

# NWMO Citizen Panels Report, Phase III: Panel Six

**NWMO SR-2008-16**

**July 2008**

Navigator Ltd.

**nwmo**

NUCLEAR WASTE  
MANAGEMENT  
ORGANIZATION

SOCIÉTÉ DE GESTION  
DES DÉCHETS  
NUCLÉAIRES



**Nuclear Waste Management Organization**  
22 St. Clair Avenue East, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto, Ontario  
M4T 2S3  
Canada

Tel: 416-934-9814  
Web: [www.nwmo.ca](http://www.nwmo.ca)

## **Nuclear Waste Management Organization**

The Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO) was established in 2002 by Ontario Power Generation Inc., Hydro-Québec and New Brunswick Power Corporation in accordance with the *Nuclear Fuel Waste Act (NFWA)* to assume responsibility for the long-term management of Canada's used nuclear fuel.

NWMO's first mandate was to study options for the long-term management of used nuclear fuel. On June 14, 2007, the Government of Canada selected the NWMO's recommendation for Adaptive Phased Management (APM). The NWMO now has the mandate to implement the Government's decision.

Technically, Adaptive Phased Management (APM) has as its end-point the isolation and containment of used nuclear fuel in a deep repository constructed in a suitable rock formation. Collaboration, continuous learning and adaptability will underpin our implementation of the plan which will unfold over many decades, subject to extensive oversight and regulatory approvals.

## **NWMO Social Research**

The objective of the social research program is to assist the NWMO, and interested citizens and organizations, in exploring and understanding the social issues and concerns associated with the implementation of Adaptive Phased Management. The program is also intended to support the adoption of appropriate processes and techniques to engage potentially affected citizens in decision-making.

The social research program is intended to be a support to NWMO's ongoing dialogue and collaboration activities, including work to engage potentially affected citizens in near term visioning of the implementation process going forward, long term visioning and the development of decision-making processes to be used into the future. The program includes work to learn from the experience of others through examination of case studies and conversation with those involved in similar processes both in Canada and abroad. NWMO's social research is expected to engage a wide variety of specialists and explore a variety of perspectives on key issues of concern. The nature and conduct of this work is expected to change over time, as best practices evolve and as interested citizens and organizations identify the issues of most interest and concern throughout the implementation of Adaptive Phased Management.

---

### Disclaimer:

This report does not necessarily reflect the views or position of the Nuclear Waste Management Organization, its directors, officers, employees and agents (the "NWMO") and unless otherwise specifically stated, is made available to the public by the NWMO for information only. The contents of this report reflect the views of the author(s) who are solely responsible for the text and its conclusions as well as the accuracy of any data used in its creation. The NWMO does not make any warranty, express or implied, or assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information disclosed, or represent that the use of any information would not infringe privately owned rights. Any reference to a specific commercial product, process or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or preference by NWMO.

---





# NAVIGATOR

## NWMO Citizen Panel Report Scarborough, Ontario

NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION  
SCARBOROUGH, ONTARIO CITIZEN PANEL REPORT  
JULY 2008

## **WHAT ARE CITIZEN PANELS?**

Building on previous qualitative research studies, the NWMO contracted Navigator to initiate Citizen Panels in 8 cities across Canada. The goal of the Citizen Panel project was to further explore the feelings, attitudes and perceptions of Canadians toward the long-term storage of Canada's used nuclear fuel.

The Citizen Panel project is markedly different from the qualitative research projects that have preceded it. The intent of the Citizen Panel format used in this project is to allow for the discussion to be formed and driven by the views of the individual Panelists. These Panelists have had a brief introduction to the NWMO and are aware of rudimentary facts surrounding Canada's used nuclear fuel such that an informed discussion can occur.

Phase Three of the Citizen Panel project occurred in Scarborough, Ontario on April 28, 2008.

## **WHAT IS NAVIGATOR?**

Navigator is a research-based public affairs firm that works with companies, organizations and governments involved in the public policy field.

Navigator has grown to become a diverse firm with consultants from a variety of backgrounds who have excelled in the fields of journalism, public opinion research, politics, marketing and law.

Our strategic approach can be summed up as: *“Research. Strategy. Results.”*

# PANEL REPORT OUTLINE

## 1. NWMO Citizen Panel Background

- a. Citizen Panel
- b. Panelist profiles
- c. Panel methodology

## 2. Dialogue: Draft Implementation Plan

- a. Overview
- b. Strategic Objectives
  - i. Building Relationships
  - ii. Building Knowledge – Technical and Social Research
  - iii. Review, Adjust and Validate Plans
  - iv. Collaborative Design and Initiation of a Siting Process
  - v. Others as available
    - I. Financial Surety
    - II. Governance Structure
    - III. Becoming an Implementing Organization
- c. Panel Notes
  - i. Disclaimer

## 3. Questions & Discussion, Technical Representative

- a. Explanation
- b. Questions & Discussion

## Appendices

- i. Navigator Personnel
- ii. Discussion Leader's Guide
- iii. Excerpts from Draft Implementation Plan

## **1. NWMO CITIZEN PANEL BACKGROUND**

### **a. Citizen Panel**

The Scarborough, Ontario Phase Three Citizen Panel was held on April 28, 2008 at a neutral third party facility in Scarborough.

The Panel was held over three hours from 6PM – 9PM with 13 Panelists in attendance. Jaime Watt, a Navigator research professional, acted as Discussion Leader.

A general outline of discussion objectives, as well as a discussion document intended to guide the work of the Panel were prepared in advance of the Citizen Panel. Reproductions of the document shown to the Panel can be found at the end of this report as appendices.

### **b. Panelist Profile**














In order to ensure that Panelists speak openly and freely over the course of this research, the individual identities of Panelists will remain protected and not revealed to the NWMO at any point of the project. Contact with Panelists is managed exclusively by a dedicated Panel Manager and each Panelist has been given an identifier code to ensure anonymity in all accessible Panel documents. All personal information and contact reports are stored separately and controlled by the Panel Manager.

While verbatim comments are used through this report, the identification will be only by Panel or by unique Panelist identifier code, but never by name.

Panelists have agreed to offer additional information, including their gender and one additional fact about their lives to make the Panel reporting richer for the reader.



