

Advisory Council

to the NWMO

NOVEMBER 2005

Advisory Council Tracking Matrix

--	--	--	--

Introduction

The purpose of this Tracking Matrix is to outline the nature of the NWMO and Advisory Council interaction over the three-year study period in which the NWMO was conducting its review of long-term management approaches for used nuclear fuel.

Early in its process, the Advisory Council discussed the type of information that it would track to assist members in developing the Council's independent comments on the NWMO study.

Accordingly, the Advisory Council agreed that it would maintain a Tracking Matrix designed to track Advisory Council and NWMO interactions in the following way:

A) NWMO-initiated Requests & Actions

Tracking of areas in which NWMO has:

1. sought advice from the Advisory Council ; and
 2. extended opportunities to the Advisory Council for interaction and briefings;
- and the response of the Advisory Council to these opportunities.

B) Advisory Council-initiated Requests

Tracking of areas in which the Advisory Council has:

1. provided suggestions to NWMO; and
 2. made requests of NWMO;
- and the responsiveness of the NWMO to these requests.

Complementary Reports

For further details on the content and discussion of Council's deliberations and meetings with the NWMO, readers may wish to refer to the minutes of proceedings from Advisory Council meetings, which are available for public review on the NWMO website at www.nwmo.ca/advisorycouncil.

The Advisory Council's formal comments on the NWMO study, are available on the NWMO website. The Advisory Council's comments were also included in the NWMO's *Final Study Report*, submitted to the Minister of Natural Resources Canada in November 2005.

Contents

SECTION 1	Operations	5
SECTION 2	Briefings / Site Visits	13
SECTION 3	Workplan	20
SECTION 4	Annual Reports	33
SECTION 5	Discussion Documents and Study Reports	37
SECTION 6	Engagement	51

Operations

This section addresses NWMO and Advisory Council interaction on general operational issues. This includes advice sought by NWMO from the Fall of 2002, as it formed the foundation for the new organization and the newly established Advisory Council. Included in this section, are suggestions and requests tabled by the Advisory Council concerning the structure of Council operations and protocol, and the activities undertaken by the Advisory Council in developing its independent comments on the NWMO study.

Operations

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>October 24, 2002 → The Advisory Council urged adoption of a public identity for the organization that offers transparency and clarity on the mandate. Council advised that the public identity for communications be the same as legal corporate name, to avoid confusion.</p>	<p>February 2003 → NWMO changed its legal name to match the public identity selected for public communications (Nuclear Waste Management Organization).</p>
		<p>October 24, 2002 → The Advisory Council requested that its meeting agendas be structured to allow both in camera discussion and discussion with NWMO, to recognize its dual accountabilities of providing independent comment and also ongoing advice to NWMO.</p> <p>→ Council requested some two-day meetings early in its mandate, to allow broad coverage of issues.</p> <p>→ Council requested that NWMO staff take minutes.</p>	<p>January 2003 on → Agendas were structured in this way to allow for discussion with NWMO and also in camera without the NWMO present.</p> <p>→ In addition, the Advisory Council convened private meetings to discuss and draft its independent comments on the NWMO study.</p> <p>→ NWMO arranged some two-day meetings in 2003.</p> <p>→ The NWMO Corporate Secretary took notes and drafted Council's records of discussion for its review and approval prior to posting the minutes on the NWMO website. (The Corporate Secretary did not attend or take notes of the Council's in camera sessions.)</p>
		<p>October 24, 2002 → The Advisory Council expressed interest in having regular debriefs on Board deliberations and decisions. It was felt that the more information that the Council had, the better equipped it would be to offer ongoing advice to the Board and NWMO generally.</p>	<p>October 2002 on → The Council Chairman was invited to attend all Board meetings and report back to Council.</p> <p>→ Opportunities were provided for full Board and Council to meet and discuss NWMO work. (e.g., October 23, 2002; March 27, 2003, September 22, 2003;</p>

Operations

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
			January 19, 2004, October 18, 2004, July 20, 2005).
		<p>October 24, 2002 → Frequent updates from NWMO were requested by the Council, so that it would be prepared to comment with integrity on the work of the NWMO.</p>	<p>January 2003 → The President proposed that her staff write monthly reports to be emailed to Council (initiated January 2003). → The NWMO extended a standing invitation to the Advisory Council to advise NWMO if they wish to have more information than is provided in the monthly reports, or would like a different format. → The NWMO also updated Council at each meeting on NWMO's activities.</p>
<p>January 11, 2003 → NWMO shared its draft Vision, Mission, Values statement for review, comment.</p>		<p>January 11, 2003 → Council provided suggestions.</p>	<p>January 2003 → NWMO incorporated Council's comments in final draft of the statement.</p>
		<p>January 11, 2003 → The Advisory Council asked to be kept apprised of the President's formal speeches, and to have access to the speeches.</p>	<p>Ongoing → NWMO referenced all speeches in monthly reports to the Advisory Council and made all speeches available on the NWMO website.</p>
<p>March 23, 2004 → The President convened a discussion with Council on its preparations for meeting legislative requirements and independent comment. She emphasized the NWMO's desire to ensure that Council is prepared to fulfill its legislated obligations in 2005.</p>	<p>March 23, 2004 → Council discussed its legislated obligations, and reviewed a range of considerations it might address in its formal comments on the NWMO study and management approaches. Initial discussion took place on the development of a critical path to ensure that Council is prepared to comment.</p>	<p>March 23, 2004 → The Advisory Council requested that NWMO set up a special session to support a continuation of Council's discussion of its preparations for independent comments on the NWMO study. Council members requested that NWMO arrange for a June 5th special session devoted to this purpose.</p>	<p>June 2004 → At the Advisory Council's request, NWMO set up a special session for June 5, 2004.</p>

Operations

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>→ President invited Council suggestions on additional information or supplemental briefings it would like to have to help prepare for its mandated commenting role. The NWMO noted upcoming conferences that Council may wish to participate in as part of ongoing briefings and research visits.</p> <p>→ The NWMO expressed its desire that Council identify any information needs, special briefings or guest presentations to supplement those previously provided.</p>	<p>→ Council agreed to pursue its discussion on preparations for its legislated role.</p> <p>→ At this time, Council did not elect to participate in further research visits or conferences until there had been further opportunity for Council members to consider their critical path and the type of information and briefings that would be helpful in preparing for the independent commenting role.</p>	<p>→ Members of the Advisory Council were interested in having further discussion on its preparations for the independent commenting role, and the implications for the structure of future Council meetings.</p>	<p>→ Subsequent meetings were set up for the purpose of private Council deliberations.</p>
<p>June 5, 2004 (Special Session)</p> <p>→ The President invited the Advisory Council to flag at an early stage, the information requirements and support Council would need to be sufficiently equipped to meet its obligations under the <i>Nuclear Fuel Waste Act</i>.</p> <p>→ NWMO provided a review of key provisions of the <i>Nuclear Fuel Waste Act</i> as context for Council.</p>	<p>June 5, 2004</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council discussed its operations and preparations for writing its independent comments.</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council set out preliminary areas in which it may elect to comment on at the conclusion of the study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NWMO's process • The substance of the study • Whether the Council had detected any inappropriate influence on NWMO by Board or government • How NWMO approached each part of the study • NWMO's responsiveness to Council suggestions and its openness to areas of inquiry by Council over the three years • Council may also review the extent to which NWMO met the recommendations of Seaborn Panel (where applicable to the study phase) <p>→ Council set dates for in camera planning sessions.</p>	<p>June 5, 2004</p> <p>→ Council discussed some process considerations associated with its obligations under the <i>Nuclear Fuel Waste Act</i>.</p> <p>→ To assist Council in preparing comments, members requested that NWMO assist in the preparation of a Tracking Matrix of Council advice given and NWMO responsiveness.</p>	<p>2004 – 05</p> <p>→ NWMO assisted with the development of a Tracking Matrix to enable Council to track NWMO/Advisory Council interaction.</p>

Operations

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
	<p>→ Council believes it is within its mandate to provide NWMO with written advice on various matters. These may be issues identified by NWMO or the Council. This would supplement the written record currently consisting of minutes of meetings.</p> <p>→ With respect to engagement, Council saw its role as offering advice and flagging areas requiring strengthening or further attention. NWMO would decide on the ultimate program designs and processes.</p> <p>→ The Council agreed it should establish and communicate to NWMO the expectations and criteria against which it will be assessing and commenting on NWMO's study.</p>		<p>→ NWMO posted on its website the Advisory Council Statement of how the Council intends to meet its legislated obligations. The NWMO also included the Council Statement in the NWMO Draft Study, published May 2005.</p>
		<p>June 5, 2004</p> <p>→ Council resolved to set up a Sub-Committee on Aboriginal Engagement composed of the Chairman and two members. NWMO was asked to provide the Sub-Committee with background information on actions taken with respect to Aboriginal engagement.</p>	<p>June 2004</p> <p>→ NWMO arranged briefings of the Sub-Committee on NWMO's Aboriginal engagement program, including plans in progress and the outcome of the Traditional Knowledge workshop.</p>
		<p>June 22, 2004</p> <p>→ Council requested that NWMO make changes to the Tracking Matrix, to support the documenting of Council deliberations.</p>	<p>August – October 2004</p> <p>→ NWMO has made these revisions and distributed the revised Tracking Matrix to Council for its use.</p>

Operations

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>November 25, 2004</p> <p>→ The NWMO presented contextual briefings relating to the Council's legislated mandate as set out in the <i>Nuclear Fuel Waste Act</i>.</p> <p>→ The President reviewed the articles of the Act that had specific relevance to the Advisory Council's work and tabled a document describing each section of the Act.</p> <p>→ The President expressed her interest in ensuring that the Advisory Council members had sufficient resources available to them in 2005 to assist with the preparation of their comments for the study to be submitted to the Minister of Natural Resources Canada.</p> <p>→ The President noted that a proposed set of meeting dates for 2005 had been distributed to Council. She invited Council members to advise NWMO if they would like additional meetings scheduled to support their internal deliberations and preparation of the Advisory Council's independent comments.</p> <p>→ The Council members were invited to identify to NWMO additional briefings or guest speakers that they would like to schedule for upcoming meetings.</p>	<p>→ Council subsequently requested access to external professional writing resources to support its written comments.</p> <p>→ Council identified additional meeting dates in 2005 to support private deliberations and drafting of comments.</p>	<p>November 25, 2004</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council convened in camera to support its private discussions on the preparation of its independent comments.</p>	
		<p>February 1, 2005</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council members confirmed approval of the Statement paper, finalized on January 22, 2005 in which they address how the Council intends to discharge its mandate under</p>	<p>→ The NWMO posted the Council Statement on the website.</p>

Operations

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>the Act with respect to its comments on the NWMO study.</p> <p>→ The Chairman directed the NWMO to make this Council paper public through posting on the NWMO website, and through inclusion in the NWMO's forthcoming <i>Draft Study Report</i>.</p>	
		<p>March 14, 2005</p> <p>→ At the request of Natural Resources Canada, the NWMO arranged for the department to meet with the Advisory Council without the presence of NWMO management. Natural Resources Canada, in fulfilling its oversight functions under the <i>Nuclear Fuel Waste Act</i>, had sought an update from the Advisory Council as to how it was fulfilling its legislative mandate.</p>	
		<p>March 14, 2005</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council convened an in camera session for private discussion of its independent comments on the NWMO study.</p>	
<p>March 31, 2005</p> <p>→ NWMO inquired about Council's plans to hire a writer. NWMO confirmed it would provide any resources required to support the Council.</p>	<p>→ Council undertook to follow up on selection of a writer.</p>	<p>April 2005</p> <p>→ Advisory Council made its selection of a writer.</p>	<p>April 2005</p> <p>→ NWMO followed up with the administration to arrange the contract commencing in May 2005.</p>
	<p>June 3, 2005</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council convened a number of private meetings with the writer that Council commissioned to assist in the drafting of its independent Council report.</p>		

Operations

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
	<p>→ As part of these in camera sessions, the Advisory Council also continued its discussion of the Tracking Matrix.</p> <p>→ These private sessions, convened without the presence of the NWMO, took place: June 3, 2005 June 20, 2005 July 1, 2005 July 20, 2005 August 5, 2005 August 19, 2005 August 26, 2005 September 6, 2005 September 15, 2005</p> <p>→ Throughout this period of time, the Council continued its dialogue with the NWMO, sharing comments that were taken into consideration by NWMO as it prepared the <i>Final Study Report</i>.</p>		
	<p>September 15, 2005</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council advised the NWMO that Council had completed its comments, and would be formally transmitting its report to the NWMO, for inclusion in the NWMO's <i>Final Study Report</i> that will be submitted to the Minister of Natural Resources Canada and made public.</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council reported it would be continuing to work on the Tracking Matrix, which would be discussed by Council for final comment during an October 31 conference call.</p>		

Briefings / Site Visits

This section outlines the opportunities provided to the Advisory Council by the NWMO in terms of background briefings and site visits. It also reports on topics and issues for which the Advisory Council had requested information, and opportunities sought by Council to meet with invited guests as a means of understanding the breadth of perspective on the issue of long-term management of used nuclear fuel.

