



Deliverable 11.10: Feedback mechanism for Domain Insights and SoK documents– Methods and results

Work Package 11

The project leading to this application has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 847593.



Document information

Project Acronym	EURAD
Project Title	European Joint Programme on Radioactive Waste Management
Project Type	European Joint Programme (EJP)
EC grant agreement No.	847593
Project starting / end date	1st June 2019 – 30 May 2024
Work Package No.	11
Work Package Title	State-of-Knowledge
Work Package Acronym	SoK
Deliverable No.	11.10
Deliverable Title	Feedback mechanism for Domain Insights, SoK documents and KM Systems – Methods and results
Lead Beneficiary	SSTC NRS
Contractual Delivery Date	May 2022
Actual Delivery Date	September 2022
Type	Report
Dissemination level	Public
Authors	Sergii Kondratiev (SSTC NRS), Kateryna Fuzik (SSTC NRS), Liliia Kutina (SSTC NRS), Yuliia Yesypenko (SSTC NRS), Alexandru Tatomir (BGE), Tobias Knuuti (BGE), Milena Schönhofen-Romer (BGE)

To be cited as:

Kondratiev S., Fuzik K., Kutina L., Yesypenko Y., Tatomir A., Knuuti T., Schönhofen-Romer M. (2023): Feedback mechanism for Domain Insights, SoK documents and KM Systems – Methods and results. Final version as of 03.02.2023 of deliverable D11.10 of the HORIZON 2020 project EURAD. EC Grant agreement no: 847593.

Disclaimer

All information in this document is provided "as is" and no guarantee or warranty is given that the information is fit for any particular purpose. The user, therefore, uses the information at its sole risk and liability. For the avoidance of all doubts, the European Commission has no liability in respect of this document, which is merely representing the authors' view.

Acknowledgement

This document is a deliverable of the European Joint Programme on Radioactive Waste Management (EURAD). EURAD has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 847593.

Status of deliverable		
	By	Date
First working draft	SSTC NRS	31/05/2022
Second draft + Appendices to address WP11 comments	SSTC NRS	18/10/2022 28/10/2022 31/10/2022
Delivered (Lead Beneficiary)	SSTC NRS	11/01/2023
Verified (WP Leader)	BGE	03/02/2023
Reviewed (Reviewers)	PMO	28/04/2023
Approved (PMO)	PMO	26/06/2023
Submitted to EC (Coordinator)	Andra	29/06/2023

Executive Summary

One of the main objectives of the EURAD Knowledge Management & Networking Programme [1] is to capture the current State-of-Knowledge available in the field of Radioactive Waste Management (RWM). To achieve this objective, a framework of Domain Insight (DI) and State-of-Knowledge (SoK) documents is being developed, and the creation of a portal-Knowledge Management System (p-KMS) is planned. This means collecting, compiling, preserving, capitalising on and providing open access to knowledge for any interested end-users.

An important and necessary component of achieving the above objective is the provision of an effective feedback mechanism.

Deliverable 11.10: “Feedback mechanism for Domain Insights (DI), State-of-Knowledge (SoK) documents and Knowledge Management (KM) Systems – Methods and results” defines:

- feedback mechanism goal and objectives;
- feedback audience;
- feedback methods;
- procedures for application of feedback methods;
- procedures for evaluation of obtained feedback;
- procedures for dissemination and implementation of the feedback results;
- questionnaire for feedback audience.

The following groups of feedback audience are defined: authors and reviewers of DI and SoK documents, end-users specialists and newcomers from the EURAD and non-EURAD RWM community.

Receiving feedback is foreseen in the form of answers to the questionnaire, discussions on EURAD online resources, at seminars, workshops, etc.

The analysis of received feedbacks is suggested to be carried out separately for authors, reviewers and different groups of end-users. In particular, it is expected to carry out the analysis of how DI and SoK documents are used by end-users and are useful for them, to what extent the information provided in the DI and SoK documents is correct and complete, according to which aspects the groups of end-users have different opinions, which shortcomings of DI and SoK documents are indicated by end-users and how they propose to improve DI and SoK documents.

The results of the feedback analysis are summarised in a defined format, distributed according to the established procedure and taken into account in the further work on the DI and SoK documents production.

Table of content

Executive Summary.....	4
Table of content.....	5
Glossary.....	6
1. Introduction	9
2. Feedback mechanism goal and objectives.....	10
3. Feedback audience	10
4. Feedback methods	11
5. Procedures for the application of feedback methods	12
6. Evaluation of obtained feedback.....	13
7. Dissemination and implementation of the feedback results	14
8. Outlook.....	14
Appendix 1 Feedback forms on the DI document	15
1. Feedback form for authors of the DI document.....	15
2. Feedback form for reviewers of the DI document	17
3. Feedback form for newcomer end-users of the DI document.....	19
4. Feedback form for end-users of the DI document.....	22
Appendix 2 Generalisation of end-users' feedback on the DI document "Domain Name"	25
References	26

Glossary

Author

The expert involved in development of the SoK or DI document

Domain

Level 3 of Goals Breakdown Structure (GBS). An area of activity, interest, or knowledge, especially one that a person, organisation etc. deals with.

