Citizen Panel Dialogue

September 26, 2009
Toronto, Ontario
Marriott Airport Hotel
The Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO) was established in 2002 under the Nuclear Fuel Waste Act (NFWA) to investigate approaches for managing Canada’s used nuclear fuel, a by-product of the generation of electricity in a nuclear power plant.

In June 2007, the government selected Adaptive Phased Management (APM), the approach recommended by the NWMO. NWMO is now responsible for implementing APM, subject to all the necessary regulatory approvals.
Canadians will have a decision to make: 
Where should our used nuclear fuel be contained and isolated for the long term?

You are here today to provide your insights on how to ensure that the process for making this decision is as fair and appropriate as possible.
Objectives

• Provide the NWMO with informed citizens’ perspectives on the proposed process for selecting a site for used nuclear fuel management

• Identify possible ways of strengthening the proposed process, with a view to ensuring that in addition to being safe for humans and the environment, the process is fair and appropriate

• Identify any potentially problematic implications related to the site selection process which require further consideration and, if possible, advise on ways to address these challenges
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 9:00</td>
<td>Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 10:00</td>
<td>Learning Session: Orientation and Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:15</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 – 11:15</td>
<td>Group Work and Plenary Discussion: Guiding Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 – 12:15</td>
<td>Learning Session: Proposed Site Selection Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 – 1:00</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 3:00</td>
<td>Work Stations: Diving Deeper – Proposed Site Selection Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 – 3:15</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 – 4:15</td>
<td>Plenary: Diving Deeper – Proposed Site Selection Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 – 4:45</td>
<td>Armchair with NWMO Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 – 5:00</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bob’s Rules
Robert’s kinder, gentler side…

1. Respect other people, their ideas and opinions.
2. Do not interrupt others.
3. Try to say it in 25 words or less.
4. Speak only to the topic at hand.
5. No side conversations.
6. When an idea has been stated previously and you agree, only speak when you have something new to add.

Henry Martyn Robert
(1837-1923)
7. Everyone gets a chance to share their opinion before someone else speaks again.

8. Speaking briefly and staying focused is everyone’s responsibility. This will make the meeting run smoothly.

9. These are everybody’s rules and everyone is responsible for seeing that they are followed.
What to Expect

• Mix of small group and plenary work

• Rotate roles from exercise to exercise:
  – Moderator
  – Reporter
  – Time-keeper

• Given size of group, build on the work of other tables and focus on providing new input/ideas when in plenary/reporting back

• Use of a “Parking Lot” to capture important thoughts
Keypad Voting

- Interactive and effective way to conduct “straw polls”
- Ensures all voices are heard equally
- Helps to focus the conversation and dynamically “see” the various perspectives in the room
- All votes are anonymous, and cannot be traced back to you

*Please make note of your keypad number for tracking purposes*
Keypad Voting

Test Vote:
*What is your favourite type of dessert?*

1. Death by chocolate
2. Motherhood and apple pie
3. La crème de la crème brûlée
4. Fruit for thought
Who’s In The Room?

Age:

1. Under 25
2. 26 – 35
3. 36 – 45
4. 46 – 55
5. 56 – 65
6. Over 65
Who’s In the Room?

Gender:

1. Female
2. Male
Who’s In the Room?

Which part of the country are you from?

1. New Brunswick
2. Toronto GTA
3. Ontario – Outside Toronto
4. Saskatchewan
5. Territories
Who’s In the Room?

Which of the following best describes which “hat” you most naturally wear when you consider the issue of used nuclear fuel management?

1. Concerned citizen
2. Parent/grand-parent
3. First Nations, Inuit and Métis
4. Taxpayer
5. Multiple
6. Other
Test you knowledge of nuclear waste management!

- Introduce yourself
- Play one round of not-so-trivial pursuit
- One card per participant
Orientation and Overview

Nuclear Waste Management Organization
Orientation and Overview

Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission
HEALTH BREAK
Guiding Principles Overview (NWMO)

1. Focus on Safety
2. Informed and Willing “Host community”
3. Focus on Nuclear Provinces
4. Right to Withdraw
5. Aboriginal Rights, Treaties and Land Claims
6. Shared Decision-Making
7. Inclusiveness
8. Informing the Process
9. Community Well-Being
10. Regulatory Review
Why Guiding Principles?

To help ensure that the siting process is fair and appropriate:

• Will the proposed guiding principles help ensure that the siting process is fair and appropriate?

• Why? Why not?

• What additions and/or revisions, if any, should be made?

• Are there any critical gaps?
Guiding Principles: Table Work

**Objective:** to obtain feedback on the proposed guiding principles, with a view to identifying those that are generally accepted (✔), those which raise concerns (✖) and those which require further clarification (?).

**Steps:**
1. Choose your **table moderator** and **timekeeper**
2. Review the proposed **Guiding Principles** (see the Guiding Principles handout)
3. Silently rate each one using your **Participant Worksheet**
4. In a round-table, compile your table’s assessment of each principle using the **Table Summary Worksheet**
5. Record any suggested **additions/revisions**
6. Report back to plenary in **35 minutes**
Guiding Principles: PARTICIPANT Worksheet

Instructions:

Please review the 10 principles outlined in the attached hand-out.

- Will the proposed guiding principles help ensure that the siting process is fair and appropriate?
- Why? Why not?
- What additions and/or revisions, if any, should be made?
- Are there any critical gaps?

