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Executive summary

Introduction and context
The Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) process, jointly sponsored by the UK Government and the Devolved Administrations in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland (hereafter collectively referred to as the Government), is seeking a solution for the long-term management of the UK’s radioactive waste. Responding to the outcomes of the initial MRWS consultation the UK Government outlined plans for the MRWS process in July 2002, including the establishment of a new independent body – the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM) - to oversee the process. One notable feature of the proposal is the major role envisaged for public and stakeholder engagement (hereafter referred to as PSE) in meeting its overall aim of ensuring broad national confidence and legitimacy in the MRWS policy process and its outcomes.

Government is currently in the process of setting up the new CoRWM committee, which is now thought likely to be in place by autumn 2003. It will be CoRWM’s role to decide how PSE can best be employed to support the MRWS policy formulation process. In order to provide initial advice to CoRWM on developing a programme of PSE, the Government commissioned the Environment and Society Research Unit (ESRU) to design, facilitate and report on a two day Participatory Methods Workshop held on 10-11th March 2003 at the Renaissance Hotel in Manchester.

The MRWS Participatory Methods Workshop
The core objective of the workshop was to bring together leading process experts, participatory practitioners and other stakeholders from within the area of radioactive waste and beyond, to consider how PSE can best support the MRWS policy options assessment stage and provide advice to CoRWM. The specific aims of the workshop were to:

• develop and agree on an inclusive set of principles or criteria that define the effectiveness of a PSE programme for the MRWS policy options review stage;
• scope three public and stakeholder engagement programmes, each relating to a different financial scenario;
• provide recommendations on how an engagement programme should be implemented and managed;
• address participants’ key issues and concerns relating to the effective engagement of the public and stakeholders in the MRWS process;
• build relationships and facilitate learning between participatory practitioners and process experts working in the area of radioactive waste management and beyond, that might form the basis of future collaboration and exchange.

The forty-three participants that attended the workshop each had significant experience of researching and evaluating participatory processes in a wider context; or designing, managing and facilitating; sponsoring/commissioning; and participating in PSE processes within the field of radioactive waste management. Participants included representatives from academic and research organisations; consultancies; national Government; Government agencies; local Government; the nuclear industry; non-governmental organizations; and science and environmental journalists working in the media.
Participants had the opportunity to develop advice submitted to CoRWM through: providing input to a preliminary phase by commenting on workshop design and a supporting paper; providing advice and guidance during the workshop process; and reviewing a final draft of this report.

In the preliminary phase three background papers were provided. The first summarised Government’s objectives for the MRWS process and suggested a broad outline programme. The second (to which participants had an opportunity to contribute) outlined PSE concepts and methods, and reviewed existing practice in the area of radioactive waste. The third, provided a general background description of radioactive waste and its management within the UK.

The workshop itself was a structured, task driven process that moved between plenary sessions, smaller working groups, and participants working as individuals or in pairs. It was designed to ensure useful advice through applying participants’ wealth of experience to the specific MRWS task, as well as capturing their significant understanding of more abstract, generic principles that should underlie participatory practice in this context. The workshop was facilitated by the ESRU team to ensure fairness of deliberations, movement towards consensus, and the acknowledgement of areas of difference. Over the two days the workshop had the following structure:

- opening presentations providing an introduction and outline of the MRWS process foreseen by Government, and an overview of the workshops process;
- discussion, development and agreement of effectiveness criteria for the PSE programme of MRWS policy options review stage;
- the design of three outline PSE programmes each relating to a different financial scenario – including the overall objectives, principles and strategy, as well as detailing specific methods and indicative costs;
- individual and group risk-benefit appraisals of the three proposed PSE programmes and the overall MRWS process as outlined by Government;
- a collective review of risk-benefit appraisals, and consideration of final recommendations for managing and implementing the engagement programme.

**Principles that should guide PSE programme design**

Eight key principles or success criteria were identified by workshop participants during early workshop discussions (see Section 2), including:

- **Clarity.** The PSE programme should: provide clarity in terms of its scope, purpose, objectives, decision points and underlying principles at the outset; be fit for purpose; produce clear and usable outputs for decision making; and promote transparency about the process and its boundaries.

