

NWMO Citizen Panels Report, Phase III: Panel Eight

NWMO SR-2008-18

July 2008

Navigator Ltd.

nwmo

NUCLEAR WASTE
MANAGEMENT
ORGANIZATION

SOCIÉTÉ DE GESTION
DES DÉCHETS
NUCLÉAIRES



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

Tel: 416-934-9814
Web: 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 Toronto, Ontario

NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION
TORONTO, 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 Toronto, Ontario in May 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 Toronto, Ontario Phase Three Citizen Panel was held on May 1, 2008 at a neutral third party facility in Toronto.

The Panel was held over three hours from 6PM – 9PM with 15 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 Toronto Panelists by Panelist identifier code:

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
|  | City: Toronto Age: 25-34 Gender: Male Occupation: Student |  | City: Toronto Age: 55-64 Gender: Male Occupation: Self-employed, semi-retired |
| Panelist: T-1A | | Panelist: T-3A | |
|  | City: Toronto Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, accountant |  | City: Toronto Age: 65+ Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, watch maker |
| Panelist: T-6A | | Panelist: T-7A | |
|  | City: Toronto Age: 45-54 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, translator |  | City: Toronto Age: 55-64 Gender: Female Occupation: Retired |
| Panelist: T-8A | | Panelist: T-9A | |
|  | City: Toronto Age: 45-54 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, business analyst |  | City: Toronto Age: 55-64 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, project manager |
| Panelist: T-10A | | Panelist: T-11A | |
|  | City: Toronto Age: 35-44 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, social worker |  | City: Toronto Age: 35-44 Gender: Male Occupation: Unemployed |
| Panelist: T-12A | | Panelist: T-13A | |
|  | City: Toronto Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed part-time, admin assistant |  | City: Toronto Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Unemployed |
| Panelist: T-14A | | Panelist: T-15A | |
|  | City: Toronto Age: 45-54 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, financial consultant |  | City: Toronto Age: 45-54 Gender: Female Occupation: Self-employed, psychotherapist |
| Panelist: T-16A | | Panelist: T-18A | |
|  | City: Toronto Age: 35-44 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, engineer | | |
| Panelist: T-19A | | | |

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 Toronto and stands alone as a record of the Citizen Panel discussion on May 1, 2008. A larger Aggregate Report on this wave of Panel discussions, including the Panels in Kingston, Montreal, Sault Ste. Marie, Scarborough, 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 Toronto 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 Toronto 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.

The issue of educating youth was raised a number of times in the Toronto Panel discussion. Many Toronto Panelists expressed their desire to see the NWMO effectively engage youth as it moves forward. One Panelist, in particular, felt it was very important to start educating youth and facilitating discussion at a much younger age, perhaps by building discussion programs at different school levels. In the words of this Panelist,

Actually...build programs for different school levels. Public school kids should be learning where the power comes from. Then high schools [learn] a little bit more, this is how it works. Then university, you'll start getting some interest, this is something they'll want to get into. Start discussion groups at that level.

Some Toronto Panelists struggled with the extent to which input from the general public should play a part in the NWMO's decision-making process. While these Panelists acknowledged that it is important to educate and inform the public, some expressed concern that the NWMO's public consultation process was "overkill", as the average Canadian is not adequately educated or informed to make decisions or provide credible input on the implementation process. In the words of one Toronto Panelist,

...an average person doesn't have the technical knowledge to evaluate whether this is valid or not...it's overkill. I don't think an average person needs to know everything. As long as they know that it exists and perhaps they have qualified people to implement it, run it and all that. As long as people are satisfied that responsible people are in charge.

Another Toronto Panelist felt the same way, stating the following,

...I know it's important to have a relationship with community and research groups and Aboriginal Peoples, but sometimes people don't have enough knowledge to see what the added value of this is. So what kind of valuable input can the public give?

However, not all Toronto Panelists shared this point of view. One Toronto Panelist felt the NWMO's commitment to community input and collaboration was not only appreciated but crucial to the organization's commitment to transparency as it moves forward with its mandate,

...I think that the community input is vital. Because otherwise, what is the point of putting forward a process that you're saying is transparent? You're saying you want community input and then having everything already set...you're wasting taxpayers time and money if it's already a fait accompli.

