NWMO Citizen Panels Report, Phase IV: Panel Three

NWMO SR-2008-22 **September 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.

NWMO Citizen Panel Report
Regina, Saskatchewan

NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION

REGINA PHASE FOUR CITIZEN PANEL

SEPTEMBER 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 Four of the Citizen Panel project occurred in June 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. **Panelist Dialogue**

    a. Overview
    b. Panel Notes
        i. Disclaimer

Appendices

i. Navigator Personnel
ii. Discussion Leader's Guide
iii. Backgrounder 1: Selecting a Site
iv. Backgrounder 2: Framing the Discussion
v. Backgrounder 3: Learning from Others

I. NWMO CITIZEN PANEL BACKGROUND

a. Citizen Panel

The Regina, Saskatchewan Phase Four Citizen Panel was held on June 4, 2008 at a neutral third party facility in Regina.

The Panel was held over three hours from 6PM – 9PM with 14 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 documents 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-3A**	City: Regina Age: 25-34 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, TA at university
 **Panelist: R-5A**	City: Regina Age: 45-54 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, insurance underwriter
 **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-13A**	City: Regina Age: 55-64 Gender: Male Occupation: Retired
 **Panelist: R-17A**	City: Regina Age: 35-44 Gender: Female Occupation: Employed, sales clerk

 **Panelist: R-2A**	City: Regina Age: 45-54 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, credit rep
 **Panelist: R-4A**	City: Regina Age: 45-54 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, interior designer
 **Panelist: R-6A**	City: Regina Age: 65+ Gender: Male Occupation: Retired
 **Panelist: R-9A**	City: Regina Age: 65+ Gender: Male Occupation: Retired
 **Panelist: R-12A**	City: Regina Age: 55-64 Gender: Male Occupation: Employed, director
 **Panelist: R-15A**	City: Regina Age: 35-44 Gender: Female Occupation: Unemployed
 **Panelist: R-19A**	City: Regina Age: 45-54 Gender: Female Occupation: Retired

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 discussions 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 those individuals who 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. 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 come 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.

Phase Four of the NWMO Citizen Panels took place in June 2008. The Panel discussions primarily gathered input and explored Panelist reaction to the design of a process for selecting a site, and used five questions as a foundation for research:

1. Does the framework of objectives, ethical principles and requirements provide a sound foundation for designing the process for selecting a site?

2. How can we ensure that the process for selecting a site is fair?

3. From what models and experience should we draw in designing the process?

4. Who should be involved in the process for selecting a site, and what should be their role?

5. What information and tools do you think would facilitate your participation?

These five questions also served as the organizing principle for the discussion leader's guide. A general outline of discussion objectives, as well as materials intended to guide the work of the Panel, were prepared in advance of the Citizen Panel. Reproductions of discussion materials shown to the Panel can be found at the end of this report in Appendices iii, iv, and v.

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 June 4, 2008. A larger Aggregate Report on this phase 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.

II. PANELIST DIALOGUE

a. Overview

The Phase Four Citizen Panel discussion of June 4, 2008 took place in Regina, Saskatchewan. Unlike Phase Three of this project, Panelists were not given any material to review in advance. Instead, they were asked a series of five discussion questions throughout their three-hour discussion, using three "backgrounder" sheets for reference. The five questions were listed in Section I of this document.

The framework of objectives was generally well-received by Regina Panelists, who thought it covered the bases adequately. One Panelist in particular said the following:

> *I think they've done a pretty good job: A definition of how big the site is going to be, how much material we have, and how big the site needs to be.*

A couple of Regina Panelists suggested that the process could be improved by specifying how the NWMO would approach and include the provinces:

> *There need to be negotiations on that level. There's no sense trying to choose an area in Saskatchewan if the government doesn't want it here.*

When the Discussion Leader suggested that the jurisdictional responsibility for used nuclear fuel lay primarily with the federal government, the Panelist responded by implying that the province had a great deal of tacit influence in siting:

> *That's fine. But [the province] has responsibility for their citizens in this province.*

In addition to speaking about the role of the province, some Panelists talked about the positive economic benefits that might arise from hosting the repository. There was an awareness amongst Panelists that economically-recessed areas might be more inclined to accept a site for the sake of the spin-off employment opportunities it might generate. Some Panelists like this one implied that the prospect of benefits could cause some to support hosting a site without fully considering the impact of such a step:

> *…But that may not be in the best interest of the people.*

Discussion of the next question allowed many worthwhile insights about siting to emerge. One Panelist suggested that asking communities to come forward before knowing if the underlying geology was appropriate was putting the cart before the horse:

> *Maybe if they made the map of what communities would be included and wouldn't be included so that when they bring it to the people, people know that "OK, it doesn't involve us."*

Some Regina Panelists also had difficulty coming to terms with the idea that more than one location could be equally suitable from a (geological) safety standpoint. This Panelist suggested that perhaps there were always small differences in geological suitability:

> *…If one location has 800 metres rock and the other place 1000. So if one place is 5% better, obviously [we] should go with safety.*

The next question also provided for fruitful discussion. Panelists wrestled with their sometimes-negative perception of politicians versus their recognition that government has a role to play in selecting a site:

> *Whenever you have the amount of dollars being talked about for this, you are not going to exclude the politicians. It's going to have the support of the province and surrounding area. There's going to be at least 18 months to two years of groundwork that has to be done to make the criteria just to get applications in. Can you imagine just the amount of work you have to do to get your application in?*

Regina Panelists were perhaps the most engaged out of all the Phase Four Panels when it came to the topic of consultation and the NWMO's physical presence in prospective willing host communities.