- **Reflexivity & Adaptability.** The PSE programme should: be revisable and flexible; be appropriate and adaptive to the needs of different constituencies; open to the expression of diverse views; capture lessons learnt during the process; and adjust to unforeseen consequences.

- **Openness and Transparency.** The PSE programme should: be open, transparent, inclusive and accessible; and provide sufficient access to balanced information, knowledge and expertise.

- **Legitimacy.** The PSE programme should: be legitimate, credible and accountable; provide a visible influence over decision making and demonstrate how views are taken into account.
• **Learning.** The PSE programme should: provide learning opportunities for all participants; build the capacity of people to take part now and in the future; enable constructive deliberation and better understanding between participants (experts, stakeholders and the public); and enhance institutional learning.

• **Representativeness.** The PSE programme should: include a representative section of the public and stakeholders; and engage a broad spectrum of constituencies, promoting integration between them.

• **Inclusivity.** The PSE programme should: represent the public and stakeholder spectrum; and account for the views of people unable to participate (including future generations).

• **Efficiency.** The PSE programme should: be efficient in its use of resources (time and money); be clear, realistic, achievable and appropriate in matching resources to its objectives; and ensure coherence and co-ordination between different programme elements.

These criteria have been used informally by participants in designing the three PSE programmes, appraising the risks-benefits of these designs, and providing advice on the Government’s overall approach. The interaction of these criteria should guide CoRWM and others in designing, implementing, managing and facilitating the engagement programme, as well as evaluating its success when completed.

**Key recommendations and advice**

The Participatory Methods Workshop revealed a diversity of views, and distinct areas of consensus, which form the basis of authoritative advice to CoRWM. Through designing three PSE programmes under different financial scenarios (see Section 3), appraising their risks and benefits (see Section 3), and offering constructive feedback and advice on the Government’s overall approach (see Section 4), participants have developed the following recommendations as to how the process should be taken forward.

**CoRWM’s role, structure and legitimacy**

CoRWM’s role, position and behaviour is fundamental to ensuring the credibility and legitimacy of the MRWS process and its outcomes. CoRWM should be seen to be independent of Government, fair, transparent and accountable, and make decisions collaboratively with those engaged. In designing the PSE programme special account should be made to ensure CoRWM’s wider legitimacy. All three programmes make this provision through ensuring that CoRWM has a close, open, interactive and ongoing relationship with those participating in engagement processes. Process expertise capacity is required within CoRWM to assess both the content and quality of outputs from the engagement programme. CoRWM must also be ‘joined up’ with other Government departments/agencies and other key organisations in the area of radioactive waste management.

If members of the public and stakeholders cannot see how their input has been used in decision making, the legitimacy of the process will be undermined. CoRWM should explain to participants how their views have been taken into account. Ministers should, in turn, publish reasons for their final decisions and explain how CoRWM’s recommendations were weighed in the light of other factors.
**Process structure for the policy options review stage**

The Government’s outline programme consisted of three phases with a number of steps in each: an options scoping phase (agree inventory of wastes, develop assessment criteria, identify options, decide on options to evaluate); an options assessment phase (agree method of assessment, meet information needs, produce draft assessment, produce final options assessment report); and a recommendation phase (CoRWM provides recommendations to Ministers on the option(s) to be taken forward).

There was a sense that this initially proposed step-wise process appears to be too ‘linear’ and sequential. It gives the impression of being overly framed by the technical programme, when in practice the PSE programme should be equally, if not more, important in shaping the MRWS process. The steps in the Government’s overall approach should be seen as decision points that need to be met, or tasks that need to be carried out, during the (proposed) 2 year duration of the policy options review stage. As long tasks are completed, and outputs fed into decision points in a timely manner, it does not matter when, or in which order, these tasks are undertaken. These tasks can be more productively seen as running in parallel, being grouped together as appropriate, with considerable iteration, feedback and interaction between them.