Another Toronto Panelist agreed, acknowledging the necessity of involving the general public as, in the mind of this Panelist, public consultation is central to ensuring a social license is obtained as well as a technical one as the organization moves forward with siting,

As far as technical aspects and safety, the experts are really important. But the public is important in having their input into how the community feels about having the site where they're proposing...and what the social impact [will be] of having the site where they're having it. It's two-tiered.

The topic of international collaboration was raised by a number of Panelists in the Toronto Panel discussion, specifically in reference to the NWMO's commitment to research and international collaboration. Some Panelists were pleased to see how prominent a role technical and social research plays in the NWMO's plans to move forward. As well, one Panelist in particular was pleased to hear of the NWMO commitment to collaboration with international partners, such as Sweden and Finland; countries that are further ahead in their own site selection processes. This Panelist felt that international collaboration would be of great use to the NWMO as it could learn and possibly emulate those processes that have been successful for other countries,

[The Draft Implementation Plan] has a lot of research, including a lot of international [collaboration]. We don't have to reinvent the wheel, we'll be able to use their knowledge and they'll be able to use ours.

Some scepticism was evident among a few Toronto Panelists when the topic of siting was raised. For these few Panelists, this largely stemmed from what they perceived to be a repeated "singling out" of Aboriginal Peoples in all NWMO materials. This repeated mention of Aboriginal Peoples seemed to result in a belief among these Panelists that the site selected would inevitably be on Crown Land, even after repeated explanation that the NWMO has yet to identify any possible sites. In the words of one Toronto Panelist,

We know that they want to put it on aboriginal land. Because otherwise they would not talk about them constantly.

This sentiment was echoed by another Toronto Panelist,

...it's going to be somewhere on Crown land, or native land basically...I think we're all sort of getting the idea that it's something along that line. Because the aboriginals are constantly being mentioned.

The inherent flexibility offered by APM was well-received by a number of Toronto Panelists, many of whom felt far more confident in the process that lie ahead as a result. One Panelist appreciated the notion that steps could always be retraced and new technologies accommodated should circumstances change or technology evolve,

I think not all information is known and the organization is flexible to change directions midstream if need be, like if there's a new use for the fuel. That makes me feel confident.

Another Toronto Panelist felt similarly, expressing their appreciation for the NWMO's commitment to safety as it moves forward. This Panelist was pleased with the NWMO's openness to change and improvement over time,

...I like that there are safety assessment models, contingency plans. They're not just going down one path...they'll continue to look at options even after they've chosen one. I think it looks good.

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 Lanny Cardow, 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: When you see the kind of things they outlined, when you look at what's on this sheet, and the kinds of activities that the organization is going to undertake, do you get the sense they're heading in the right direction, or are they on the wrong track?

T-10A: What is the purpose of building these relationships?

Discussion Leader: Do you have any sense?

T-10A: I thought probably they want to get input. Is it only getting input to educate people? I know it's important to have relationships with community and research groups and Aboriginal Peoples, but sometimes people don't have enough knowledge to see what is the added value of this. So what kind of valuable input can the public give?

T-9A: I think it's overkill. An average person doesn't have the technical knowledge to evaluate whether this is valid or

not... it's overkill. I don't think an average person needs to know everything... as long they know that it exists and perhaps that they have people qualified to implement it, run it, and all that. As long as people are satisfied that responsible people are in charge.

Discussion Leader: Do you think that as long as they say that they want to help build relationships with “interested Canadians” that helps qualify those people?

T-9A: Yes, there should be an address where interested Canadians can contact them or go to the Web site... an ad on the TV for instance, referring to a Web site. Interested Canadians will do it. If it's not for interested Canadians, it doesn't really matter. There are so many of these panels, and so on. I think it's overkill.

Discussion Leader: So when they say that this is designed for “interested Canadians”, does that make sense to you?

T-9A: Yes, but with so many panels and all that, I think this is overkill.