Below are the profiles of the Scarborough Panelists by Panelist identifier code:

	City: Scarborough Age: 55-64 Gender: Female Occupation: Retired nurse		City: Scarborough Age: 55-64 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, health and nutritionist
<b>Panelist: S-1A</b>		<b>Panelist: S-2A</b>	
	City: Scarborough Age: 35-44 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed part-time, daycare provider		City: Scarborough Age: 55-64 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, real estate
<b>Panelist: S-4A</b>		<b>Panelist: S-3A</b>	
	City: Scarborough Age: 18-24 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed part-time, painter		City: Scarborough Age: 35-44 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, print buyer
<b>Panelist: S-6A</b>		<b>Panelist: S-17A</b>	
	City: Scarborough Age: 18-24 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed part-time, grocery store		City: Scarborough Age: 45-54 Gender: Female Occupation: Unemployed
<b>Panelist: S-8A</b>		<b>Panelist: S-9A</b>	
	City: Scarborough Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed part-time, teacher		City: Scarborough Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed part- time, educational
<b>Panelist: S-11A</b>		<b>Panelist: S-12A</b>	
	City: Scarborough Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Self-employed, teacher		City: Scarborough Age: 18-24 Gender: Male Occupation: Student
<b>Panelist: S-13A</b>		<b>Panelist: S-14A</b>	
	City: Scarborough Age: 25-34 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, BMO		
<b>Panelist: S-15A</b>			

### **c. Panel Methodology**

These Citizen Panels have been designed, as much as possible, as collaborative discussions facilitated by a Discussion Leader. They are separate and apart from focus groups in that they empower individual Panelists to raise questions and introduce new topics. The role of the Discussion Leader, in this format, is merely to introduce new topics of discussion and lead the Panel through a number of discussion exercises.

As well, additional measures were incorporated into this Citizen Panel format to empower individual Panelists. Each Panelist was made aware of their independence and responsibilities to both contribute to, and lead, the Panel discussion. A transcriber, traditionally taking contemporaneous notes behind one-way glass or in another room, was, in this case, placed inside the discussion room. Panelists were empowered to direct him or her to take special note of elements of the Panel discussion they felt were important, or ask him or her to recap any part of the discussion upon request. A commitment was made by the Discussion Leader that the notes taken would be sent to Panelists for review, possible revision and approval, to give Panelists faith that they are in control of the proceedings and ensure their contribution is reflected accurately.

Potential Panelists were originally selected through random digit dialling among a general population sample in the wide area in which each Panel was held. Individuals called underwent a standard research screening survey in which they indicated that they were interested and able to participate in a discussion about a general public policy issue with no advance notice of the specific topic. Individuals were screened to include community-engaged opinion leaders in at least one of these topics: community, environment, and/or public/social issues. Those that passed the screening process were asked to participate in a traditional focus group on the perceived trust and credibility of the NWMO, which allowed an introduction to the topic of used nuclear fuel and topics such as Adaptive Phased Management. The discussions were neutral in tone and did not presuppose any outcome on issues such as nuclear power generation and siting for used nuclear fuel.

At the end of this research study, participants were asked if they would be willing to continue in discussions on the topic of used nuclear fuel. Those that expressed interest were placed on a “short list” of potential Panelists for the four-phased Citizen Panel project. Research professionals at Navigator subsequently used this pool to select Panelists that would ensure a diversity of age, gender and experience in the Panels. Only participants who demonstrated both a willingness and ability to contribute to group discussion and complete exercises were included in the pool. The content of each participant’s contribution in the focus groups was not reviewed by Navigator professionals. Rather, the only qualifiers were that individuals could speak clearly and were able to grasp concepts introduced to them at a basic level.

A target Panel population of 18 was determined for each location in the interest of ensuring the long-term viability of each Panel over the course of four discussions.

Phase One Citizen Panels occurred in late Fall 2007. Panel discussions began with an in-depth review of the NWMO's *Moving Forward Together* brochure. Individually, Panelists were asked to mark the document with red and green pens, green indicating they felt positively about a certain point and red indicating that they felt negatively. Furthermore, Panelists were asked to circle the items they felt the most strongly about, both positively and negatively, with the "Sharpie" marker. Panelists were then asked to write down what they thought about the brochure, what they would say about the brochure and how the brochure made them feel. This metaphorical or projective exercise was an attempt to get a more nuanced view of the brochure and to have Panelists share some of their internal reservations they may have been holding back from the Panel. Following the "Think, feel, say" exercise, Panelists reviewed the NWMO's strategic objectives and were asked to rate how important each strategic objective was to them, as well as how appropriate the particular objective was to them. Lastly, Panelists were provided with an excerpt of the draft NWMO's draft approach to transparency. The exercise was introduced with a reminder to Panelists about the frequency with which they raised the issue of transparency as an important pursuit and focus for the NWMO in the previous research phase of the study. Panelists were asked to discuss whether or not the NWMO's proposed approach to transparency met with their general expectations. At the conclusion of the Panels, Panelists were provided with post-session work (homework) to complete following the Citizen Panel. The work consisted of a simple seven question survey to be completed after a brief review of the NWMO website. Those without any access or ability to use the internet were exempted from the exercise.

Although successful in terms of the richness of data collected in all 8 Panel locations, it was clear upon completion of the Panels that it would be necessary to hold Supplementary Citizen Panels in four locations (Toronto, Montreal, Regina and Sault Ste. Marie) due to smaller than expected Panel populations, as well as a difficulty experienced by some Panelists to honour their commitment to attend, as was confirmed on the day of the Panel.

Supplementary Citizen Panels occurred in early January 2008 and consisted of 6 new recruits, selected by random digit dialling, to replicate the experience by which all other Panelists had been selected. New recruits were sent a reading package in advance and then had a one hour "lobby" session immediately prior to the Supplementary Citizen Panel. This session replicated a condensed version of the Preparatory Phase research and allowed for any questions Panelists might have had about the NWMO. Following the "lobby" session, the Supplementary Citizen Panel continued, adding Panelists who had confirmed but, for a myriad of reasons, could not participate in the Phase One Citizen Panels.

Following the completion of the Supplementary Citizen Panels, those that demonstrated a willingness and ability to continue were added to the pool for Phase Two Citizen Panels.

Phase Two Panels occurred in mid-to-late January 2008. The Panel discussion began with the Discussion Leader asking Panelists if they had thought any more about the NWMO since the last Panel, or if they had just gone back to their daily routines and not given the organization much additional thought. The Discussion Leader then distributed a

document for discussion, the Executive Summary of the NWMO's study *Choosing a Way Forward: The Future Management of Canada's Used Nuclear Fuel*. The document was given both individual consideration, as well as collective consideration. Individually, Panelists were asked to mark the documents with red and green pens, green indicating they felt a certain point was helpful to their understanding and red indicating that they did not find the point helpful. The intent of the individual document review was to serve as a launching point for further collective consideration and discussion of the more complex strategic objectives of the NWMO. The Panel discussion concluded with Panelists reviewing the answers provided by the NWMO to the questions Panelists had posted in the Parking Lot in Phase One.