The Discussion Leader asked about the degree of consultation required, and specifically what would happen if attendance at open forums and information sessions fell below expectations. One Regina Panelist said he expected people would show up, and offered the following advice:

> *The secret of this is not to send talking heads. You need to set up some parameters where you say your expectations are that the community is going to make these decisions. If you present that properly, and it's a big issue, you will fill some halls.*

Another Panelist assumed that many people would pay attention to the issue only once there was personal impact, for instance on the value of their property:

> *The first thing I thought of is that since it affects property values, is landowners in the area. They have a vested interested. People moving to Vancouver in a week are not going to be as interested as people who have a business. Direct mail to registered landowners will get a good portion [to attend].*

This Panelist did not seem worried about attendance as long as the town council or local community leadership was engaged:

> *Once the communities have shown an interest, the meetings will follow! The people will come! I don't see a problem there. If the town councils or the chambers of commerce decide we would be a community that would want to participate, I believe the people will come.*

A particularly noteworthy comment came from a Panelist who believed that engagement in the process would depend on the authenticity of the consultation itself:

> *… It depends on how it's being communicated. If people get the sense that the powers that be have made their mind up, then I wouldn't be that inclined to go. But if they feel that "this is up to you" – in a real sense – then [the NWMO must] communicate this effectively.*

One Regina Panelist made a suggestion that was positively received by their fellow Panelists. Their idea was to establish a "storefront" presence in potential host communities:

> *What if they established a physical presence – a storefront – in the five communities that are shortlisted. They'd see it isn't a whole bunch of dudes from Ottawa.*

While several Panelists in the same group later worried that some methods of communication would appear to be too much of a "sell," others thought that creative presence could be engaging. To that end, one Panelist suggested an information "fair":

> *… It [would be] a social event. It's done well. It gives them a hands-on, touchy, they can go through it.*

On the whole, Regina Panelists were an engaged and motivated group. They had much to say about consultation in particular, and about the importance of local input in the siting process.

b. Panel Notes

i. Disclaimer

The attached are contemporaneous notes of the general Panel discussion, as well as the discussion on the three backgrounder documents provided by the NWMO. The notes were taken by a transcriber positioned in the room with the Panelists. The transcriber was taking direction from the Citizen Panel on specific points of interest. The following is not an official transcript, but a best effort to capture the sense of discussion with some granularity.

The transcriber for this Panel was Lanny Cardow, a Navigator research professional.

General Discussion:

Discussion Leader:	Did anyone talk about this topic with friends or family or co-workers? Anyone hear about it on the news?
R-10A:	I notice when you talk about it being a long-term plan, people disconnect. Usually people are looking short-term. One of the people I talked to was concerned about who was funding the whole commission. If the money came from the industry itself, they said they would be worried.
Discussion Leader:	Did this person have any idea who should pay for it?
R-12A:	He didn't offer. But he felt we should make sure the outcome isn't tied to private funding.
Discussion Leader:	We talked about the idea of site selection being still many years down the road, but the process for selecting the site is what we're talking about tonight. Tonight we're not discussing where this thing will go, because there are lots of factors that will go into that. We're talking about the process the NWMO will design to figure out where this stuff is going to go. So what the NWMO is asking us tonight is for help in designing a selection process that would be fair, ethical, and effective. I'm going to distribute two backgrounders that I'd like you to review. One of them describes what a site itself

might look like and possible features for a process for choosing it. The other one provides information on the values and objectives that Canadians have told NWMO that are important to them.

R-19A: Will global warming and melting of snow and ice affect this?

Discussion Leader: What do you think?

R-19A: I think it could. We see landslides and earthquakes. Where are we going to store it?

Discussion Leader: Do you remember when the technical representative from the NWMO talked about that? When you go that far down, it's stable and has been for a very long time. The scientists said that it's been stable for millions of years.

R-19A: I remember now.

Discussion Leader: One of the things that the NWMO has said is that whatever site is chosen must be safe and secure. Beyond that, it must be a process that Canadians have confidence in. Do the types of things they talk about here seem appropriate? Are there things missing here? Would you say they're on the right track? Or are they off in the wrong direction?

R-8A: I think it's good, other than "Adaptive Phased Management" which is going to mean nothing to the average Canadian person who reads it.

Discussion Leader: That's one thing I'm interested in. Beyond that, on the substance – not just how they said it – does it seem like things are going in the right direction, or are they off on the wrong track?

R-8A: I think they've done a pretty good job. A definition of how big the site is going to be, how much material we have, and how big the site needs to be should be included.

R-17A: I think it's pretty good too. The people who have the site, who have been storing it

temporarily, how long have they been storing it? What were they told? Have they been waiting a long time?

Discussion Leader: They were told in the beginning that if they accepted the reactor, they would not have to live with the waste.

R-17A: So for 40 years?

Discussion Leader: Which is why the study said we needed to move on this. Do you think these are the kind of things they need to look at?