T-1A: If I recall from the discussion groups, a lot of this is public affairs based on the idea of creating a positive environment toward nuclear energy, and management of nuclear waste, the types of things people fear, because a lot of people are worried that people will move away from nuclear technologies and might go to something else. They want to promote these technologies.

Discussion Leader: What makes you think that this is what they're doing?

T-1A: The meetings, the public disclosure, etc ... it seems like they're trying to make this a public affairs [exercise].

T-16A: I am puzzled by what this means: “establish a corporate citizenship program”. What the hell is that?

T-11A: They want money from corporations.

T-12A: Corporate citizenship is when a corporation behaves in a responsible way for its employees and the environment ... that's what it's supposed to be.

Discussion Leader: T-12A's right. It's when a corporation takes a holistic responsibility to the community. Corporate citizenship

programs are about ways corporations behave. Some people call it the “double bottom line.” It’s a well-developed concept but we don’t have to know a lot about it here.

T-18A: [Corporate citizenship is] the way their ethics are... their guidelines.

Discussion Leader: So when we talk about building relationships, T-9A says it’s overkill. Other people? Do you think they’re heading in the wrong direction?

T-14A: They’re on the right track. They’re trying to say “we’re being open, transparent, this is the technology, and we have no choice. If we’re going to meet energy requirements, and more than adequately...because people expect that when I turn the switch on, it had better come on. This is where we’re going and for people who want to listen this is what we’re going to share with you.”

T-18A: I don’t think it’s overkill at all. How are they going to engage kids?

Discussion Leader: Any ideas?

T-15A: Bring it in the high schools. Actually, junior school, grades 7 and 8. You seem to have more of an interest in 7/8 than you do in 9/10.

T-19A: Actually, if you build programs for different school levels...Public school kids should be learning where the power comes from. Then high schools, [they’ll learn] a little bit more, this is how it works. Then university, you’ll start getting some interest; this is something they’ll want to get into. Start discussion groups at that level.

T-9A: ...and then potential careers down the road.

Discussion Leader: Would people here agree that the idea of finding ways to effectively engage youth is a good idea?

T-14A: You have to!

T-1A: Based on the mandate of what they’re doing, this is all very necessary.

- T-18A: I just wanted to address the [dialogue] with national and regional aboriginal groups. I was just wondering to what extent they've already been doing that? That is one of the most important factors in this given the aboriginal communities' relationship with the land, and how that is going to be worked around in terms of aboriginal values.
- Discussion Leader:** Anyone else?
- T-8A: They want to rebuild their Web site, but I think their Web site is perfect as it is.
- T-3A: Well everything has to be upgraded - website, communications, etc. In the end though, to say you're going to deal with aboriginals, well, you're going to have to deal with them even if you don't want to, aren't you? They're acting as if they're doing a big thing when actually, they have to. It's not really a choice they have to do, or not do. They have to. It's not going to be in a factory in Hamilton – it's going to be somewhere on Crown land, or native land basically.
- Discussion Leader:** But we don't know that, right?
- T-3A: No, but I think we're all sort of getting the idea that it's something along that line. Because the aboriginals are constantly being mentioned.
- Discussion Leader:** I would just caution that they are not even close to deciding where this would go. The only thing I've heard is that they are going to make sure that it goes in to "suitable rock".
- T-3A: No, they want it to be totally transparent, and we're part of establishing that, I understand.
- T-8A: We know that they want to put it on aboriginal land? Because otherwise they would not talk about them constantly.
- T-15A: Because it's always native land... a lot of things are popping up on native land Caledonia... and there's the new one, Deseronto.
- T-8A: Why don't they put in on Crown land? That's my question.
- Discussion Leader:** This is the point I was just making, and it's a very important point. The NWMO has no idea where this is

going to go. It would be wrong for people to leave here thinking that decision for siting has been chosen.

Building Knowledge: Technical and Social Research

Discussion Leader: I'm wondering from this sheet – which outlines some of the things the organization will do in terms of technical and social research – whether this seems like the right direction? Maybe not quite what you had in mind? How does this stack up?

