

NWMO Citizen Panels Report, Phase III: Panel Three

NWMO SR-2008-13

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 Regina, Saskatchewan

NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION
REGINA, SASKATCHEWAN 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 Regina, Saskatchewan on April 29, 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 Regina, Saskatchewan Phase Three Citizen Panel was held on April 29, 2008 at a neutral third party facility in Regina.

The Panel was held over three hours from 6PM – 9PM with 16 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 Regina Panelists by Panelist identifier code:

 Panelist: R-1A	City: Regina Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, telephone operator	 Panelist: R-2A	City: Regina Age: 45-54 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, credit rep
 Panelist: R-3A	City: Regina Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, TA at university	 Panelist: R-4A	City: Regina Age: 45-54 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, interior designer
 Panelist: R-5A	City: Regina Age: 45-54 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, insurance underwriter	 Panelist: R-6A	City: Regina Age: 65+ Gender: Male Occupation: Retired
 Panelist: R-7A	City: Regina Age: 55-64 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed part-time, joint advocacy	 Panelist: R-8A	City: Regina Age: 45-54 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, IT manager
 Panelist: R-10A	City: Regina Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, human resources	 Panelist: R-19A	City: Regina Age: 45-54 Gender: Female Occupation: Retired
 Panelist: R-12A	City: Regina Age: 55-64 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, director	 Panelist: R-13A	City: Regina Age: 55-64 Gender: Male Occupation: Retired
 Panelist: R-14A	City: Regina Age: 45-54 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, CEO of NFCw	 Panelist: R-15A	City: Regina Age: 35-44 Gender: Female Occupation: Unemployed
 Panelist: R-9A	City: Regina Age: 65+ Gender: Male Occupation: Retired	 Panelist: R-17A	City: Regina Age: 35-44 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, sales clerk

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. 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 Regina 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, Scarborough, Saint John, Saskatoon, and Montreal 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 Regina 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.

As was the case in all other Panel discussions, the Draft Implementation Plan was well-received by Regina Panelists, most of whom felt the plan and, by extension, the NWMO was headed in the right direction. A few Regina Panelists voiced a concern that some of the wording chosen in the document was not as clear as possible. Again, some Panelists struggled with the term "hydride cracking" and stressed the importance of documentation that is both "accessible and understandable." Many Panelists preferred the document to ones they had read in the past. One Panelist stated the following,

I think [the Draft Implementation Plan] is better than anything we have seen. It is very detailed and makes me feel better.

Another Regina Panelist echoed this sentiment,

I like the breakdown; it is spelled out better than other documents.

The notion of putting in place a process, either externally or internally, to monitor the NWMO as it moves forward was discussed by some Regina Panelists. While suggestions as to how the organization might either monitor itself, or be monitored by a third-party, were not provided, these Panelists were quite clear that some means of monitoring should be in place to ensure the NWMO remains on the right track as it moves forward. This was an extension of transparency in the eyes of these Panelists as they felt a monitoring process was the ultimate means by which the organization proves it is open and transparent. In the words of one Regina Panelist,

I'd like to see more on what kind of process they will use to monitor it and how they will be meeting their goals. It is not clear how they are monitoring themselves. Reports are nice, but proof of a monitoring process is much more reassuring to people. All I see here is reporting, nothing on monitoring and how they prove its openness.

As well, the importance of engagement was often mentioned in the Regina Panel discussion. A continuous effort to engage Canadians, communities and Aboriginal Peoples was seen as important for the NWMO by many Regina Panelists. As well,

engaging and collaborating with academics and countries undergoing similar processes was something seen as important by a number of Regina Panelists.

As stated by one Panelist,

[I like] the people in Europe they are going to talk with, as well as the fact that they will try and get academics.

However, some Regina Panelists felt that the NWMO's promise to consult interested individuals and organizations in a dialogue on the design of a process for a site was somewhat excessive. These Panelists had difficulty wrapping their heads around the necessity to develop a process to decide upon a suitable site. In the words of one Panelist,

The first line makes me want them to start moving sooner rather than later. Four to five years is too long for a selection process.

There was a desire among a few Regina Panelists to see siting begin sooner rather than later. These Panelists felt that the used nuclear fuel would be far safer underground than sitting in storage above ground, as it is currently. In the words of one Regina Panelist,

To me, the storing of waste above ground for the time being is more dangerous than digging too soon.