Briefings / Site Visits

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>October 24, 2002 → The NWMO arranged for an orientation session for Council, providing introductory briefings and discussion on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Nuclear Fuel Waste Act</i> (addressing study obligations under Act, Council's role, focus on social and ethical issues, Aboriginal consultation) • Current interim storage practices in Canada and the CANDU technology • The evolution of policy reviews in Canada, through to Seaborn Panel and the <i>Nuclear Fuel Waste Act</i>. 			
		<p>October 24, 2002 → The Council requested an opportunity for a site visit to an interim storage facility.</p>	<p>May 9, 2003 → The NWMO arranged for Council to tour Pickering Nuclear Generation Station, for a briefing on interim storage.</p>
		<p>October 24, 2002 → Council expressed interest in international reviews, to take stock and stay abreast of how other countries are addressing this issue.</p>	<p>January 2003 → NWMO staff provided a briefing at the January 2003 Council meeting on the status of international studies and approaches taken in other countries.</p> <p>→ NWMO initiated distribution of a weekly news scan to keep Council abreast of international developments.</p> <p>→ At the January 10, 2004 meeting, the NWMO provided Council with copies of background papers on comparative approaches in other countries, and an overview of European initiatives.</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council was provided with opportunities to participate in research trips to other countries. For</p>

Briefings / Site Visits

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
			<p>example, NWMO arranged a research trip to Yucca Mountain in 2003. NWMO extended the offer to Council to identify other research sites or countries it wished to visit.</p> <p>→ Council had a representative attend an international conference in Luxembourg for purposes of reporting back on research and development and social considerations relating to nuclear waste management.</p> <p>→ NWMO invited a Council member to participate in a research trip to Finland. One Council member participated.</p>
		<p>October 24, 2002</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council tabled topics on which it would be interested in having briefings and discussions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy policy directions in Canada • Technical and financial aspects of used fuel management • The ethical dimensions of the study • Consultation plans, Aboriginal outreach 	<p>October 2004</p> <p>→ NWMO arranged briefings for Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADM Ric Cameron (NRCAN) January 11, 2003. He addressed Canada's energy sector and the nuclear fuel cycle. • NWMO arranged for presentation by joint waste owners (K. Nash, F. King) on engineering and costing of different options, May 9, 2003 Council meeting. • NWMO arranged Council briefing by Lois Wilson in March 2003. • In addition, NWMO arranged for discussions on ethics with the Ethics Roundtable, United Church of Canada and Joanne Barnaby.

Briefings / Site Visits

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blair Seaborn, and findings of the Panel • Consultation plans, Aboriginal outreach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blair Seaborn was a guest speaker at the January 2003 Council meeting. • NWMO briefed Council on engagement plans and methods on an ongoing basis.
		<p>January 11, 2003 → The Advisory Council expressed interest in having a briefing from Lois Wilson of the Seaborn Panel, on the social and technical aspects of safety, and ethical considerations.</p>	<p>March 2003 → NWMO arranged for the guest presentation by Lois Wilson on March 28, 2003.</p>
		<p>January 11, 2003 → Advisory Council expressed interest in a briefing from Linda Keen, President of the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, on the role of the regulator in future reviews of the long-term management approach.</p>	<p>March 2003 → This was arranged for March 27, 2003. Ms. Keen and staff provided a presentation.</p>
<p>March 28, 2003 → The President offered list of research visits that Council may be interested in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yucca Mountain • URL in Manitoba • Pickering Nuclear Generating Station. <p>→ The NWMO reviewed a longer list of technical conferences for the Council's information.</p>	<p>March 28, 2003 → Council confirmed their interest.</p> <p>→ The NWMO arranged the trips with Council participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yucca Mountain – July 2003 (6 members) • Underground Research Laboratory Pinawa, Manitoba – May 6, 2003 (one Council member joined NWMO) • Pickering Nuclear Station – May 9th, 2003 (4 members) 		

Briefings / Site Visits

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>May 9, 2003 → NWMO arranged for guest speakers to address the technical designs of the options:</p> <p>Mr. Ken Nash Vice President – Nuclear Waste Management Division, OPG Mr. Frank King, Director – Nuclear Waste Engineering and Technology, OPG.</p> <p>→ Mr. King provided an overview of the technical research that was previously commissioned by joint waste owners (JWO) for options referenced in the <i>Nuclear Fuel Waste Act</i> – deep geologic disposal, centralized storage and storage at reactor sites. The JWO also commissioned work on associated transportation systems for the centralized facility options. Associated cost estimates were also developed. In his presentation, Mr. King referenced some of the design criteria and assumptions and the engineering design of the systems.</p> <p>→ Mr. King noted areas in which the geologic disposal concept differed from the concept originally put forward by AECL for review by the Seaborn Panel, and the scope of issues addressed following the Seaborn Panel process.</p>		<p>May 9, 2003 → Two Council members proposed that they provide technical briefings to Council on used nuclear fuel and radiation. Council expressed interest in such briefings.</p> <p>September 2003 → As part of September 2003 agenda, two Council members provided the briefings for Council and NWMO staff on radiation and basic nuclear physics concepts.</p>	
<p>March 23, 2004 → The NWMO invited a Council member to attend a technical conference in Luxembourg (EURADWASTE '04) for status updates on European work on nuclear waste management.</p>	<p>May 20, 2004 → A Council member agreed to attend the meeting. The Council member provided a report back to Council at the May 20, 2004 meeting on collaborative research underway in Europe, and the</p>		

Briefings / Site Visits

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
	community and social considerations being addressed in relation to management of nuclear waste.		
<p>May 20, 2004 → The President invited Council comments on its preferred structure for its meetings, including additional briefings that members may wish to have.</p>	<p>May 20, 2004 → Council members expressed support for presentations such as that provided by the Assessment Team (see page 27), which members had found to be informative and engaging and provided for full exchange and discussion.</p>	<p>May 20, 2004 → Specifically, Council expressed an interest in having similar opportunities to engage actively in discussions on the ethical dimensions of the study.</p> <p>→ Council members suggested it may also be appropriate for NWMO to consider meeting again with participants from earlier planning discussions, which were intended to assist NWMO in developing an Aboriginal engagement program.</p>	<p>October 18, 2004 → NWMO arranged for many members of Roundtable on Ethics to participate in Council discussion on ethical issues. Also invited, was the United Church of Canada and Joanne Barnaby (see Engagement).</p> <p>→ NWMO continued to reach out to some participants (such as Ron Doering and Joanne Barnaby) from the earlier planning session which focused on the approach NWMO might take in developing its program for Aboriginal outreach.</p>
<p>September 2004 → The NWMO President extended an invitation for a Council member to participate in a research visit to Finland to meet with the organization responsible for managing used nuclear fuel.</p>	<p>October 2004 → A Council member agreed to participate in the research trip to Finland the last week of October. The member reported back to the Council on the findings from the trip.</p>		
		<p>October 18, 2004 → A Council member provided some data to further inform Council's consideration of the issue of whether CANDU fuel should be considered waste or a potential resource.</p> <p>→ Council members expressed their appreciation to two Council members who made technical contributions to the Council which members felt was very helpful in understanding and considering the implications of the management approaches.</p>	

Briefings / Site Visits

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>January 22, 2005 → The President reported that NWMO was in the process of arranging a research visit to the organization responsible for managing used nuclear fuel in Sweden. She extended an invitation for an Advisory Council member to participate in the trip to learn first hand about Sweden's experiences in planning for the long-term management of used nuclear fuel.</p>	<p>→ Some Advisory Council members expressed interest, but were unable to participate due to their schedules.</p>		
		<p>January 22, 2005 → A Council member brought to the attention of the Advisory Council the issue of whether used nuclear fuel should be considered a waste, or whether it should be considered to be a resource. The member noted that the perspective adopted on this important issue will have a bearing on the nature of the long-term management strategy ultimately recommended for used fuel.</p> <p>→ The member provided a paper to the NWMO which addressed these issues.</p>	<p>February 2005 → NWMO reviewed the paper in the context of its analysis and addressed this issue in the <i>Draft Study Report</i>, released May 2005.</p>

Workplan

This section profiles the nature of the exchange between the NWMO and the Advisory Council in discussing the NWMO workplan for the three-year study period. It reflects areas of particular interest on which the Council requested opportunities to comment and provide advice. It also reflects NWMO's desire to seek early Advisory Council input on draft workplans and proposed activities corresponding to each annual business plan, and to share the outcome of various research and assessment activities with the Council.

Workplan

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>October 24, 2002 → The Advisory Council offered suggestions on the range of expertise that NWMO may wish to seek in the study process, including expertise in geology and the perspectives of youth.</p>	<p>2003, 2004, 2005 → NWMO took this into account in the selection of participants for dialogues and analysis. Some dialogues were convened specifically with youth, such as the dialogue held with the International Youth Nuclear Congress of young professionals from the nuclear sector.</p> <p>→ An e-dialogue convened in 2004 focused on university students, addressing the topic of risk and uncertainty.</p> <p>→ NWMO President and staff continued to participate in university lectures and classes upon request.</p>
<p>January 11, 2003 → The President tabled elements of the workplan for Q1 2003 for discussion.</p> <p>→ NWMO arranged for Council to be briefed by Navigator on its research findings from focus groups convened in November and December 2002.</p> <p>→ NWMO briefed Council on the status of policies and studies on used nuclear fuel in other jurisdictions.</p>	<p>January 11, 2003 → Discussion ensued on the workplan, including government interface, engagement of experts and dialogues to support early conversations.</p>		

Workplan

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>March 28, 2003</p> <p>→ The President tabled a Draft Workplan for discussion with Advisory Council, and outlined the sequence of proposed discussion documents, and streams of engagement and analysis.</p>	<p>March 28, 2003</p> <p>→ Council discussed the workplan and provided comments.</p>	<p>March 28, 2003</p> <p>→ Council members requested that the NWMO workplan be published as a “roadmap” for people to follow.</p> <p>→ Council suggested that NWMO allow for input from international reviewers on each document.</p>	<p>Spring 2003</p> <p>→ NWMO posted the workplan and engagement plan on the website, which provided a roadmap to the three-year study.</p> <p>→ Subsequently, the NWMO also posted a paper on the NWMO approach to the development of the analytical framework to be used in the assessment of options.</p> <p>→ The NWMO invited informal and ongoing advice, critique and validation by international reviewers. In addition, NWMO reviewed its work internationally through fora such as the Nuclear Energy Agency of the NEA and other such organizations.</p>
<p>May 10, 2003</p> <p>→ The President shared an updated workplan to assess the management approaches with Council as a status update.</p> <p>→ The President distributed a paper on the ethical dimensions of the study, and key activities planned to ensure incorporation of ethical issues into the study.</p>		<p>May 10, 2003</p> <p>→ Council requested that meetings be arranged to allow for maximum opportunity to comment on NWMO workplans early in the process.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>→ Agendas for Council meetings provided for reviews of the NWMO workplan.</p> <p>→ The mid-year review of the 2004 workplan (engagement and analysis) took place at the October 18 Council meeting. In addition, annual Business Plans are tabled for Council discussion early each year.</p>
		<p>May 10, 2003</p> <p>→ Council flagged the area of costs of alternative management approaches as one issue likely to be of considerable public interest.</p>	<p>2003, 2004, 2005</p> <p>→ NWMO initiated background papers on economic considerations in 2003.</p> <p>→ In 2004, upon receipt of joint waste owners cost estimates, NWMO initiated third-party review to examine the cost estimating process. This body of work, and the third party review, has been made available on the website.</p>

Workplan

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>May 10, 2003 → The President briefed the Council on work under way to define the different management approaches. She referenced the work of the Joint Waste Owners on the engineering and cost estimates.</p> <p>→ As part of this work, NWMO indicated it would be undertaking a review of the findings of the Seaborn Panel's Scientific Review Group.</p>		<p>May 10, 2003 → Council requested that NWMO present the management concepts publicly in a simplified way for clarity.</p> <p>→ Council encouraged NWMO to identify the range of all feasible management options under consideration in a timely way, to ensure adequate time for study of each different method.</p> <p>→ Council recommended that NWMO arrange for peer reviews of the joint waste owners' work on concepts and costs.</p>	<p>→ NWMO arranged for a cost estimate of a fourth option.</p> <p>May 10, 2003 → NWMO committed to summarize the technical concepts at a higher level for general public in the Discussion Documents.</p> <p>November 2003 → NWMO provided a listing of 14 options in Discussion Document 1. Through a process of public comment and assessment team review, NWMO narrowed the range of methods for study to: disposal, centralized storage and reactor site storage. This screening of options was reported on in subsequent Discussion Documents.</p> <p>December 2003 → NWMO received the JWO work on engineering designs. This work is posted on the NWMO website.</p> <p>January 2004 → NWMO arranged for third-party reviews of both the cost estimation process and the engineering designs relating to three management approaches. The results of these reviews were posted on the NWMO website in June 2004.</p> <p>2005 → NWMO subsequently arranged for a third-party review of the cost estimating process and conceptual design for the fourth option, proposed in the <i>Draft Study Report</i>.</p>

Workplan

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>June 25, 2003 → The Advisory Council expressed its interest in hearing from the NWMO on work underway to review issues raised by the Scientific Review Group of the Seaborn Panel.</p>	<p>September 23, 2003 → Further to the Council request, the NWMO provided a report on the issues raised by the Scientific Review Group of the Seaborn Panel, and work undertaken to date in considering those issues.</p> <p>May 13, 2005 → In responding to the Council request, the NWMO tabled its understanding in the form of a report entitled “Response to the Seaborn Panel Report Recommendations”. The completed report produced by NWMO is a 90-page account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response to Seaborn Panel conclusions and recommendations as contained in the Executive Summary of the Panel report. NWMO reports on how it has used this insight and direction as a critical input and starting point for its study. Each Panel recommendation is discussed in the context of the NWMO study. • Social Issues / Shortcomings raised during the Seaborn Panel process. The NWMO reports on how it has sought to address these issues. • Technical Issues / Shortcomings raised during the Seaborn Panel process. The NWMO reports on its understanding of how the industry has sought to address these issues since 1996. Substantial work led by Ontario Power Generation, on behalf of the Joint Waste Owners, addressed the technical issues or shortcomings raised during

Workplan

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
			<p>the Seaborn Panel process concerning the Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL) disposal concept.</p> <p>→ As a supplement, NWMO made available on its website in December 2004 Ontario Power Generation's 600-page report that documents how industry has addressed the technical issues and shortcomings in its deep geological repository design concept, used as the basis for Option 1 in the NWMO study. This report is entitled "Response to Technical Comments raised during Environmental Assessment of AECL Disposal Concept". NWMO has also posted on its website, under the heading of "Technology Program for Deep Geologic Repository", reports summarizing research and development activities conducted by Ontario Power Generation on the Deep Geologic Repository over the past several years. These documents were posted on the NWMO website, in conjunction with Background Paper 6-9, to facilitate the review and scrutiny of interested Canadians. NWMO offered to provide printed copies for the Council upon request.</p>
		<p>June 25, 2003</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council requested an update on NWMO's engagement activities and development of the analytical framework at an upcoming meeting.</p>	<p>September 2003</p> <p>→ NWMO provided a briefing on these issues at the September 2003 Council meeting.</p> <p>→ In addition, the President tabled a "Year in Review" report of NWMO's activities, and outlined a newsletter that was being produced. She briefed Council on the range of concept and background papers being prepared.</p>