T-7A: I think the overall approach is right, however I would suggest that I probably would be interested in a couple of salient features: one is the financial aspect of it, and what the insurance industry would think. And much more than that would be the aspect of safety. So I think we probably should be educated in the dangerous aspects.

Discussion Leader: I hear what you're saying T-7A, but I mean the research?

T-7A: In general it's correct.

Discussion Leader: Other thoughts on research program as it's laid out?

T-19A: One of the things I noticed is that they're going to get the information from everywhere. Whether they use it or not they're going to publish findings. Again it goes back to transparency: these are the items that are available, this is the direction that we're going. They're not saying that "this is the direction we're taking because it's the best" and then saying nothing else. They're saying "well, these are the options that we've looked at and we find this one to be the most viable for us..." They're giving you all the information that's available. It goes back to that transparency thing. It's not whether people want that information, it's that if people want it, it's there.

Discussion Leader: So that's good?

T-19A: That's good.

T-13A: I like the way it was structured. It breaks things down as to what, and to whom. It makes people comfortable.

Discussion Leader: Beyond just how it's structured, do these seem like the right things to be doing?

- T-13A: I would think so. Knowledge is key, and the more people know what's going on and what's happening, the better.
- T-9A: I think they're big on timelines, plans, hiring people, I think they're right on.
- Discussion Leader:** You had concern that the first one was overkill...
- T-9A: My concern with overkill was about too much information for people who weren't interested. I feel that knowledge – you can't skimp on that. You have to have it.
- T-12A: I like how it looks. It has a lot of research, including a lot of international [collaboration]. We don't have to reinvent the wheel, we'll be able to use their knowledge and they'll be able to use ours. And also I like that there are safety assessment models, contingency plans. They're not going down just one path ... they'll continue to look at options even after they've chosen one. I think it looks good.
- Discussion Leader:** There's two parts to it: there's technical research side and there's the social research side: How do you think about the two?
- T-12A: I think that the social research side, that's a new corporate mentality... I think that's good.
- T-11A: Absolutely. It's all-encompassing to me. They're looking into siting, they're going to take care of business by making sure that's what's put in there is well taken-care of. It's a great proposal.
- Discussion Leader:** Do you think they have got their act together?
- T-11A: Yeah, I do. They really thought it through. Not just finding a spot and dumping the stuff in there... but I like the idea of transparency and how they're doing it. Consulting youth, because its going to be a long project, and by the time they get through it, people are going to be adults, so they need to buy into it and understand what's happening.
- T-14A: In the world of globalism and all that sort of thing... with nuclear technology... what's Canadian [should] stay Canadian. I don't want people coming over here and borrowing from us, I don't want us going over there. We can do it. We don't need anyone. No sharing agreements,

no partnering. What's Canadian should stay Canadian. That would make me feel better.

Discussion Leader: You should make a point of speaking to the technical representative about that. Anyone else we haven't heard from?

T-6A: Like T-12A said, they were assessing potential sites and doing their research and getting the information from the other countries that do have the higher knowledge. Looks like they're going to do more citizen panels, and complete telephone surveys for siting design. I don't know what they're trying to get from that.

T-9A: That's what I thought was overkill.

T-1A: They're trying to create a system which is flexible and will remain flexible... not trying to pick a individual site, but create a system in which they will be picking sites, continuing to change, upgrading their system, and how they will actually deal with the nuclear waste and maintain their industry, make all Canadians happy. This is actually very, very important.

Review, Adjust, and Validate Plans

Discussion Leader: What do you think?

T-9A: I have a question: "seek input from Canadians" – is that an average Canadian or informed Canadians?

T-18A: I had the exact same question.

T-9A: If you ask an average citizen, I'd say yes. But the rest looks OK.

T-12A: I think it's a new way of presenting yourself. I think that not all the information is known, and the organization is flexible to change directions midstream if need be, like if there's a new use for the fuel. That makes me feel confident.

T-10A: I'm still thinking. "Seek input from Canadians." Specifically from where? Interested people? I think that's not enough. They should make it more knowledgeable and to have more people interested.

T-3A: I think they have a flexible way of doing it. Any government could change and they might say: “no more nuclear plants at all”. That’s conceivable, not probable. So they’re opening themselves up to handle any circumstances that the government of the day could come forward with.