Domain Insight (DI) Documents

Context documents that provide direct links for each knowledge domain to safety and implementation goals related to DGR requirements.

End-users

Organisations, experts, newcomers who are potential users of DI, SoK documents and KMS in general – EURAD community (WMOs, TSOs, REs) and non-EURAD RWM community, newcomers (somebody who started out in the field of RWM).

EURAD

The European Joint Programme on Radioactive Waste Management (EURAD). Also referred to as the 'Joint Programme'.

Feedback

Requesting and receiving opinions of authors, reviewers, end-users regarding DI, SoK documents and KMS in general.

Feedback audience

Authors, reviewers and end-users.

Goals Breakdown Structure (GBS)

The EURAD goals breakdown structure is a thematic breakdown of knowledge and activities essential for radioactive waste management. It comprises Themes (Level 1), Sub-themes (Level 2) and Domains (Level 3), each formulated as goals. Although hierarchical and numbered, the knowledge and activities presented across the GBS should be considered collectively with no weighting to order of importance. Rather it is emphasised that there are many inter-dependencies and linked data across the GBS, where knowledge and activities can be centred in different ways, depending on the end user role and precise boundary conditions of the RWM programme to which the roadmap is applied.

Knowledge

Knowledge is the acquisition, understanding and interpretation of information. It is often used to refer to bodies of facts and principles accumulated by humankind over the course of time. Knowledge and information each consists of true statements, but knowledge serves a purpose: knowledge confers a capacity for effective action.

Knowledge Area

An area of activity, interest, or knowledge, especially one that a particular person, organisation etc deals with.

Knowledge Management (KM)

An integrated, systematic approach of identifying, managing and sharing an organisation's knowledge and enabling groups of people to create new knowledge collectively to help in achieving the organisation's objectives.

Knowledge Management System (KMS)

Knowledge Management System (KMS) is an IT-infrastructure designed for supporting the KM-process by tools and technologies for management of knowledge and information.

Management system

A set of interrelated or interacting elements (*system*) for establishing policies and objectives and enabling the objectives to be achieved in an efficient and effective manner.

Portal-Knowledge Management System (p-KMS)

Portal-KMS is a comprehensive access structure to resources that are suitable to support the fundamental activities of knowledge management of EURAD WP SoK to communicate, study and do research.

Radioactive Waste Management (RWM)

All activities, administrative and operational, that are involved in the handling, pre-treatment, treatment, conditioning, transport, storage and disposal of radioactive waste.

Reviewer

The expert involved in review of the SoK or DI document.

Roadmap

A high-level overview of a programme's goals, typical activities and knowledge needed to implement a RWM programme, from the generation of radioactive waste to disposal.

SoK document

The document describing the state of knowledge in a specific domain of EURAD Goals Breakdown Structure (GBS). Experts' view of the most relevant knowledge and associated uncertainties in a specific domain applied in the context of RWM programme. Short summary of scientific and engineering facts relevant to the domain. Typically, SoK documents would use a relatively small number of key primary references and signposts out to further detail where necessary (i.e. relevant SoTA).

SoK System

System consisting of set of SoK documents and all the processes related to their management (initiation, development, updating etc.).

State of Knowledge (SoK)

Experts' view of the most relevant knowledge and associated uncertainties in a specific domain applied in the context of a radioactive waste management programme. Activities consisting of developing a systematic approach of establishing the state-of-knowledge in the field of RWM research.

State of the Art (SoTA)

Scientific facts underpinning the knowledge base. SoTA documents are oriented typically on a narrower scope and go into significant detail (e.g. focus on mechanistic or process-level understanding). They would not normally demonstrate the application of that knowledge. They typically include lots of technical references and are long documents.

Strategic Research Agenda (SRA)

Describes the scientific and technical domains and knowledge management needs of common interest between EURAD participant organisations.

Themes

Themes are large groupings of related Knowledge Domains typical in Radioactive Waste Management. They are the highest level of the EURAD Roadmap Goals Breakdown Structure (GBS).

Work Package (WP)

A work package is a group of related tasks established within EURAD. Because they look like projects themselves, they are often thought of as sub-projects within the Joint Programme.

Newcomer

Somebody who started out in the field of RWM (students, researchers, new employees etc.).