R-4A: I think some of this is pretty straightforward in the beginning, but when you start adding numbers, people get confused. When you try to explain to someone and include these kinds of numbers, sometimes people don't have a clue. Even in picture form, they don't get it.

Discussion Leader: We've got that, push through the style, and the comprehension issues. It's not a communications piece. It's not written by their communications department. If these are the things that they're going to do, do they have it right?

R-5A: I thought it was pretty good. And it seemed fairly simple and straightforward. It's on the right track. They do seem to touch on the important points.

R-19A: I thought it was straightforward and easy to read.

Discussion Leader: I'm going to stop you right there. What this is trying to do is talk about the way that they're going to go about it.

R-19A: Yes, that's what I meant when I said it was straightforward and easy to read.

Discussion Leader: But do you agree with what they're doing?

R-19A: Yes.

Discussion Leader: Do you think they're getting this process right?

R-13A: I think they're missing step one. I think the NWMO has to look to the four nuclear provinces and sit down with the federal and provincial governments so they can get an idea as to what areas of the provinces might be willing participants. There need to be negotiations on that level. There's no sense in trying to choose an area if the government doesn't want it there.

Discussion Leader: Why is the province involved?

R-13A: Well, you're not going to place anything like this in a province if there's political opposition by the provincial government. It isn't going to happen. Of the provinces named, I wouldn't be surprised if all four of them wouldn't get involved in this. You can't bypass them.

Discussion Leader: And why can't you bypass them?

R-13A: Because they're governing the province!

Discussion Leader: But they have no statutory responsibility for this at all.

R-13A: That's fine. But they have responsibility for their citizens in this province.

Discussion Leader: Not for this.

R-13A: Just try it, and see what happens.

Discussion Leader: What about municipal governments?

R-2A: There's going to be opposition no matter where it goes.

R-13A: The province, the federal government, and the NWMO working with the municipalities would have a better chance of making it work.

Discussion Leader: Other people? Are they on the right track with what they're talking about on this sheet?

R-12A: I think they're right

R-3A: I agree with R-13A. It's important.

R-13A: For some of the provinces, part of that initial site selection discussion may involve some facet of transportation too.

R-9A: You're worried about local municipalities and stuff, but I don't know of any place that they could put it where they had a booming municipality. In other words, the people would be so damned happy to have work, they'd jump up and down and say "yes!"

R-19A: But that may not be in the best interest of the people.

R-13A: There may have to be financial incentives.

R-2A: I think something like that may have worked five years ago when the economy was way worse. It might be a tougher sell today.

R-10A: What was missing is the collaboration with people in the different areas that might be involved.

Discussion Leader: Let's move over to the green sheet… how could "fairness" best be assured?

R-2A: The first point is a great point. Intergenerational fairness. That's a big issue. By raising it as an issue I think it will become part of the discussion.

Discussion Leader: How do you judge fairness?

R-2A: I think cost, costs for people who aren't born yet. And risk.

Discussion Leader: R-12A, what are you thoughts on the need to ensure some kind of fairness?

R-12A: I'd have my communications strategy as part of that. It strikes me that a lot of work is being

done, but not a lot of communications. The earlier that communications happens, the better.

R-2A: But won't this process work like this: the NWMO produces a document like this, hands it out and then basically treat it like a tender? "If you fit all of this, apply to us?"

Discussion Leader: That's how you picture it? And they'd prove they had the geology, etcetera?

R-2A: Yes, send it out, and then let them do the work to see if they qualify. Once they have done the work, they send it back. I don't think there will be a shortage of places that want to have this.

Discussion Leader: You don't think so?

R-2A: No. Most communities will see this as a good thing.

R-9A: You might not get a good reaction here in Regina, but you won't have opposition up north.

R-2A: That's a good point. It'll be some place up north where the Aboriginal Peoples agree. Where everyone agrees. Where the site is right.

R-8A: The economic spin-offs could be a bonus.

R-10A: Is that what they mean by benefits? How do you judge what the benefits are? How do we determine that the geographic structures in the four provinces we have discussed are suitable?

Discussion Leader: There are two hallmarks for choosing a site. One, it can only go where it's safe and secure. The other is that it has to be an informed, willing community. They don't have a plan B. That's the second part. Those are the only two mandatory factors in the site selection process. And that idea of fairness, at the end of the day, it's a subjective thing, but if it's going to work they're going to need something that people think is fair.

R-6A: The sooner they can get at this the better. This was part of our discussion when we first met as a group. We need results.

R-4A: What if it was a community that didn't exist? What if they had to build a community? It's going to be in the middle of nowhere anyway.

R-2A: I wouldn't go too far into the middle of nowhere, because of transportation. The farther it has to travel, the more communities you involve, the more people you'll have opposed.

Discussion Leader: Does it sound to you like you're reading about an organization that has its act together?

R-6A: I think there's enough public awareness that it will be dealt with judiciously and in a proper manner. I don't see any shortcomings there, other than I wonder if the space is enough, given that they're generating this stuff like crazy. Is it adequate? At least they've done their homework. But the Canadian public has not been given a shot at this.

R-1A: I think it's good. I don't have a problem with how it's presented. It seems OK.

Discussion Leader: Do they have their act together?

R-1A: I like it. They're trying to get the job done.