T-6A: I think they need to get it out there more, to get feedback. We get flyers all the time but no one has ever heard of this. They need to put pamphlets in community centres.

Discussion Leader: I hear you, and I will make a strong recommendation to the NWMO on the communications side, but under this strategic objective it’s about something different, trying to be responsive to move forward, but also be open to learning, scientific advancement. Putting aside the communications part, do you think this is delivering on that?

T-11A: Absolutely. How much more could you ask? They’re going to review, adjust, and validate plans against factors such as advances. I mean, how much more could you ask? I think this is actually surprisingly great.

Discussion Leader: Anyone support that, or have contrary view?

T-7A: I have trouble envisioning the average Canadian really trusting these fine details. I think that what would perk up their interest would be if they would hear more about coming out into the open...transparency. I think what this corporation should do for a good effective PR relationship job is educate the people of that aspect of the industry which concerns them, bottom line. And that’s their fears.

Discussion Leader: Let’s set aside PR for a moment... I’d like to talk about this particular strategic objective, which is on this green sheet. Some people will say that this is a reasonable approach?

T-13A: I like the way they structured it. They give you a little bit, and don’t go into too much detail.

Discussion Leader: Beyond how it’s structured, are these the right activities or not?

T-18A: I think these are [structured well], and I’m a little bit of a stickler for ethics and the fact that that is something they’ve specifically mentioned, they will have advisors specifically for ethics, makes me happy.

T-10A: I think it's a good introduction to keep it adaptable... flexible for change

Collaborative Design and Initiation of a Siting Process

Discussion Leader: The NWMO has outlined some of the things it wants to do in the medium term. What do you think, is this a good plan? On the right track? Off in the wrong direction?

T-14A: Take that word "fair" out. Fair is a bad word ... I think "equitable" is a good word.

Discussion Leader: What's the difference between "fair" and "equitable"?

T-14A: Equitable is more a compromise, whereas fair implies a far higher standard than equitable. And everyone has a different perspective of fair, whereas people are more likely to agree on equitable.

Discussion Leader: Why do you think that fair is an inappropriate standard?

T-14A: Because there's no such thing as fairness.

T-9A: Shouldn't they do some initial studies of possible sites and then that way when they talk with people they'll have an idea of where this thing is going? Not final studies, but initial studies. 5-10 possible sites?

Discussion Leader: Hold on to that question for the technical representative.

T-9A: It would be more meaningful if they had something in mind.

T-10A: Who will decide the site, finally?

Discussion Leader: The NWMO will decide the site.

T-10A: Who will be in the discussion? Is the public? Some organization? The experts?

Discussion Leader: Who do you think should be involved?

T-10A: I think for sure the experts must be. Because, if you want to have me to have the discussion, I cannot give much valuable input. I think experts, for sure, have to have opinion in choosing the site. Not the general public.

T-18A: As far as technical aspects and the safety, the experts are really important. But the public is important in having their input into how the community feels about having the site where they're proposing the site... and what the social impact of having the site where they're having it. It's two-tiered.

T-10A: I agree public input is important but I still think the experts' opinions should be weighted even more.

T-12A: It seems what they want to do is give some information to the public so they enough information to participate in the discussion. And I like the idea of a fact sheet. I used to canvass for Greenpeace, and if you give people a fact sheet they can actually hold a pretty reasonable conversation afterwards. They also know what to look for in the media. So I think it's a good idea to give them a little information so then they can have some input. But I agree, in the end the experts will decide in the end.

Discussion Leader: But do you agree with the approach, or is it a bit off the beam?

T-16A: I think it's a bit off. They have to pick, let's say, ten possible sites, and then after that engage the local people, and say "this is why this would be a good site ... these are the advantages and disadvantages." I guess money will be involved. But I guess just randomly picking people where their community or part of the province wouldn't remotely be involved, it kind of wastes time.

Discussion Leader: Why do you think they would take all comers even if they were inappropriate?

T-16A: It said they'd invite interested parties to design the process for selecting the site. But if it's just the process to select the site, it seems, there's something wrong with that to me... it's something of an abstract notion? The experts are the only ones who would know where it can be.

