

# NWMO Citizen Panels Report, Phase III: Panel Seven

**NWMO SR-2008-17**

**July 2008**

Navigator Ltd.

**nwmo**

NUCLEAR WASTE  
MANAGEMENT  
ORGANIZATION

SOCIÉTÉ DE GESTION  
DES DÉCHETS  
NUCLÉAIRES



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

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

## **Nuclear Waste Management Organization**

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

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

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

## **NWMO Social Research**

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

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

---

### Disclaimer:

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

---





# NAVIGATOR

## NWMO Citizen Panel Report Saint John, New Brunswick

NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION  
SAINT JOHN, NEW BRUNSWICK 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 Saint John, New Brunswick on April 22, 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. Questions & Discussion, Technical Representative

- a. Explanation
- b. Questions & Discussion

## 3. 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

## Appendices

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

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

### **a. Citizen Panel**

The Saint John, New Brunswick Phase Three Citizen Panel was held on April 22, 2008 at a neutral third party facility in Saint John.

The Panel was held over three hours from 6PM – 9PM with 12 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 Saint John Panelists by Panelist identifier code:

	City: Saint John Age: 45-54 Gender: Female Occupation: Self-employed, interior decorator		City: Saint John Age: 55-64 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, plumber
<b>Panelist: SJ-1A</b>		<b>Panelist: SJ-3A</b>	
	City: Saint John Age: 25-34 Gender: Male Occupation: Student		City: Saint John Age: 45-54 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, teaching assistant
<b>Panelist: SJ-4A</b>		<b>Panelist: SJ-5A</b>	
	City: Saint John Age: 55-64 Gender: Female Occupation: Unemployed		City: Saint John Age: 18-24 Gender: Male Occupation: Student
<b>Panelist: SJ-7A</b>		<b>Panelist: SJ-9A</b>	
	City: Saint John Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed		City: Saint John Age: 45-54 Gender: Female Occupation: Home maker
<b>Panelist: SJ-10A</b>		<b>Panelist: SJ-11A</b>	
	City: Saint John Age: 25-34 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed		City: Saint John Age: 55-64 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed
<b>Panelist: SJ-12A</b>		<b>Panelist: SJ-13A</b>	
	City: Saint John Age: 25-34 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed		City: Saint John Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, customer service call centre
<b>Panelist: SJ-8A</b>		<b>Panelist: SJ-15A</b>	

### **c. Panel Methodology**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This Panel Report is, to the best of Navigator's abilities, a faithful rendering of the discussion held in Saint John and stands alone as a record of the Citizen Panel discussion on April 22, 2008. A larger Aggregate Report on this wave of Panel discussions, including the Panels in Kingston, Toronto, Sault Ste. Marie, Scarborough, Montreal, Saskatoon, and Regina has also been submitted to the NWMO.

## **2. 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.

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 Saint John 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 Saint John Panelists to the technical representative from the NWMO.

## b. Questions & Discussions

- SJ-4A: I am interested to hear your interpretation of the organization. This being fairly new, how do you find the NWMO to work for as far as being an expert in the field? How's your time been?
- SJ-4A: The concerns that come up here are "how do we feel Canada is doing in the race to solve the storage problem?" How do you feel Canada is doing?
- SJ-1A: Can you give us an indication of the siting process itself in other countries? What have been the criteria? What obstacles have they been able to overcome and how?
- SJ-1A: Are there any deep repositories actually working now?
- SJ-1A: How remote are those areas?
- SJ-1A: But that could change, the future will change that.
- SJ-10A: In respect to Finland, where they already have their site in place, what has been the local reaction?
- SJ-11A: There has to be some benefit. Why would they be pissed off [that they were not picked]?
- SJ-15A: Are we talking Euros, how much in relation to Canadian dollars?
- SJ-11A: Will this facility employ a lot of people?
- SJ-3A: The facility that the States has now, is it strong enough to withstand an earthquake, etc.?
- SJ-3A: I saw something on W5 about a facility up north, it was isolated and well below freezing and I thought this could be a good place for nuclear waste.
- SJ-8A: What about terrorist attacks? Especially in a populated area, what a great target for terrorists!
- SJ-4A: Back to the siting process. Do you know already or have a vague idea, because of the geological demands of having an

underground facility, how available are these areas you are looking at? Is it easy to find the type of rock you need?