1. Introduction

1.1 The European Programme on radioactive waste management (EURAD) has developed a Roadmap, which is essentially a representation of a generic radioactive waste management (RWM) programme for implementing a radioactive waste disposal, enabling users and national programmes to access existing knowledge and the status of future and ongoing work. According to the Roadmap, the overall knowledge in the field of RWM can be presented by a common structure for categorizing knowledge called **EURAD Roadmap Goals Breakdown Structure** (GBS). It comprises themes (Level 1), sub-themes (Level 2) and domains (Level 3), each formulated as goals. Themes are the highest level of the EURAD Roadmap Goals Breakdown Structure. Themes are divided into sub-themes, which in turn are divided into domains.

One of the main objectives of the EURAD Knowledge Management & Networking Programme [1] is to capture the current State-of-Knowledge available in the field of RWM. To achieve this, Work Package 11 – State-of-Knowledge (WP11 SoK) aims to fill the framework provided by the GBS/Roadmap with content, i.e., creation of KM documents for all the Roadmap domains (79 as of May 2023) and development of portal-Knowledge Management Systemplatform (p-KMS [2,3,4]. This means: collecting, compiling, preserving, capitalising on and providing open access to knowledge generated in the field of Radioactive Waste Management (RWM) that can be extracted by present and future generations and by any interested end-users in Europe and beyond (for example Waste Management Organisations (WMOs), Technical Support Organisations (TSOs), Research Entities (REs)). In EURAD, SoK is defined as “experts’ view of the most relevant knowledge and associated uncertainties in a specific domain applied in the context of a RWM programme”.

1.2 The document Deliverable 11.5 “QA Procedures for the Generation of SoK Demonstration cases” (QA Procedures) [5] defines the general procedure for planning and managing a system for the production of DI and SoK documents.

1.3 For dissemination of results and for making KM documents available the EURAD Wiki was developed and made accessible to the EURAD community. The Wiki covers work from all KM WPs and beyond, such as the SotA documents developed by the R&D WPs. The EURAD Wiki will be further developed and updated once new content becomes available.

1.4 An important component is the development and application of a feedback mechanism to improve the processes for engaging experts producing the SoK and DI documents. This feedback will serve as valuable input for all activities in WP11 and beyond.

The development of a feedback mechanism contains of:

- defining goal and objectives of feedback mechanism;
- determining the target groups/feedback groups to be addressed. These groups may vary depending on the topic and the implementation phase of the RWM programme;
- development of appropriate methods for obtaining feedback;
- development of the procedures for applying feedback methods;
- development of the procedures for evaluation of obtained feedback;
- development of the procedures for dissemination and implementation of feedback results.

2. Feedback mechanism goal and objectives

2.1 The basis (core) of the EURAD knowledge management is the DI and SoK documents (complemented with capabilities, guidance and training) populating the Roadmap, which outlines systematic approaches and knowledge for implementation of radioactive waste disposal.

Accordingly, the development of the DI and SoK documents should ensure that feedback is obtained from each of the authors, reviewers and end-users of these documents.

The system of DI and SoK documents should be considered as a "living" system that is constantly being improved and adapted to the needs of the end-users.

2.2 The main goal of feedback mechanism is to ensure the effectiveness of the system of DI and SoK documents for the needs of the end-users.

2.3 The feedback mechanism objectives are the following:

- defining how DI and SoK documents are in demand and/or useful for end-users;
- defining to what extent the approaches set out in the DI and SoK documents for individual RWM programmes are supported by end-users;
- identifying important gaps in DI and SoK documents;
- ensuring adaptation of the SoKs to the needs of end-users.

3. Feedback audience

3.1 The feedback audience for the DI and SoK documents can be classified in the following categories:

- 1) Authors and reviewers.
- 2) EURAD community – internal beneficiaries.

The EURAD community includes WMOs, TSOs and REs. These organisations come from almost all European countries, including all countries where a large amount of radioactive waste of different types and characteristics is generated. Accordingly, feedback from organisations and experts belonging to the EURAD community can provide a comprehensive and collectively objective perspective.

The goal and objectives mentioned in Section 2 can be generally achieved if the majority of EURAD community organisations participate in the feedback process.

- 3) Non-EURAD RWM community – external organisations.

It is important that also non-EURAD RWM end-users provide their feedback on DI and SoK documents. These organisations and experts can provide an "outside view" from outside the EURAD community. This is in agreement with the long-term vision of EURAD, of creating a sustainable knowledge system that is to be used also after the end of EURAD.

- 4) Community of newcomers.

The DI and SoK documents are also aimed for somebody who has started out in the field of RWM (students, researchers, new employees, etc.). It is important to know how DI and SoK documents are used by them and useful to them.

3.2 Feedback mechanism should be harmonised with socialisation of DI and SoK documents mechanisms. The document QA Procedures [5] defines the following mechanism socialisation of SoK and DI documents.