T-7A: I think that's right!

Discussion Leader: In order to get there, we're going to need a process. That has technical inputs, community inputs, whatever. It was the design of that process.

- T-16A: I don't know. For some reason, there is something awkward about that.
- T-9A: It's just that we don't know what we're talking about here. It's putting the horse in front of the cart.
- T-16A: That's right.
- T-13A: Everything's open. Nothing's finalized. Some of us want the end part first.
- T-9A: No, we just want to know what you're talking about. Whether it's going to be next door to Toronto? It's going to affect different communities...and depending who's making the decision it's probably going to be biased on the opinion.
- T-13A: Because nobody wants it in their backyard.
- T-16A: It's just the syntax maybe that's awkward here. Selecting a site to invite...I don't know. I just don't think the wording is all that good. "Engage interested individuals and organizations in a process for selecting a site..." There's clause overkill here or something. It's awkward.
- T-6A: I'm just reading the book part of it: "The site selection process that emerges must meet the expectations of Canadians", but, I mean, what are the expectations we're dealing with?
- T-19A: What are the expectations right now? Because the stuff is being stored somewhere right now, not at some new site. So what are our expectations as citizens right now?
- T-6A: That's ... right ... I mean, they must meet the expectations...
- T-10A: Is the organization going to give a feasibility study report for possible site selection?
- Discussion Leader:** That's a good question to ask the technical representative when he comes.
- T-18A: I have been involved in other committees, not necessarily on something as serious as this, but I think that the community input is vital. Because otherwise, what is the point of putting forward a process that you're saying is

transparent and you're saying you want community input [on] and then having everything already set, knowing you're wasting taxpayers' time and money if it's already a *fait accompli*. The way they're talking about it as a process is actually a positive thing. Again, I think obviously the experts will present the technical information they already know what the proper sites are, and then they have to deal with the politics of it, the community.

T-1A:

Do you actually create a process, and then have people arguing about whether or not that process is correct and adding to it, or do you go through the effort to have everybody give their input concerning that process? Part of the argument, "is it going to be here, is it going to be there, is it going to be in my backyard" is part of those types of inputs and things that would actually be considered when creating that process. So they're trying to be much more open and create a much more flexible system rather than saying "this is it" and then blinding people to certain other alternatives.

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 Toronto Panelists to the technical representative from the NWMO.

b. Questions & Discussions

- T-11A: Has any other country gone before us and established anything close to what we're expecting to see by the year 2020, 2012, or what have you?
- T-14A: Does nuclear energy leave a carbon footprint? That we can be taxed on later?
- T-1A: How are the issues different in Canada based on our size [versus Sweden, Finland]?
- T-9A: Has Canada identified any possible sites? Like 10 or 15 or whatever? Where are the possible sites?
- T-16A: Can you tell me why this process timeline is 60 years or something? Why would it take so long? By having a 60 year timeline, it can cause it to never happen, because the people who are working there at the moment aren't responsible for the final result. So it would be very easy to just keep postponing it and postponing it. So I don't see why it can't be done in 4 or 5 years? Why does it have to take 60 years?
- T-11A: With the Swedes having the two areas that are viable, aside from a geological evaluation, I expect location and transportation costs have a lot to do with it, but what else would be a consideration for one to win the bid over the other?
- T-8A: Why do they want it?
- T-9A: Do you expect the same response in Canada? People wanting the site?
- T-15A: You have a lot of land up that way... and rock. The Bruce Peninsula is all rock and a lot of space... that's one thing that always stuck in my head: Kincardine, Owen Sound.
- T-10A: Will it be really safe in the geological repository? Do you think there will be some unrealized side effects? Harmful effects to health? For the nuclear stuff, I'm not 100% confident with this storage method. Probably I'm wrong.
- T-16A: What do they do in France? I heard that France isn't doing all that great a job at handling nuclear waste.