SJ-4A: Is it fairly easy to identify a site from a technical perspective?

SJ-4A: What do they do for that? Is it more drilling?

SJ-15A: Natural gas? I bet you they've checked every inch of this province.

SJ-4A: With the size of Canada and a central location, there's got to be transportation and that could be quite a trek for the waste to make. What precautions will there be?

SJ-15A: What have they found out? What do they know about long-term stability?

SJ-10A: What is the state of the waste? Is it solid?

SJ-4A: Another thing we discussed is the potential for future use and that the site will be retrievable. From your view, is there anything out there that's promising in terms of use of used nuclear waste? What we're calling waste now will not be waste at some point?

SJ-4A: Does repurposing reduce the overall waste in the first place?

SJ-15A: By what proportion does repurposing reduce it reduce the volume of waste?

SJ-5A: Going back a little bit in time, the incident in Chalk River, one of the senior people was fired by the government. I don't know any further details than what I heard on the news, but one thing that has stayed in my mind is that it really is possible for people with scientific credentials and technical background to disagree with each other. I wonder if you can envisage any comparable situation within the NWMO and how you would resolve it if such conflicts arise?

SJ-5A: Are you confident in the dispute resolution mechanisms? Nuclear waste is too significant to leave to the politicians.

SJ-5A: Do you like that? Do you like the government having the final decision?



- SJ-8A: First of all, sometimes it's a good idea to wait and see what other countries do and then copy and tweak it, but other times I think they're going about it with a sense of urgency because they feel the way it is being held today is a little more dangerous than it should be, therefore the urgency to get a central holding site is a priority. I wondering if there's a consensus to not wait for a country to come up with a perfect solution or go ahead on our own?
- SJ-8A: I agree with the money factor with waiting for other countries to figure it out first, but they might have figured it out and we're here having nuclear disasters all over the place. Would you be comfortable letting the politicians make the decisions? Having had a little experience working with politics – politicians say “what the hell is he talking about” and the bureaucrats fill them in.
- SJ-1A: How much sharing of information is there between countries? Do they have conferences where all of the different countries doing research get together and share information?
- SJ-1A: The consensus is really that it's for the common goal and good for the project overall?
- SJ-4A: We've discussed the financing, but also the bias of the organization itself. If the job of the organization is to manage waste and a lot of others' is to reduce waste, that's the way of managing it. Yet, there is a bit of a feeling that it is so tightly connected to the waste producers who are money making organizations, do you feel that's a little contrary to the scientists that are working in their field and constantly moving forward, do you feel that's a little contrary to the idea that nuclear energy in the first place is a wise idea? Do you think this organization pushes the cause for more nuclear production?
- SJ-4A: If there's less waste, wouldn't it be easier to deal with?
- SJ-4A: General consensus that society will be on your side that those that are contrary to nuclear production sees a divide between the NWMO and the producers.
- SJ-8A: How many nuclear waste sites are we going to be talking about in 20 years time?

- SJ-13A: I think we as Canadians should be proud of how we are approaching this and our process.
- SJ-1A: Is it the type of rock that determines [the site]?
- SJ-1A: Do you expect this to be implemented in your career?

### 3. DIALOGUE: DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

#### a. Overview

During this Phase of Citizen Panels, the NWMO's Draft Implementation Plan was reviewed by Saint John 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.