Viewed this way there is broad agreement with the nature of the tasks, and the need for the decision points, outlined in the Government’s approach. A minority view appreciated the Government’s preliminary outline for its clarity, logic, and transparency.

The three programme designs provide specific advice on how the Government’s outline process should be revised and reorganised to enhance creativity and build in flexibility and iteration. One area of consensus is that the engagement programme for the MRWS policy options review stage should include a ‘Step 0’ to allow for important preparation and planning tasks, and to address framing issues. Despite reforming the Government’s outline structure the three programme designs generally agree that the phase 1 decision point (to agree on options to be assessed) should precede that of phase 2 (to assess which options to take forward).

**Process time-scale**

If the options assessment stage has to be limited to a duration of two years the tasks contributing to phase 1 and phase 2 decisions should take approximately one year each. However, a large majority of participants felt that a two year time-scale does not allow sufficient time to undertake the PSE programme effectively, thus presenting a significant risk that the programme will not be completed. A solution is to allow timetable flexibility for the PSE programme of approximately 12-15 months, built into the process as a contingency to respond to the needs of participants, emerging outcomes and unforeseen events, and allow for flexibility and adaptiveness. The challenge is to find the right balance between the need for flexibility and the need to contribute to timely decisions without delaying the process unnecessarily.

**Maintaining focus and managing wider framings**

The issue of wider framings held by participants is absolutely critical and, if not dealt with properly, could cause fundamental disputes thus undermining the whole MRWS
process. It will be very difficult to maintain focus on the issue of radioactive waste during the PSE programme if genuine concerns about the link between radioactive waste and a nuclear new build programme, as well as excluding certain wastes from the inventory, are not acknowledged and dealt with. Some participants suggested that the PSE programme should learn from existing processes where wider framings have been managed. Others argued that the only effective way to manage the issue is to comprehensively explore wider framings at the start of the process, and actively respond to these findings in shaping the MRWS policy options review stage.

‘Nuclear communities’
Existing ‘nuclear communities’¹ should be involved in the MRWS process. PSE Programmes 1 and 3 include special mechanisms for involving nuclear communities and outline how this could be done. It is important to appreciate that ‘nuclear communities’ are not a homogeneous group; there was divergence over the extent to which they should be represented as such. Divergent opinions were expressed about whether and how ‘emergent nuclear communities’ (i.e. those considered as potential hosts for waste sites) should be involved in the policy options assessment. Some argued this was vital to avoid later confrontation and loss of credibility. Others argued this would blight communities unnecessarily and would allow greater mobilisation against the process.

Integration, interaction and flexibility
The PSE programme should be a highly integrated and coordinated process, involving an iterative flow of communication and feedbacks between decision-making (CoRWM and Ministers), stakeholder and public components of the engagement programme. It should ensure close integration and communication of knowledge/information with ongoing technical work within the MRWS process, acknowledging and accounting for multiple and competing expert views that exist, and clearly defining what constitutes ‘expertise’ in this context. The engagement programme should be highly interactive with specific engagement processes ensuring direct interaction between members of CoRWM, experts, stakeholders and the public. The PSE programme must also be flexible. All three programme designs build in flexibility and iteration to varying degrees, in order to respond to the changing context and unforeseen outputs and outcomes of the MRWS process. Flexibility is dependent on relieving constraints relating to budget and timings.

Engagement strategies and methods
The engagement programme should employ the full range of engagement strategies and a mix of methods, including deep (intensive) stakeholder and public strands of deliberation/dialogue that are supported by broader more extensive approaches to

¹ Within the context of the workshop ‘nuclear communities’ were taken to mean people that host or live close to existing nuclear sites/activities within the UK at the present time. Because of their direct experience of nuclear activities existing nuclear communities are likely to have different existing interests, knowledges and views of radioactive waste management than those that don’t. Workshop participants also used terms such as ‘potentially affected communities’ and ‘future/possible nuclear communities’ to describe those that do not currently host or live near existing nuclear sites but might do in the future as a result of implementing the chosen waste management options. Given that the management option(s) are still to be decided this potentially includes everyone within the UK – i.e. the ‘general public’ or citizens - at this stage of the MRWS process (this would cease to be the case if the range of management options considered at any future point in the MRWS process collectively define specific geographic areas). Some participants used the broad term ‘local communities’ which is taken to include both existing nuclear communities and those potentially affected (i.e. members of the public) while recognising the differences between these two categories.
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information provision, education and consultation. The programme should also draw on existing engagement processes, mechanisms and networks. Specific provision should be made within programme design to include members of the public, stakeholder groups, and nuclear communities.