The socialisation step shall be performed according to the following procedure:

- 1) WP11 Team with the PMO support and the help of other EURAD partners shall disseminate the DI and SoK document to the defined end-users. The coordinator will publish the DI and SoK document on the EURAD homepage and announce it to the EURAD community (e.g. via the EURAD newsletter). PMO also disseminate the SoKs to the IAEA that inserts them in the INIS.
- 2) WP11 Team shall import the DI and SoK document into the EURAD KM database to foster exchange and discussion of the document.
- 3) In agreement with the authors, WP11 Team jointly with WP13 Team and the PMO are encouraged to organise lectures on the DI and SoK document.
- 4) WP11 Team shall support the EURAD SoK authors to disseminate the SoK document among the expert's community. WP11 Team has to define a mechanism to acknowledge the EURAD SoK authors.

4. Feedback methods

4.1 The use of the following feedback methods is envisaged:

- obtaining feedback from any organisations, experts and newcomers in an arbitrary form;
- obtaining feedback from authors, reviewers and organizations, experts and newcomers in the form of questionnaire responses;
- obtaining feedback in the form of a discussion (exchange of views) on the document at the on-line resources (EURAD website, Wiki etc.);
- obtaining feedback in the form of discussions (exchange of views) at a seminar (or workshop, etc.).

4.2 On the EURAD website (Wiki etc.) hosting DI and SoK documents, as well as the in the documents themselves, it is envisaged to ask end-users to provide feedback [7].

4.3 Questionnaires are expected to be sent:

- to the authors and reviewers;
- to the EURAD community organisations for feedback on specific DI and SoK documents, with a request to distribute this questionnaire, as far as possible, to organisations, experts and newcomers non-EURAD RWM community.

4.4 On the EURAD website (Wiki, etc.) hosting DI and SoK documents, it is envisaged to invite end-users to provide their views on the document in any form directly on the website, to exchange views [7].

4.5 Another feedback method is by organising seminars (webinars, workshops) to present lectures (presentations) on the developed DI and SoK documents and to hold discussions on these documents.

5. Procedures for the application of feedback methods

5.1 The procedure for obtaining feedback from authors, reviewers and any organisations, experts and newcomers in an **arbitrary form** is the following:

- 1) DI and SoK documents are posted on the websites in accordance with the socialisation procedure defined in the QA Procedures [5] (see item 3.2).
- 2) A similar feedback request to end-users may be posted directly in the DI and SoK documents and on the website. For example:

“Dear end-user, could you kindly share with us any of your thoughts on this document. Your thoughts are very important for our further work on the production of DI and SoK documents. Please send your thoughts to the following contact persons: WP11 Leader..., WP17 Task 4 Leader Thank you in advance. ”

- 3) As soon as feedbacks are received, their generalisation and analysis of feedback from different end-users are performed.

5.2 The procedure for obtaining feedback from authors, reviewers and organisations, experts and newcomers in the form of **questionnaire** responses is the following:

- 1) DI and SoK documents are distributed to end-users in accordance with the socialisation procedure defined in the QA Procedures [5] (see item 3.2).
- 2) WP11 Team (with the possible support of WP12, WP13 and WP17 Task 4 Teams) prepare a questionnaire on DI and SoK documents. The WP11 Leader (or contact person from WP11 Team) sends the questionnaire to the authors, reviewers and EURAD community within 1 month of distributing DI and SoK documents. The questionnaire form is given in Appendix 1. Contact persons from each organisation should be identified for feedback issues.
- 3) As feedbacks are received, the generalisation and analysis of feedback from different end-users are performed and are issued in accordance with the form given in Appendix 2.

5.3 The procedure for obtaining feedback through **an online discussion** is the following:

- 1) DI and SoK documents are posted on the websites in accordance with the socialisation procedure defined in the QA Procedures [5] (see item 3.2).
- 2) A similar suggestion to end-users to participate in the exchange of views is posted at the online resources: *“Dear end-user, could you kindly share any of your opinions about this document on the website page with other end-users ... Your opinions and results of discussions with other end-users are very important for our further work on production of DI and SoK documents. Thank you in advance”*.
- 3) As feedbacks are received, the generalisation and analysis of feedbacks from different end-users are performed and are issued in accordance with the form given in Appendix 2.

5.4 The procedure for obtaining feedback in the form of **discussions at seminars** (workshops) is the following:

- 1) WP11 and WP13 Teams within the WP13 procedures organise seminars (workshops) where DI and SoK documents are presented in the form of lectures (presentations, etc.).
- 2) At the seminars (workshops) there is an arbitrary discussion between the participants about the DI and/or SoK documents. Also in the materials of the seminars (workshops), a questionnaire should be distributed to the participants with a request to prepare answers to the questions and send the answers, as indicated in paragraph 5.2.

- 3) Generalisation and analysis of the results of the discussion at seminars (workshops) of feedback from different end-users are performed and are issued in accordance with the form given in Appendix 2.