Again, Panels were successful in the richness of the data gathered. Furthermore, Panelists have begun to demonstrate a higher degree of ownership in the process with impressive attendance, commitment to the discussion and, in some cases, engaging in extra work, such as assembling their thoughts on paper and seeking out additional information.

Phase Three Panels occurred in late April and early May 2008. Unlike previous Panels, Phase Three Panels were divided into two parts: a discussion portion and a question and answer portion with a technical representative from the NWMO.

The discussion portion of the Panel began with a general discussion on Panelists' thoughts, if any, on the NWMO since the last Panel session and then turned to the Draft Implementation Plan that had been distributed to Panelists upon their arrival. Similar to Phase Two, the document was not reviewed by Panelists but, rather, used to inform Panel discussion on the NWMO's strategic objectives. Although Panelists were given an opportunity to comment on all objectives, as well as the document as a whole, they were asked to concentrate specifically on four of the seven NWMO strategic objectives: Building Relationships; Building Knowledge: Technical and Social Research; Review, Adjust and Validate Plans; and Collaborative Design and Initiation of a Siting Process. These objectives were rated by Panelists in Phase One as highly appropriate and important for the NWMO. For each strategic objective, Panelists were given a summary that outlined items the NWMO plans to implement over the next five years (2008-2012) and asked for their feedback; specifically whether they felt the NWMO was moving in the right direction with these plans and whether they felt that anything important had been overlooked.

Due to a timing issue in Montreal, Montreal Panelists were only able to concentrate on three of the seven strategic objectives during the Panel discussion: Building Relationships; Building Knowledge: Technical and Social Research; and Review, Adjust and Validate Plans. As a result, all Montreal Panelists present for the Phase Three Panel discussion were contacted by the Francophone Panel Manager to schedule an in depth interview to discuss the remaining objectives not covered in the Panel: Collaborative Design and Initiation of a Siting Process; as well as Financial Surety, Governance Structure and Building an Implementing Organization. Panelists scheduled for the individual in-depth interviews were provided with a copy of the Implementation Plan in advance of the discussion and, as was the case in the Panel discussion, were given a chance to provide their feedback on the objectives outlined above.

Once the discussion on the Draft Implementation Plan was complete, in seven of the eight Panel discussions, a technical representative from the NWMO was invited into the Panel discussion for a question and answer session. This was not the case in Saint John, New Brunswick, where the technical representative from the NWMO was brought into the Panel prior to the discussion of the Draft Implementation Plan. All eight Panel discussions concluded with a wrap-up discussion, including feedback on the question and answer portion of the discussion.

This Panel Report is, to the best of Navigator's abilities, a faithful rendering of the discussion held in Scarborough and stands alone as a record of the Citizen Panel discussion on April 28, 2008. A larger Aggregate Report on this wave of Panel discussions, including the Panels in Kingston, Toronto, Sault Ste. Marie, Montreal, Saint John, Saskatoon, and Regina has also been submitted to the NWMO.

## 2. DIALOGUE: DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

### a. Overview

During this Phase of Citizen Panels, the NWMO's Draft Implementation Plan was reviewed by Scarborough Panelists in advance of a general discussion beginning. While a significant amount of Panel discussion was directly related to the four strategic objectives identified by Panelists in Phase One Panels as most important and appropriate for the NWMO, there was time dedicated for a more general discussion of the Draft Implementation Plan among Panelists.

The Draft Implementation Plan was very well-received by Scarborough Panelists. Most Panelists felt the Plan, as well as the organization, was on the right track and were pleased with the direction the NWMO intends to take over the next five years.

One Scarborough Panelist, in particular, appreciated what they perceived to be the NWMO taking thoughts and input from previous Panel discussions into consideration. This Panelist felt the NWMO had listened to Panelists' views on transportation as expressed in the last Panel session,

*It says in June 2009 they will review transportation options. That to me is a big deal. This is something that has to and should take a long time. Seeing what we said the last time, it gives me a good sense they're listening to us.*

There was a discussion among some Scarborough Panelists on the need for the NWMO to educate and inform the general public. In the words of one Panelist,

*I believe the best way to communicate to Canadians is to have them more informed.*

These Scarborough Panelists, looking to themselves as examples, understand the importance education plays in becoming more comfortable with the NWMO and its mandate, as well as in successfully building relationships with Canadians and Aboriginal Peoples. A few Scarborough Panelists were interested to hear how the NWMO was planning to engage youth, with a couple curious to know what age groups the NWMO was targeting. In the words of one Scarborough Panelist,

*Are they engaging the universities? That would be a good idea because they're youth.*

Again, the media was thought by some Panelists to be a good way to expose the public to both the organization and its mandate.

Although some were pleased to see that the NWMO is committed to engaging the media as it moves forward, one Panelist felt that efforts should be made sooner rather than later,

*They should be looking into meetings with editorial boards and other media. They should be starting to do things like that already, things that will give people knowledge right now, other than in 2010.*

Although there was consensus on the need for education, some Panelists struggled with the NWMO's engagement strategy, specifically who the NWMO was planning to engage and if it was truly necessary to engage all Canadians. One Panelist felt it was necessary for the NWMO to engage all Canadians at all levels,

*When they say input from Canadians, are they talking about us, having small forums like this? Or are they talking about colleges? The legislature? How widespread are they going to be? Can a commoner get some information about this so they can voice their opinion? I think they should go to all levels.*

The view that it was the NWMO's responsibility to inform and engage all Canadians, despite their level of interest, was a commonly held viewpoint in Panel discussions. However, one Scarborough Panelist did not feel that it was necessary or realistic to engage all Canadians, stating the following,

*I don't think they literally mean all Canadians. Who is prepared to sit down and listen to people talking about nuclear waste? Before I wasn't interested. Make it available for those that are interested.*

Unlike other Panel discussions, many Scarborough Panelists seemed to have a far greater understanding and appreciation of the NWMO's projected timeline as it moves forward. Some Scarborough Panelists expressed their appreciation of what they perceived to be a thorough and methodical approach to long-term management by the NWMO. In the words of one Scarborough Panelist,

*...I think these are all moving in the right direction. I like that they are limiting what they are trying to do in a certain amount of time. If you want to do anything efficiently, you have to do it in small chunks, especially since this is a long-term solution.*

This sentiment was echoed by another Scarborough Panelist,

*They're very good with their planning. You don't want a bunch of cowboys out there. All this has to be taken into consideration, taken very seriously. It's very technical.*

One Panelist felt that the NWMO's pace might prove to be beneficial as, over time, further research might lead to new knowledge that will not only benefit the process, but might uncover alternative solutions for the used fuel, such as reprocessing,

*The fact that this project is taking so long allows for new knowledge that we can incorporate into what we are doing. Plus, they might find a use for it by the time it is supposed to be going into the ground.*

However, not all Scarborough Panelists agreed, with one, in particular, expressing a desire to see the NWMO move forward at a faster pace.