R-15A: I agree. It's time to get in there. Maybe if they made the map of what communities would be included and wouldn't be included so that when they bring it to the people, people know that 'OK, it doesn't involve us'.

Discussion Leader: So as one step of the selection process, maybe they should communicate what's not on the table?

R-15A: Right.

R-13A: Are you talking about a tender with specifications?

R-2A: Exactly.

R-10A: I agree. You should limit it because then it becomes something way bigger.

R-2A: But it'd be part of the specifications. It would be limited right there. Much like applying for a job.

R-3A: I'd be curious about the process that they'll go through if there are three or four or five locations fighting for this. A lot of what we read today seemed to be geared towards the notion that "we're going to make sure that whoever ends up with it is going to want it".

Discussion Leader: So that's one of my questions. In Sweden, where there are two communities vying for it. Any sense that, if that happens here, what we'll need to design into the process so that however we make the ultimate decision, it will be a fair one?

R-3A: That's really tough and I'm not sure how it would work. Who'd be building it? Do you give it to them based on the community and whether they can support the number of staff they'd need? I'm not sure. There are so many factors.

R-5A: If you have multiple locations vying for it, to me, it should come down to transportation and who has the most stable rock formation. If one place is five percent better, obviously it should go with safety.

Discussion Leader: But they're telling us we're going to have a whole bunch of places that are relatively equal. So I'm interested in the other factors. Anyone have any other ideas?

R-12A: That's when it's important to really define what that criterion is. So when one community doesn't get it they can't come back and say "what were the processes?" The other thing is not to have political involvement. Nothing smears it worse than a provincial government chipping in 500 million dollars because that taints the process. You can't buy it. It has to be

based on safety and science. My final point would be to really stay open to alternatives right to the end, because if, too early in the process you select a city and something goes wrong, you could lose years and years.

R-8A: The problem with transportation is the cost. The further you go, the more this will cost to move this. That should be one of the criteria on the list.

R-10A: The communities affected, those that it'd be going through, should they be part of that conversation also. Neighboring communities and the ones affected by the transportation.

R-2A: It would have to be similar to shortlist, down to three or four communities. Then you'd visit each one. Its one thing to be told a community is OK with it, and then they're standing in the streets with axes.

Discussion Leader: When the technical representative was here, one of the things he told us is when they do have a shortlist, there is an enormous amount of testing that will be done. One of the iron-clad criteria is that they're only going to a place that's informed and willing. Is there anything you can think of about the design of the process they can put in to make sure a community is informed and willing?

R-15A: Money, incentives. That will always get people going.

Discussion Leader: How do you imagine that would work for this?

R-15A: If it's a really great incentive for communities, like if you live within a 100 km of here, you're going to get a check for $100 dollars.

Discussion Leader: Any other ideas about what you might build in the process? So you would know you had a community that was informed?

R-10A: What about referendum? It'd have to be established. Are they looking for a consensus?

They'll never get that. So they should establish some type of benchmark? It shouldn't be 50 plus 1.

R-2A: Let's say we have a provincial referendum and say "yes". This stuff's got to be trucked through Manitoba. They may have something to say about that.

R-3A: My question is, they've got to dig these boreholes, and that will take some time. So, you get this snapshot in a referendum or whatever. Yes, the community is willing. And then ten years later, that's almost a generation later, and the community changes its mind. Or maybe there's a community that was perfect that wasn't willing, but ten years down the road is willing.

Discussion Leader: To your point, in the time that I've been doing work for NWMO, nobody envisaged the growth of nuclear energy. People's attitudes can change a lot.

R-3A: I'm not sure how you assure that this willing community is not just only willing in that moment.

Discussion Leader: But it's only willing if you take a snapshot. Are there things the organization can do to keep checking in with that community, as they're doing that stuff, to keep them interested?

R-1A: Some of the fairness thing would be that if you wanted to live in that area versus move on. If there's a two percent chance your community would be picked, you could apply for a job somewhere else and move on. Financially, there'd be 20 maybe 30 years of a warning that this is going in our backyard.

R-4A: I would emphasize the employment aspect of who would work where and who they need, they might educate people. Send them to school to learn.

Discussion Leader: Any chance you'd know how the community was actually willing?

R-19A: Depending on the size of the community, they could do town hall meetings.

R-4A: That's why I'm saying put this in a place where there isn't a community. Real estate prices would plummet, and people who have been there forever don't want to move away.

R-13A: I don't think provincial governments would want to have a referendum on this. I don't think they really believe in government by referendum. We don't do that. We elect people. If you get four contenders, I think the best way the NWMO can select a site is to take those four and then do a cost accounting. And if it's cheaper and affects less people, they put it before the government and they say "go ahead".

R-10A: Maybe that's something I worry about when I think about cost. I would not want that to be a priority. If it's safe enough and it's cheaper, go ahead.

Discussion Leader: I passed out another sheet. This backgrounder gives you some background on some challenges that arise and ways we can draw from other experiences. I'm wondering if there's any experience of models that you can think of that would be relevant to consider and draw on when you're designing a site selection process.

R-8A: There must be something out there from the implementation of the first nuclear sites to draw on?

Discussion Leader: Given that was so long ago, do you think things might have changed?

R-8A: The safety issue is still there.

R-3A: I really appreciated the number of questions they raised. They were right on the mark.