6. Evaluation of obtained feedback

6.1 Evaluation of obtained feedback includes summarising and analysing feedback from authors, reviewers and various end-users. The feedback is then discussed and conclusions are approved based on the results of summarisation and analysis.

6.2 WP11 Team (with the possible support of WP12, WP13 and WP17 Task 4 Teams) performs the generalisation of feedbacks and their preliminary analysis.

6.3 The generalisation of feedbacks is performed according to the list of questions specified in the questionnaire.

Generalisation of feedbacks is performed separately by authors, reviewers and groups of organisations: WMOs, TSOs, and REs. Also, the feedbacks provided by the organisations that are non-EURAD RWM community are also considered separately. Generalisation of feedbacks is performed separately also for the community of newcomers.

6.4 Feedbacks for each specified group of end-users are analysed for similar opinions, complementary opinions, and conflicting opinions.

Next, the generalised opinions of different groups of end-users are analysed in the same way.

6.5 Based on the results of the analysis, preliminary conclusions are formed on the following:

- 1) in the opinion of various end-users, to what extent the DI and SoK documents are used and useful for them;
- 2) in the opinion of various end-users, to what extent do the DI and SoK documents provide adequate and complete information on the chosen RWM topic;
- 3) on which aspects have the end-users of different groups a different point of view than that presented in the DI and/or SoK documents;
- 4) what suggestions have end-users from different groups for supplementing the DI and SoK documents;
- 5) on what aspects have the end-users of different groups significantly different points of view.

6.6 The WP11 Leader organises a meeting with the WP11 Team (and other interested WP Teams), authors and reviewers DI and SoK documents. During the meeting, it will be discussed the generalised results of obtained feedback and determined what improvements should be made to the evaluated DI and SoK documents, as well as to the further documents, if necessary.

6.7 Based on the results of the discussion on the generalised feedbacks, the previously prepared results of the generalisation and preliminary analysis are corrected, as well as supplemented with the adopted recommendations for further improvement of DI and SoK documents.

7. Dissemination and implementation of the feedback results

7.1 The results of the feedbacks generalisation are posted on the website where the DI and SoK documents are posted.

7.2 The WP11 Leader (or contact person from WP11 Team) sends the results of the feedback generalisation to the end-users from which feedback was received (in particular, through survey responses) to inform them on the impact of their feedback.

7.3 The implementation of feedback results is carried out taking into account the adopted recommendations for further improvement of DI and SoK documents. This may include:

- 1) preparation and release of new editions of DI and SoK documents, which take into account the feedback;
- 2) adjustment of the format and/or content of the DI and SoK documents that are under development and/or planned to be developed.

7.4 New editions and adjustments to DI and SoK documents are released in accordance with the applicable procedures [5].

8. Outlook

DI documents production started in year 2 of EURAD. By the end of 2022, three DI documents have been developed and published. The production of DI documents will be actively continued during years 4 and 5 of EURAD with the plan to publish 12 DI documents per year.

It was decided that the production of SoK documents within the EURAD will be limited to two demonstration cases. By the end of 2022, one SoK document has been developed and published. The second SoK document was published in May 2023.

It is planned that within the years 4 and 5 of EURAD, Deliverable 11.5 [5] and this Deliverable 11.10 will be actively applied. The experience of using these documents will be analysed. In order to improve the effectiveness of the DI and SoK documents for the needs of the end-users, it is planned to start implementing the developed mechanism in the Deliverable 11.10 for obtaining feedback and to conduct surveys by collecting feedback from the EURAD community. The insights and lessons learnt will be collected and formulated with recommendations in MS334 “Recommendations on integration of feedback mechanism into the KM programme”.

Procedures for the development of DI and SoK documents and feedback procedures are expected to be improved as experience is accumulated and analysed.

It will also be useful to set the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for the expert involvement activities in the production of SoK and DI documents, i.e., the production process itself, the dissemination of knowledge and the collection of feedback in the framework of WP11.

Appendix 1 Feedback forms on the DI document

1. Feedback form for authors of the DI document



FEEDBACK ON DI DOCUMENT

DEAR AUTHORS OF THE DI DOCUMENT!

First of all, thank you for your fruitful cooperation.

To optimize the production of further DI documents, WP11 Team would greatly appreciate if you could share your opinions on the process and outcomes of producing the DI document, as well as your thoughts on its future use.

We would kindly ask you to take a moment and answer the following questions, and where necessary, provide a rating on a scale from 1 (worst) to 10 (best).

No	Question	Answer/ Suggestion
1	How effective is the structure of the DI document for ensuring the achievement of its goals and capturing the state-of-knowledge of a knowledge domain (Rate 1-10)? Please explain your reasoning and provide suggestions for potential improvement?	
2	Do you think the current requirements for the content and scope of the DI document are appropriate (Rate 1-10)? Please explain which areas you think could be improved.	
3	What difficulties and/or questions arose during the development of the DI document (procedure for developing, interaction of all interested parties etc.)?	
4	Have you considered and referenced other DI documents in the document (yes/no)? What steps can be taken to ensure mutual consistency between different Domains Insight documents?	