*There seems like there are a lot of years and it's just preparation work and ground work being laid. I'd like to see things move along at a quicker pace.*

A few Scarborough Panelists felt that, at times, the wording chosen in the Draft Implementation Plan was not as clear as possible. These Panelists felt that, to inform and educate the general public and, in turn, build relationships, it was important to use language and terms the general public could understand. In the words of one Scarborough Panelist,

*I know they have to be academic, but they need to be in accessible language. I don't want to go through a huge glossary to find out what certain words mean. If they want to go read that 36 page paper, that's fine, but have some sort of aide for the public.*



## **b. Strategic Objectives**

In the Phase One Citizen Panels, seven strategic objectives were shared with Panelists. Panelists were asked to examine each objective and then give an indication of their relative importance and appropriateness. Although all strategic objectives seemed largely in line with the majority of Panelists' expectations, there were consistently stronger views on four of the seven strategic objectives: Building Relationships; Building Knowledge – Technical and Social Research; Review, Adjust and Validate Plans; and Collaborative Design and Initiation of a Siting Process. As such, these four objectives were selected as the primary objects of discussion in Phase Three for reasons of time availability.

For each strategic objective, Panelists were given a colour-coded worksheet outlining items the NWMO plans to implement over the next five years (2008-2012). A more comprehensive overview of each objective in the Draft Implementation Plan document was flagged with the same colour of the worksheet for quick reference should Panelists have wanted or required more information. After reviewing each of the four objectives, Panelists were asked for their feedback; specifically whether they felt the NWMO was moving in the right direction with these plans and whether they felt that anything important had been overlooked.

After reviewing and discussing the four objectives mentioned above, Panelists were provided with an opportunity to provide feedback on the remaining three objectives: Financial Surety, Governance Structure and Building an Implementing Organization. Panelists were asked by the Discussion Leader if any of the remaining objectives now struck them as more important, given the increase in their knowledge on the subject matter since Phase One.

Below, please find contemporaneous notes of the Panel discussion on the strategic objectives.

### c. Panel Notes

#### i. Disclaimer

The attached are contemporaneous notes of the Panel discussion on the Draft Implementation Plan and strategic objectives. The notes were taken by a transcriber positioned in the room with the Panelists. The transcriber was taking direction from the Citizen Panel on specific points of interest. The following is not an official transcript, but a best effort to capture the sense of discussion with some granularity.

The transcriber for this Panel was Courtney Glen, a Navigator research professional.

### Draft Implementation Plan Discussion

**Discussion Leader:** When you got here tonight, we passed out a Draft Implementation Plan. Another name for this would be a business plan, work plan, activity plan. What it lays out is the NWMO's thinking about how it can move ahead with its work. It is transforming itself from being a study organization to an implementing organization. To plan their work over the next couple of years, they put together this plan. In it, they have 7 strategic objectives. Tonight I'd like to focus on 4 of those 7. We're going to look at them one at a time.

### Building Relationships

**Discussion Leader:** Are they going in the right direction? Wrong direction?

S-2A: I noticed on this sheet, as well as in the Annual Report, that about 1/7 of the instances that mention building relationships have to do with the aboriginal community. I don't recall ever seeing that we are going to establish a repository on aboriginal land, yet there seems to be, as opposed to specifying other specific communities, a very strong push towards dealing with Aboriginal Peoples. Is it a fait accompli that this is where it's going to be?

S-11A: I think it is because our country was founded by Aboriginal Peoples so anything done here, there is a certain treaty with the government, so this could be a part of it. If you're going to do anything on their land, you have to go through the government.

**Discussion Leader:** Some Aboriginal Peoples consider themselves to have a distinct identify.

- S-14A: I think undertaking a communications audit is an excellent first step in determining a communications strategy. I'm more interested in what the communications audit entails.
- S-6A: I want to know about engaging youth and what age group that would be.
- S-10A: I believe the best way to communicate to Canadians is to have them more informed.
- S-9A: I'm wondering what a corporate citizen program is. Is it something like this? When I see corporate, I see business. Are they reaching out to the business community?
- S-15A: It's a joint venture. They're making some businesses accountable but also working together to come up with long-term solutions. I think these are all moving in the right direction. I like that they are limiting what they are trying to do in a certain amount of time. If you want to do anything efficiently, you have to do it in small chunks, especially since this is a long-term solution.
- S-3A: Are they engaging the universities? That would be a good idea because they're youth.
- S-11A: What do they mean about improving accessibility to the website? Does that mean it is more reader friendly? It's not clear because everyone has access.
- S-1A: I thought it would be good to get information out to a lot of people through Macleans magazine. Very often the magazine has inserts and they have a huge readership. Have the website very prominently displayed.
- S-4A: They should be doing some sort of telephone survey.
- S-3A: Have they started doing the stuff they say they will do in 2008?
- S-8A: In the period of 2008 – 2012, the list is almost as long as the list for 2008. It seems that between 2008 and 2012, you highlight the most dramatic changes.
- S-14A: They should already be looking into meetings with editorial boards and other media. They should be starting to do

things like that already, things that will give people knowledge right now, other than in 2010.

### **Building Knowledge: Technical and Social Research**

**Discussion Leader:** I was wondering the extent to which the kinds of activities take the organization in the right direction. Yes? Not quite?

S-9A: There seems like there are a lot of years and it's just preparation work and ground work being laid. I'd like to see things move along at a quicker pace.

**Discussion Leader:** Any sense of why it takes this long?

S-8A: Well it's a very serious issue, something you want to last forever. The language is very non-committal. I'd like to hear where they are. What stage they're at today?

S-14A: For me, how are we going to transport this material? It says in June 2009 they will review transportation options. That to me is a big deal. This is something that has to and should take a long time. Seeing what we said the last time, it gives me a good sense that they're listening to us.