Discussion Leader: They were raising the right questions. What particular questions were good?

R-3A: Under finding community, the question that ended with "there". I liked the end question under "demonstrating fairness". There's also one under "balance and social acceptability" and then "what processes needs to be put into place to ensure that a community continues to benefit from a facility well into the future?" It makes me feel really good about that they're thinking the same things I am thinking of.

R-10A: It makes me wish we made a lot of our decisions using this type of thinking and questions.

R-9A: What happens to the community that inevitably sprung up to build this thing? Do you have something like Chalk River where they beg people to move there are retire?

R-5A: I really liked the "defining community" aspects. That it should be based on economic activity. If that starts affecting tourism, then it's a great side effect. It's a very good question.

R-4A: It's not like they're going to give tours.

R-1A: They do give tours at nuclear plants.

Discussion Leader: Not in all parts of them. Are they using the right kinds of models and experiences?

R-19A: Yes, I think they are. In terms of community acceptance, do we go to town hall meetings? They've put a lot of things forward here that are very good.

Discussion Leader: What are some of the ways that the NWMO can keep their eyes and ears open to advice and expertise as they move forward?

R-9A: They seem to be doing a good job. That doesn't bother me at all.

R-6A: All interested communities should have a minimum 75% percent referendum. Should "community" be narrowly defined? Of course not! You need to have consensus.

R-17A: With technology the way it is, maybe they can do something with it in the future.

Discussion Leader: The experts doubt that. Those of us who aren't experts have a hard time believing it. Who should be in involved in the site selection process? Should it be individuals? Should it be groups? Who gets involved and who is responsible?

R-6A: Who it should not be are the politicians! The track record is not admirable.

R-2A: Whenever you have the amount of dollars being talked about for this, you are not going to exclude the politicians. It's going to have the support of the province and surrounding area. There's going to be at least eighteen months to two years of groundwork that has to be done to make the criteria just to get applications in. Can you imagine just the amount of work you have to do to get your application in? I cannot believe that you're talking $20 billion for one of these sites and you're thinking it will be possible to exclude government.

R-12A: Well I want loud agreement from scientists involved. It's a scientific issue.

R-3A: You think that by the time it gets to that point, science has already said "yes", but you need these other people to make sure the community sees it.

Discussion Leader: So we'll take that the scientists have a large voice, that'll be a given. Who do we layer on top of that? Is it a process by which, for example, the NWMO will put ads in the paper about, or on the radio? Or does the NWMO have to do more than that? Recruit people?

R-13A: I think the NWMO has to hire a substantive staff, have a standard presentation at public meetings, but then about three quarters of the meeting should be them asking people what their expectations and concerns are.

Discussion Leader: But what happens when five people show up?

R-13A: I think you'll have a lot more people show up.

Discussion Leader: But that that's their track record so far.

R-13A: Once you get to a site and start talking about economic spin offs on sites….

Discussion Leader: I take your point. Maybe more will come. The question still remains: if people choose not to engage, does the NWMO have an obligation to do more than lead a horse to water?

R-13A: The secret of this is not to send talking heads. You need to set up some parameters where you share your expectations. If you present that properly, and it's a big issue, you will fill some halls. Because this process is such a long process, part of it is selecting that appropriate time. Not to be there too early, or too late. This is so elongated by the time you've done this and the drilling takes four years, people will forget what you did.

R-5A: The first thing I thought of, is since it affects property values, is the landowners in the area. They have a vested interest. People moving to Vancouver in a week are not going to be as interested as people who have a business. Direct mail to registered landowners will get a good portion.

Discussion Leader: You could have a town hall meeting. And make a list of people to invite, leaders of the community, rotary club, etc. So what I'm trying to get a sense from you is whether the NWMO just needs to do some basic communications, and if they don't come, tough? Or does the organization need to roll up its sleeves and do some work to stimulate some interested?

R-6A: Once the communities have shown an interest, the meetings will follow! The people will come! I don't see a problem there. If the town councils or the chambers of commerce decide we would

be a community that would want to participate, I believe the people will come

R-3A: I know what you're saying, but it depends on how it's being communicated. If people get the sense that the powers that be have made their mind up, then I wouldn't be that inclined to go. But if they feel that "this is up to you", in a real sense, then I think it is up to the NWMO to communicate this effectively.

Discussion Leader: So communicating that it is an open, transparent, honest, ethical process that isn't a *fait accompli* is very important?

R-3A: That and it matters that it's there, that you can't do this without them.

R-10A: And the vocabulary has to be appropriate.

R-13A: What if they established a physical presence – a storefront – in the 5 communities that are short-listed. They'd see it isn't a whole bunch of dudes from Ottawa. Then you do the community leader thing. Then it can expand from there. If you just put a notice in the paper, nothing much is going to happen.

R-10A: But just understanding the impact. They're building a condo in my area. I saw the notice and didn't do anything about it. When someone came knocking on my door, I listened. It has that extra impact.

R-4A: But it could be a social thing. Almost like a fair, they can bring the family.

R-2A: No, that'd look like too much of a sell.

R-4A: But something that's a bit more informed. It's a social event. It's done well. It gives them a hands-on, touchy, they can go through it.

