clearly)

LIST OF APPLICATIONS FOR PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, REGISTERED DESIGNS, UTILITY MODELS, ETC.					
Type of IP Rights	Confidential	Foreseen embargo date dd/mm/yyyy	Application reference(s) (e.g. EP123456)	Subject or title of application	Applicant(s) (as on the application)

OVERVIEW TABLE WITH EXPLOITABLE FOREGROUND

Type of Exploitable Foreground	Description of Exploitable Foreground	Confidential	Foreseen embargo date dd/mm/yyyy	Exploitable product(s) or measure(s)	Sector(s) of application	Timetable for commercial use or any other use	Patents or other IPR exploitation (licences)	Owner and Other Beneficiary(s) involved
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------	---	--	---

ADDITIONAL TEMPLATE B2: OVERVIEW TABLE WITH EXPLOITABLE FOREGROUND

Description of Exploitable Foreground	Explain of the Exploitable Foreground
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

4.3 Report on societal implications

B. Ethics

1. Did your project undergo an Ethics Review (and/or Screening)?	No
If Yes: have you described the progress of compliance with the relevant Ethics Review/Screening Requirements in the frame of the periodic/final reports?	
2. Please indicate whether your project involved any of the following issues :	
RESEARCH ON HUMANS	
Did the project involve children?	No
Did the project involve patients?	No
Did the project involve persons not able to consent?	No
Did the project involve adult healthy volunteers?	No
Did the project involve Human genetic material?	No
Did the project involve Human biological samples?	No
Did the project involve Human data collection?	No
RESEARCH ON HUMAN EMBRYO/FOETUS	
Did the project involve Human Embryos?	No
Did the project involve Human Foetal Tissue / Cells?	No
Did the project involve Human Embryonic Stem Cells (hESCs)?	No
Did the project on human Embryonic Stem Cells involve cells in culture?	No
Did the project on human Embryonic Stem Cells involve the derivation of cells from Embryos?	No
PRIVACY	
Did the project involve processing of genetic information or personal data (eg. health, sexual lifestyle, ethnicity, political opinion, religious or philosophical conviction)?	No
Did the project involve tracking the location or observation of people?	No
RESEARCH ON ANIMALS	

Did the project involve research on animals?	No
Were those animals transgenic small laboratory animals?	No
Were those animals transgenic farm animals?	No
Were those animals cloned farm animals?	No
Were those animals non-human primates?	No
RESEARCH INVOLVING DEVELOPING COUNTRIES	
Did the project involve the use of local resources (genetic, animal, plant etc)?	No
Was the project of benefit to local community (capacity building, access to healthcare, education etc)?	No
DUAL USE	
Research having direct military use	No
Research having potential for terrorist abuse	No

C. Workforce Statistics

3. Workforce statistics for the project: Please indicate in the table below the number of people who worked on the project (on a headcount basis).

Type of Position	Number of Women	Number of Men
Scientific Coordinator	1	0
Work package leaders	5	0
Experienced researchers (i.e. PhD holders)	11	8
PhD student	0	2
Other	9	4

4. How many additional researchers (in companies and universities) were recruited specifically for this project?	0
Of which, indicate the number of men:	0

D. Gender Aspects

5. Did you carry out specific Gender Equality Actions under the project ?	No
6. Which of the following actions did you carry out and how effective were they?	
Design and implement an equal opportunity policy	Not Applicable
Set targets to achieve a gender balance in the workforce	Not Applicable
Organise conferences and workshops on gender	Not Applicable
Actions to improve work-life balance	Not Applicable
Other:	
7. Was there a gender dimension associated with the research content - i.e. wherever people were the focus of the research as, for example, consumers, users, patients or in trials, was the issue of gender considered and addressed?	No
If yes, please specify:	

E. Synergies with Science Education

8. Did your project involve working with students and/or school pupils (e.g. open days, participation in science festivals and events, prizes/competitions or joint projects)?	No
If yes, please specify:	
9. Did the project generate any science education material (e.g. kits, websites, explanatory booklets, DVDs)?	No
If yes, please specify:	

F. Interdisciplinarity

10. Which disciplines (see list below) are involved in your project?	
Main discipline:	1.2 Physical sciences (astronomy and space sciences, physics and other allied subjects)
Associated discipline:	
Associated discipline:	