Qualitative and deliberative/dialogue based methods of PSE are preferred in the context of the MRWS process due to the highly complex nature of the radioactive waste issue, how people relate to it, and the robustness of such methods in exploring and negotiating the plurality of views among stakeholders and the public. Information provision, education, and awareness raising, support these qualitative approaches, and should be initiated before, and continue throughout, the MRWS policy options review stage. Various forms of ‘open’ consultation mechanisms should be employed to reach those that have not been included by qualitative based approaches.

The scaling issue is a massive process challenge. Cultural pluralism throughout the UK makes claims for national representativeness unrealistic and unattainable. Deliberative and inclusive forms of engagement cannot be wholly representative of the UK population, but can give an informed viewpoint of a subset or cross-section of the public. The challenge is to establish what is critical within these viewpoints. It would be useful to undertake experimental work to assess what, if any, contributions can be made by hybrid approaches of qualitative and questionnaire or other survey work. This is important for managing the media element of the MRWS process – given journalists’ scepticism about ‘focus groups’.

**Risks and benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme 1</th>
<th>Programme 2</th>
<th>Programme 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained budget £300,000pa</td>
<td>Baseline budget £500,000pa</td>
<td>Augmented budget £750,000pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by majority</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A direct comparison of the risks and benefits associated with the three PSE programme designs, each adhering to different budgets, is given in the table above. It shows the total number of different types of risk and benefit identified by participants in group discussion and individual written responses. The table also shows the number of risks and benefits around which there was significant consensus between participants. It should be noted that designing the Programme of public and stakeholder engagement for the MRWS policy options review phase is a substantial, complex and challenging undertaking. The three Programmes designed by

---

2 Programme 2 was designed over budget but, as is explained in Section 3.2.2, broadly equates to the given baseline budget (of £500,000 per year) when adopting the same assumptions as Programmes 1 and 3 about media components being externally funded. It is difficult to know whether the explicit inclusion of an extensive media component influenced participant appraisals. In addition, when drawing general conclusions about programme performance it is important to acknowledge the complexities of consortium group composition and variations in programme design between groups.
participants (described in Section 3) should therefore be regarded as initial first attempts at scoping the engagement Programme, which will have to be further developed and refined before being implemented.

Programme 1 was thought to offer the least number of benefits and the greatest number of risks by the majority of participants in the working group who designed the Programme. Programmes 2 and 3 perform better, and in many respects equally well. The only real distinction is that there was more consensus among participants about the number of benefits associated with Programme 2.

Most of the Programme 1 risks identified by a majority of participants are ‘critical risks’ that could be solely accountable for the programme failing: such as the omission, failure, or inadequacy of essential components of PSE process. Although the programme contains some good design features and innovative aspects, it would appear that budgetary constraints limit the range and quantity of essential features in Programme 1, leading to critical risks.

Benefits of Programmes 2 and 3 are more numerous and consensual, highlighting aspects of good process (particularly learning, reflexivity/adaptability, inclusiveness and openness/transparency). Risks associated with these two programmes are generally less critical than for Programme 1, focusing less on the omission or failure of design features, and more on the relative differences in the design of things that are already in place. Where critical risks can be identified, Programme 2 has more than Programme 3.

**Budget**

Within the confines of the design and appraisal task there is evidence to suggest that the Programme 1 budget is not enough, and that an acceptable budget might be somewhere between the baseline (of £500,000 per annum) and the augmented budget (of £750,000 per annum). However, all three programmes suffer from risks resulting from limited budget and resources. The conclusion is that that the budget should be increased. This is supported by the overwhelming consensus between participants, when offering advice on the Government’s overall approach, that all three preliminary budgets suggested are not adequate for the task.