R-2A: The education process on the fear and the risks will take place long before they're ready to go back and set up the storefront. There will be a lot more education out there. I like the storefront

idea because anyone can go in and ask questions. And they're willing to invest their time in this community.

APPENDICES

i. Navigator Personnel
ii. Discussion Leader's Guide
iii. Backgrounder 1: Selecting a Site
iv. Backgrounder 2: Framing the Discussion
v. Backgrounder 3: Learning from Others

I. NAVIGATOR 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.

LANNY A. CARDOW, PROJECT MANAGER

Lanny Cardow is a consultant performing research-based strategic communications work on projects for Navigator's corporate and not-for-profit clients.

Lanny most recently served in the Office of the Prime Minister as the Executive Assistant to the PM's Chief of Staff, having previously worked in the Office of the Leader of the Opposition in various capacities, including Manager of Outreach (Operations).

Lanny graduated with a master's degree from The George Washington University's Graduate School of Political Management in 2006, specializing in both Campaign Management and Polling course concentrations.

While completing his degree, Lanny performed research at GWU's Institute for Politics, Democracy and the Internet, contributing to numerous studies and events that explored the crossroads of online technology and advanced campaigning techniques.

Lanny earned his bachelor's degree in Political Studies at Queen's University in 2002.

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.

AMY LONEY, PANEL MANAGER (ANGLOPHONE)

Prior to joining Navigator, Amy attended Queen's University where she graduated with a Bachelor of Arts Honours degree in Political Science. Amy has also completed intensive Explore French Language Bursary Programs at Université de Montréal and Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières respectively.

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

II. DISCUSSION LEADERS GUIDE

PHASE FOUR CITIZEN PANELS

DISCUSSION LEADER'S GUIDE

1. OPENING OF PANEL SESSION (0:00 – 0:03)

- Welcome back
- Explanation of NWMO disclosure of proceedings
- Re-introduction of Transcriber
- Re-introduction of Parking lot
- Re-introduction of Panel Managers

2. PRE-DISCUSSION EXERCISE (0:03-0:15)

'Creating an Information Package' Exercise

- Brainstorming about what an information package should look like.
- Will revisit suggestions later in the Panel discussion.

3. OVERVIEW OF AGENDA FOR SESSION (0:15 – 0:17)

4. RE-INTRODUCTIONS (0:17 – 0:21)

5. GENERAL DISCUSSION (0:21 – 0:25)

- Read, seen or heard anything about NWMO in the media since our last discussion?

6. BROAD DISCUSSION OF SITING PROCESS (0:25 – 0:30)

7. DISCUSSION OF BACKGROUNDERS 1 AND 2: BACKGROUND – 'SELECTING A SITE' AND 'FRAMING THE DISCUSSION' (0:30 – 1:10)

- **Q1: Does the framework of objectives, ethical principles and requirements provide a sound foundation for designing the process for selecting a site?**
  - Do you think this ethical framework will be good for the siting process?
  - Do you feel this framework covers all of the important aspects?
  - Do you feel that anything is missing?

- **Q2: How can we ensure that the process for selecting a site is fair?**
    - How, in your view, could fairness be best assured in and by the process for selecting a site?
    - How should the process for selecting a site take into account the needs of both this generation and future generations - so that costs, benefits, risks and responsibilities are distributed fairly across generations?
    - Are there other geographical considerations which should be taken into account for the process to be fair?
    - The NWMO has committed to only choosing a site in a location that is informed and willing. How might the design of the process ensure that this happens?

8. DISCUSSION OF BACKGROUNDER 3: 'LEARNING FROM OTHERS' (1:10 – 1:40)

- **Q3: From what models and experience should the NWMO draw in designing a siting process?**
    - From your perspective, what experience and models do you think would be particularly relevant to consider and draw from in designing the process for selecting a site?
    - What other decisions/processes might we learn from or are comparable? Are there events which have happened in the past which you are aware of which we should look back on for lessons?
- **Q4: Who should be involved in the process for selecting a site, and what should be their role?**
    - What are your views on who should be involved in selecting a site? What would you count on them to bring to the process?
    - Would you expect each of these individuals and groups to play a different role in selecting a site, or have different responsibilities in the process? What role or responsibilities?

9. DISCUSSION OF 'COMMUNICATIONS' GROUP WORK (1:40 – 2:10)

- **Q5: What information and tools do you think would facilitate your participation?**
    - What information and tools do you think would help Canadians participate constructively in the siting process?
    - What about reporting: things like documents and publications?

- Do any of the questions raised today strike you as more important than the others? Less important?

- Do you have any suggestions for what remains to be considered?

10. REVIEW "PROJECT DESCRIPTION" AND "WHO WE ARE" AND OTHER DOCUMENTS (2:10 – 2:50)

- Do you think something like this would help explain the project to larger audiences?

- If you didn't know what you now know about the NWMO's project, would a document like this answer your questions, or perhaps help you ask some better ones?

- What suggestions do you have to help NWMO improve this document?

[Distribute 'Who we are' document and give Panelists a few minutes to review]

- If you didn't know about the NWMO or the role it plays, would a document like this answer your questions, or perhaps help you ask some better ones?

- What suggestions do you have to help NWMO improve this document?

[Distribute 'Security and Safeguards', 'Transportation of Used Nuclear Fuel', and 'Monitoring and Retrievability' documents and give Panelists a few minutes to review]

- And what do you think about these ones?