Again, a few Saint John Panelists made occasional comments about the overall subject matter being complicated and, in some instances, felt the wording chosen was not as clear as possible. For instance, one Saint John Panelist stated the following,

*This page is hard to understand...all the big words. Just the way it's worded.*

However, despite some minor criticisms, the majority of Saint John Panelists did find the Draft Implementation Plan very informative and a useful document. One Saint John Panelist felt the Draft Implementation Plan was an improvement over previous NWMO documents they had read. Another Saint John Panelist said the following,

*...some of the wording I didn't understand, but it gave me a much better understanding.*

One Saint John Panelist was interested to see how far things had progressed throughout the Citizen Panel process, evidence the NWMO is committed to moving forward with APM.

*I feel like it's advanced a lot, they're coming right out and saying that they're looking for a site, and they didn't even mention that in the first group.*

Although some Saint John Panelists understood that the process was meaningful and should not be rushed, some were concerned that the breadth of public consultation and extensive reporting involved were driving an already excessive timeline. According to one Saint John Panelist,

*It shouldn't be hurried, but it could be done at a faster pace.*

Another Panelist echoed this sentiment,

*Sometimes you can overdo the reporting process, you waste a lot of money doing reports that will just tell you the same thing as the last one. Do all of these reports need to be done? Wait until we've got something solid.*

Despite the frustrations of a few, a number of Saint John Panelists appreciated what they perceived to be the NWMO taking their thoughts and input from previous Panels into consideration. This gave these Panelists more confidence in the Citizen Panel project, as well as in the organization itself and its commitment to collaboration. In the words of one Saint John Panelist,

*...It feels like they are really taking input into consideration.*

As was the case in all eight Panels, Panelists throughout Saint John Panel discussions expressed a desire to see the NWMO increase its public profile, as well as educate and engage Canadians through an increased media presence, as well as an increased presence in the community. In the words of one Panelist,

*I think it's important, especially seeking meetings with editorial boards...When you hit that level, it will take on its own life. The big media is where you get real public interest.*

Engaging and educating youth was felt by many Saint John Panelists to be important and a key priority for the NWMO as it moves forward with APM. For these Panelists, the challenge being faced by the NWMO as it moves forward is an intergenerational one so it is important to educate and engage future generations as, in the words of a Saint John Panelist,

*They are obviously the ones that are going to have to deal with it too. They should be involved, it's going to be their generations that have to deal with it.*

A Panelist in Saint John acknowledged and applauded the NWMO'S intention to undertake a communication audit to support the design of a new communications strategy by stating,

*They are a pain in the butt if you are on the receiving end, so it's a good thing. It will identify weak links.*

As has been the case in previous Panels, a small number of Saint John Panelists questioned, again, why the NWMO consistently differentiates between Canadians and Aboriginal people. For most, it did not occur to them that this was a distinction that many in the Aboriginal community would welcome. Rather, it was deemed by some to be exclusionary and, to some, perhaps offensive. In the words of one Panelist,

*I'm not offended, but maybe others will be to see the distinction between Canadians and Aboriginal people.*

## **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.

**a. Panel Notes**

i. Disclaimer

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

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

**Draft Implementation Plan Discussion: Strategic Objectives**

**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?

SJ-5A: What is a communication audit?

SJ-15A: They are a pain in the butt if you are on the receiving end so it’s a good thing. They will identify weak links.

SJ-12A: Too many same lines – I counted 4 that were the same.

SJ-11A: It’s a big environmental issue and they can get away with a lot more than you and I can get away with.

SJ-15A: On a positive note, I think they took out the term characterization facility.

**Discussion Leader:** In terms of the organization moving forward, one of the things they have committed to is building relationships,

which people have said is very important. This sheet begins to outline how they are going to put this commitment into action. Do these activities seem reasonable/ do they seem like things the organization should be doing?