A programme run on a budget somewhere towards that of Programme 3 will still present an number of risks, some of which might be critical. There is an indication that providing additional resource will limit these risks further. However, it is not possible to ascertain where a ‘critical threshold’ lies. There will be a better idea of critical budgetary needs as the programme unfolds, hence the fundamental need for ongoing evaluation and budgetary flexibility. Rather than imposing a fixed budget and designing an engagement programme within this constraint, there needs to be flexibility in the way that budgets are allocated. If the level of budget cannot, for political or other reasons, meet the objectives of the engagement programme, then it will be necessary for CoRWM to re-assess and scale back the objectives of the PSE programme in the light of these constraints. This would be the case if the budget were set at the baseline level (of £500,000 per annum).
The need to manage generic risks
In addition to budgetary risks, certain risks are common to all three programme designs, indicating that whatever the budget allocated to the PSE programme, there will always be what might be described as ‘generic’ risks: i.e. risks that might be associated with any given programme no matter how it is designed. A clear feature of these generic risks is that they depend, to varying degrees, on structural, institutional and contextual factors that lie beyond immediate social processes that can be dealt with and managed by programme design alone. The success of the PSE programme depends as much on the quality of its management, co-ordination and facilitation, and the ongoing ‘performance’ of the institutions that it is embedded within, as the effectiveness of the process design in itself. It is fundamentally important, then, that generic risks are clearly identified and managed both prior to, and throughout, the engagement programme of the MRWS policy options review stage.
Independent Assessor’s Statement
I very much appreciate the opportunity to act as Independent Assessor for the Participatory Methods Workshop set up to consider the public and stakeholder engagement programme of the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely policy options review stage. Defra’s support for this workshop demonstrates its commitment to a transparent programme of work which is clear about how the views of the public will contribute to key decisions.

My role has been to comment on and ensure the comprehensiveness, fairness and accuracy of this report. The aim has been to ensure that the report provides a full and fair account of both the workshop process itself and the conclusions at which it arrived, reflecting diversity of views as well as the substantial degree of consensus which emerged.

I am pleased to report that the facilitating team from the Environment and Society Research Unit (ESRU) has organised and carefully documented the workshop proceedings and that this report does indeed represent a full and fair account of the views of those who participated. The report provides clear messages to Government about methods of effective consultation and the resources required.

In reaching this conclusion I have taken the following steps:

- Reviewed preliminary workshop materials prepared by Defra and ESRU.
- Observed the workshop process and the recording of the proceedings
- Read the draft report of the workshop and participants’ observations on the report
- Reviewed the final report to ensure that it fairly reflects both the proceedings themselves and participants’ comments.

In addition, I have provided the facilitating team with a small number of comments on the report which I hope will make the workshop process and conclusions clearer to those who did not attend. I am pleased to say that the team has responded positively to these suggestions.

I believe that this report now provides a reliable and accurate account of stakeholder views which Government can take into account in formulating its forward plans. I look forward to the development of the public and stakeholder engagement programme.

Professor Jim Skea
Director, Policy Studies Institute
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1 The MRWS Participatory Methods Workshop process

1. This Section briefly outlines the background, purpose and objectives of the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) Participatory Methods Workshop that took place on the 10-11th March 2003 at the Renaissance Hotel in Manchester, before describing the workshop process, including the preparatory and reporting stages.

1.1 Background and purpose

2. The Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) process, jointly sponsored by the UK Government and the Devolved Administrations (DAs) in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, seeks to come up with a solution for the long-term management of the UK’s radioactive waste. Responding to the outcomes of the initial MRWS consultation process the UK Government gave an indication of the MRWS process currently foreseen by its sponsoring Ministers in July 2002. A striking feature of the proposed process is the predominant role that public and stakeholder engagement will play in meeting its overall aim of ensuring broad national confidence and legitimacy in the MRWS policy process and its outcomes.