Workplan

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>January 19, 2004 → NWMO presented an overview to Council and Board of proposed areas of focus for the 2004 Business Plan. The President invited Council and Board comments on the workplan for 2004.</p> <p>→ The President reported on her intention to set up an Assessment Team, and shared biographies of team members.</p> <p>→ She reported on the outcome of a Social Issues meeting, the Roundtable on Ethics, and meetings with sustainable development executives.</p> <p>→ The President distributed background papers that NWMO thought would be of particular interest to Council, on the status of international studies and management approaches.</p>	<p>January 19, 2004 → Discussion ensued with Council and Board members. They asked questions and discussed various areas in the proposed business plan.</p>		<p>→ Council members received binders of all concept papers for their information.</p>
<p>March 23, 2004 → The President profiled the work of the Assessment Team to date. She reviewed the respective areas of expertise of Assessment Team members.</p>	<p>March 23, 2004 → Council complimented NWMO on the high caliber of Assessment Team members, and noted the significant amount of time members were devoting to the NWMO assessment. Council discussed the focus of the Team's terms of reference.</p>		
<p>April 14, 2004 → NWMO arranged an informal luncheon opportunity for Council to meet members of Assessment Team.</p>	<p>April 14, 2004 → Was attended by some members of Council.</p>	<p>April 14, 2004 → Council requested that NWMO provide for a substantial discussion on the Assessment Team's work at future meetings.</p>	<p>May 20, 2004 → NWMO provided for a presentation by the Assessment Team members on May 20th.</p>

Workplan

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>May 20, 2004</p> <p>→ NWMO arranged for a presentation to be delivered to Council by Assessment Team members. The Team highlighted its findings to date and invited discussion.</p> <p>→ The Assessment Team reviewed its selection of an appropriate methodology for the assessment that would allow the systematic integration of social and ethical considerations into the analysis of options, and build on NWMO's 10 Questions.</p>	<p>May 20, 2004</p> <p>→ Council members engaged in discussion with the Assessment Team, to understand the methodology, the range of objectives underpinning the assessment and findings.</p> <p>→ Council inquired about methodological limitations and how the Assessment Team was handling the lack of replicability.</p> <p>→ Council inquired as to how NWMO's 10 Questions were integrated into the assessment, how future generations would be taken into account, and the type of sensitivity analysis that would be performed.</p>	<p>→ Council indicated that it was important that the methodological limitations regarding replication were recognized and that the Team's response would be highlighted in their report (different weighting rationale).</p> <p>→ Council emphasized the importance of subjecting the preliminary assessment to public scrutiny, and allowing others to examine the options for themselves.</p>	<p>→ NWMO released the preliminary assessment in Discussion Document 2, with a view to inviting others to work through the review of options.</p> <p>→ In some meetings, the President walked participants through the exercise of some of the influence diagrams and assessment.</p> <p>→ The Assessment Team reported on its sensitivity analysis. NWMO subsequently undertook further sensitivity analysis to test the robustness of the findings.</p>
		<p>June 5, 2004</p> <p>→ Council requested that NWMO table for Council review and discussion, NWMO's draft approach to addressing the identification of Economic Regions. Council requested background information on the requirement in the Act, a map of the regions, and work in progress.</p>	<p>June 5, 2004</p> <p>→ The NWMO provided the Council with an update on October 18, 2004. Economic Regions were discussed with Council in the context of the evolving approach as it was communicated in various drafts of the <i>Draft Study Report</i>.</p>
<p>October 18, 2004</p> <p>→ The President provided an overview of the analysis of the management options in progress through to December 2004.</p>			

Workplan

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>November 25, 2004</p> <p>→ The President provided updates on a range of NWMO activities, noting that fuller written reports on engagement activities are made available to Council.</p> <p>→ The President expressed her interest in reviewing with the Advisory Council the structure of public engagement for 2005. NWMO would be interested in Council advice on the most appropriate design of public engagement to follow the release of the <i>Draft Study Report</i>.</p>	<p>→ Council discussion continued in March and May 2005 as program specifics were tabled for discussion.</p>		
		<p>November 25, 2004</p> <p>→ A Council member brought to the attention of Council the issue of whether used fuel should be considered a waste or resource. He presented a technical paper, which Council agreed should be referred to NWMO for consideration in its study.</p>	<p>May 2005</p> <p>→ In the NWMO <i>Draft Study Report (Choosing A Way Forward, issued May 2005)</i>, the NWMO sought to reflect the key points raised in the Council member's paper.</p>
<p>February 1, 2005</p> <p>→ The President arranged for the Advisory Council to be briefed on the assessment of options under way by Golder Associates and Gartner Lee Limited. The President introduced this analytical work commissioned by the NWMO to assist the organization in assessing the three technical methods requiring review under the <i>Nuclear Fuel Waste Act</i>. Specifically, the work was commissioned to assist NWMO with addressing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The legislative requirement to examine the costs, benefits and risks of the three management approaches, taking 	<p>→ Throughout the presentation, discussion ensued as Advisory Council members sought clarification on the methodology, including the selection of illustrative economic regions and how the assessment took into account implications of climate change and glaciation.</p> <p>→ Council members discussed the findings with respect to risk, including findings with respect to transportation. Members discussed how the different options performed in terms of adaptability and flexibility and opportunities to adjust direction.</p>		

Workplan

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>into account the economic regions in which the approaches may be implemented; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The legislated requirement to consider the means by which negative socio-economic effects may be avoided or minimized. <p>→ Mr. Stemeroff and Mr. Davis reviewed the objectives of this work with Council. They presented findings of their comparative assessment of the three options.</p>			
<p>February 1, 2005</p> <p>→ The NWMO presented elements of a proposed Option 4 for consideration, which draws on findings from NWMO's assessment and public engagement activities.</p> <p>→ NWMO invited Council discussion on this approach.</p>	<p>February 1, 2005</p> <p>→ Council members offered comments on the new option.</p> <p>→ Members expressed support for the general direction of this new option, the flexibility it provides, and the ongoing opportunity for collaborative public engagement. Discussion took place on how the new option differed from the other three options.</p> <p>→ There was discussion around NWMO's proposed range of potentially suitable geomedia, and in particular, the supporting research for sedimentary rock.</p> <p>→ Council emphasized the need to allow for public comment period around Option 4.</p>		<p>February 1, 2005</p> <p>→ The President thanked Council members for sharing their preliminary comments and observations with NWMO. She indicated that this draft management approach would be the subject of ongoing development and analysis. Subsequent work would be shared with the Advisory Council at an upcoming meeting.</p> <p>May 2005</p> <p>→ NWMO invited public comments on Option 4 in the May–September period.</p>

Workplan

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>March 31, 2005 → The Advisory Council requested information on the extent of insurance provisions built into the cost estimates for the management options.</p>	<p>May 13, 2005 → NWMO tabled a briefing note to address the insurance provisions that had been costed.</p> <p>→ As requested by Council, more detailed information was prepared to address issues raised May 13, 2005.</p>
		<p>May 13, 2005 → In discussions at the May meeting on the NWMO's briefing note on insurance provisions, Council raised additional questions and requested further information from NWMO on matters including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative provisions concerning nuclear liability; • The policy underpinnings for Canada's approach to nuclear liability – how risk is addressed and shared between industry and government; and • Implications for NWMO as a future operator, and for cost estimates in the study of management approaches. 	<p>July 20, 2005 → The NWMO reported to Council with additional information concerning the Nuclear Liability Act, further to the Advisory Council request.</p> <p>→ The NWMO undertook to provide an elaboration on this issue in the <i>Final Study Report</i>.</p>
			<p>June 20, 2005 → Upon the request of the Advisory Council, the NWMO provided further updates on its workplan, to assist the Council in drafting its comments on the NWMO study.</p>

Workplan

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>June 20, 2005 → Advisory Council members provided comments to NWMO on the <i>Draft Study Report</i>. In this discussion, the Council identified some areas for clarification and elaboration to strengthen the report. The Council recommended that the NWMO consider adding these clarifications in the <i>Final Study Report</i>. Specifically, the Advisory Council requested information from the NWMO in some specific areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the NWMO incorporated the advice and counsel of the Roundtable on Ethics into the study; • Clarification on the nature of the hazard; and • The rationale underpinning NWMO's decision to cite Ordovician sedimentary rock as potentially suitable geology for a deep repository. 	<p>July 20, 2005 → The NWMO provided information to members, to respond to the Council's requests in each of these three areas.</p> <p>→ At the suggestion of the Advisory Council, the NWMO undertook to incorporate these clarifications into the <i>Final Study Report</i>.</p>
		<p>July 1, 2005 → The Advisory Council requested information from the NWMO on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The costing of the recommended management approach (Option 4); • The replicability and robustness of the assessment conducted by the NWMO Assessment Team; and • How the NWMO considered the notion of "social safety". 	<p>July 20, 2005 → The NWMO provided information to members, to respond to the Council's requests in each of these three areas.</p> <p>→ At the suggestion of the Advisory Council, the NWMO undertook to incorporate the discussion of replicability of the assessment in the <i>Final Study Report</i> prepared for November 2005.</p>

Workplan

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>July 20, 2005 → The NWMO arranged for Mr. Jamie Watt and Mr. Anthony Jonker from the public opinion research firm Navigator, to report to the Advisory Council on interim findings from the focus groups under way. This work was commissioned by the NWMO to invite comments on the NWMO's draft recommendation, outlined in the NWMO's 2005 <i>Draft Study Report</i>. Navigator reviewed the research objectives and methodology adopted for the focus groups, and summarized findings to date.</p>	<p>July 20, 2005 → Discussion ensued, as members of the Advisory Council sought clarification and elaboration on the process utilized and the nature of comments and issues raised by focus group participants.</p>		
		<p>August 5, 2005 → The Advisory Council sought additional information from the NWMO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification on the rationale for making centralized shallow storage an option within the recommended Adaptive Phased Management approach; • Clarification on the purpose of the underground characterization facility; and • Elaboration on how the NWMO proposes that a willing host community be identified. 	<p>August 19, 2005 → The NWMO responded to each of these areas of Council request.</p> <p>→ The NWMO undertook to include these clarifications in the <i>Final Study Report</i>.</p>

Annual Reports

This section highlights the Advisory Council interaction with the NWMO in the development and review of each annual report that is prepared for submission to the Minister of Natural Resources Canada, and subsequently tabled in Parliament by the Minister. The Advisory Council reviewed and commented on NWMO's annual reports from the perspective of ensuring a full and accurate depiction of the Council activities for the preceding year. In addition, the Council provided comment to ensure that the annual reports provided a comprehensive and clear public reporting on the outcome of the study and public engagement over the past year.

Annual Reports

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
2002 ANNUAL REPORT			
<p>January 11, 2003</p> <p>→ President briefed Council on the upcoming 2002 Annual Report requirement.</p> <p>→ NWMO invited suggestions from Council on messages/items for inclusion.</p>	<p>January 11, 2003</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council provided comments.</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council agreed to hold conference call in February, to provide input to draft Annual Report.</p>		
<p>February 2003</p> <p>→ A conference call was convened by the NWMO to invite Council input into draft report, and confirm the quotes from members.</p>	<p>February 2003</p> <p>→ Council provided comments on the draft.</p>		
2003 ANNUAL REPORT			
<p>January 19, 2004</p> <p>→ The NWMO invited Council to confirm the extent of its desired involvement in the production of the NWMO's 2003 Annual Report.</p>		<p>January 19, 2004</p> <p>→ Council members requested that NWMO not include Council comments in the annual report, in light of Council's independent role. Council asked NWMO to include a factual account of their activities in the report.</p> <p>→ Council resolved to write its own letter to Minister of Natural Resources Canada with its reflections on the NWMO's last year.</p>	<p>→ NWMO adopted this approach for the 2003 Annual Report and for subsequent reports.</p> <p>→ Council's letter was tabled with the Minister on March 26, 2004.</p>

Annual Reports

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
2004 ANNUAL REPORT			
<p>February 1, 2005</p> <p>→ NWMO invited Advisory Council comments on the content and general direction proposed by the organization for the NWMO's 2004 Annual Report.</p>	<p>→ Council members were supportive of the proposed format for this year's report.</p>	<p>→ Council suggestions were offered for clarifying NWMO's report, in particular with respect to themes emerging from NWMO's engagement activities</p> <p>→ Following last year's practice, the Advisory Council confirmed its intention to write its own letter to the Minister of Natural Resources Canada in March 2005 with its report on the past year.</p>	<p>→ The President reported that the draft report would be refined and a final draft shared with the Council for final review in an upcoming meeting planned for February. The Council's suggestions were addressed in the next version of the Annual Report, tabled with Council on February 7, 2005.</p>
<p>February 7, 2005</p> <p>→ NWMO tabled a refined draft of the 2004 NWMO Annual Report with the Advisory Council for discussion.</p> <p>→ Council members were requested to bring to the NWMO's attention any updates required to their biographical sketches for inclusion in the report.</p>	<p>→ The Chairman opened the meeting for Advisory Council discussion and comments on the Annual Report.</p> <p>→ Discussion ensued, as Council members provided comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members of the Sub-Committee on Aboriginal Engagement were pleased that the Annual Report profiled some of the key messages emerging from NWMO's engagement with Aboriginal peoples. • A member commented that the report illustrated the significant amount of work and public engagement undertaken by the NWMO. <p>→ Council members provided updates to their bios.</p>	<p>→ The Council Chairman presented development of an independent letter from the Advisory Council to the Minister of Natural Resources Canada, reporting on the Council's activities over the past year. This letter was subsequently drafted and approved by Council.</p> <p>→ Members offered further editorial suggestions to enhance clarity of the document. Sub-Committee members proposed that the section on Aboriginal outreach be moved up.</p> <p>→ Members emphasized the importance of NWMO distinguishing clearly between sections of the report which summarize comments received from Canadians through engagement with general public and Aboriginal peoples, from sections which report on the NWMO's own</p>	<p>March 14, 2005</p> <p>→ The NWMO forwarded the Council letter to the Minister in late March, consistent with the timing of NWMO's Annual Report filing.</p> <p>→ NWMO incorporated the editorial suggestions in the next draft.</p> <p>→ NWMO provided greater clarity on this distinction in the final report.</p>

Annual Reports

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>reflections and perspectives.</p> <p>→ NWMO was encouraged to elaborate on the rationale underlying its conclusions provided at the end of the annual report.</p> <p>→ Council recommended that the concluding section be more definitive about the issues that are well understood and where NWMO has confidence.</p>	<p>→ The last section was expanded to address the rationale for the report's conclusions.</p> <p>→ The last section of the report was reworded to provide greater clarity around key issues, to articulate where the NWMO has confidence, and to present the rationale underlying NWMO's interest in a fourth option.</p>

Discussion Documents and Study Reports

This section reviews the Advisory Council interaction with the NWMO in the development and review of each of the three milestone discussion documents that were released for purposes of inviting public dialogue and comment on each key phase of the study. The Advisory Council reviewed and commented on NWMO's draft documents with a view to ensuring clarity, completeness and balance in the reporting of the study findings to date. The Advisory Council, having had opportunities to observe some public dialogues first hand, sought to ensure a balanced and comprehensive reporting of key issues from the general public and Aboriginal peoples. The Council also offered advice on the structure and format of the documents, with a view to ensuring the effectiveness of the documents which were intended as key tools for public engagement.