S-6A: First point, I think that's going in the right direction.

S-17A: They're very good with their planning. You don't want a bunch of cowboys out there. All this has to be taken into consideration, taken very seriously. It's very technical.

S-2A: In regards to point number 2, there's a lot of information and statistics regarding fuel bundles and where they are and as far as the finances are concerned. They do mention safety but they don't talk about epidemiology. I think it's necessary because a lot of people are interested in the health and safety aspect of what's happening with the nuclear waste. The other thing I got from reading the annual report, you have lightly affected, moderately affected nuclear waste products. I gather that these are also being stored in the same types of sites. It's a question of what is moderate, what is light.

S-1A: Going back to what S-6A was saying about having the timeline, you could have each section like they do in fundraisers with thermometers.

- Discussion Leader:** The organization is turning itself from a study organization to an implementing organization. You've said over and over again that research is a very important thing. The NWMO has taken that and crafted out a bit of a plan. I hear that it seems like it might be a bit slow, but seems like it's pretty comprehensive. Others saying they want to know how the NWMO is doing. Is there anything else?
- S-6A: This workshop on Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge. I think it's a really good thing.
- S-15A: I'd like them to expand the idea more. The general population will not know what this entails. There's a degree of ignorance there that needs to be expanded upon. Going back to the technical side, in the book I don't know, but could they give us a bit of an outline as to what projects they have undertaken with certain groups outside of our country?
- S-1A: Two things, engaging the aboriginal community is important because the chances are very good that a repository will be on aboriginal land so you want them on your side. Also, where they will continue to monitor developments in Canada and internationally, as well as the development of an annual report, as time goes on, they're going to learn more and there will be more knowledge. The fact that this project is taking so long allows for new knowledge that we can incorporate into what we are doing. Plus, they might find a use for it by the time it is supposed to be going into the ground.
- S-2A: One of the things that struck me as not too helpful is completing telephone surveys. By being involved in this process, I've received an education so now I can talk a little more about this subject. If you call the average person, they won't have any idea at all of what they're talking about.
- S-11A: I agree. Telephone surveys, please no.
- S-1A: What about setting up a booth at the mall and handing out pamphlets?
- Discussion Leader:** I'm surprised that no one has talked about the importance of the NWMO consulting around the world. No one has commented on the last bullet about cooperation agreements.

- S-10A: That was discussed in the past, so it's not as trivial. The countries here are countries with nuclear technology and are well respected. We can learn a lot from them.
- S-2A: Are these countries that have the same nuclear technology that we're using?
- S-4A: I think it's a wonderful idea if we take the inputs in research and development.
- S-12A: I agree that it's a good thing to consult with others.

### **Review, Adjust and Validate Plans**

- Discussion Leader:** Does this seem to address what you had in mind? Is it a bit off? Close?
- S-11A: Yes, it is what I had in mind. It seems pretty thorough in terms of whom they are contacting, and it seems as if it's on an ongoing basis.
- S-14A: It's definitely in line with what I had in mind. The last 4 bullets, I know they have to be academic, but they need to be in accessible language. I don't want to go through a huge glossary to find out what certain words mean. If they want to go read that 36 page paper that's fine, but have some sort of aide for the public.
- S-17A: It comes back to building relationships.
- S-13A: I like the last bullet of the first part, where they talk about having ethicists and stuff, they are concerned with safety and putting our needs first.
- S-8A: If they had the technical description of what they are doing/using and then a "what this means" for education. An update on the plan and then finding ways to tell people what they are doing.
- S-14A: Do you know what they mean by projected inventories? To me that is thousands of different things.
- S-15A: The sheer volume of what they put into the repository.
- S-9A: I liked the annual update to their five year implementation plan. It makes it so that it's a bit more user friendly which makes me more comfortable.

- S-3A: When they say input from Canadians, are they talking about us, having small forums like this? Or are they talking about colleges, the legislature? How widespread are they going to be? Can a commoner get some information about this so they can voice their opinion? I think they should go to all levels.
- S-14A: I think the social research addresses that and how they will do it, but then you have to look at what scope.
- S-1A:e Seeing as there are only 4 nuclear provinces as of now, when they engage Canadians, are they just engaging Canadians in those 4 provinces or from coast to coast? We're talking about a 60 year plan here. What if other provinces decide to jump on the nuclear bandwagon? Is it just one repository or does each province have to find their own storage facility?
- Discussion Leader:** The proposal now is to have just one. They will look first at those provinces that produce the waste but they are open to considering other communities if they are interested.
- S-14A: Does this project take into account other provinces that might become nuclear provinces? Is this facility going to have the capacity to store an additional two provinces' load?
- S-15A: The last session gave us a description of how large it was. There's enough to handle extra.

### **Collaborative Design and Initiation of a Siting Process**

- Discussion Leader:** Does this seem like a plan that is headed in the right direction?
- S-2A: How are they going to engage individuals and organizations? What will be the process to identify who will be engaged?
- S-1A: The second bullets, they should include in those fact sheets a way for those interested to engage in the dialogue.
- S-2A: Who will have this in their hands?
- S-1A: Through the media, newspapers. Information tables with a team that can invite individuals to submit their names.

S-10A: What they might do, looking at NIMBY, they might go the other way by talking to environmentalists and the Federal government.

S-9A: When I was reading about facilitating conversations, would that be a town hall? Our MPPs and MPs always send out reports, maybe those could be the people who write up inserts so people could tear off and send back.

S-8A: At least in the nuclear provinces, people are aware. You can get it through your own MP and it will spread through word of mouth.

S-3A: I don't think they literally mean all Canadians. Who is prepared to sit down and listen to people talking about nuclear waste? Before I wasn't interested. Make it available for those that are interested.

S-6A: They clearly know where they want to put it. Why wouldn't they just find the spot where it is the farthest away from where people live?

S-8A: My understanding is that it will be deep underground in the mountains in solid rock. It doesn't seem to me that there will be towns set up on this place anyway.

**Discussion Leader:** As the organization moves forward, it has to figure out a process for choosing a site and get input for that. This is a crucial part of their work. The kinds of activities they've outlined here, do they make sense? Is this what you'd expect them to do?

S-14A: Definitely is in line with what I've talked about. One thing that kind of strikes me is the schedule draft for 2008 – 2012 is subject to readiness to proceed. What if we are not ready? Does it become 70-80 years? I'd like to see more info about how they can go through with this.