Transportation was a topic of discussion often raised by some Regina Panelists. Similar to other Panel discussions, a number of Panelists had numerous questions and concerns about transportation. This largely stemmed from the fact that transportation, for the majority of Panelists, was the simplest element of APM to grasp. For instance, everyone uses highways and have witnessed traffic accidents. As a result, the bulk of the questions and concerns expressed centred on how safety would or could be planned for, especially given the need to move the used fuel from point A to point B. In the words of one Regina Panelist,

If [the used nuclear fuel] is getting transported any direction, it will be going through other provinces...for that reason, it is a concern of more provinces than just where the site of the repository is.

Other Panelists made it clear that they would like to see more of a mention and more information available on transportation. According to a Regina Panelist,

[The Draft Implementation Plan] doesn't mention much about transportation. I don't want to assume anything, I want to see their plans.

A Regina Panelist praised the NWMO's collaboration with ethicists, an illustration of the organization's commitment to high ethical standards, as well as an important facet of the NWMO's efforts towards achieving greater transparency and dialogue.

In the words of this Regina Panelist,

I am pleased to see they are working with ethicists. Ethics are very important, especially when working multi-nationally.

An interesting line of discussion occurred in the Regina Panel, a discussion that was also had in other Panel locations, about whether or not a conceptual discussion could be had sincerely, and if opinions will change once the siting process begins. Some Regina Panelists were unsure themselves whether or not their opinion might change dramatically if they were engaged in a debate on siting in their region or province. This sentiment was very well articulated by one Regina Panelist, who stated the following,

Up until now, it has been an abstract process; the siting process will be when the waste hits the fan. People will be polarized on the issue.

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 Stephen Leonard, a Navigator research professional.

Draft Implementation Plan Discussion

Discussion Leader: When you got here today, 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. The NWMO 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: Now that you see what they're planning to do, does it make sense to you? Are they on the right track? Heading in the wrong direction?

R-4A: I think that engaging the youth will be a tough subject. How are you going to get them out and involved? They are not that easy to get into issues like this.

R-8A: I disagree. Youth are big environmental activists in the new generation. My kid's know more about new environmental programs than I do.

R-5A: I thought it was very comprehensive. The part about municipal and provincial organizations, I can't tell who they are referring to.

Discussion Leader: Who should they be involving?

- R-5A: I don't know, it could be varied if you are looking at transportation.
- R-2A: Could be engineers.
- R-13A: Seeing as our Premier is putting our province forward as a nuclear place. I am wondering what the plans are in the main provinces, would there be government meetings to set this up in a provincial format. You would have to start with the Premier and they would assign someone to deal with it.
- R-14A: The list is comprehensive; it outlines how they will engage everyone. The objectives should be in there with its main goal to achieve.
- R-13A: The end goal is pretty clear - they want to engage people.
- R-14A: It doesn't say to what end they want to involve them
- R-7A: It isn't necessarily building partnerships. Looking at it, it is talking about engaging people but I am not sure it says anything about making this an "us" situation, it seems like a "them" and "us". It is not a round partnership.
- R-3A: Can you tell us about the last bullet? Which parts of the corporate world are they targeting?
- Discussion Leader:** Any ideas what a corporate citizenship program would look like?
- R-13A: They could be hiring community members to work for them.
- R-5A: They would have to have components of national and regional communities. They have to be able to speak for more than just their own region.
- Discussion Leader:** Any thoughts on the kinds of actions the NWMO is taking to build future relationships?
- R-12A: When I look at the fourth bullet, regardless of the people I think it is ambitious because I do not think there is a common voice in the aboriginal community. How do they determine a consensus?
- R-9A: In this province the aboriginal community will out number Caucasians by 2020.

R-12A: I just want to know how they can get an accurate consensus.

R-13A: At some point they'd have to talk to the elected officials of the aboriginals.

Building Knowledge: Technical and Social Research

Discussion Leader: Now that the NWMO has shown you what they propose to undertake, do you feel they have a good handle on it? Heading in the right direction? Missing the mark?

R-6A: What is hydride cracking?

Discussion Leader: Let's let our technical representative answer that question later on.

R-15A: I think it is better than anything we have seen. It is very detailed and makes me feel better. The people in Europe they are going to talk with as well as the fact that they will try and get academics.

R-19A: I don't know that is a short or long enough time, but the fact they are giving a date of 2011 for used fuel management is a good solid concept.

R-10A: Where it says by the end of 2008, it seems like a big move forward that they are working on already. It is very ambitious. Is it still on track?

R-6A: I will assume that the USA will be consulted as well. They are high into the uranium usage.