Discussion Documents and Study Reports

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
DISCUSSION DOCUMENT 1: ASKING THE RIGHT QUESTIONS?, 2003			
<p>May 10, 2003 → The President tabled a preliminary outline of Discussion Document 1 with Council for comment and discussion, to invite early thoughts and advice.</p>		<p>March 28, 2003 → Council requested that its meetings be scheduled to allow for opportunities to review draft discussion documents prior to release.</p>	<p>Ongoing → NWMO provided opportunities for Council to review the proposed outlines and drafts of each discussion document.</p>
	<p>May 10, 2003 → Council provided extensive comments on the structure and content and expressed interest in reviewing the next draft.</p>	<p>May 10, 2003 → Council suggested reordering of document to address engagement before analysis.</p> <p>→ Council made suggestions for setting the context of the used fuel issue.</p> <p>→ A shorter executive summary was recommended as a stand-alone handout for consultations.</p> <p>→ NWMO was advised to target the document to multiple audiences.</p> <p>→ Suggestions were made on terminology and phrasing.</p> <p>→ Council expressed interest in reviewing the next draft of the Document. The Chairman requested that the revised outline be the principal focus for the next Council meeting in June to allow Council to review it from the point of view of developing trust and integrity in the NWMO study.</p>	<p>May through June 2003 → These comments were reviewed by NWMO and addressed in the subsequent drafts.</p> <p>→ The revised document was provided to the Advisory Council for discussion at the June meeting.</p>

Discussion Documents and Study Reports

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>June 25, 2003</p> <p>→ NWMO tabled a Draft Annotated Outline of Discussion Document 1 for comment, that had been revised to address comments from the May Council meeting.</p> <p>→ The President invited Council advice on the overall direction and proposed focus for the document.</p> <p>→ The President invited Council views on the use of “discussion questions” to focus public dialogue.</p>	<p>June 25, 2003</p> <p>→ Council discussed the outline and provided extensive comments.</p> <p>→ Council supported inclusion of discussion questions in the documents.</p>	<p>June 25, 2003</p> <p>→ Council provided comments on the clarity around the Council role, the context of used nuclear fuel, discussion on radioactivity, structure of document, and use of discussion questions to stimulate public dialogue, and offered editorial suggestions. The Council noted the importance of addressing governance issues, and seeking to integrate learnings of traditional knowledge in the NWMO study.</p> <p>→ Council encouraged NWMO to underscore that it is open to a range of management options – and is not limited to the three options in the Act.</p> <p>→ Council stressed the importance of considering issues such as sustainability of social structures in the long term in considering the robustness of options.</p>	<p>July/ August 2003</p> <p>→ NWMO developed a first draft that incorporated the suggestions from Council.</p> <p>→ In each public document, NWMO sought to emphasize its openness to considering options other than those in the Act.</p> <p>→ This issue was an important one in the comparative assessment framework of options, in considering the relative long term performance. See <i>Draft Study Report</i>.</p>
<p>September 23, 2003</p> <p>→ NWMO presented Draft 1 of Discussion Document 1 to Council for comment, inviting views on any aspect of the document.</p>	<p>September 23, 2003</p> <p>→ Council offered a number of suggestions.</p>	<p>September 23, 2003</p> <p>→ For example, members advised on ways to improve the clarity of the messages and technical facts. They discussed the appropriate level of detail for a public discussion document and the best way of encouraging engagement around the report in a way that would invite public comments.</p> <p>→ Individually, Council members sent NWMO many detailed editorial comments and corrected technical factual information.</p>	<p>September/October 2003</p> <p>→ These suggestions were integrated in NWMO’s Draft 2 of the Document.</p> <p>→ The President arranged a conference call with Council in October for the purpose of taking comments on Draft 2.</p>

Discussion Documents and Study Reports

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
DISCUSSION DOCUMENT 2: UNDERSTANDING THE CHOICES, 2004			
<p>May 20, 2004 → NWMO shared an annotated outline of Discussion Document 2 with Council for comments.</p> <p>→ The President invited Council comments at the May 20 meeting. She also invited Council to forward additional comments on the outline to NWMO electronically.</p> <p>→ The President invited Council comments on how it wished to be involved in the reviews of Discussion Document 2.</p>	<p>May 20, 2004 → Council provided preliminary comment on appropriate focus, scope, structure of document.</p> <p>→ Members expressed support for the proposed outline.</p>	<p>May 20, 2004 → For example, Council advised NWMO to draft Discussion Document 2 as a stand-alone document, that could be read without reference to Discussion Document 1. Council encouraged NWMO to make more explicit the links to the Act, and to note clearly the work on social and ethical considerations, values and Aboriginal outreach.</p> <p>→ Council discussed at length the appropriate types and scope of public consultation appropriate to follow issuance of Discussion Document 2, to ensure NWMO meets obligations under the Act. A range of possible engagement models were tabled for NWMO consideration.</p> <p>→ Council requested that NWMO continue the process established with the first discussion document – inviting Council comments on a document outline, a first draft and a refined draft. There was agreement that having a face-to-face meeting would facilitate discussion of the draft.</p>	<p>June 2004 → NWMO integrated these suggestions in Draft 1 of Document.</p> <p>→ The June 22, 2004 Council Agenda was structured to provide for extensive discussion and feedback on Draft 1 of Discussion Document 2, to help guide the Document development.</p> <p>→ The President arranged June 22 and July 5 meetings with Council.</p>
<p>June 22, 2004 → The President tabled a first draft of Discussion Document 2 for Council review and comment. She noted the draft was at an early stage, and NWMO was interested in having feedback from Council at this early stage in the document development on structure and proposed presentation of content.</p>	<p>June 22, 2004 → Council provided many suggestions on each part of the document.</p>	<p>June 22, 2004 → Council discussed the appropriate level of detail to support public discussion.</p> <p>→ Members recommended elaboration in the document to convey how the public has helped to shape the issues and questions addressed in the study,</p>	<p>July/August 2004 → NWMO addressed Council's comments in subsequent drafts of Discussion Document 2, and carried these changes through to the <i>Draft Study Report</i> in 2005 where applicable.</p>

Discussion Documents and Study Reports

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>including how the public input has been translated into objectives and the assessment framework.</p> <p>→ Some members offered suggestions for expanding upon the research findings from the National Citizens' Dialogue. Members noted some of the additional themes that they had heard during the Dialogue sessions, such as the emphasis that many participants placed on retaining access to the used fuel to take advantage of new knowledge and technology.</p> <p>→ Members suggested reporting in more detail on the extent of engagement realized to date through website visits and submissions and comments received by the NWMO.</p> <p>→ Members suggested that additional detail be included on the background papers and analysis commissioned by NWMO that have contributed to the study of management options.</p> <p>→ Members recommended further elaboration in the Document on the composition of the Assessment Team and its role, and how the Team considered the insights from NWMO's engagement and research on Canadian values.</p> <p>→ Council emphasized the importance of distinguishing where findings in the Document (particularly in Part Two) are those of a third party, such as the Assessment Team, as opposed to findings or conclusions of NWMO.</p>	<p>→ NWMO addressed Council's comments in subsequent drafts of Discussion Document 2, and carried these changes through to the <i>Draft Study Report</i> in 2005 where applicable.</p>

Discussion Documents and Study Reports

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>→ It was underscored that the Document must convey clearly that the Assessment Team provided a preliminary assessment only, in that the analysis of options is continuing and NWMO has much more work to do before it is prepared to table a draft recommendation.</p> <p>→ Council suggested that the Document highlight two parallel tracks of work with different participants– public engagement and expert analysis – led to convergence on many key themes and findings.</p> <p>→ Suggestions were tabled to clarify concepts and terminology that might not be readily understood by a broad readership. Members offered some factual corrections.</p> <p>→ It was suggested that the Document outline some of the specific engagement activities to be launched by the NWMO. The Document should communicate that public engagement is continuing to play an important role as NWMO furthers its assessment of the options. Council members noted that participants who have engaged in dialogues to date will be interested in following the NWMO’s work, and NWMO should make those opportunities well known.</p> <p>→ Members suggested a schematic depiction be provided to illustrate the ongoing and growing role of public input at each stage of the NWMO study.</p>	<p>→ NWMO addressed Council’s comments in subsequent drafts of Discussion Document 2, and carried these changes through to the <i>Draft Study Report</i> in 2005 where applicable.</p>

Discussion Documents and Study Reports

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>→ The Document should outline how the public might contact NWMO, and the various ways in which the public can share comments, including through web-based activities.</p> <p>→ Council advised that other formats of engagement tools may be useful to supplement the large Discussion Document, such as smaller back-grounders and an Executive Summary or possibly electronic means of facilitating dialogue around the Discussion Document and the assessment framework.</p> <p>→ Suggestions were tabled regarding discussion questions that might be included in the document to stimulate comments from the public.</p>	<p>→ NWMO addressed Council's comments in subsequent drafts of Discussion Document 2, and carried these changes through to the <i>Draft Study Report</i> in 2005 where applicable.</p>
<p>July 5, 2004 → NWMO convened a conference call to invite Council comments on a more advanced Discussion Document 2 (Draft 3).</p> <p>→ NWMO had sought to respond to comments provided by the Advisory Council previously.</p>	<p>July 5, 2004 → Council provided comments on Draft 3.</p> <p>→ Members acknowledged the significant changes in the document. They were appreciative of NWMO's responsiveness to their earlier comments, and expressed positive comments on the revised draft.</p> <p>→ Members noted that the NWMO had clearly listened to Council and responded to the suggestions.</p>	<p>July 5, 2004 → Council members offered some additional suggestions for streamlining the document, removing duplication, enhancing the clarity and providing definitions that would enhance general understanding for public audience.</p> <p>→ One member followed up with NWMO by phone to provide additional comments.</p> <p>→ Council requested that the section on Aboriginal values be revised and sent out to the three Sub-Committee members for review.</p>	<p>July/August 2004 → NWMO took these further comments into account in preparing subsequent drafts of the document.</p> <p>→ NWMO circulated the revised sections of the Aboriginal section to the Sub-Committee via email. Members worked together to advise on final wording.</p>

Discussion Documents and Study Reports

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
DRAFT STUDY REPORT: CHOOSING A WAY FORWARD (DRAFT) 2005			
<p>February 1, 2005</p> <p>→ The President reviewed an annotated outline proposed for the NWMO's <i>Draft Study Report</i>. The President invited Advisory Council comments on the proposed structure of the document.</p> <p>→ The NWMO undertook to share first drafts of each part of the document with the Advisory Council for review and discussion against a set of conference calls and meetings scheduled for this purpose in February and March.</p>	<p>→ Council discussion ensued on the draft outline.</p>		
<p>March 2, 2005</p> <p>→ NWMO convened a conference call meeting with the Advisory Council, to invite comments on draft text for Parts Three and Four of the <i>Draft Study Report</i>.</p>		<p>March 2, 2005</p> <p>→ Council provided preliminary comments to initiate the discussion which ensued on the <i>Draft Study Report</i>.</p> <p>→ Council members supported the addition of further expert commentary on technical matters.</p> <p>→ Members advised on a range of issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested the document should report more fully on the diversity of views expressed, to clarify that not all Canadians are of the same view. • Suggested reduction in repetition in reporting what people said. • Suggested reduced number of lists, or distilling the information. 	<p>March 2, 2005</p> <p>→ NWMO went through each set of comments and integrated the changes wherever possible in subsequent drafts.</p>

Discussion Documents and Study Reports

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Some members offered detailed editorial suggestions. Members reflected on the accuracy and balance of the comments captured in the Draft Study, based on their own experiences in listening to public dialogues. → Council advised that the charts which summarized public comments on “strengths and limitations” be expanded beyond the summary bullets to a more fulsome discussion. → Council suggested removing the few quotes from the draft. → Sub-committee members advised on key issues to report in respect of future engagement with Aboriginal peoples. They suggested moving the Insights from Aboriginal peoples up earlier in the chapter. → Council requested that its Statement be included in the <i>Draft Study Report</i> as a separate section. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> → NWMO replaced the summary charts with longer, full discussions of the advantages and limitations as reported by the public. → Quotes were removed. → These edits were incorporated. → This Statement was included in the <i>Draft Study Report</i>.
<p>March 14, 2005</p> <p>→ The President tabled the NWMO’s draft text for the <i>Draft Study Report</i> for Advisory Council discussion and comment.</p>	<p>March 14, 2005</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council went through a section-by-section review of the document, providing comments on each part.</p>	<p>March 14, 2005</p> <p>→ Structural suggestions for the report were tabled by Council. As part of this discussion, Council members suggested that the document be reordered to give prominence to the part which summarized comments received from NWMO’s engagement with the general public and Aboriginal peoples, to set the context for the assessment of management approaches which would then follow.</p>	<p>March 2005</p> <p>→ NWMO reordered the <i>Draft Study Report</i> accordingly, moving the engagement section up front to precede the analysis.</p> <p>→ NWMO incorporated these suggestions into next draft.</p>