3. Given this context, there was awareness of a considerable body of practice and experience based around engaging the public and stakeholders in radioactive waste management that has built up rapidly in the UK and internationally over the past half a decade or so. It was also recognised that there was a diversity of expert and practitioner views about how the public and stakeholders can best be involved in the area of radioactive waste, associated with a wide range of existing engagement practice. Such differences of view were clearly represented in the responses to the initial consultation. With this in mind Defra, in conjunction with their Devolved Administration co-sponsors, identified the need to draw these diverse views together and discuss how things should be taken forward. The Participatory Methods Workshop was commissioned to address the key issue:

“What form should public and stakeholder engagement take to secure public confidence in eventual policy decisions concerning the long-term management of the UK’s radioactive waste under the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely process?”

4. Defra approached the Environment & Society Research Unit in September 2002 (acting also on behalf of Ministers and Devolved Administrations of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland) to undertake the task of designing, facilitating, and reporting on, the MRWS participatory methods workshop. It was agreed that Defra would

---


4 As outlined in the letter from the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs to MPs on 29th July 2002 explaining the next steps in the MRWS process in the light of responses to the September 2001 MRWS consultation document. (http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/radioactivity/waste/pdf/radwaste_sofs-letter.pdf)

provide a supporting administrative role, but that ESRU would remain independent throughout and have the final decision on matters relating to the workshop process. Importantly, although highly skilled in engaging the public and stakeholders in technical decisions, ESRU do not actively practice in the area of radioactive waste management, giving a degree of independence from the specific matters under discussion.

1.2 Objectives of the Workshop
5. The core objective of the workshop process was to bring together process experts and participatory practitioners from within and beyond the area of radioactive waste, along with other interested and affected parties, to consider how public and stakeholder engagement can best support the development of policy during the policy options review stage of the MRWS process, and provide advice to the new Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM) in the form of a report. As part of this objective it was intended that this report should provide a comprehensive, fair and accurate representation of deliberation in the workshop, highlighting areas of consensus and difference between participants. In order to achieve this objective the workshop aimed to:

- Develop and agree on an inclusive set of principles or criteria that define the effectiveness of a public and stakeholder engagement programme for the MRWS policy options review stage, and can be used to guide the design and implementation as well as assess the performance of a programme of engagement.
- Scope three public and stakeholder engagement programmes, each relating to a different financial scenario.
- Provide recommendations on how an engagement programme should be implemented and managed.
- Address participants’ key issues and concerns relating to the effective engagement of the public and stakeholders in the MRWS process.
- Build relationships and facilitate learning between participatory practitioners and process experts working in the area radioactive waste management and beyond, that might form the basis of future collaboration and exchange.

1.3 The Workshop Process
6. On the basis that all the participants in the workshop have spent considerable time in other contexts discussing the generic principles behind processes of public and stakeholder engagement, the decision was taken to focus the workshop on the application of those principles to the specific task. The workshop was therefore structured tightly to achieve a set of outputs that could be appraised by the participants themselves, the sponsors, and the members of CoRWM. At each stage of the process, all participants have been given opportunities to contribute to the advice that will be submitted to CoRWM. Specifically, by providing:

- (a) feedback/input to the Participatory Methods Working Paper for the workshop; and the proposed workshop process;
- (b) advice, guidance and feedback during the workshop process;
- (c) feedback on the draft final report from the workshop prior to its submission to the Independent Assessor.
1.3.1 Preparatory phase

1.3.1.1 Selection of participants

7. Invitations were sent out in early January 2003, and a finalised list of 50 Workshop participants was drawn up in February (see Appendix 1). Participants were selected to represent the following constituencies:

- academics and researchers who either study and evaluate participatory process, develop participatory methodologies, or design, manage and facilitate participatory processes in the UK and overseas;
- private and voluntary sector participation practitioners with experience of designing, managing, facilitating and evaluating participatory processes within in the area of radioactive waste management in the UK;
- UK Government and Government agency representatives with experience of sponsoring or commissioning participatory processes;
- local Government representatives, including those with responsibility for existing nuclear communities;
- nuclear industry representatives with experience of sponsoring, commissioning and participating in engagement processes;
- non-governmental organizational representatives with interests in management of radioactive waste;
- science and environmental journalists working in the media.