- What suggestions do you have to help NWMO improve these documents?

11. WRAP-UP (2:50 – 3:00)

- As we end our session does anyone have any remaining issues to discuss or questions to raise about our discussions here?

- Panel Management issues

- Adjourn

III. BACKGROUNDER 1: SELECTING A SITE

Background - Selecting a site

Canadians have been using electricity generated by nuclear power reactors for about four decades. Canada currently has 20 operating commercial reactors at 5 nuclear generating stations located in New Brunswick, Québec and Ontario. These reactors are fueled by uranium formed into bundles. Once used, the bundles are hazardous to humans and the environment, essentially indefinitely. They must be managed properly.

Canada has about two million used fuel bundles and is generating about 85,000 more each year. We can expect to produce about 3.6 million used fuel bundles if each of the current electricity generating reactors operates for its anticipated average life-span of about 40 years.

Currently, the used fuel bundles are safely stored at licensed facilities located at the reactor sites in Canada. The communities hosting these facilities understand this to be temporary, and that the used fuel has always been destined for long-term management at a specially-designed facility.

Through Adaptive Phased Management, the used fuel bundles will ultimately be packaged into long-lived strongly built containers, transported to the selected site and placed in the deep geological repository.

While technical studies suggest that large geographic portions of Canada have rock formations potentially suitable for the deep geological repository, scientific, technical, social, ethical, economic, and environmental factors also have to be weighed in selecting a site.

That site will occupy a surface area of about 2 kilometres by 3 kilometres. Underground, the repository will be about 1.8 square kilometres in area. It will consist of a network of horizontal tunnels and rooms excavated in stable rock at a depth between 500 to 1,000 metres. Once there, the used fuel will be monitored to confirm the safety and performance of the repository until a decision is made to close the site. It will remain retrievable until such time as a future society decides on final closure and on the appropriate form and duration of post-closure monitoring.

People will be keenly interested in where the site is located, in how the used fuel will get there, and in how safety and security will be assured. Communities considering hosting the site will want to know how their well-being could be affected including what risks they might face, how they might benefit, and what commitments they will have to make.

Communities will also want to have updated information about the used fuel to be managed. We will regularly publish inventory information on the current and future potential used fuel inventories. Recognizing the potential for industry to make decisions that may affect the amount and characteristics of the used fuel to be managed in future, we will continually monitor, review and invite broad discussion about new developments so that our plans may be adjusted as required.

Selecting the site thus requires dialogue and careful thinking. We expect that the design of the selection process will need to have many features including:

- The objectives of the siting process and the principles that would apply.
- The major steps in the siting process.
- The factors and criteria that will be applied in making siting decisions.
- How Aboriginal insights and traditional knowledge will be respected.
- How information will be communicated and shared.
- The studies required at each step.
- How to work collaboratively throughout the process.

IV. BACKGROUND 2: FRAMING THE DISCUSSION

Framing the discussion

In conversations with Canadians during the study phase of our work, we heard that the approach for managing Canada's used nuclear fuel must respond to a *framework* of objectives and characteristics. This framework will help shape the process for selecting a site and to help guide implementation.

Objectives

The process for selecting a site should help Adaptive Phased Management achieve the objectives set for it by citizens:

Fairness – To ensure fairness (in substance and process) in the distribution of costs, benefits, risks and responsibilities, within this generation and across generations.

Public Health and Safety – To protect public health from the risk of exposure to radioactive or other hazardous materials and from the threat of injuries or deaths due to accidents.

Worker Health and Safety – To protect workers and minimize hazards associated with managing used nuclear fuel.

Community Well-being – To ensure the well-being of all communities with a shared interest.

Security – To ensure the security of facilities, materials and infrastructure.

Environmental Integrity – To ensure that environmental integrity is maintained over the long term.

Economic Viability – To ensure the economic viability of the waste management system, while simultaneously contributing positively to the local economy.

Adaptability – To ensure a capacity to adapt to changing knowledge and conditions over time.

Of these objectives, people consider safety, security and fairness to be paramount: the management approach must ensure *safety and security* for people, communities and the environment, and it must be seen to be safe and secure from the perspective of current and future generations.

Characteristics

The process for selecting a site should also be responsive to the characteristics which Canadians said would be important for any siting process:

- Be open, inclusive and fair to all parties, giving everyone with an interest an opportunity to have their views heard and taken into account.
- Ensure that groups most likely to be affected by the facility, including through transportation, are given full opportunity to have their views heard and taken into account, and are provided with the forms of assistance they require to present their case effectively.
- Respect all Aboriginal rights, treaties and land claims.
- Be free from conflict of interest, personal gain or bias among those making the decision and/or formulating recommendations.
- Be informed by the best knowledge — from the natural and social sciences, Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge, ethics and technology development – relevant to making a decision and/or formulating a recommendation.
- Be in accord with the precautionary principle, which seeks to avoid harm and the risk of harm, and which demands ethical justification for such harm that is unavoidable.
- Ensure that those who could be exposed to harm or risk of harm, or other losses or limitations, are fully consulted and are willing to accept what is proposed for them.
- Take into consideration the possible costs, harms, risks, and benefits of the siting decision, including financial, physical, biological, social, cultural, and ethical costs.
- Ensure that those who benefited most from nuclear power (past, present and perhaps future) bear the costs and risks of managing used fuel and other materials.
- Address scientific and technical factors that may help ensure safety.