Discussion Documents and Study Reports

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>→ Suggestions were offered for reporting more extensively on the breadth of research and development on the conceptual management methods previously undertaken, from which NWMO has drawn for the study.</p> <p>→ Clarifications were proposed to the technical and financial descriptions of the management options, to highlight clearly the differences across approaches.</p> <p>→ Elaboration was suggested, to make explicit the assumptions underlying the cost estimates of the options and the illustrative timelines around the rebuilding of storage facilities.</p> <p>→ Discussion ensued on the specification of economic regions for implementation, and the social and technical siting requirements. In discussing the intent to seek a willing host, Council members emphasized that the process of siting must never compromise safety.</p> <p>→ Members noted that some participants in public engagement sessions had suggested that the provinces that have benefited most from the nuclear fuel cycle should bear the responsibility for hosting a waste management facility. The Council suggested that Saskatchewan be considered a nuclear province in this regard.</p>	<p>→ NWMO incorporated this wording in the Draft Study. NWMO has proposed the focus of siting be within provinces associated with the nuclear fuel cycle, including Saskatchewan.</p>

Discussion Documents and Study Reports

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> → With respect to addressing social, economic and cultural effects, it was noted that impacts are not exclusively negative; that implementation is likely to also make possible positive, sustained socio-economic impacts in the area hosting the facility. → In reviewing the proposed research agenda to support implementation, the Council emphasized the important role of social research in supporting future decision-making. → It was suggested that there may be a role for periodic third-party reviews and comments on NWMO's planned research and development program during the implementation process. → A Council member undertook to provide additional comments on the section addressing reprocessing, partitioning and transmutation. → Council cautioned against being overly specific with dates and fuel volumes, where information is meant to be indicative and illustrative. → Council suggested revisions to the descriptions of costs to clarify the components which are covered, such as retrievability. → It was suggested that risks of transport were not simply related to transport distance, but also transport routes selected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> → The Draft Study acknowledged the opportunity for positive economic spin-offs from hosting the facility. → References to social research were added to the chapter on research. → This reference was added to the chapter on research. → The suggested wording offered by a Council member was incorporated into the section of the report on reprocessing, partitioning and transmutation. → NWMO sought to emphasize the illustrative nature of dates. → These changes were made. → Assessment tables were revised accordingly.

Discussion Documents and Study Reports

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>→ NWMO was advised to include streams of social research, in such areas as adaptive management, as part of the chapter on R&D. NWMO might consider peer reviews of its research plans by third party bodies.</p>	<p>→ Reference to this type of research was incorporated into the report. NWMO added a reference on the role for independent third party guidance on research agendas.</p>
<p>March 21, 2005 → NWMO reviewed with Council Part Three of the report and appendices of the Draft Study through a conference call.</p> <p>→ NWMO invited Council comment on whether the appropriate information was captured in the proposed appendices.</p> <p>→ Advisory Council was invited to email additional suggestions for coverage in the Glossary of Terms.</p>	<p>March 21, 2005 → Council confirmed that the appendices were informative and useful. Some reordering was suggested.</p> <p>→ Council worked through each section of the draft text, providing NWMO with comments of both an editorial and content nature to improve the clarity of the document.</p>	<p>March 21, 2005 → Some members commented that the draft was quite readable. Others suggested the need for additional copy editing.</p> <p>→ Council sought confirmation that the part of the document reporting back on public engagement would be moved up to precede the analytical chapters.</p> <p>→ Council identified areas of repetition to be reduced.</p>	<p>March 2005 → The NWMO subjected the report to a professional copy edit.</p> <p>→ NWMO confirmed this change. “What Canadians Said” became “Part Two” of the <i>Draft Study Report</i>.</p>
<p>March 31, 2005 → NWMO convened a conference call meeting with the Advisory Council, to invite comments on Parts One and Two of the Draft Study text.</p>	<p>March 31, 2005 → Council provided comments, section by section.</p>	<p>March 31, 2005 → Council suggested clarification in the text in the Draft Study concerning NWMO’s discussion of sedimentary rock as a potentially suitable geomedia.</p> <p>→ Council advised against use of some terminology, such as “emplacement”. Stressed need for consistent approach to capitalization, headers.</p> <p>→ Council identified possible gaps in the assessment tables for some options.</p>	<p>April 2005 → NWMO incorporated the proposed clarification on sedimentary rock in the text of the May 2005 <i>Draft Study Report</i>.</p> <p>→ “Emplacement” since replaced with “placement”.</p> <p>→ Assessment tables were since completed.</p>

Discussion Documents and Study Reports

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>May 13, 2005 → NWMO provided advance copies of the <i>Draft Study Report</i> to the Advisory Council members. NWMO briefed the Advisory Council on communications planning around the release of the <i>Draft Study Report</i>.</p>			
FINAL STUDY REPORT: CHOOSING A WAY FORWARD, 2005			
<p>July 20, 2005 → The NWMO circulated to the Council a production schedule for the <i>Final Study Report</i>.</p>	<p>→ The draft outline was reviewed by the Advisory Council in its subsequent private deliberations.</p>	<p>June 20, 2005 → The Advisory Council offered suggestions for elaboration and clarification in the <i>Final Study Report</i>.</p>	
<p>August 2, 2005 → The NWMO circulated to the Advisory Council a draft annotated outline for the <i>Final Study Report</i>.</p>	<p>→ The draft outline was reviewed by the Advisory Council in its subsequent private deliberations in August.</p>		
<p>August 26, 2005 → The NWMO provided a draft of the <i>Final Study Report</i> to Council. → The NWMO kept Council updated on subsequent editorial refinements to the report.</p>		<p>August, September 2005 → The Advisory Council provided further editorial suggestions on the August 26th draft to the NWMO. → The Advisory Council highlighted other areas proposed for elaboration and clarification in the <i>Final Study Report</i>. (See “Workplan” section of Tracking Matrix.)</p>	<p>→ The NWMO incorporated the Advisory Council’s suggestions on the <i>Final Study Report</i>.</p>

Discussion Documents and Study Reports

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>September 15, 2005</p> <p>→ The NWMO reviewed with Council the process under way to finalize the <i>Final Study Report</i>.</p> <p>→ The NWMO discussed the production timelines and development of a communications plan.</p> <p>→ The NWMO outlined the editorial refinements and copy edits made further to the August 26th draft.</p>		<p>September 15, 2005</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council requested a further briefing on the communications planning around the release of the <i>Final Study Report</i>.</p>	<p>September 15, 2005</p> <p>→ The NWMO committed to set up a conference call for this purpose on October 31, 2005.</p>

Engagement

This section outlines the interaction between the NWMO and the Advisory Council over the three-year study period on the topic of public engagement. It indicates the advice sought by the NWMO as the organization developed engagement plans, and the nature of direction provided by the Council in response. It outlines the areas of advice provided by the Advisory Council in commenting on NWMO's plans to ensure effective and full engagement with Aboriginal peoples and the general public. The NWMO and the Advisory Council reviewed together the findings from each phase of public engagement, and ensured transparency in the reporting out to the public on the outcome of the various engagement activities.

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>October 24, 2002 → Council indicated they would not be initiating their own consultations. However, Council members expressed their desire to provide advice on NWMO's consultation plans.</p>	<p>October 24, 2002 → President undertook to share draft engagement plans.</p>
		<p>October 24, 2002 → Council advised NWMO to undertake benchmarking work, to track changes in opinions and views throughout the course of NWMO's study.</p>	<p>2002 – 2005 → NWMO initiated public opinion research in 2002, which was fielded regularly to permit benchmarking of opinion on key issues. Council received presentations on findings from public opinion research.</p>
		<p>October 24, 2002 → The Advisory Council urged the NWMO to establish a sophisticated website to support external communications. The NWMO should seek to use electronic communication to supplement other models of outreach, such as roundtables and face-face stakeholder meetings.</p>	<p>January 11, 2003 → The President briefed Council on work under way to design the interactive website, indicating a prototype to be operational by January. Samples of design shared with Council.</p> <p>→ NWMO directed significant resources to refining the website and expanding capabilities for more interactive opportunities for submissions, deliberative surveys and polls, including E-dialogues which commenced Fall 2004 for focused engagement on certain topics.</p>
<p>January 11, 2003 → The President tabled highlights from introductory meetings and international research trips.</p> <p>→ The President tabled the proposed architecture for NWMO engagement plans for Council discussion.</p>	<p>January 11, 2003 → Discussion with Council focused on phase one, early conversations about expectations.</p>	<p>January 11, 2003 → The Council expressed concern over the parallel consultation process initiated by Natural Resources Canada with Aboriginal peoples with that in progress through NWMO.</p>	<p>January 11, 2003 → The President reported to Council with clarification on Natural Resources Canada's process at the September meeting, indicating the consultation processes will not be duplicative.</p>

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>January 10-11, 2003 → Advisory Council requested an opportunity to meet Minister of Natural Resources Canada.</p>	<p>March 2003 → Two Council members joined the Board Chairman and President in the March 19 meeting with the Minister. Members debriefed full Council on March 28, 2003. Notes from the meeting were distributed to Council.</p>
<p>March 28, 2003 → The President updated Council on the plans under way to support Aboriginal engagement.</p> <p>→ The President invited the Council to share further thoughts on the workplan on an ongoing basis, and welcomed Council participation in any activities or consultations.</p>	<p>March 28, 2003 → Council commented that Aboriginal engagement is critical section of the report.</p> <p>→ Recognizing its desire to remain independent, and yet contribute constructively throughout the study period, Council resolved to consider their level of participation at a future meeting.</p>	<p>March 28, 2003 → Council advised that engagement of Aboriginal peoples should take place at each point in the workplan, and that there be recognition that the extent and success of Aboriginal engagement would be a critical component for Council to assess.</p> <p>→ Council urged a minimum of three to four months public consultation on each discussion document, noting importance of making most effective use of the short study period available to NWMO.</p>	<p>Q1 – Q2 2003 → From its early informal conversations in different provinces. NWMO sought involvement of Aboriginal people in its workshops and dialogues, as well as through formal programs for outreach to Aboriginal organizations.</p> <p>→ NWMO has sought as much as possible to provide for three to four month periods of public consultation around each document. The NWMO's workplan for the three-year study was structured to provide for these periods of public dialogue at each milestone. In total, the NWMO provided for at least 12 months of consultation in the course of its study, focused on discussion documents. In many respects, the full three-year study by NWMO was a continuous period of engagement and dialogue with Canadians.</p>

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>May 10, 2003</p> <p>→ The President updated Council on engagement activities being planned, including reactor site community dialogues and deliberative polling.</p> <p>→ The NWMO briefed Council on the latest round of public opinion research.</p> <p>→ The President updated Council more broadly on the engagement activities undertaken since the last monthly report and Council meeting.</p>		<p>May 10, 2003</p> <p>→ Council suggested other dialogues might be convened in communities that do not host nuclear facilities, to benefit from the difference in perspectives and opinions.</p> <p>→ Council advised that building trust will require different engagement processes from those used in the past.</p> <p>→ Council suggested use of media, possibly television as a possible option.</p> <p>→ Council advised that NWMO make the website known as the repository of NWMO information. Focused efforts would be required to make use of the interactive website. Council supported use of website for e-based polling and interactive dialogues with public. The website should be designed in a way to encourage young people to engage.</p> <p>→ It was pointed out that the website had limitations in that not all Canadians had access to, or could use, the internet. NWMO should pursue a multiplicity of routes to channel information – not relying solely on website.</p> <p>→ Council expressed interest in tracking effectiveness of NWMO's outreach.</p>	<p>Early 2004</p> <p>→ NWMO convened regional and national dialogues with stakeholders in cities that were not nuclear site communities in 2004. In addition, many of the 34 communities in which NWMO led public information and discussion sessions were not nuclear communities.</p> <p>May 10, 2003</p> <p>→ NWMO indicated that its approach to engagement had been to adopt a range of engagement tools designed to support dialogue and constructive input to each phase of its work. Greater use of media (radio and print) was adopted as part of NWMO plans for engagement post-Discussion Document 2.</p> <p>→ NWMO's engagement was designed in such a way as to promote two-way discussion and dialogue and a sharing of perspectives.</p> <p>→ The President indicated that NWMO would monitor the uptake and website visits. Statistics were collected and reported out monthly.</p>

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>May 10, 2003 → The President debriefed Council on initial planning discussions as NWMO explored how best to structure Aboriginal engagement.</p> <p>→ There was a discussion of a one-day planning workshop that had been convened to consider the approach NWMO might take in developing an Aboriginal engagement program.</p>	<p>→ Mr. Obonsawin participated in the planning workshop for Aboriginal outreach and outlined key priorities emerging from the workshop.</p>	<p>May 10, 2003 → In debriefing Council, Mr. Obonsawin noted some conclusions from the workshop:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That traditional knowledge be examined for guiding principles that might be integrated into NWMO's study, and not examined separately. • NWMO should target a fall Traditional Knowledge workshop. • NWMO should consult broadly with First Nations, and invite Aboriginal peoples to participate in the range of NWMO activities. • NWMO should consult with national organizations on best way of engaging. • NWMO should reach out to Aboriginal Seaborn Panel participants, to invite their participation. • NWMO should consider a communications specialist to assist with outreach to Aboriginal communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NWMO reported in Discussion Document 2 (2004) and the <i>Draft Study Report</i> (2005) on traditional knowledge, and the principles drawn from it for the assessment framework. • A Traditional Knowledge workshop was convened September 24-25, 2003 in Saskatoon. • NWMO continued to invite participation of Aboriginal people in its workshops and various dialogues and activities. NWMO sought to broaden its outreach to regional and local levels. • NWMO approached all five national organizations. They will be designing and implementing their own engagement for NWMO. • NWMO wrote to 43 Aboriginal organizations that contributed to Seaborn Panel proceedings soliciting their involvement. • NWMO originally considered need for communications specialist, but much activity had since shifted to national and regional Aboriginal organizations which sought to design and lead their respective outreach activities on behalf of NWMO. Aboriginal organizations chose to direct and manage their own communications, with some support