Discussion Leader: That is a good question for our technical representative.

R-4A: I think it is good, the development and model for uranium disposal seems positive. Well written.

R-17A: I like the breakdown; it is spelled out better than other documents.

Discussion Leader: Can we go a bit beyond the writing and look more so at the actions they are taking in the document. Is it a good plan?

R-13A: Bullet five is great, it is what we have been crying for. I noticed they mention telephone and web surveys in a few

objectives. I am wondering the who/what/when element of that. It is important in finding out a community's view.

R-10A: For the aboriginal knowledge section, so far the technical research has not been done fully, but it sounds disconnected to be going back to that cultural knowledge now. It is nice but not the best idea. The part on the capacity on implementation issues is curious to me as well.

R-2A: They are obviously going ahead in Sweden; my question is on the 2009 date which makes me wonder if we will be having more panels in the future to check up on their changes.

R-14A: They set themselves up well for an international conference. It is a logical extension for Canada to show leadership.

R-6A: Should we not consult with Canadians in general? I think Canada, as a whole, should have an opportunity for input.

R-8A: If it is getting transported any direction it will be going through other provinces like Manitoba. For that reason it is a concern of more provinces than just where the site of the repository is.

R-13A: CNN news discussed 400 new reactors that will be on stream in the next year and a half. That is why we need the international groups.

Review, Adjust and Validate Plans

Discussion Leader: How does the NWMO as an organization move forward and get things done but at the same time, keep itself open to changes that might have taken place? This is what the NWMO has undertaken to do in order to remain open to change. What are your thoughts on what they are proposing?

R-19A: Having all Canadians commenting on a website would be best for that likely.

R-9A: I have seen several questions on web surveys in the past year that would work well with this objective.

Discussion Leader: What kind of surveys?

R-9A: Web surveys...I can't remember who it was for. Several questions hit on it.

Discussion Leader: On the green sheet I passed out, some of the activities are outlined. Does this make sense? Are these things you want to see worked on?

R-4A: At the bottom it talks about reporting to ministers and such. How knowledgeable are these ministers going to be in this area since they are the decision-makers. There is not much advantage to ministers having a say in the matter if they don't know the material.

R-3A: I thought it was good. It is less specific with timelines but that is implied to be there.

R-17A: The publishing of info and continuing input is very useful. If we are looking at involving people it will be more comforting with constant reassurance.

R-13A: We may want to ask about the governance structure.

Discussion Leader: That is a later objective; I am keen on people's feelings on the organization's adaptive commitment. We want them to move forward but not be close-minded right? So are these activities what you would have expected?

R-7A: I'd like to see more on what kind of process they will use to monitor it and how they will be meeting their goals. It is not clear how they are monitoring themselves. Reports are nice, but proof of a monitoring process is much more reassuring to people. All I see here is reporting, nothing on monitoring and how they prove its openness.

R-6A: You want a definition of who the watchdog is and that they are watching themselves.

R-7A: I can give a report on anything, but it doesn't deal with the monitoring.

Discussion Leader: I saw this part as a way to make sure that they were taking new information into account as they move forward. This wasn't really commenting on the process itself, but more making sure they do not miss any new things.

- R-13A: If they intend to do what we think they'd do it would be clear that new science would have to be taken into account, but how is that going to work mid project?
- R-5A: I think it is if something changes over time like reducing coal plants, I kind of assumed the last bullet would cover that.
- R-12A: It talks about using societal expectations, but I am not sure if values are an evolutionary thing. Often bad things are done as a change of values. I am pleased to see they are working with ethicists. Ethics are very important especially when working multi-nationally.

Collaborative Design and Initiation of a Siting Process

- Discussion Leader:** Again, we've talked a lot about how this is where the rubber hits the road when it comes to siting. This is what the NWMO is proposing to do to get a siting process. I'm wondering if these make sense to you. Are they on the right track? Are they off base?
- R-9A: I think it is alright, I don't care for the 2012 date, I don't expect to be around then.
- R-8A: The first point seems a little like a committee prepared this document. Maybe that is just how discussion documents are made? This is the least impressive document so far tonight.
- R-2A: Yes, and this is probably the most key part of the process. The first line makes me want them to start moving sooner rather than later. Four to five years is too long for a selection process.
- R-19A: I don't think we have enough going forward; it does not seem solid what we are doing. A lot of it looks good at first but then it just stops.
- R-10A: I had a different impression on this. Documentation that is accessible and understandable is important, and it can be quick which is good.
- R-3A: In the site communities the town hall meetings will be very important.