Keeping these questions in mind, please rate each principle using the following key:

✔: This principle will help ensure the siting process is fair and appropriate
✖: I am concerned that this principle, as presented, will NOT help ensure the siting process is fair and appropriate
?): I don’t understand / am not sure about this principle

Don’t forget to jot down your suggested revisions/additions!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Rating:</th>
<th>Revisions / Additions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Focus on safety</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✖️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Informed and willing</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“host community”</td>
<td>✖️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Focus on the nuclear</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provinces</td>
<td>✖️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>❓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Guiding Principles: TABLE Summary Worksheet

**Table #: __________**  **Table moderator:_____________________________**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
<th>P6</th>
<th>P7</th>
<th>P8</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Revisions/ Additions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Focus on safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Informed and willing “host community”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Focus on the nuclear provinces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guiding Principles: Report Back

Objective: to obtain feedback on the proposed guiding principles, with a view to identifying those that are widely accepted (✔), those which raise concerns (✖) and those which require further clarification (?).

1. Which principles were most **widely accepted** at your tables?
2. Which principles **raised concerns**?
3. Which principles **required further clarification**?
4. What **revisions or additions** were brought forward by your table?
## Table Work: Report Back

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Overall Rating:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Focus on safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Informed and willing “host community”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Focus on the nuclear provinces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Right to withdraw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Aboriginal rights, treaties and land claims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Shared decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Inclusiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Informing the process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Community well-being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Regulatory review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Site Selection Process

Learning Session (NWMO)
Given the NWMO’s presentation and what you understand, to date, of the proposed site selection process:

Q1: How confident are you that the siting process, taken as a whole, is fair?

1. Not confident at all
2. Somewhat confident
3. Confident
4. Very confident
5. Not sure
Proposed Site Selection Process

Given the NWMO’s presentation and what you understand, to date, of the proposed site selection process:

Q2: How confident are you that the siting process, taken as a whole, is appropriate?

1. Not confident at all
2. Somewhat confident
3. Confident
4. Very confident
5. Not sure
LUNCH
Diving Deeper: Proposed Site Selection Process

Table Work and Wall Stations
Objective: to explore the proposed site selection process in more depth, with a view to refining/strengthening the process as a whole.

• Table Work: Review / refine / strengthen the 9 steps of the proposed site selection process individually and collectively

• Wall Stations: Delve into and offer input on key issues, which “cut across” multiple steps of the proposed site selection process

• Station work will be followed by a plenary debrief
Diving Deeper: Work Stations

ACTIVITY 1
Table Work: Unpacking the 9 Steps

Round 1
• Even tables start (#s 2, 4, 6, 8)
• Self-moderated (see moderator instructions)
• 55 minutes

Round 2
• 5 minute “switch”
• Move to Activity 2 (Wall Stations)
• 55 minutes

ACTIVITY 2
Wall Stations: X-Cutting Issues

Round 1
• Odd tables start (#s 1, 3, 5, 7)
• Led by 1 of 4 facilitators
• 55 minutes

Round 2
• 5 minute “switch”
• Return to your table of origin to complete Activity 1 (Table Work)
• 55 minutes
ACTIVITY 1 – Table Work (55 mins per round)

Discussion Questions:

- Is this 9-step siting process **fair** and **appropriate**?
- Why? Why not?
- Are there any critical elements and considerations missing or not adequately addressed?
- How might we strengthen each of the individual steps and/or the process as a whole to make it as fair and appropriate as possible?

Instructions:

1. Choose your **table moderator**
2. Review the 9 steps of the proposed **Site Selection Process** (see blue table in the *Moving Forward Together – Summary* handout)
3. Silently write down **questions/concerns** OR **suggested refinements** on post-it notes (1 thought per sheet)
4. In a round-table, compile your table’s suggestions for each step, with a focus on **clustering similar thoughts together**
5. **Post** your table’s post its to the “9-Steps Wall”, under the title card
Stations A1 and A2  
Informed & Willing Communities

- How well does the siting process provide for the kinds of information, tools and resources that are needed to support the participation of communities that may be interested?
- What might a community be expected to do to demonstrate ‘in a compelling way’ that it is willing to become a host site?

Stations B1 and B2  
Community Well-Being

- How well do the criteria to assess community well-being capture the key factors that should be considered in deciding whether the project would support or damage a community’s well-being?
Plenary: Unpacking the 9 Steps

Discussion Questions:

• Is this 9-step siting process **fair** and **appropriate**?
• Why? Why not?
• Are there any critical elements and considerations missing or not adequately addressed?
• How might we strengthen each of the individual steps and/or the process as a whole to make it as fair and appropriate as possible
If the NWMO incorporated the refinements to the proposed site selection process that you’ve suggested today:

Q1: How confident would you be that the siting process, taken as a whole, is fair?

1. Not confident at all
2. Somewhat confident
3. Confident
4. Very confident
5. Not sure
If the NWMO incorporated the refinements to the proposed site selection process that you’ve suggested today:

Q2: How confident would you be that the siting process, taken as a whole, is appropriate?

1. Not confident at all
2. Somewhat confident
3. Confident
4. Very confident
5. Not sure
Stations A1 and A2
Informed & Willing Communities

• How well does the siting process provide for the kinds of information, tools and resources that are needed to support the participation of communities that may be interested?

• What might a community be expected to do to demonstrate ‘in a compelling way’ that it is willing to become a host site?

Stations B1 and B2
Community Well-Being

• How well do the criteria to assess community well-being capture the key factors that should be considered in deciding whether the project would support or damage a community’s well-being?
“Dot-mocracy”

• 5 dots for Station A: Informed and Willing Communities
• 5 dots for Station B: Community Well-Being

Instructions:

• Select what you consider to be the “top 5” ideas at each station

• Criteria:
  – Ensuring that site selection process is as **fair and appropriate** as possible
Armchair with NWMO Staff
Before You Go…

• Next steps
  – Francophone session (October 3, 2009)
  – Report (before year-end)
  – Keep informed: www.nwmo.ca

• Evaluations and consent forms

• Expenses
Thank You!