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
			<p>from NWMO. NWMO remained open to reassessing the acquisition of in-house communications expertise should the need arise over the course of the study.</p>
<p>September 23, 2003 → NWMO presented an update on consultations, upcoming roundtables and workshops. The President provided a debrief on the meeting of the Roundtable on Ethics.</p> <p>→ The President described the proposed research project with CPRN to understand values. She invited each Council member to attend one of the dialogues to hear the views of citizens directly.</p>	<p>→ Council members accepted the NWMO invitation to observe some CPRN sessions.</p>	<p>September 23, 2003 → The Advisory Council registered its interest in attending one of the sessions of the Roundtable on Ethics.</p> <p>→ Following the Roundtable presentation, the Advisory Council Chairman invited discussion around the Roundtable's work.</p> <p>→ A two-hour discussion ensued, during which Advisory Council members and Roundtable members engaged in dialogue on the ethical dimensions of the NWMO study. In their questions, Advisory Council members explored a range of areas with the Roundtable members and NWMO.</p>	<p>September 23, 2003 → The President undertook to discuss with the Roundtable and identify an appropriate opportunity for the Council to meet with the Roundtable participants.</p> <p>→ Further to the Advisory Council's previous request, NWMO invited the Roundtable on Ethics to participate in the October 18, 2004 Council meeting for a focused session on ethical aspects of the NWMO study. Attending from the Roundtable were three of the six members: Andrew Brook, Arthur Shafer and Margaret Somerville.</p>

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>September 23, 2003 → A Council member expressed interest in having the President deliver a speech at a university venue.</p>	<p>→ The President delivered this speech in Thunder Bay.</p>
<p>January 19, 2004 → NWMO gave a presentation to Board and Council on NWMO's outreach with Aboriginal peoples, reviewing key areas of work proposed for 2004. Council comments were invited.</p> <p>→ Council received a presentation on NWMO's work with nuclear site communities, and were invited to comment and discuss.</p> <p>→ Judith Maxwell presented the methodology for CPRN national dialogues to research Canadian citizens' values. Council members received copies of the draft Workbook, discussed participant selection and the nature of reports generated.</p> <p>→ President reiterated her invitation for Council members to participate in some of the dialogues as observers.</p>	<p>January 19, 2004 → Council provided advice and highlighted the importance of meeting requirements of the legislation with respect to consulting Aboriginal peoples, and understanding how traditional knowledge might contribute to the study.</p> <p>→ Discussion ensued as the Council inquired about the methodology of the dialogues, including participant selection and the nature of reports to be generated.</p> <p>→ Six Council members observed a CPRN national dialogue.</p>	<p>January 19, 2004 → There was discussion of how to make the most effective use of the study period in seeking out public input through many and varied engagement opportunities.</p> <p>→ The Council advised NWMO to explore practical applications of traditional knowledge in the study, and inquired about the status of communications planning with Aboriginal communities.</p> <p>→ Advisory Council requested NWMO to set up meeting for Council and Nuclear Waste Watch (NWW), in response to a NWW request.</p> <p>→ Following the NWW presentation, the Advisory Council Chairman invited discussion with NWW. Dialogue ensued, during which Council invited the perspectives of NWW.</p>	<p>January 19, 2004 → NWMO indicated it would take this advice into account in designing the post-Discussion Document 2 engagement activities.</p> <p>March 23, 2004 → NWMO set up this meeting with Nuclear Waste Watch for Council's March 23, 2004 meeting. Five members of NWW attended and briefed Council on the components of the NWW Position Statement and their additional comments.</p>
<p>March 23, 2004 → NWMO provided status updates on a range of engagement activities, and CPRN research on citizen values.</p> <p>→ President invited Council comments on the CPRN sessions that they had observed.</p>	<p>March 23, 2004 → Council members provided their verbal feedback on CPRN dialogues that they had attended, noting some areas in which sessions could be strengthened.</p>		<p>March 23, 2004 → The President thanked Council for their comments. She noted that Council's comments were immediately fed back to CPRN to course correct where possible in the delivery of sessions.</p>

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>March 23, 2004 → NWMO discussed planned work with national Aboriginal organizations. NWMO has worked with one Ontario organization and would be seeking to broaden outreach as part of regional consultations planned for latter part of 2004.</p>	<p>March 23, 2004 → Council felt this approach sounded reasonable, and recommended additional outreach to regional and local level contacts with Aboriginal peoples, to supplement the dialogue at the national level.</p>		
<p>March 23, 2004 → Noting that the next phase of public engagement would require a broader range of engagement models, NWMO invited Council suggestions on the nature of public consultations to follow release of Discussion Document 2.</p>		<p>March 23, 2004 → Council requested that a future agenda provide for a full discussion of the next phase of engagement. → Discussions continued at the October 2004 meeting.</p>	<p>May, June Council meetings → NWMO arranged for engagement to be part of the Council discussion at future meetings.</p>
<p>March 23, 2004 → Council was briefed on the methodology behind the upcoming Regional and National Stakeholder dialogues.</p>	<p>March 23, 2004 → Council discussed and asked for details on the focus and participant selection for these stakeholder dialogues.</p>	<p>March 23, 2004 → Some Council members expressed interest in attending a stakeholder dialogue. → A Council member attended one of the stakeholder dialogues.</p>	<p>March 23, 2004 → NWMO provided this opportunity.</p>
		<p>March 23, 2004 → Council members inquired about NWMO's provision for participant funding. Council requested that copies of NWMO's policy in this regard be circulated to Council for review.</p>	<p>March 2004 → NWMO emailed its policy to Council following the March meeting. NWMO noted that the engagement plan posted on website makes reference to availability of participant funding upon request. NWMO has provided participant funding to organizations or individuals whenever requested, including some peer review funds.</p>
<p>May 20, 2004 → NWMO arranged for a presentation to Council by CPRN, on research findings from national dialogues on values, for discussion.</p>	<p>May 20, 2004 → Council members asked questions about the values emerging from the research, and offered their own observations and reflections based on sessions attended.</p>		

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>→ CPRN thanked the Advisory Council for attending and providing critical feedback on sessions that members had observed.</p>	<p>→ Council members discussed insights gained from these dialogues that might be useful as NWMO decides on the format for future dialogues. There was discussion on the appropriate role for experts and technical information providers, and the extent of background information required to support meaningful engagement.</p>		
<p>May 20, 2004 → The President noted Discussion Document 2 would be the focus of the next round of public engagement.</p>		<p>May 20, 2004 → In engaging on Discussion Document 2, the Advisory Council urged NWMO to provide for consultation with the general public and Aboriginal peoples as required in the <i>Nuclear Fuel Waste Act</i>.</p> <p>→ Preliminary discussion ensued on a variety of engagement approaches that might be considered by NWMO. Council members counseled that NWMO take every possibility to consult by providing a range of opportunities for the public to engage.</p> <p>→ The Council tabled an interest in pursuing further its advice with respect to NWMO's next phase of public engagement.</p> <p>→ In addition to designing new consultation opportunities, Council emphasized that it was important that NWMO follow up on comments and suggestions tabled in workshops and meetings to date. It was agreed that time would be set aside during Council's special session on June 5th to address the topic of public engagement.</p>	<p>May 20, 2004 → NWMO indicated it was in the course of developing the next phase of engagement for 2004, and would be taking into account Council's input.</p> <p>→ NWMO wrote individual tailored letters to participants in its engagement program, outlining how NWMO had addressed their comments.</p>

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>June 5, 2004</p> <p>→ The President reviewed the timelines for release of subsequent milestone documents, and the objectives of the next phase of engagement that will commence with the release of Discussion Document 2 in August. She noted that important dialogues already initiated with Aboriginal peoples and nuclear site communities will be continuing, but NWMO will be seeking to broaden engagement to the public at large.</p> <p>→ To assist NWMO in designing the nature and scope of the next phase of engagement, NWMO welcomed Advisory Council's input, including:</p> <p>→ Council advice – and expectations – for how NWMO addresses the “general public” consultation and consultation with “Aboriginal peoples” – both important requirements of the Act.</p> <p>→ NWMO invited Council's advice on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geographic reach and focus of consultations – nationally, provincially, regionally, locally. • Choice of engagement tools best suited to this engagement. 		<p>June 5, 2004</p> <p>→ Many suggestions were provided as possible engagement models:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council concurred with NWMO's proposal to have reports from each workshop or dialogue rolled up (rather than transcript reporting). • The reports should reflect the raw data in terms of comments made – and not be reinterpreted or analyzed by a third party. It was important to hear directly the comments made by participants. • Council would like quantitative information also provided for each consultation, with respect to locations and number of participants. • Council concurred that the appropriate time for broad public engagement would be the period following release of Discussion Document 2. • Council acknowledged the many innovative mechanisms already implemented by NWMO to invite dialogue on the study and the key issues. Council noted the need to also offer less formal, open opportunities for the general public to learn about the study. <p>→ Council suggestions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National level consultations, (but not as intensive as regional/local) (perhaps in major metropolitan areas). • Deeper, intensive consultations with 	<p>June 5, 2004</p> <p>→ NWMO indicated it would table a proposed engagement plan once it is drafted internally, to invite Council advice.</p> <p>September 2004</p> <p>→ In the interim between Council meetings, the President updated the Council via email with draft proposal for Community Information and Discussion Sessions, to address Council's advice for broader general public outreach.</p> <p>October 18, 2004</p> <p>→ Council was invited to discuss the NWMO's Fall 2004 engagement activities, and to shape the nature of the 2005 engagement plan.</p> <p>→ NWMO's Fall 2004 engagement plan was designed to capture the suggestions offered by the Advisory Council for outreach to the general public and to Aboriginal peoples.</p> <p>→ NWMO's engagement program in Fall 2004 included, among other activities, some 120 meetings in 34 locations across the country, designed for the general public. These included open house information sessions, followed by discussion sessions for a dialogue around Discussion Document 2.</p> <p>→ NWMO continued to seek comments from Canadians nationwide through the invitation of submissions, web-based comments and surveys, e-dialogue, and nationwide quantitative public opinion</p>

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>Economic Regions, to meet requirements of Act, including nuclear site communities.</p> <p>→ The Council advised that the engagement program should provide an innovative array of outreach mechanisms – to complement the excellent work on the technical side:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement should be multi-faceted – there would likely be a role for generic NWMO information sessions to start the discussion with the general public. • Engagement should include some of the more conventional approaches to consultations. • NWMO's next phase of engagement must be broader in terms of numbers of Canadians engaged, types of open dialogues convened and substantive discussion of the key issues in the study. • NWMO should consider multi-media to help get the word out – public service approach to messaging on radio, TV, opportunities on cable stations – seen as much more effective than the website in raising awareness of the study. NWMO should advertise broadly its open consultations. • There may be opportunities to use colleges and universities in different locations to lead public discussions with students, to benefit from perspectives of youth. 	<p>research.</p> <p>→ Further to the Council suggestions, the focus of NWMO's 2005 public engagement program was concentrated in the provinces associated with the nuclear fuel cycle (the regions proposed by the NWMO to be the focus of siting). In addition, open houses and discussion were convened in nuclear site communities.</p> <p>→ NWMO sought to raise the profile of these sessions through radio and print advertising, and through interviews with local media.</p> <p>→ NWMO distributed more than 1,700 DVDs which profile the NWMO study.</p>

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town hall meetings, in venues that would be accessible to the general public, were suggested. → NWMO should give consideration to population bases in determining locations for engagement activities. It is important to offer opportunities for as many people as possible to participate in the engagement activities. → It was important for NWMO to be very clear about objectives of each consultation and how the NWMO will use the input, to manage expectations of public. → NWMO should focus discussions clearly on key elements in Discussion Document 2, and invite input to help inform the implementation plans. Simply focused and condensed information in the Document is required for constructive feedback. → It is important to communicate clearly in Discussion Document 2 that the Assessment Team’s work represents a preliminary assessment based on the framework questions put forward by Canadians. It did not represent NWMO’s final analysis. Nor did it represent NWMO’s recommendations. Focus engagement on the Discussion Document around methodology / process – rather than the Assessment Team’s outcome. The Assessment Team work should be seen as a tool to help them work through process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Further to the Advisory Council comments, the NWMO took the following actions: • NWMO approached Dr. Lee Merkhofer to understand the process that would be required for this broader type of public involvement in the assessment. (Dr. Merkhofer was the technical advisor and facilitator of the NWMO Assessment Team process, and an expert in multi-attribute decision analysis.) Dr. Merkhofer outlined for NWMO the onerous process requirements to enable this work to have full methodological integrity.

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>→ Following the Assessment Team's preliminary assessment, the Council suggested that NWMO broaden its base for assessment by putting in place tools to allow interested citizens to perform their own assessment of the management approaches in a comparable way to the process used by the Assessment Team.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With this advice in mind, the NWMO adopted a multi-pronged approach to making the assessment more publicly accessible. • As suggested by Dr. Merkhofer, NWMO extended an offer to many groups that had been involved in the NWMO study, to participate in a dedicated session in which they would be guided through the assessment with the assistance for Dr. Merkhofer. <p>→ NWMO provided opportunities through its public engagement to help participants explore the appropriateness of the assessment process and gain an understanding of the process used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through the National and Regional Stakeholder Dialogues, NWMO devoted the first day of the two-day dialogue sessions to familiarizing participants with the Assessment Team process. Assessment Team presentations were followed by a participant workshop during which they worked through the process of scoring the three management approaches against an objective. • In nation-wide Public Information and Discussion Sessions, NWMO described the eight objectives used in the assessment and the methodology, along with the findings, as a basis for public discussion. More than 900 participated in these sessions.