5	Which end-users / end-user groups will most benefit from this document (e.g., students, young professions in WMOs, etc.)?	
6	Please, suggest the usefulness of the document for end-users (Rate 1-10) and explain your reasoning.	
7	How important is the feedback from the end-users of the Domain Insight document (Rate 1-10)? Which aspects of the feedback do you consider are in particular important?	
8	What lessons did you learn that might be useful for future efforts to capture and communicate knowledge in this field?	
9	In what cases and considering what main factors is it advisable to update the DI document in the future?	
10	Would you be interested in giving a lecture or presentation on the topic covered by the DI document (yes / no)?	
11	Please indicate any other suggestions for optimizing the process and improving the results of the development of a DI document	
	Additional	
12	What motivated you to contribute as an author to producing DI documents?	
13	What kind of support or resources would have been helpful during the development of the DI document?	
14	How do you envision the DI document being used by end-users in practice ?	
15	What advice would you give to future authors working on DI documents?	
16	How do you see your role as the document evolves over time ensuring its continued usefulness?	

Thank you for your time and for sharing your opinions.

With best regards,

WP11 Team

WP11 Team Contacts

Alexandru-Bogdan Tatomir Alexandru.Tatomir@bge.de

Kateryna Fuzik kv_fuzik@sstc.ua

2. Feedback form for reviewers of the DI document



FEEDBACK ON DI DOCUMENT

DEAR REVIEWERS OF THE DI DOCUMENT!

First of all, thank you for your fruitful cooperation.

To optimize the production of further DI documents, WP11 Team would greatly appreciate if you could share your opinions on the process and outcomes of producing the DI document, as well as your thoughts on its future use.

We would kindly ask you to take a moment and answer the following questions, and where necessary, provide a rating on a scale from 1 (worst) to 10 (best).

No	Question	Answer/ Suggestion
1	How effective is the structure of the DI document for capturing the state-of-knowledge of a domain (Rate 1-10)? Please explain your reasoning and provide suggestions for potential improvement?	
2	Do you think the current requirements for the content and scope of the DI document are appropriate (Rate 1-10)? Please explain which areas you think could be improved.	
3	What difficulties and/or questions arose during the review of the DI document (procedure for reviewing, interaction of all interested parties, etc.)?	
4	Which end-users / end-user groups will most benefit from this document (e.g., students, young professions in WMOs, etc.)?	
5	Please, suggest the usefulness of the document for end-users (Rate 1-10) and explain your reasoning.	
6	In what cases and considering what main factors is it advisable to update the DI document in the future?	

7	Optionally, indicate any other suggestions for optimizing the process and improving the results of the review of a DI document	
	Additional	
8	What motivated you to contribute as a reviewer of this DI document?	
9	What kind of support or resources would have been helpful during the review of the DI document?	
10	How do you envision the DI document being used by end-users in practice ?	
11	What advice would you give to future reviewers working on DI documents?	
12	How do you see your role as the document evolves over time ensuring its continued usefulness?	

Thank you for your time and for sharing your opinions.

With best regards,

WP11 Team

WP11 Team Contacts

Alexandru-Bogdan Tatomir Alexandru.Tatomir@bge.de

Kateryna Fuzik kv_fuzik@sstc.ua

3. Feedback form for newcomer end-users of the DI document



FEEDBACK ON DI DOCUMENT

DEAR NEWCOMER END-USERS!

In the framework of EURAD, a system of DI documents is being developed. Each document from this system refers to a predefined Domain in the EURAD Roadmap (GBS) (please find more information about EURAD Roadmap here <https://www.ejp-eurad.eu/roadmap>).

The general goal of DI documents is to provide direct links for each knowledge Domain to safety and implementation goals related to DGR requirements.

This DI document according to the EURAD Roadmap (GBS) takes the following place:

- Theme Name:
- Subtheme Name:
- Domain Name:

We would kindly ask you to take a moment and answer the following questions (all or individual ones, at your choice), and where necessary, provide a rating on a scale from 1 (worst) to 10 (best).

The questions are prepared mainly for the community of newcomers in the RWM field. However, we will be happy to receive answers from any end-user.

We would also be pleased to receive your general opinion on the DI document in free form.

We appreciate your opinion and we will certainly take it into account in the further work with the DI document.

You can access the summarized results of the end-users' feedback over the course of 3 months at this website.

1. QUESTIONS FOR THE DI DOCUMENT

No	Question	Rating (1-10)	Answers
1	Why are you interested in the topic (Theme, Subtheme, Domain)?		
2	How are you going to use the information from this DI document?		