S-11A: They don't mention aboriginals, so I don't know if they are not included in the siting process.

**Discussion Leader:** Would it be fair for me to say, in general terms, that if the NWMO actually followed through, you'd be reasonably satisfied they are heading in the right direction.

Consensus that yes, Panelists would be satisfied.



## Remaining Strategic Objectives

- Discussion Leader:** There are 3 other objectives that we haven't discussed. Any particular comment or thoughts?
- S-6A: If anyone is going to make sure the plans go through financially, it should be the companies as they are the ones earning the money off of the fuel.
- S-8A: I read the financial surety one. It's going to cost \$5-6 billion and I don't recall the number from the last book and they said how much would be donated and it's not \$5 or 6 billion.

### **3. QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION, TECHNICAL REPRESENTATIVE**

#### **a. Explanation**

Technical representatives from the NWMO were present for a question and answer session at the request of the Panelists themselves. Panelists were twice given the option to have a technical representative present at the Panel discussion but preferred to wait until Phase Three as, until this point, felt that they still had more they needed to learn and discuss so that they were able to ask informed and insightful questions.

The technical representatives had approximately 90 minutes with the Panel to offer technical insight, institutional knowledge and a corporate perspective that, to date, only been present in written materials. Panelists were able to present their questions on a “first come first serve” basis with the Discussion Leader keeping a speaker’s list to ensure all were able to address the technical representative.

Technical representatives were not permitted to view the Panel before, nor after, the question and answer session. The Panel was informed of this so that they felt comfortable being frank before and after the appearance of the technical representative and did not feel required to censor themselves fearing observations.

As was the case in all Panel discussions with the NWMO technical representative, the majority of questions posted by Saskatoon Panelists fit clearly into five themes: safety, site selection, timeline, international comparison and transportation. For a full analysis of each theme, please refer to the Aggregate Report.

Below, please find questions posed by Scarborough Panelists to the technical representative from the NWMO.

## b. Questions & Discussions

- S-2A: We haven't seen any numbers from studies about the rate of cancer or birth defects as opposed to other areas in the province. I was wondering if any of those figures were available?
- S-15A: We've been discussing the geological formations we would use to contain nuclear waste. Other than the Canadian Shield, can you expand on any other types of rock that would be considered?
- S-14A: The report discusses alternative technologies for long-term management. Can you discuss some of those?
- S-10A: How will you compare Canadian technology of nuclear storage with other countries?
- S-9A: I was interested in the timeframe that they've been working with on this. Have they been researching? Are they moving ahead at a faster pace than we are?
- S-9A: These communities that want the facility in Sweden and Finland, why are they so eager? Do they get some sort of benefit? Is there a monetary benefit? Are they just happy it's being done properly?
- S-2A: We find that Canada's participating in cooperation agreements with several countries. Left out of the lists were countries such as the US and Russia. The countries we are working with, do they have the same basic nuclear technologies we have? Is there a specific reason we are not working with the US?
- S-2A: In talking about the different technologies, we have CANDU reactors and the US might have a different process, does that make a difference in terms of dealing with nuclear waste?
- S-14A: What transportation methods do other countries use? What are you considering for transportation in Canada?
- S-14A: So Canada already has that kind of technology, it just hasn't been utilized?

- S-17A: It's very interesting. If you've got countries like Sweden and France who's been doing it for such a long time, I feel like there's an apprehension with moving forward with it here. I don't know if that's because of the size of the country or politics, unlike the smaller European countries.
- S-15A: Before we were talking about repatriation of used fuel and then in this session, we talked about projected inventories. How will repatriation affect those inventories?
- S-10A: What are your thoughts on third world countries who try to use nuclear energy? What would be the impact on the world down the road?
- S-11A: What if they find a site but then people say no? What if it's not okay with the Aboriginal community?
- S-11A: What if a community doesn't volunteer?
- S-14A: You mentioned that Finland started working on their projects in the mid to late 1980s. Can you parallel how far along the Canadian process is in reference to that process? Can you give us some sort of timeline?
- S-14A: How far is the Finnish site from being complete?
- S-8A: We've heard a lot about types of geology, surveying, host communities. In the next 60 years, most people that would oppose would be dead. If it comes down to there being a best location in Canada, why would it be voluntary? You hear about the idea of the surveying and where these host communities will be, but you don't hear how they're going to connect. You don't hear about the actual types of geology.
- S-8A: Could they not have a map so you could tell ahead of time what would be suitable locations?
- S-6A: You have to know what you are applying for before you apply.
- S-3A: You said in Sweden they have 2 locations and they have started bore holes. In some places you say it takes 7-8 years to do the digging?

- S-3A: You can spend millions of dollars and many years and then have to walk away. If the first one is okay, they would start?
- S-15A: What do you foresee being the largest hurdle with the current technologies? Or is it simply just time?
- S-2A: We know what happens today with the used bundles. Around the nuclear plants there are median radioactive stuff used in housekeeping, rags and instruments and stuff that have to be disposed of. Are they treated much the same way as the bundles? What is the process for that?
- S-2A: Do we handle the nuclear waste from the smaller reactors? Is that handled the same way, through OPG?
- S-9A: It seems that there are a lot of different organizations and people involved and it sounds very costly. We've learned that OPG and other producers are responsible for creating a fund for the upkeep of all of this. Do they pay \$100 million for the boring or does that come out of our tax dollars?

# APPENDICES

- i. Navigator Personnel
- ii. Discussion Leader's Guide
- iii. Excerpts from Draft Implementation Plan

## I. PERSONNEL

### **JAMES STEWART WATT, SENIOR DISCUSSION LEADER**

Jaime Watt is Chair of Navigator, a Toronto-based research consulting firm that specializes in public opinion research, strategy and public policy development.

Prior to relocating to Toronto, he was, for ten years, Chair of Thomas Watt Advertising, a leading regional advertising agency and communications consulting firm based in London, Ontario.

A specialist in complex communications issues, Jaime has served clients in the corporate, professional services, not-for-profit and government sectors and has worked in every province in Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Central America, Korea and Kosovo.

He currently serves as Chair of Casey House, Canada's pioneer AIDS hospice, as well as Casey House Foundation and is a Vice President of the Albany Club. He is a director of the Dominion Institute, Woodrow Wilson Center's Canada Institute, TD Canada Trust's Private Giving Foundation, The Canadian Club of Toronto and The Clean Water Foundation. As well, he is a member of the President's Advisory Council for the Canadian Red Cross and is a member of the Executive Committee of Canadians for Equal Marriage. He was a founding Trustee and Co-chair of the Canadian Human Rights Trust and the Canadian Human Rights Campaign.