- T-7A: As far as nuclear waste management industry, what is the difference, from a safety perspective, of crystalline and sedimentary rock?
- T-11A: A consideration for me is the transportation of materials to the repository. I found it interesting that Sweden is going to be transporting theirs by ship. That concerns me more than by road, because if it goes down, it goes down. What type of ship would transport such a thing to ensure that if it went down, it never split open and contaminates the ocean?
- T-16A: Because we're so spread out, from Saskatchewan to New Brunswick, is it conceivable that they would have two repository sites?
- T-16A: Due to the transportation distances... costs? It would take quite a bit of transportation to move from New Brunswick [to Saskatchewan], Would they be looking for a place halfway?
- T-11A: Like Ontario, you mean?
- T-11A: When you speak about licensing, what does that mean?
- T-7A: How long is the lifespan of the reactor? And after that, what is involved in decommissioning?
- T-7A: Where would you store these radioactive parts?
- T-9A: Would it be helpful to identify some sites before you start this discussion of where this site is going to be?
- T-18A: There's a lot of reference to aboriginal communities, and I'm wondering why that is so strong. Is it because there is a sense that it may be located in an aboriginal community?
- T-7A: If a company really educates the affected community... first of all the nature of the fuel and then the process of safety... the issue of non-consent would never appear. Someone would have to really be ignorant or superstitious to think this technology would affect the environment.
- T-15A: Informing the people – let's say you walk into Owen Sound – how will you let them know you're there? Will you call a town meeting to talk about that there's a space of land there? How do you go about making it public? Do you

make it Canada-wide public, like going on W5? I hadn't heard about any of this until I got a phone call. So I've been educated since being here. But there are a lot of people who have no idea about any of this. So if you look at any spots in Ontario, you're going most likely to go outside Toronto... am I right?

T-15A: But getting them to even know who you are, and what the process is...

T-16A: Where's that nuclear waste site in New Mexico?

T-16A: Oh, I was there last year... I didn't realize there was nuclear!

T-16A: What's at Yucca Mountain though? Isn't there some controversy with Nevada or something?

T-7A: Was it an issue of safety with regards to it being an earthquake-prone area?

T-12A: Have any other countries used a similar process as the U.S. that is done just chosen, and then put it in there? Instead of a consultative process?

T-14A: It's more a comment: I feel safer with nuclear waste being managed in a repository than I do about carbon. Because they're going to start pumping carbon into natural repositories. I'm uneasy about that. Nuclear energy I feel a lot better about.

T-3A: What about the financial end of all this? How is this going to be guaranteed? How is this funding going to be guaranteed over 35 years? Will it come from taxpayers' pockets?

T-13A: I'm just amazed... it's not just being built, and then left. I wasn't aware it's being built all the way down. I didn't know there were so many procedures in order to get it done.

T-8A: Will it be safe against terrorists? Or a bomb?

T-10A: In the site selection process, if there are two sides: one side is community volunteer and the other is geologists point of view, which is more suitable?

- T-19A: You talked about the rock being the safest place for it. But it's not just rock being used to build this thing. How much study has been done on the other building materials to see how long they'll last? I mean concrete? There's been talk about Chernobyl and the concrete breaking down at a faster rate than they thought. What about the other materials used?
- T-9A: So once this thing is built and you deposit the waste in there, do you seal it, like a mine, or is it open so that you can visit it any time?
- T-9A: But how would you retrieve it?
- T-7A: The point should be made that it's infinitely easier to store the spent fuel than to operate a nuclear reactor. This is a feature that should be emphasized, that it's far more dangerous to operate a reactor. This should be a point you make.
- T-16A: One thing I want to ask is it seems to be there's much more of a receptive climate to more nuclear facilities because they don't produce greenhouse gasses. Am I right about that?
- T-16A: Could the world run out of uranium any time soon?
- T-18A: Why do we hear so much opposition to nuclear energy because of fears, but we don't hear a lot about fears for disposal? Why do you think that is?
- T-9A: Are there others who are not following these processes?
- T-1A: When we were talking about the transportation safety, we know from the past things like the Titanic, Exxon Valdez, no matter what we try to do for safety, there is always a contingent factor. What are the kinds of contingency plans we have in place if there is a spill, if there is an accident?

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 (UO₂) 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™