- Discussion Leader:** So later in the process some of these issues will be more crucial than now?
- R-13A: In February the nuclear provinces have groups that are picking out sites as of this year for their new reactors. Atomic Energy is involved with a mix of public and private funding. What kind of impact will new reactors have on the storage facility organizers?
- R-3A: I heard it was either you produce or store the waste.
- R-15A: If it will take years to educate and persuade the public, they will not even begin siting until 2012.
- R-17A: It looks like a good process even just for initiating.
- R-2A: Would it be safe to assume it will take an additional four years to actually decide on the final site. To me the storing of waste above ground for the time being is more dangerous than digging too soon. The public pressure is at some point going to move this along quickly.
- R-12A: Up until now it has been an abstract process; the siting process will be when the waste hits the fan. People will be polarized on the issue. I don't see any planning for the reaction of the public. Strategically how do you plan for controversy?
- R-7A: It doesn't mention much about the transportation. I don't want to assume anything I want to see their plans.
- R-13A: I can't see the government not being involved. If people in a particular province said they did not want to get involved this could be quite a mountain to climb.
- R-1A: What happens if no one wants it? Is there a plan b?
- Discussion Leader:** The organization has said that they will just keep at it and there is no back up plan. It is a fundamental point by the organization.

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 Regina 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 Regina Panelists to the technical representative from the NWMO.

b. Questions & Discussions

- R-6A: We have mentioned Sweden, France and Switzerland. I would think the USA would be the first on the list. Why is the United States not a major partner of the NWMO?
- R-13A: What kind of volumes of used fuel does the US deal with?
- R-1A: Does the US not have the same rock? Is it their choice?
- R-6A: They have the deep rocks like the Canadian Shield?
- R-14A: Who is furthest along in the storage process?
- R-14A: How long have they been working on this?
- R-14A: So there is a possibility they could dig down and not end up using the site?
- R-2A: If we are looking at the next 4-8 years on consultation, 4 more for siting. How long would it be from the point of choosing the site to the repository being complete?
- R-2A: What is the difference between the threat to above ground storage and underground?
- R-1A: Would the States be willing to take our waste?
- R-8A: You mentioned the capacity and time frame. Do we have the capacity to store what we make in the next 30 years or further?
- R-5A: Does the international discussion have much input into transportation?
- R-5A: Countries looking at one or two facilities would see transportation as a very important topic.
- R-3A: What are the biggest risks in transportation? Will we have to make changes to accepted transportation methods to fit our standards?
- R-1A: How are the bundles we move now shipped?

- R-13A: We had an incident in the last month with hazardous waste. People in the area had to be moved and it was a fairly intensive operation. But they were prepared for a chemical situation. What kind of pressure will there be on the system with a great proliferation of reactors?
- R-10A: I am curious if there has been thought about the continued use of nuclear energy?
- R-9A: The delayed hydrate cracking of used fuel, what is it?
- R-7A: What is generic geo-scientific research?
- R-5A: Is there a minimum depth for the repository?
- R-6A: Is there a proper and good collaboration between countries involved?
- R-12A: You have spoken about the safety issues. Failure tends to be human error in the nuclear area from what I have heard and read. What are your thoughts on possible human error?
- R-12A: What about theft and security of the sites?
- R-14A: To what degree is technology advancing in reprocessing used fuel?
- R-14A: So the fuel put in the ground likely won't be used in future recycling processes?
- R-6A: So, at 2000 feet the earth's heat wouldn't be a problem?
- R-4A: Is it feasible to have more than one site?
- R-9A: Don't we have a deep enough site in Sudbury?
- R-2A: How many employees would a site have?
- R-5A: Obviously the sites would have capacity for future use. Do you have any idea what capacity you will be looking to have?
- R-8A: So is there a plan for "corking" a full site?
- R-17A: Once it is sealed, does monitoring cease?
- R-17A: So the NWMO would stop monitoring the sites?

- R-13A: Before the new used fuel from new sites arrives, has work been done to anticipate the arrival of new material?
- R-13A: It seems that there is the possibility of a lot happening to the fuel before it gets put into storage. Will it be done in a standardized and monitored fashion?
- R-8A: What happens with the waste water where fuel is stored?
- R-6A: Is there any idea of a way to neutralize this waste?
- R-7A: Sometimes the involvement of aboriginals seems more like political prep just thrown in. How does that work with scientific issues?
- R-13A: If the waste could go in their land, then it is very important that they be incorporated in the process.

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™