- SJ-4A: I think it's important. Especially seeking meetings with editorial boards. Once you willingly go to large organizations, it opens you up for criticism. When you hit that level, it will take on its' own life. The big media is where you'll get the real public interest.
- SJ-13A: Bringing youth into it was really good, and the website.
- SJ-1A: I see this as a bit of a coming out party, in a nutshell. Softens the effect it will have on the public. Showing us how they will approach the public and the media to let them know what they're up to.
- SJ-4A: I'm not quite sure of the corporate citizen program. Do they mean themselves and citizens or within the community?
- SJ-5A: I'm still looking at specifics, but the third point down from the top, why is youth being targeted in this particular instance?
- Discussion Leader:** Youth is being targeted because of feedback that groups like this and others have given.
- SJ-11A: They are obviously the ones that are going to have to deal with it too. They should be involved, it's going to be their generations that have to deal with it.
- SJ-5A: It's not too early to get this organization mentioned in text books. Good teaching opportunity there. The other thing, I'm not offended, but maybe others will be to see the distinction between Canadians and Aboriginal People?
- Discussion Leader:** A lot of Aboriginal Peoples expect to see this distinction made.
- SJ-8A: What about all Canadian stakeholders?
- SJ-9A: What about the French? If they distinguish aboriginals, what about the French? They need to maybe develop a marketing campaign. This is just getting their feet wet.

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

- Discussion Leader:** One of the things the NWMO has made a promise to do is advanced research to support the implementation of adaptive phased management. Do you think the organization is going in the right direction? When you actually see the actual activities they are going to engage in, are they going in the right direction?
- SJ-9A: It seems like they have an iron in every fire, are completely aware of everything that is going on, which they should be since they say they're so collaborative. They want to be socially responsible and ethical. What more can you want? It seems too good to be true perhaps.
- SJ-11A: I'm always a cynic. The main thing that all of us as citizens are concerned with is that someday we will have a site, the goal is to have this deep repository. I don't know, I just kind of think why can't we just do that? Why can't we take 2 years and find a site? Why does it take so many years to even get to that point?
- Discussion Leader:** Didn't they always say it had to be in a geologically suitable location? It couldn't just go anywhere?
- SJ-11A: But different times they've said that if a community is interested...
- Discussion Leader:** We should correct that right now. If a community is interested and is otherwise suitable...They would not put it in some place that is not otherwise suitable.
- SJ-11A: There are those 2 communities in Sweden and Finland that were upset they weren't picked at sites. Something's missing here, either we have a lack of knowledge or education because they're mad they're not putting it in their backyard but we are completely the opposite.
- SJ-10A: We welcome stuff like that all the time for financial reasons. If that's why Finland wants it, then we have to respect it. It's going to be contained, what's wrong with that?
- Discussion Leader:** One of these things I've heard in all of these groups is that research is very important. So what the NWMO has gone away and done is coming up with a work plan. I'm



interested to know whether they got it right. Would you say yes, it's a good research program or no, I think they're missing stuff. It's not what I had in mind?

SJ-10A: I agree with SJ-9A, I don't think there's anything in this that's blatantly missing.

SJ-8A: Sometimes you can overdo the reporting process, you waste a lot of money doing reports that will just tell you the same thing as the last one. Do all of these reports need to be done? Wait until we've got something solid.

**Discussion Leader:** Many people have said that they worry that once they start digging the hole, they're going to forget about everything else. They think the organization will get single focused so they won't focus on getting a solution different to that. So doing these reports will ensure that they don't get single focused.

SJ-8A: I buy that. Maybe just a social acknowledgement but not all these reports.

SJ-4A: They better be clear about the very first thing, how they're going to go about assessing for geological sites, but even setting up the process to go about doing that. The timing of that from a media perspective and PR perspective for the company could be quite important.

SJ-12A: I agree with the technical stuff, maybe sometimes it's unclear to the general public. With social, I thought we implied last time that the web based stuff might be a problem, not everyone has internet so maybe you could go about sending stuff out.

SJ-11A: They said this is what they want to accomplish over 2008-2012. Aren't a lot of these things already done? Like convene citizen Panels. I don't know, I just tend to think it's going a little too slow. But, you know, that's the way a lot of things are.

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

SJ-3A: It seems like it's taking us forever at my job to get the paper work, you're waiting for 2 or 3 weeks. Now we're talking about this. What's the paper work going to be like for that?

SJ-15A: I think that's why it's going to take 60 years, that's the only thing that makes sense.