G. Engaging with Civil society and policy makers

11a. Did your project engage with societal	Yes
--	-----

actors beyond the research community? (if 'No', go to Question 14)	
11b. If yes, did you engage with citizens (citizens' panels / juries) or organised civil society (NGOs, patients' groups etc.)?	Yes, in communicating /disseminating / using the results of the project
11c. In doing so, did your project involve actors whose role is mainly to organise the dialogue with citizens and organised civil society (e.g. professional mediator; communication company, science museums)?	Yes
12. Did you engage with government / public bodies or policy makers (including international organisations)	Yes, in communicating /disseminating / using the results of the project
13a. Will the project generate outputs (expertise or scientific advice) which could be used by policy makers?	Yes - as a primary objective (please indicate areas below multiple answers possible)
13b. If Yes, in which fields?	
Agriculture	No
Audiovisual and Media	No
Budget	No
Competition	No
Consumers	No
Culture	No
Customs	No
Development Economic and Monetary Affairs	No
Education, Training, Youth	Yes
Employment and Social Affairs	No
Energy	Yes
Enlargement	No
Enterprise	No
Environment	No
External Relations	No
External Trade	No
Fisheries and Maritime Affairs	No
Food Safety	Yes
Foreign and Security Policy	Yes
Fraud	No
Humanitarian aid	No
Human rights	No
Information Society	Yes

Institutional affairs	Yes
Internal Market	No
Justice, freedom and security	No
Public Health	Yes
Regional Policy	No
Research and Innovation	Yes
Space	No
Taxation	No
Transport	No
13c. If Yes, at which level?	European level

H. Use and dissemination

14. How many Articles were published/accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals?	22
To how many of these is open access provided?	5
How many of these are published in open access journals?	10
How many of these are published in open repositories?	0
To how many of these is open access not provided?	0
Please check all applicable reasons for not providing open access:	
publisher's licensing agreement would not permit publishing in a repository	No
no suitable repository available	No
no suitable open access journal available	No
no funds available to publish in an open access journal	No
lack of time and resources	No
lack of information on open access	No
If other - please specify	
15. How many new patent applications ('priority filings') have been made? ('Technologically unique': multiple applications for the same invention in different jurisdictions should be counted as just one application of grant).	0
16. Indicate how many of the following Intellectual Property Rights were applied for (give number in each box).	
Trademark	0

Registered design	0
Other	0
17. How many spin-off companies were created / are planned as a direct result of the project?	0
Indicate the approximate number of additional jobs in these companies:	0
18. Please indicate whether your project has a potential impact on employment, in comparison with the situation before your project:	Increase in employment, None of the above / not relevant to the project
19. For your project partnership please estimate the employment effect resulting directly from your participation in Full Time Equivalent (FTE = one person working fulltime for a year) jobs:	0Difficult to estimate / not possible to quantify

I. Media and Communication to the general public

20. As part of the project, were any of the beneficiaries professionals in communication or media relations?	Yes
21. As part of the project, have any beneficiaries received professional media / communication training / advice to improve communication with the general public?	Yes
22. Which of the following have been used to communicate information about your project to the general public, or have resulted from your project?	
Press Release	Yes
Media briefing	Yes
TV coverage / report	No
Radio coverage / report	No
Brochures /posters / flyers	Yes
DVD /Film /Multimedia	No
Coverage in specialist press	Yes
Coverage in general (non-specialist) press	Yes
Coverage in national press	Yes
Coverage in international press	Yes
Website for the general public / internet	Yes
Event targeting general public (festival, conference, exhibition, science café)	Yes

23. In which languages are the information products for the general public produced?

Language of the coordinator	No
Other language(s)	Yes
English	Yes

Attachments	
Grant Agreement number:	604521
Project acronym:	EAGLE
Project title:	Enhancing educAtion, traininG and communication processes for informed behaviors and decision-making reLatEd to ionizing radiation risks
Funding Scheme:	FP7-CSA-CA
Project starting date:	12/08/2013
Project end date:	11/08/2016
Name of the scientific representative of the project's coordinator and organisation:	Dr. Tanja Perko STUDIECENTRUM VOOR KERNENERGIE
Name	
Date	

This declaration was visaed electronically by Tanja PERKO (ECAS user name nperkota) on