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>→ Council asked for NWMO to table with members for discussion and comment a draft engagement plan for the post-Discussion Document 2 phase.</p>	<p>→ Focus groups and a nation-wide survey were used to explore the appropriateness of the objectives used by the Assessment Team. More than 2,800 participated in this research.</p> <p>→ The Assessment Team's evaluation of the management approaches was tested and enriched by work by Golder Associates and Gartner Lee Ltd. This work contributed further to the NWMO's assessment of costs, benefits and risks, drawing on experience with nuclear waste management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This work provided further assurance of integrity of the original assessment, and added to it a recognized base of knowledge, expertise, measurement and transparency. The several months of work served to both confirm the validity of the original work, and add substantively to it. <p>→ NWMO provided this opportunity. See for example, the discussion noted below for October 2004.</p>
<p>June 5, 2004</p> <p>→ NWMO invited suggestions on the next phase of outreach with Aboriginal peoples.</p>		<p>June 5, 2004</p> <p>→ In addressing Aboriginal engagement, Council underscored the important legislative focus on Aboriginal outreach and Traditional Knowledge and the need to address this fully in the study.</p> <p>→ Council advised continued work with national organizations, as one of the important mechanisms and, on Aboriginal outreach, Council recom-</p>	<p>June 2005</p> <p>→ NWMO reported on how it had increased its level of activity on engagement with Aboriginal peoples, and was reaching out both to national organizations and local/regional contacts.</p> <p>→ Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge helped to guide the articulation of ethical principles for the assessment of management approaches, and NWMO</p>

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>mended that NWMO actively seek out dialogues with Aboriginal peoples at the local and regional levels, in addition to national levels. Council provided suggestions for structuring regional outreach as part of the broader NWMO engagement in selected economic regions.</p> <p>→ It is important that NWMO follow up on recommendations from previous workshops.</p> <p>→ NWMO should be tracking its work on Traditional Knowledge and demonstrating how it is applying it.</p> <p>→ Council suggested NWMO may wish to revisit hiring of an Aboriginal communications assistant.</p>	<p>continued to seek guidance from Traditional Knowledge in establishing the foundations for next steps to follow in subsequent phases of NWMO's work. In particular, the extensive involvement of Aboriginal peoples in the current dialogues on the NWMO <i>Draft Study Report</i> was providing advice to NWMO on appropriate considerations for implementation of the management approach selected by government.</p> <p>→ In the <i>Draft Study Report</i>, NWMO reports on how it drew principles and values from Traditional Knowledge, which were integrated into the Assessment Framework, and used in assessing options.</p> <p>→ Since Aboriginal organizations had chosen to design and lead their own engagement, NWMO had not been leading the external communications, and thus had not recruited a communications specialist.</p> <p>→ However, NWMO arranged to have the Executive Summary for NWMO's <i>Draft Study Report</i> translated into Cree, Oji-cree and Ojibway.</p>
		<p>June 5, 2004</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council's Sub-Committee on Aboriginal Engagement requested briefings on the NWMO's work with Aboriginal organizations.</p>	<p>2004 – 2005</p> <p>→ The Sub-Committee was supported by briefings and updates from NWMO staff.</p>

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>June 22, 2004</p> <p>→ The NWMO reported on a number of engagement activities.</p> <p>→ The NWMO outlined its progress on the development of the next phase of public engagement, building on the Council's suggestions for broad and open dialogue.</p>			
<p>October 18, 2004</p> <p>→ The President provided an update on the NWMO's public engagement activities, which invited dialogue around Discussion Document 2. She reviewed plans for the Community and Information Sessions delivered in 34 communities.</p> <p>→ The President outlined additional Fall 2004 public engagement plans, and general directions planned as part of the proposed 2005 Business Plan.</p> <p>→ Council members were invited to provide comments/advice.</p>	<p>October 18, 2004</p> <p>→ Council members offered comments on the structure of the public information sessions.</p> <p>→ Council members complimented the NWMO for the impressive range of public engagement under way and acknowledged the commitment of staff time and resources to such a broad engagement program.</p>	<p>October 18, 2004</p> <p>→ Council members emphasized the importance of advance advertising for the Community Information and Discussion Sessions, and consideration of whether additional approaches might be worth pursuing to increase attendance through media profile.</p> <p>→ Council suggested, for example, NWMO consider pursuing additional radio opportunities, as vehicles for expanding reach to a broader audience.</p>	<p>October 18, 2004</p> <p>→ The President responded that notices were issued in both print media and on local radio in advance of both the scheduled Information Sessions, and again in advance of the Discussion Sessions. Advertisements in local papers would run at least two weeks in advance of the activity, and a second time the week of the event. Local newspapers with the largest circulation for each area were chosen. Advertisements on radio would begin two weeks prior to the event and run up to the date of the NWMO session. For national coverage, the full calendar of dates and venues ran in an advertisement in the Globe and Mail in September. Local media were contacted by NWMO in advance of each scheduled session to encourage additional participation and coverage. NWMO sent out media information kits two weeks prior to the event. This was followed by personal calls from NWMO four to six days prior to the public session. The full schedule and location information was also available on the NWMO website.</p> <p>→ The President noted that NWMO had arranged for national profile of the Community Sessions through scheduled radio segments on CBC radio.</p>

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>→ Council members inquired about the notice provided to local officials.</p> <p>→ A Council member inquired as to whether NWMO had considered contacting previous participants, noting that many attendees at the NWMO National Citizens' Dialogue convened in 2004 had expressed interest in further opportunities to learn more and to remain engaged in the NWMO work.</p> <p>→ Council members inquired about the format of the Community Information and Discussion Sessions.</p>	<p>→ The President reported that NWMO sent letters in advance of each session to provincial MPPs/MLAs and federal MPs for the community. Letters introduced the NWMO and outlined the purpose of the community session. The officials were provided with an executive summary of the discussion document, and were invited to attend.</p> <p>→ The President confirmed that NWMO contacted all participants of the National Citizens' Dialogue who had provided their names, to invite their attendance at the Community Information and Discussion Sessions.</p> <p>→ The President outlined the format in detail. Further to previous Council advice, highlights from the discussion document were made available in a number of formats, including back-grounders on the different approaches, an Executive Summary of the document, and poster board displays that highlight the key issues.</p>
<p>October 18, 2004</p> <p>→ The President extended an invitation for Council members to attend to observe the upcoming Fall/Winter Community Information and Discussion Sessions of their choice, to hear the nature of public comments first hand. Members were provided with the calendar of dates and locations for the sessions.</p>	<p>→ Some Council members attended the Public Information / Discussion sessions convened around Discussion Document 2.</p>		

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>October 18, 2004 → NWMO reported on activities under way to engage Aboriginal peoples in the work of the NWMO.</p> <p>→ NWMO invited Advisory Council comments.</p>	<p>→ Members provided advice. See next column.</p> <p>→ They commended NWMO on the range of activities under way on this important component of NWMO's engagement program, including activities focused at the local/regional levels.</p>	<p>October 18, 2004 → Members reiterated their advice that NWMO seek to engage Aboriginal peoples at the local levels to benefit further from the input, experience, and Traditional Knowledge of Aboriginal peoples. They underscored the importance of reaching out both nationally and locally.</p> <p>→ Members encouraged NWMO to follow-up with provincial government departments for suggestions on engagement models that have worked well in the past in providing the basis for engagement with Aboriginal peoples.</p> <p>→ Members recommended that Aboriginal peoples be part of NWMO's broader outreach at the regional level as the study addresses implementation plans.</p> <p>→ In addition, the Chairman requested that NWMO provide a progress report on its engagement with Aboriginal peoples at the next meeting.</p>	<p>October 18, 2004 → NWMO reported that it was seeking to work collaboratively with national Aboriginal organizations as well invite dialogue at the local level.</p> <p>→ NWMO discussed its Aboriginal engagement program with staff from the Ontario Ministry of Northern Development and Mines, as well as the federal department of Indian and Northern Affairs.</p> <p>→ NWMO provided this update.</p>
		<p>→ In May 2004, the Advisory Council had requested opportunities to hear additional perspectives on ethical issues and principles from those who have been considering the NWMO's issues.</p>	<p>October 18, 2004 → The NWMO subsequently arranged for the Advisory Council to have a presentation by the NWMO Roundtable on Ethics. The Council had an opportunity for discussion with the Roundtable, which is composed of individuals expert in the field of ethics, tasked with assisting the NWMO with the ethical and social considerations of the study.</p>

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>→ General discussion followed, providing an opportunity for Council members and Roundtable members to ask questions and pursue informal discussion with the guest presenters.</p> <p>→ Members continued informal discussion with the Roundtable on Ethics.</p>	<p>→ NWMO arranged for guest speaker Joanne Barnaby. Ms. Barnaby addressed the topic of drawing on Aboriginal wisdom to formulate ethical guidelines for the NWMO. She reviewed highlights from the workshop on Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge that she had facilitated in September 2003 on behalf of NWMO.</p> <p>→ NWMO invited David Hallman and Mary Lou Harley, both of the United Church of Canada. Dr. Hallman presented some historical context on the United Church of Canada's engagement and advocacy positions on nuclear issues. Dr. Harley reviewed the Church's approach to contributing comments to the NWMO.</p>
		<p>November 25, 2004</p> <p>→ Council members confirmed their interest in meeting with representatives of the Canadian Nuclear Society and/or Canadian Nuclear Association to invite their perspectives on the long-term management of used nuclear fuel.</p> <p>→ The Council tabled its interest in staying abreast of the growing number of submissions and comments from the public, and reports from the different engagement activities, all of which are posted on the NWMO website.</p>	<p>November 25, 2004</p> <p>→ The President undertook to explore the possibility of these meetings for the February 2005 Council meeting.</p> <p>→ NWMO distributed a Table of Contents for the many submissions on the NWMO website and invited Council to identify papers which they would like printed for them. NWMO provided copies upon request.</p> <p>→ NWMO has since summarized in the <i>Draft</i> and <i>Final Study Reports</i> and Annual Report many key points raised in submissions and dialogues – common ground and areas of divergence.</p>

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>January 22, 2005 → The NWMO President tabled reports with the Advisory Council and addressed highlights from public engagement activities initiated following the release of Discussion Document 2.</p> <p>→ The President reviewed some upcoming meetings and workshops.</p>			
<p>January 22, 2005 → The President noted that the Advisory Council would be invited to have a representative participate in the meeting with the Minister of Natural Resources Canada on January 31, 2005.</p>	<p>January 31, 2005 → A Council member participated in the meeting on behalf of the Advisory Council, reporting to the Minister on how the Council was approaching the mandate assigned to it under the <i>Nuclear Fuel Waste Act</i>, and the way in which the Advisory Council was providing ongoing guidance to NWMO through the study period.</p>		
		<p>January 28, 2005 → At the request of the Assembly of First Nations (AFN), Advisory Council member Donald Obonsawin met with representatives of the AFN.</p>	
		<p>February 1, 2005 → The Chairman welcomed Mr. Murray Elston who spoke on behalf of the Canadian Nuclear Association, and Dr. Jeremy Whitlock, guest speaker from the Canadian Nuclear Society. They were invited by the Advisory Council to profile their respective organizations' views and perspectives on the long-term management of used nuclear fuel.</p> <p>→ Following the presentations, the Chairman opened the meeting for</p>	<p>February 1, 2005 → Further to the Council's direction, guest presentations from the Canadian Nuclear Association and Canadian Nuclear Society were arranged by NWMO as part of the February 1st meeting of Council.</p>

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>discussion. Informal discussion ensued as Council members engaged in discussion with Mr. Elston and Dr. Whitlock to pursue in depth some of the points raised in their presentations.</p>	
<p>February 1, 2005 → The President provided a status report to the Advisory Council on NWMO's Aboriginal engagement activities, and invited Council discussion.</p> <p>→ The NWMO reviewed with the Council some activities under consideration for delivery in spring 2005, in the period following release of the <i>Draft Study Report</i>, to build on the Aboriginal dialogues already in progress.</p>	<p>February 1, 2005 → Members of Council provided preliminary comments.</p>	<p>February 1, 2005 → Members followed up with questions on NWMO's proposed activities.</p> <p>→ With respect to the proposal for an Elders' Forum as proposed by NWMO, Council members made a number of comments and suggestions for improving the structure of the Forum.</p> <p>→ Members emphasized that NWMO should, in addition to Aboriginal-led activities, continue to engage Aboriginal peoples in initiatives designed to engage the general public in the variety of NWMO public dialogues.</p>	<p>August 2005 → For NWMO's response to Council suggestions, see page 78.</p> <p>→ NWMO continued to invite Aboriginal peoples to its full cross section of general public dialogues and workshops.</p>
<p>February 1, 2005 → The NWMO invited Advisory Council discussion around NWMO's next phase of public engagement planned for 2005, following the release of the <i>Draft Study Report</i>.</p> <p>→ The President reviewed the objectives set for the NWMO's engagement, including the legislated requirements for consultation. Possible options for engaging the general public on discussion of the <i>Draft Study Report</i> were tabled as a starting point for discussion with the Advisory Council.</p>	<p>February 1, 2005 → Lengthy discussion followed as Council members tabled comments and shared advice on the nature and scope of this next phase of public engagement.</p> <p>→ Council discussion addressed the relative merits of different activities and media, and the breadth of interested communities of interest who would want to participate in the next phase of engagement.</p> <p>→ Council considered the appropriate scope of activities, taking into account the legislative requirement to consult and summarize the comments of the</p>	<p>February 1, 2005 → NWMO was encouraged to maintain the continuity and quality of the base of public input developed to date.</p>	<p>February 1, 2005 → The President expressed her appreciation for these comments that would be taken into consideration as NWMO continued to work at refining the next phase of engagement.</p> <p>→ NWMO's engagement around its <i>Draft Study Report</i> has taken the Advisory Council comments into account.</p> <p>→ Personal invitations to attend workshops on the <i>Draft Study Report</i> were extended to persons who had engaged in NWMO's study process. Personalized letters expressed NWMO's appreciation for the participants input to date, and</p>

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
	<p>general public.</p>	<p>→ Council noted that while it is important to hold events that are open to the public, NWMO has found that it is difficult to engage large numbers of the general public. It would be important to consider inviting back the individuals who have participated to date and, where appropriate, seek additional perspectives. Some participants have indicated that they would hope for opportunities to participate in further dialogues with the NWMO as the draft study is released.</p> <p>→ Council encouraged NWMO to continue the approach it had used since inception of its work to engage Canadians, noting the richness in inviting two-way dialogue around the key issues. NWMO was discouraged from moving away from this approach which has worked well in bringing together individuals and organizations with diverse views to meet to discuss the management approaches.</p> <p>→ Interest was expected to be higher in the nuclear provinces. NWMO was advised to focus in those areas to make the most use of the available time for outreach.</p> <p>→ Council members noted the importance of ongoing public opinion research which has considerable reach and enables benchmarking of the views through broad public outreach. It would be important that this work continue</p>	<p>indicate how that contribution was used in the report.</p> <p>→ On March 14, 2005 the President confirmed that, per the Council advice, the dialogues around the Draft Study would maintain continuity with the key groups and individuals with whom NWMO has built a relationship over the last two years. Dialogues would be intended to continue the dialogue with past participants in NWMO's engagement activities.</p> <p>→ NWMO's engagement around the <i>Draft Study Report</i> continued the dialogue model, through presentations and discussions, to engage participants with a diversity of views in discussion around NWMO's report and its recommendation. Facilitated sessions planned over two days would support this dialogue in each location.</p> <p>→ Dialogues were planned for nuclear fuel cycle provinces – Ontario, Quebec, Saskatchewan, New Brunswick and Manitoba, where greatest interest was anticipated.</p> <p>→ NWMO continued its public opinion research in 2005 through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24 focus groups in June/July 2005 (Navigator). • Nation-wide telephone survey of 2,600 in June/July (Veraxis).