SJ-11A: It shouldn't be hurried but it could be done at a faster pace.

SJ-10A: It should take time.

**Discussion Leader:** As they move forward the organization has a commitment to this approach of adjusting and validating their approach. I'm interested to know, does this seem to be a sensible direction for the organization?

SJ-4A: It's definitely adequate, not necessarily overkill. It's sufficient. It seems they are very conscious and aware to double check every single thing they do and say. I don't want to call it overkill, but they definitely seem to be moving forward slowly, but surely.

SJ-15A: They seem to have the answers, the only thing is communication.

**Discussion Leader:** Do you think that if they implement the kinds of activities outlined in this sheet, they'll achieve that?

SJ-15A: They will, but when? What are the timeframes for communicating? There are no answers right now for the people that are concerned about what's going on.

SJ-5A: I don't have a clue what 'nuclear new build' means?

SJ-15A: It explains it in the book.

SJ-7A: This page is hard to understand. The other pages were fine, but this page was different. All the big words. Just the way it's worded, in particular the whole phrase about adapting and developing plans on how to go forward.

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

SJ-4A: Better definition of the siting process.

**Discussion Leader:** As the NWMO thinks about a process for choosing a site, they have committed to it being a collaborative process. I'm interested to know, are these the kind of things you think are important? Is it going along the right track?

- SJ-4A: Vitally important, the fact that they will have some document ready to give to Canadian cities to discuss the actual siting process. Then, later on, the education and awareness program. Move that up quickly. You need people knowing.
- SJ-12A Sending out fact sheets so people know what's going on.
- SJ-5A: The very last point really doesn't register, perhaps should be rewritten. It sounds abstract. I'm sure there's a more pointed way of expressing that idea. Education materials are so much more tangible than supporting engagement and information program. Didn't know what it meant.
- SJ-9A: If we wanted to talk to someone from the NWMO, where would you go to meet face to face with them?
- SJ-15A: I swear I read something about opening a place like that somewhere in the province.
- SJ-9A: Like a regional office or something.

### **Remaining Strategic Objectives**

- Discussion Leader:** Any thoughts or comments on those last three?
- SJ-4A: Always weary of the governance structure. Of course the companies that are paying for things are going to have a vested interest and make sure it's managed properly. The fact that they decide who are on the board of directors. I'm sure it's fine but make it public, make people aware and make sure you don't get a public problem of inside bias.
- Discussion Leader:** How does this document stack up to other documents I've shared with you?
- SJ-4A: Much better than the first one.
- SJ-7A: Some of the wording I didn't understand but it gave me a much better understanding.
- SJ-15A: It looks like they are really taking input into consideration.
- SJ-11A I feel like it's advanced a lot, they're coming right out and saying that they're looking for a site, and they didn't even mention that in the first group.

# APPENDICES

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

## I. PERSONNEL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Having previously worked on Parliament Hill as both a legislative and communications assistant to Members of Parliament and Senators, he has an in-depth knowledge of Canada's Parliament and its committees, caucuses and procedures.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## II. DISCUSSION LEADERS GUIDE

### PHASE THREE CITIZEN PANELS

#### DISCUSSION LEADER'S GUIDE

#### ADVANCE OF DISCUSSION

##### 1. LOBBY EXERCISE

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

#### PANEL DISCUSSION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**[SHORT BIO INTRODUCTION OF PERSONNEL]**

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

#### **7. WRAP-UP (2:55 – 3:00)**



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

#### **BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS**

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

In 2008 we will:

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

In the period 2008-2012 we will:

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

## Building Knowledge - Technical and Social Research

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

### Technical Research

During 2008-2012 we will:

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

By the end of 2008 we will:

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

By the end of 2010 we will:

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

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

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

## **Social Research**

In the period 2008-2012 we will:

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

## Review, Adjust and Validate Plans

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

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

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

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

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

## Collaborative Design and Initiation of a Siting Process

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

In 2008 we will:

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

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

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

RESEARCH | STRATEGY | RESULTS™