### **CHAD A. ROGERS, SUPPORTING DISCUSSION LEADER**

Chad Rogers is a Consultant at Navigator providing strategic planning and public opinion research advice to government, corporate and not-for-profit clients.

He has recently returned to Canada after working abroad with the Washington, DC based National Democratic Institute as director of their programs in Kosovo and Armenia respectively. Chad oversaw multi-million dollar democracy and governance assistance programs directed at political parties, parliaments and civil society organizations in newly democratic nations. He conducted high-level training with the political leadership of Armenia, Bosnia Herzegovina, Iraq, Kyrgyzstan, Macedonia, Moldova and Serbia.

Having previously worked on Parliament Hill as both a legislative and communications

assistant to Members of Parliament and Senators, he has an in-depth knowledge of Canada's Parliament and its committees, caucuses and procedures.

He is a board member of the Kosova Democratic Institute and is a member in good standing of the Public Affairs Association of Canada (PAAC) and the Market Research & Intelligence Association (MRIA). Chad has trained at the RIVA Qualitative Research Training Institute.

### **COURTNEY GLEN, PROJECT MANAGER**

Courtney Glen is a Consultant at Navigator assisting in public opinion research, strategic planning and public policy advice for government, corporate and not-for-profit clients.

Courtney most recently worked at the Fraser Institute as a junior policy analyst in health and pharmaceutical policy. In her time at the Institute, Courtney co-authored a major pharmaceutical policy paper and contributed to their monthly policy journal, *The Fraser Forum*.

Prior to that, Courtney worked as a researcher for the Scottish Labour Party in Edinburgh, Scotland, conducting an audit of the Parliament's Cross Party Group on International Development.

Courtney has a Masters in International and European Politics from the University of Edinburgh in Scotland and a Bachelor of Arts Honours degree in Political Science from the University of Guelph.

### **JOSEPH LAVOIE, PANEL MANAGER (FRANCOPHONE)**

Prior to joining Navigator, Joseph Lavoie worked at Citigroup Global Transaction Services where he improved communications within the Transfer Agency Systems department. Joseph achieved this objective via Web 2.0 technologies, which he previously leveraged in developing Santa's Journal, a successful viral marketing campaign that introduced Santa Claus to the world of blogging and podcasting.

Joseph has been active in numerous provincial and federal election campaigns; has provided political commentary for various websites and television/radio programs; and has served as the recruitment director for the Ontario Progressive Conservative Youth Association. In March 2007, Joseph was selected *Canada's Next Great Prime Minister* by Canadians as part of a scholarship program sponsored by Magna International, the Dominion Institute, and the Canada-US Fulbright Program. He currently serves on the Public Affairs/Marketing Team for the Toronto Symphony Volunteer Committee.

### **STEPHEN LEONARD, PANEL MANAGER (ANGLOPHONE)**

Prior to joining Navigator, Stephen attended the University of Guelph where he graduated with a Bachelor of Arts Honours degree in History. Throughout his undergraduate career, Stephen was an active member of the Canadian Forces Army Reserve in Toronto, which he left in June due to medical reasons as a Corporal.

Stephen is head Panel Manager and plays a vital role in the management and organization of the Citizen Panel project.



## II. DISCUSSION LEADERS GUIDE

### PHASE THREE CITIZEN PANELS

#### DISCUSSION LEADER'S GUIDE

#### ADVANCE OF DISCUSSION

##### 1. LOBBY EXERCISE

- **Review of Draft Implementation Plan**
  - Panelists are provided with the NWMO's Draft Implementation Plan to review in advance of the Panel discussion.
  - Panelists will be asked to “scan” or read the document quickly, indicating they are not expected to have digested it in detail for the discussion

#### PANEL DISCUSSION

##### 1. OPENING OF PANEL SESSION (0:00 – 0:05)

- Welcome back
- Reminder: Confidentiality of session
- Explanation of NWMO disclosure of proceedings
- Re-introduction of Transcriber
- Re-introduction of Parking lot
- Re-introduction of Panel Managers

##### 2. OVERVIEW OF AGENDA FOR SESSION (0:05 – 0:10)

- Document Review
  - Tonight we will review the Draft Implementation Plan
- Representative from NWMO
  - Guidance for questions

- Speakers list, allowed a limited number of questions, time permitting.
- Briefing details
  - Has read your Parking Lot questions and a summary of your discussions to date
  - Has not viewed a complete session

### **3. RE-INTRODUCTIONS (0:10 – 0:15)**

### **4. GENERAL DISCUSSION (0:15 – 0:20)**

- I am wondering if you thought more about the NWMO after our last session
- Has anyone read, seen or heard anything about NWMO in the media since our last discussion?

### **5. DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (0:20 – 1:35)**

- When you arrived, you were given a copy of the NWMO's Draft Implementation Plan to review.
- This Implementation Plan lays out NWMO's thinking about how it will move ahead with its work. In your opinion, overall, do you think NWMO is moving in the right direction?
- In the Draft Implementation Plan, the NWMO provides a detailed overview of all 7 of their strategic objectives. I would like to concentrate on 4 objectives that Panels have previously rated as important and appropriate for the NWMO:
  - Building Relationships
  - Building Knowledge
  - Review, Adjust and Validate Plans
  - Collaborative Design and Initiation of a Siting Process

**[For each of the above 4 Strategic Objectives]**

**[Give Panelists a few minutes to review each objective]**

- Discuss the objective after review.
  - Do you think that plans are moving in the right direction?

- When you reviewed the Draft Implementation Plan earlier, you will have seen that there were 7 strategic objectives in total. I'd like you to refer to the remaining 3 objectives in the Draft Implementation Plan:
  - Financial Surety
  - Governance Structure
  - Building an Implementing Organization

**[Give Panelists a few minutes to review the remaining 3 objectives in the Plan – all marked with same pink colour tags]**

- Do any of the other strategic objectives now strike you as more important?
- Do you have any other comments about the Draft Implementation Plan?
- You are free to take the Draft Implementation Plan with you after this evening's session.

#### **6. NWMO REPRESENTATIVE Q & A (1:35 – 2:50)**

- We have a lot of work to do here this evening, and have allocated just over an hour for these questions. If we do not finish in that time we will defer to our parking lot or we will look at bringing the NWMO representative back either in person or by teleconference.