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>into 2005, as a supplement to other public engagement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → It would be useful to allow for short presentations by organizations or individuals who wish to present their viewpoints. → NWMO must still provide opportunity for the views of the general public to be heard. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Invitations to the 2005 dialogues were forwarded to all past participants of NWMO's processes. NWMO also welcomed any members of the public who wished to attend a session. Those who wished to make a brief statement in the dialogue sessions were permitted to do so.
<p>March 14, 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → NWMO invited Advisory Council discussion on the nature of engagement with Aboriginal peoples following the release of <i>Draft Study Report</i>. → The President distributed binders of reports from Aboriginal dialogues to members of the Advisory Council's Sub-Committee on Aboriginal Engagement. 		<p>March 14, 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Council stressed the importance of ensuring that Aboriginal peoples had a forum in which to provide their feedback on the NWMO study and the draft recommendation. → NWMO revisited with Council the concept of an Elders' Forum, with Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal participants. Council members tabled concerns about the proposed structure and duration of the forum, and commented on some other areas that NWMO might consider, with a view to providing broadest possible opportunities for Aboriginal peoples to comment. → NWMO must be reaching out broadly to Aboriginal communities for comments, and must reflect these comments in its reports. It is important that NWMO be responsive to the suggestions raised. 	<p>March 14, 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → NWMO indicated that it would take these comments under advisement, so as to deliver the most effective outreach with Aboriginal peoples in the study period available. → NWMO responded to Council suggestions for the design of the Elders' Forum. → Having reflected on Council comments, in its updates to Council in May/June NWMO reported on the range of engagement activities planned with Aboriginal peoples for 2005. → In addition to the continued activities led by national organizations, NWMO reported on a number of local and regional workshops and meetings planned for May through August.

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
		<p>→ Above all, it would be important for NWMO to offer the opportunities for Aboriginal input.</p>	<p>→ The NWMO <i>Draft Final Report</i> was being distributed to all Ontario First Nations. Effort has begun to make contact with a sub-set of five to six communities to initiate discussion using the Fort Hope approach as a model. An initial approach was made to the Chiefs and if appropriate, a follow-up meeting in the community would be convened.</p> <p>→ To support Aboriginal engagement on the Draft Study, the Executive Summary for NWMO's <i>Draft Study Report</i> was translated into Cree, Oji-cree and Ojibway.</p>
<p>March 14, 2005</p> <p>→ The President debriefed the Advisory Council on the comments received from the general public in national and regional dialogues. The NWMO distributed copies of the report summarizing comments received through the NWMO's nationwide community information and discussion sessions.</p> <p>→ The President invited Advisory Council discussion around the NWMO's proposed plans for public engagement following the release of the <i>Draft Study Report</i>.</p>	<p>March 14, 2005</p> <p>→ In responding to Council questions, the President addressed the timing and proposed formats for the sessions.</p>	<p>March 14, 2005</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council requested copies of the revised Ethical and Social Framework, upon completion by the Roundtable on Ethics.</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council inquired as to the possibility of Council members attending the public dialogue sessions in order to observe the discussions first hand and the comments on the <i>Draft Study Report</i>.</p> <p>→ Council suggested that one dialogue in Ontario might be insufficient, in light of the larger numbers of interested citizens in this province.</p>	<p>March 14, 2005</p> <p>→ Copies were distributed at the conclusion of the March 14, 2005 meeting.</p> <p>→ The President confirmed that this would be possible.</p> <p>→ NWMO added a second Ontario dialogue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Toronto • North Bay
<p>March 14, 2005</p> <p>→ At the request of Natural Resources Canada, NWMO lined up session for the department to meet with Council, without the presence of NWMO management.</p>	<p>March 14, 2005</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council met in camera with Natural Resources Canada.</p>		

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>→ Natural Resources Canada, in fulfilling its oversight functions under the <i>Nuclear Fuel Waste Act</i>, sought an update with the Advisory Council as to how it was fulfilling its legislative mandate.</p>			
<p>May 13, 2005 → NWMO debriefed Council on the range of comments received during NWMO's advance briefings on the content of the forthcoming <i>Draft Study Report</i> and recommendations.</p>		<p>May 13, 2005 → Council asked if advance briefings on the Draft Study would also be provided to Aboriginal organizations.</p>	<p>May 2005 → The President confirmed that such briefings would also be provided to Aboriginal organizations.</p> <p>→ Advance briefings, with those who responded to the invitation, included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wed. May 11 – Pauktuutit, Ottawa • Thurs. May 5, MNC, Ottawa • Fri. May 13, AFN, Ottawa • Wed. May 18, Eabamatoong FN, Fort Hope • Thurs. May 19, ITK, Ottawa
<p>May 13, 2005 → NWMO distributed a status update note on its Aboriginal engagement activities for Council information and discussion.</p> <p>→ NWMO offered to arrange a separate meeting or conference call at the request of the Sub Committee, should they wish to pursue discussion in detail.</p>	<p>May 13, 2005 → Members agreed that they would review the note, and follow up with NWMO for elaboration.</p>	<p>May 2005 → Sub-Committee Members followed up with an exchange of comments and questions with NWMO on the Aboriginal engagement by way of email. Specifically, questions related to the NWMO's decisions taken with respect to an Elders' Forum and future plans for engagement at reactor sites.</p> <p>→ The Chair proposed a session on June 3 for the purpose of Sub-Committee's continued discussion on these and other topics.</p> <p>→ The Sub-Committee members continued their discussions of the engagement initiatives on June 3. Members continued to discuss with NWMO the possibility of convening an Elders' Forum.</p>	<p>→ For NWMO's response to Council comments on the Elders' Forum, see page 78.</p>

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>May 13, 2005 → NWMO reviewed with Council draft plans for engaging the general public following the release of the <i>Draft Study Report</i>.</p> <p>→ As part of this, NWMO reported that it had tailored personal letters to contributors to NWMO's process, thanking them for their input and indicating how NWMO had considered and applied it in the study.</p>	<p>May 13, 2005</p> <p>→ Council expressed support for NWMO's efforts to provide individual responses to all past participants in its engagement processes.</p>	<p>May 13, 2005 → Council members sought opportunities to observe some dialogue sessions on the <i>Draft Study Report</i>.</p>	<p>May 2005 → Dates and locations for the scheduled sessions were emailed to the Council, inviting them to identify sessions they wish to observe.</p> <p>→ NWMO arranged for Council members to attend some of the public dialogues on the <i>Draft Study Report</i>.</p>
<p>June 20, 2005 → The President provided a briefing on the early feedback to the <i>Draft Study Report</i> since its release in May 2005.</p> <p>→ In her briefing, the President noted comments on the <i>Draft Study Report</i> originating from a range of sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings with the general public in open house sessions; • Dialogues being led by Aboriginal organizations; • Written responses and electronic submissions forwarded to NWMO; • Preliminary findings from the focus groups underway at 24 locations, as part of the NWMO's continuing program of public opinion research; • Endorsement of recommendation, with caveats, by the NWMO's Roundtable on Ethics; and 		<p>June 20, 2005 → The Advisory Council requested ongoing reports from the various public engagement activities as they become available in the weeks ahead.</p>	<p>July 20, 2005 → The NWMO distributed reports from the dialogues convened in: Saint John, Trois-Rivières, Pinawa and Saskatoon.</p> <p>August 2005 → Reports from North Bay and Toronto circulated to Council as the reports were finalized.</p>

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments and opinion reflected in the media coverage of the Draft Study. <p>→ The President reviewed the focus of NWMO's facilitated dialogues around the <i>Draft Study Report</i>.</p>			
<p>June 20, 2005</p> <p>→ Further to a request of the Advisory Council, the President presented a comprehensive review of the NWMO's process of engagement with Aboriginal peoples.</p> <p>→ The NWMO reviewed the components of the NWMO's engagement program, including activities at the national, regional and local levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NWMO reported on the range of activities, meetings and reports being produced by Aboriginal organizations through programs that they are designing and leading for NWMO. NWMO highlighted some key messages emerging in the review of NWMO's study by Aboriginal organizations. 	<p>June 20, 2005</p> <p>→ Discussion ensued, as the Chairman invited Council comments on the NWMO's Aboriginal engagement program.</p> <p>→ Following discussion, Council members thanked the NWMO for providing the update on Aboriginal engagement.</p>		
		<p>June 20, 2005</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council requested that NWMO provide members with a summary of comments arising from the Aboriginal dialogues presently in progress. The President confirmed that NWMO would be providing this summary.</p>	<p>August 5, 2005</p> <p>→ The NWMO provided an interim summary of comments from Aboriginal peoples, based on reports received to date.</p>

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>June 20, 2005 → As part of the discussion on Aboriginal engagement, NWMO presented a further developed outline for the Elders' Forum, for consideration of the Advisory Council.</p> <p>→ Through the proposed Forum, the NWMO would seek the perspectives of those who embody Traditional Knowledge, as they are invited to comment on the NWMO's draft recommendation, including conditions required to successfully implement the approach.</p>	<p>June 20, 2005 → As part of this discussion, the Council expressed strong support for the NWMO proceeding to implement the Elders' Forum.</p> <p>→ Members of the Council's Sub-Committee on Aboriginal Engagement reported again that they had strongly endorsed the concept of such a dialogue in prior discussions with the NWMO.</p>	<p>June 20, 2005 → Council members supported the suggestion that Aboriginal organizations be invited to select participants for the Elders' Forum.</p> <p>→ Council suggested that it would be beneficial to the discussion to both invite back participants who have previously engaged with NWMO through Aboriginal dialogues or NWMO's other activities, as well as provide for participation of Elders not yet involved in the dialogue.</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council emphasized the importance of ensuring some local representation in the Forum.</p> <p>→ Council was strongly supportive of the NWMO's intent to extend an invitation to each Elder to invite a young person to serve in a support role.</p>	<p>June 20, 2005 → NWMO undertook to proceed to arrange the Elders' Forum, taking into account suggestions offered by the Council members.</p> <p>July 20, 2005 → NWMO made arrangements for the Forum, taking into account suggestions offered by the Council members.</p> <p>September 15, 2005 → The NWMO debriefed the Advisory Council on the outcome of the Elders' Forum.</p> <p>→ The NWMO reported that the Elders' Forum was initiated following the format previously discussed with the Advisory Council. The Forum took place in Ottawa at the Odawa Native Friendship Centre from Thursday evening, August 25th through noon on Saturday, August 27th.</p> <p>→ The NWMO invited the local, regional and national organizations who had worked with NWMO to suggest Elders to be invited to the Forum. Forty-eight individuals participated, including 23 Elders, 19 young people named by the Elders in a support role, a special translator and five individuals from the NWMO.</p> <p>→ A report from the Forum was prepared and posted on the website.</p>
<p>July, 2005 → The President updated the Council on the NWMO's plans for further Aboriginal dialogues.</p>			

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>→ In addition to updating the Council on plans in progress for the Elders' Forum, the President reported that the NWMO will convene a workshop as part of a Youth Wellness Conference in Northern Saskatchewan in early August. This would provide an opportunity for the NWMO to invite discussion and comment on the <i>Draft Study Report</i>.</p>			
<p>July 20, 2005</p> <p>→ Further to the Council's desire to receive regular briefings on the public commentary received through the public engagement activities, the President reviewed the discussions convened through various engagement activities initiated to invite comment on the NWMO's <i>Draft Study Report</i>.</p> <p>→ The President reviewed the structure of the facilitated Dialogues with members of the public and other communities of interest that have participated in the NWMO study. These dialogues were convened in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NWMO highlighted the areas of public discussion and points of clarification sought in each the individual dialogues. • A final report was being prepared and would be shared with the Advisory Council and posted on the NWMO website. 	<p>July 20, 2005</p> <p>→ The Chairman thanked the President for her update, and invited general discussion and questions from the Advisory Council.</p> <p>→ The Advisory Council members who attended the NWMO Dialogues provided their comments and observations on the dialogues that they had observed, commenting on the process and the breadth of discussion which took place.</p>	<p>July 20, 2005</p> <p>→ Noting the range of viewpoints provided through the dialogues, Council members expressed their hopes that the summary reports prepared from each dialogue would capture the full range of perspectives tabled, capturing not only the "common ground", but also points of divergence.</p>	<p>July-August, 2005</p> <p>→ The NWMO undertook to ensure that reports from the dialogues reflected the full range of perspectives tabled by participants. This was conveyed to Stratos, the firm commissioned to facilitate and report on the dialogues.</p>

Engagement

Advice Sought / Opportunities Provided by NWMO	Advisory Council Response	Suggestions Made / Requests Tabled by Advisory Council	NWMO Response
<p>September 15, 2005 → The NWMO updated the Advisory Council on the recently-received public submissions.</p>			