3	Does the DI document meet your expectations (Rate 1-10)? Please state any inconsistencies with your expectations?		
4	Is the structure of the DI document clear (Rate 1-10)? What adjustments could be made?		
5	Are you satisfied with the DI document information (Rate 1-10)? Are there any gaps?		
6	Is the length of the DI document appropriate for the amount of information provided?		
7	Can the DI document be used as a starting point to explore RWM Domain-related issues further (Rate 1-10)? What improvements to the DI document do you suggest in this context?		
8	Are the links (references) given in the DI document useful (Rate 1-10)? What improvements do you suggest?		
9	Is the information in the DI document clear and easy to understand (absence of contradictions, duplications, degree of detailing of various sections) (Rate 1-10)? How can the DI document be improved in this context?		
10	Is the DI document harmonized with other DI documents within this Subtheme, Theme (Rate 1-10)? How do you think harmonization could be improved?		
11	EURAD plans to develop a document with a more detailed description of the issues considered in the DI document. Please indicate for which questions and to what degree it is advisable to perform detailing.		
12	Does the DI document provide any new insights or ideas that you had not considered before?		
13	Does the DI document provide any actionable steps or recommendations that you can apply in your work?		
14	Would you recommend this DI document to others? Why or why not?		
15	Please, make an assessment of completeness and correctness of the information presentation in the DI document in general with regard to the overall goal for this Domain.		
16	Further comments and suggestions.		

2. YOUR PERSONAL INFORMATION

Please note that any personal information provided will remain anonymous unless the respondent chooses to identify themselves.

2.1 Full name (optional)

2.2 What is type of organization (WMO or TSO or RE) are you working for? And what is the name of the organisation)? (optional)

2.3 What department or area of organisation you are working in? (optional)

2.4 What is your job title/role within your organisation?

2.5 How many years of experience do you have working in RWM?

2.6 Contact information (e-mail address, tel. number, etc.).

Thank you for your cooperation and your time, and for sharing your opinions.

With best regards,

WP11 Team

WP11 Team Contacts

Alexandru-Bogdan Tatomir Alexandru.Tatomir@bge.de

Kateryna Fuzik kv_fuzik@sstc.ua

4. Feedback form for end-users of the DI document



FEEDBACK ON THE DI DOCUMENT

DEAR END-USERS,

In the framework of EURAD, a system of DI documents is being developed. Each document from this system refers to a predefined Domain in the EURAD Roadmap (GBS) (please find more information about EURAD Roadmap here <https://www.ejp-eurad.eu/roadmap>).

The general goal of DI documents is to provide direct links for each knowledge Domain to safety and implementation goals related to DGR requirements.

This DI document according to the EURAD Roadmap (GBS) takes the following place:

- Theme Name:
- Subtheme Name:
- Domain Name:

We would kindly ask you to take a moment and answer the following questions (all or individual ones, at your choice), and where necessary, provide a rating on a scale from 1 (worst) to 10 (best).

If possible, please provide information in arbitrary form on:

- in the "Deficiencies" column: a description of the shortcomings regarding the relevant issue, and/or,
- in the column "Suggestions": your suggestions on updating of the DI document.

We would also be pleased to receive your general opinion on the DI document in free form.

We appreciate your opinion and we will certainly take it into account in the further work with the DI document.

You can access the summarized results of the end-users' feedback over the course of 3 months at this website.

1. QUESTIONS FOR THE DI DOCUMENT

No	Question	Rating (1-10)	Deficiencies	Suggestions
----	----------	---------------	--------------	-------------

1	Section “Typical overall goals and activities in the Domain”			
1.1	Is the overall goal for this Domain specified completely and clearly?			
1.2	Are the defined typical actions sufficient to achieve the Domain goal?			
2	Section “Contribution to generic safety functions and implementation goals”			
2.1	Are safety significant relevant features of the Domain or key aspects that are important for the overall implementation fully and correctly accurately described?			
2.2	Are the specified features, characteristics, or properties of the Domain that contribute to achieving long-term interim storage safety as well as long-term safety of the geological disposal system sufficient and correct?			
2.3	Is it sufficiently and correctly accurately demonstrated how safety functions and implementation goals are fulfilled?			
2.4	Is it sufficiently described how the Domain (and its associated information, data, and knowledge) contributes to high-level disposal system requirements?			
3	Section “International examples of Domain”			
3.1	Is the provided short list of key examples from across the international literature / MSs for the Domain of interest sufficient?			
4	Section “Critical background information”			
4.1	Is the presented list of the knowledge areas that most organizations focus on for this Domain sufficient and correct?			
4.2	Is the presented information on specific components, key information, processes, data or challenges that have a high impact or are considered most critical for implementing geological disposal, with respect to the Domain sufficient and correct?			
4.3	Is the presented list of key interfaces with other Domains sufficient and correct?			
5	Section “Maturity of knowledge and technology”			
5.1	Is the information on an indication of the relative maturity of information, data and knowledge for disposal of Domain sufficient and accurate?			
5.2	Is the information on the latest developments for the most promising advances, including innovations at lower levels of technical maturity where ongoing R&D and industrialization activities continue sufficient and accurate?			
5.3	Are the described lessons learnt from the past and ongoing projects and work relevant to you?			
6	Section “Uncertainties”			
6.1	Is the information on key uncertainties sufficient and presented correctly?			
7	Section “Guidance, Training, Communities of Practice and Capabilities”			
7.1	Are the provided links to resources, organizations and networks that can help connect people with people, focused on the Domain sufficient and correct?			