Out of this finalised list a total 43 participants attended the workshop, in addition to 6 facilitators from ESRU, an independent assessor, and 3 administrative support staff from Defra (see Appendix 1).

1.3.1.2 Background papers and workshop materials

8. Three papers were prepared and distributed to participants one week prior to the workshop:

- An overview of the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely process as foreseen by Ministers, the outline structure set for it, the role of CoRWM in overseeing the programme and providing recommendations for the long-term management of the UK’s radioactive waste. This paper, prepared by Robert Jackson (Defra), formed the opening presentation of the workshop;
- A background paper, prepared by Katherine Mondon (Defra), which provided information on the nature and quantities of radioactive waste held in the UK and recent developments in its management;
- A participatory methods working paper, prepared by Jason Chilvers, Jacque Burgess and John Murlis (ESRU, UCL) which provided a foundation for the workshop through ensuring that those attending have a common understanding of:

---

the range of public and stakeholder engagement approaches available; key concepts and terms used in respect of them; how such methods might relate to the MRWS process; and existing experiences of the application of such methods in the area of radioactive waste management in the UK and internationally.

These three papers are published as a companion volume to this main report.\(^9\)

1.3.1.3 Participant feedback

9. The third of the above papers represented a working document that was sent out to all participants in an interim draft form one month before the workshop and open to a two week review period where participants had the opportunity to provide written feedback. Participants were invited to: check the draft for coverage and accuracy; provide further information; comment on whether the descriptions, definitions and concepts offered in the paper are adequate; and contribute evaluative judgements on existing engagement processes and methods. Participants were also asked to suggest a maximum of three key issues or concerns relating to the public and stakeholder engagement programme of the MRWS process that they felt should be addressed in the workshop.

10. Around one third of workshop participants responded to the request for feedback, with ten participants providing in-depth responses. A final draft of the working paper was then produced in light of this feedback and sent out with the two accompanying papers prior to the workshop. Key concepts and terms were only amended where comments from a number of participants (i.e. more than one) converged on specific points. Most revisions related to further information provided by participants, while their key issues and concerns raised were summarised at the end of the paper.

11. Rationales for opening the paper up for review included: the need for up to date information in what is a rapidly developing area of work; the divergence in expert views as to which forms of engagement work best; and the tendency for participatory concepts and terms to be open to multiple interpretations. The intention was to ensure that the paper provided a foundation to the workshop that was inclusive of all the views of participants, facilitated a common level understanding and information, and began to develop mutual understandings of key concepts and terms between participants. It was also intended that the design of the workshop process should be similarly iterative and responsive to the needs and concerns of participants. A draft outline of workshop process was sent to participants with the three papers prior to the workshop for comment, although no feedback was received.

1.3.2 Workshop process

12. The Workshop process\(^10\) is summarized in Box 1. A more detailed overview is provided in Appendix 3. The workshop was facilitated by the ESRU team to ensure

---


\(^10\) The outline of the process given here documents what happened in the workshop and differs very slightly from the initial process design sent out to participants for review. In the initial design Session 4 employed a multi-criteria mapping approach to appraise the risks and benefits of the engagement programmes (developed in Session 3) using criteria (developed in Session 2); Session 5 was then intended to be an open discussion of risks and benefits based on these results. A number of factors (including the difficulty of the designing processes within groups; group dynamics; significant differences between participants; time constraints) meant that the design of the three programmes in Session 3 took longer than envisaged. (In retrospect a longer time period might have been allowed.) The facilitation team responded reflexively by slightly adjusting the workshop process. Programme design continued through into Session 4, meaning that appraisal of risks and benefits became a much more
fairness of deliberations, movement towards consensus, and the acknowledgement of areas of difference. A core component was to produce three scenarios for public and stakeholder engagement to support the MRWS policy options review stage (in Sessions 3 and 4), that attempted to work with the overall framework outlined by Government, and within a set of resource and political parameters determined by the sponsor\textsuperscript{11}. Further components involved the identification of criteria or principles to guide the development of the engagement programme and define its success (in Session 2); the informal consideration of these criteria in identifying the specific risks and benefits of each scenario (in Session 5); and making space for participants to offer feedback and advice on the Government’s overall approach\textsuperscript{12} in full plenary discussions (Sessions 1 and 6), and through individual written responses and group discussions (Session 5). The Workshop was a structured, task driven process that moved between plenary sessions, smaller working groups, and participants working as individuals or in pairs. Following the first plenary, six small groups worked on sets of criteria for the evaluation of PSE programmes. The six groups were then amalgamated into three ‘consortia’ charged with the design of a PSE programme at one of three budgetary levels.