**[SHORT BIO INTRODUCTION OF PERSONNEL]**

- The individual will not be watching you before or after this session, and they will not see a tape.
- Do you have any questions?
- Guidelines for questions

#### **7. WRAP-UP (2:55 – 3:00)**

### **III. EXCERPTS FROM THE DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN USED AS INDIVIDUAL WORK SHEETS**

#### **BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS**

**The NWMO will continue to build long-term relationships with interested Canadians and Aboriginal people and involve them in setting future direction.**

In 2008 we will:

- Undertake a communication audit to support the design of our communication strategy;
- Rebuild the NWMO web site to enhance accessibility;
- Develop and implement a strategy to more effectively engage youth in the implementation of APM;
- Work with national, provincial and regional Aboriginal organizations to establish protocols to support Aboriginal involvement in engagement; and
- Establish a corporate citizenship program.

In the period 2008-2012 we will:

- Continue to identify speaking engagements, community-based presentations and media opportunities to develop awareness about NWMO activities;
- Develop communications materials about NWMO, APM, the project and other issues as required;
- Use many tools, including multi-party dialogues, citizen panels, topical workshops and web-based surveys, to invite input from Canadians and Aboriginal people in regional
- and community-based associations, interest groups, researchers, industry, governments and the general public;
- Broaden NWMO's relationships in the four nuclear provinces to include municipal, regional and provincial associations; Seek advice on engagement of Aboriginal people from the Elders' Forum and Niigani, the working group established by the NWMO Elders' Forum;
- Seek meetings with editorial boards and other media;
- Continue to provide regular updates to provincial and federal government ministers, departments and agencies;
- Maintain protocols with interested organizations, including Aboriginal Peoples; and
- Develop strategies to address knowledge-building as the needs are identified.

## Building Knowledge - Technical and Social Research

The NWMO will advance research to broaden its foundation of technical and social knowledge, bringing to bear the most advanced Canadian and international expertise to support implementation of Adaptive Phased Management.

### Technical Research

During 2008-2012 we will:

- For the purpose of assessing potential candidate sites, develop the capability to conduct geoscientific aspects of site feasibility assessments, including sub-surface investigations and evaluations, in both crystalline and sedimentary settings;
- Maintain safety assessment system models and data suitable for supporting site feasibility studies;
- Continue to monitor developments in Canada and internationally related to regulatory aspects of used fuel management facilities;
- Prepare an annual report documenting alternative technologies for long-term management of used fuel including reprocessing, partitioning and transmutation; and
- Continue to participate in cooperation agreements with national radioactive waste management organizations around the world, specifically, SKB (Sweden), Posiva (Finland), Nagra (Switzerland) and ANDRA (France). These agreements provide the framework for sharing research information and participating in joint research and development programs in underground facilities such as the Äspö Hard Rock Laboratory in Sweden.

By the end of 2008 we will:

- In the area of geosciences, develop generic geo-scientific siting criteria; and
- In engineering, complete evaluation of container placement methods for the conceptual design of a deep geological repository in crystalline or sedimentary rock; and
- Appoint members to an Independent Technical Review Group and convene the inaugural meeting.
- By June 2009 we will develop the capability to review transportation options to a used fuel long-term management facility for various locations in the four nuclear provinces.

By the end of 2010 we will:

- Develop an improved model for uranium dioxide (UO<sub>2</sub>) dissolution rates under deep geological repository conditions;
- Evaluate conceptual designs for optional centralized underground storage of used fuel; and

By 2011 we will support safety assessment and licensing, through completion of two illustrative safety cases, one for a deep geological repository in crystalline rock and one in sedimentary rock.

By December 2011 we will maintain a program to provide assurance of integrity of used fuel while in storage, including completing evaluation of delayed hydride cracking of used CANDU fuel bundles under dry storage conditions.

## **Social Research**

In the period 2008-2012 we will:

- Commission background papers to support the collaborative design of the siting process, drawing on experiences in Canada and abroad;
- Convene capacity-building workshops on selected implementation issues;
- Convene Citizen Panels in each of the four nuclear provinces;
- Convene workshops on Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge;
- Complete telephone surveys for input on siting design and other implementation issues;
- Conduct deliberative surveys on the web site;
- Collaborate with interested academics in Canada and internationally to bring the best knowledge and practices of social and community-based process to NWMO's work; and
- Apply the ethical and social framework developed for the study phase to guide Implementation and report regularly on activities against this framework.

## Review, Adjust and Validate Plans

**The NWMO will continually review, adjust and validate plans against factors such as advances in technical learning, evolving societal expectations and values, and changes in energy and environmental policies.**

In order to facilitate the process of dialogue and adaptation in response to the changes in projected fuel quantities and types, we will:

- Publish on an annual basis information on current and future potential inventories of used fuel volumes and types;
- Seek input from Canadians on how NWMO's plans should be amended to accommodate current and projected inventories; and
- Adapt and develop plans on how to go forward against the framework of the Strategic Objectives and with the guidance of our many advisors including ethicists. Specifically, we will consider the implications of used fuel from nuclear new build in our engagement program, in our technical and social research programs, in our financing formula, on the size and structure of the organization and governance, and on the design of a process for site selection.

We are committed to reporting on developments in technology, societal expectations and energy and environmental policy on an ongoing basis through many communication routes, including:

- Posting research papers and the results of engagement activities on the NWMO web site;
- NWMO Triennial Report to Minister of Natural Resources and public;
- NWMO Annual Report to Minister of Natural Resources and the public; and
- Annual update to the NWMO five-year implementation plan.

## Collaborative Design and Initiation of a Siting Process

**The NWMO will proceed with the collaborative design of a siting process, supported by a public engagement program, and subsequent initiation of a siting process.**

In 2008 we will:

- Prepare a discussion document to initiate and facilitate conversations with Canadians on the design of the process for selecting a site. The document will, among other things, present an initial framework of objectives and principles and key issues that people will likely wish to consider; and
- Prepare information materials, such as fact sheets, to support a public dialogue on the design of a process for site selection.

In 2008-2012, subject to confirmation of readiness to proceed with each step, we will:

- Engage interested individuals and organizations in a dialogue on the design of a process for selecting a site to invite diverse perspectives;
- Draft a siting process proposal, including preliminary criteria, based on input from the previous round of dialogue;
- Test and validate the draft siting process proposal using a public engagement process;
- Develop supporting information and an education and awareness program; and
- Initiate the process for selecting a site subject to validation of the siting process proposal and readiness of the supporting engagement and information program.



RESEARCH | STRATEGY | RESULTS™