8	Section “Further reading, external Links and references”			
8.1	Are the presented broad and high-level references in the DI document sufficient and accurate?			

2. YOUR PERSONAL INFORMATION

Please note that any personal information provided will remain anonymous unless the respondent chooses to identify themselves.

2.1 Full name (optional)

2.2 What is type of organization (WMO or TSO or RE) are you working for? And what is the name of the organisation)? (optional)

2.3 What department or area of organisation you are working in? (optional)

2.4 What is your job title/role within your organisation?

2.5 How many years of experience do you have working in RWM?

2.6 Contact information (e-mail address, tel. number, etc.).

Thank you for your cooperation and your time, and for sharing your opinions.

With best regards,

WP11 Team

WP11 Team Contacts

Alexandru-Bogdan Tatomir Alexandru.Tatomir@bge.de

Kateryna Fuzik kv_fuzik@sstc.ua

Appendix 2 Generalisation of end-users’ feedback on the DI document “Domain Name”

Below are the generalised end-users’ feedback on the DI document "Domain Name", sent/made publicly available on date (file name _____).

As of date, ___ feedbacks have been received from ___ end-users (including ___ WMOs, ___ TSOs, ___ R&Ds, ___ newcomers).

Feedbacks were received following end-users: _____ (list).

Also, feedbacks have been received from author(s) _____ and reviewer(s) _____.

No.	No. and the wording of the question (according to the questionnaire)	Generalised feedback*	Disadvantages*	Suggestions*	Conclusions and analysis of the presence of similar/contradictory opinions
1					
2					
...					

* In the "Generalised feedback" column, concise generalised description of the feedbacks should be indicated for each issue. The "Disadvantages" column should include a generalised description of the disadvantages indicated by end-users. In the "Suggestions" column, a generalised description of the suggestions specified by end-users should be provided.

General summary of feedback on the DI document

(Generalised feedback and conclusions)

References

- [1] EURAD Knowledge Management & Networking Programme 2020-2024 (2021), <https://www.ejp-eurad.eu/publications/eurad-knowledge-management-and-networking-programme>
- [2] **Abbasova D., Arnold T., Brendler V., Franzen C.** (2021): Screening and review of existing/available knowledge management approaches and/or tools. Final version as of 08.03.2021 of deliverable D11.1 of the HORIZON 2020 programme EURAD. EC Grant agreement no: 847593. <https://www.ejp-eurad.eu/publications/eurad-d111-screening-and-review-existingavailable-knowledge-management-approaches>
- [3] **Abbasova D., Arnold T., Brendler V., Franzen, C.** (2021): Specification of the EURAD p-KMS. Final version as of 06.06.2022 of milestone MS242 of the HORIZON 2020 programme EURAD. EC Grant agreement no: 847593.
- [4] **Abbasova D., Arnold T., Brendler V., Franzen C.** (2022): Specification of the EURAD KM platform (p-KMS). Final version as of 30.05.2022 of deliverable D11.9 of the HORIZON 2020 programme EURAD. EC Grant agreement no: 847593.
- [5] **I. Iarmosh, O. Tokarevskiy, S. Kondratyev, K. Fuzik, Y. Yesypenko, A. Göbel, A. Tatomir, T. Knuuti, D. Abbasova** (2022): QA Procedures for the Generation of SoK Demonstration Cases. Final version as of 08.12.2022 of deliverable D11.5 of the HORIZON 2020 programme EURAD. EC Grant agreement no: 847593. <https://www.ejp-eurad.eu/publications/eurad-d115-qa-procedures-sok>
- [6] **Knuuti T., Tatomir A., Göbel A., Franzen C., Abbasova D., Arnold T., Brendler V., Fuzik K.** (EURADWASTE'22): Capturing the State-of-Knowledge in EURAD Knowledge Management. EPJ Nuclear Sciences & Technologies 8, 37 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1051/epjn/2022030>
- [7] **ISO/IEC/IEEE 23026:2015(en)** Systems and software's engineering-Engineering and management of websites for systems, software, and service information.