Implementation of the approach will respect the social, cultural and economic aspirations of affected communities.

A matter of ethics:

The process for selecting a site should strive to:

- **Respect life in all its forms, including minimization of harm to human beings and other sentient creatures.**
- **Respect future generations of human beings, other species, and the biosphere as a whole.**
- **Respect peoples and cultures.**
- **Promote justice across groups, regions, and generations.**
- **Be fair to everyone affected, particularly to minorities and marginalized groups.**
- **Respect the values and interpretations that different individuals and groups bring to dialogue and other means of collaboration.**

Canadians told the NWMO they want to be sure, above all, that the site for the deep geological repository is safe and secure. The process for choosing that site must be grounded in values and objectives that Canadians hold important. The process must be open, transparent, fair and inclusive. And the NWMO believes it must be designed in a way that citizens across this country are confident meets the highest scientific, professional and ethical standards.

The NWMO makes commitments as to how such a process must work:
1. The decision by a community to host the site must be informed and made willingly.
2. The site selected must meet strict, scientifically-determined safety requirements.
3. In the interest of fairness, the process should focus on the provinces directly involved in the nuclear fuel cycle: New Brunswick, Québec, Ontario and Saskatchewan. Communities in other regions that express an interest will also be considered.
4. Communities that decide to engage in the process for selecting a site, as potential hosts, shall have the right to withdraw consistent with any agreements between themselves and the NWMO

V. BACKGROUNDER 3: LEARNING FROM OTHERS

Learning from others

In beginning to think about the design of a process for selecting a site for Canada's used nuclear fuel, we take the view that a process for Canada needs to be designed by Canadians. In the study phase of our work, citizens told us a great deal about their concerns and expectations.

At the same time, siting experiences here and abroad—involving nuclear waste and other hazardous substances, as well as comparable decision-making processes–offer insight about what might be challenging and about what might work well. Overall, these experiences seem to confirm the merit of a site-selection process for Canada that seeks an informed and willing host community, that is collaborative and that considers technical, social, environmental and social factors together.

The following are some challenges and opportunities that may be important to consider:

Being inclusive
Canadians told us that the success of the process for selecting a site hinges on open and fair collaboration with all potential host communities and other interested people and organizations at every step. At some point, the process will need to focus on candidate host communities and ultimately on the selected community. How can we ensure that the process for selecting a site involves the right people at the right times without leaving anyone out unfairly? Participation also carries important responsibilities for all participants. We seek the advice of Canadians in identifying those responsibilities and ensuring they are shared and applied fairly.

Defining 'community'
We want to ensure that people and communities can participate in all aspects of the site selection decision that affect them. It will be important to identify what constitutes a 'community' and who can best speak on its behalf. Should a community be defined narrowly and by political boundaries, such as the confines of a town, or should it be based on patterns of economic activity and include the surrounding area?

Measuring community acceptance
We believe that any community which eventually hosts the nuclear waste management facility must be willing to do so. It will be important to identify how we might gauge the willingness of any community that expresses an interest. In what ways might potential host communities demonstrate they have the permission and trust of their residents to explore hosting the facility? And how might we consider the needs of future generations in considering expressions of interest?

Demonstrating fairness
Fairness demands that any community expressing willingness to host a facility do so in a way which is free and informed. This means that the community has the information it needs to assess how it might be affected by the decision, and that it is not under undue influence of economic considerations. Key decisions must be taken through full and deliberate engagement. How can this be best accomplished?

Balancing social acceptability with other factors
If more than one community wishes to host the site, how might we decide between them? Each site is likely to have its own but different strengths. One site may be closer to where used fuels are currently stored, but require more engineering to make sure the facility is safe. Another community may have more support among residents but require more technical research to ascertain whether the physical characteristics of the site are appropriate.

Strengthening community capacity
People and communities must have the wherewithal to take part in the process. Different groups will have their own requirements, ideas and way of doing things. Particularly important are the time and resources that potential host communities will require to make informed choices. We need to understand the requirements of participants and seek tools that can aid their involvement. What suggestions do you have for ensuring that people are equipped to take part?

Partnership
Experience suggests that the building of long-term relationships and partnerships is vital to the success of the process for selecting a site. This takes time and effort, but the benefits can range from sharing information and resources to building trust and improving communication. What are the essential ingredients for building real and lasting relationships and partnerships? What kinds of agreements should be forged?

Ensuring community well-being
We are committed to ensuring that any community that decides to host the facility will be better off for having done so. The well-being of a community might be affected in a broad range of ways, from traditional use of land to economic development and socio-cultural cohesion. It will be important to understand how a community might be affected by its decision and to ensure this is weighed appropriately before proceeding. What processes need to be put in place to ensure that the community continues to benefit from the facility well in to the future? How do we resolve potential conflicts and differences in perspective?

RESEARCH | STRATEGY | RESULTS™

NAVIGATOR LIMITED BRITISH COLONIAL BUILDING, THIRD FLOOR, EIGHT WELLINGTON ST. E., TORONTO, CANADA M5E1C5
main 416-642-6440 *fax* 416-642-6435 *web* www.navltd.com