13. The guiding principle for the workshop process was not to repeat the experience of the UK Government’s public debate on GM crops as overseen by the Agriculture and Environment Biotechnology Commission (AEBC). In that case, members of the committee designed an ideal national process for a ‘public debate’ which was submitted to Government in May 2002. The resources (time, money) that Government agreed to allocate to the ‘public debate’ fell so far short of the proposal that the credibility of the whole process was seriously undermined. The MRWS workshop determined to take a pragmatic approach by asking participants to work within the resources constraints that are likely to exist; and to identify the risks-benefits of programmes operating within those constraints. It is more valuable to highlight criticisms and potential deficiencies before the process gets underway, than have to fire-fight further down the line after the process has been designed or implemented.

14. Workshop participants were, therefore, asked to balance overall principles that should guide a process of public and stakeholder engagement with consideration of more detailed design to provide practical guidance to CoRWM. A number of workshop participants found the process of having to work within resource constraints in the design of specific engagement scenarios very frustrating. This frustration was

---

\textsuperscript{11}The outline process structure for the MRWS policy options review stage, and proposed budgets and timescales, were outlined in the opening presentation by Defra and an accompanying paper - Defra (2003a) \textit{Participatory methods workshop: opening presentation}, prepared for the Managing Radioactive Waste Participatory Methods Workshop, 10-11th March 2003, Manchester. The overall framework and outline structure for the process was further elaborated in a mock tender document (reproduced in Appendix 4) which was prepared by the ESRU team to set out the design task in Sessions 3 and 4.

\textsuperscript{12}Initially outlined in the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs’ initial letter to MPs on 29\textsuperscript{th} July 2002 (http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/radioactivity/waste/pdf/radwaste_sofo-letter.pdf), this overall approach as foreseen by Minister’s was further developed for the purpose of the workshop in Defra (2003a) \textit{Participatory methods workshop: opening presentation}, prepared for the Managing Radioactive Waste Safety Participatory Methods Workshop, 10-11th March 2003, Manchester, outlining the role and position of CoRWM, wider institutional dimensions, a proposed outline process structure for the MRWS policy options review stage, proposed budgets and timescales, along with other foreseen challenges/requirements.
exacerbated by the limited time (3.5 hours) available in the workshop for the design of the scenarios. The outputs described in this report, however, indicate the quality of participants’ deliberations about the CoRWM strategy in principle, as well as capturing the wide range of expertise in the specific elements of process design. An evaluation of the Workshop process is provided in Appendix 5, which summarises feedback from participants.

**Box 1. A summary of the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely Participatory Methods Workshop process (see Appendix 3 for details).**

**Day 1: Monday 10th March 2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-1pm</td>
<td>Session 1 (plenary): Opening presentations and overview of workshop process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4pm</td>
<td>Session 2 (pairs, working groups, and plenary): Development and agreement of effectiveness criteria of a public and stakeholder engagement programme for the MRWS policy options review stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-4:30pm</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30-6:30pm</td>
<td>Session 3 (working groups and plenary): Design three outline public and stakeholder engagement programmes each relating to different financial scenarios – strategy of overall process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8pm</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Day 2: Tuesday 11th March 2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30-10am</td>
<td>Session 4 (working groups): Design three outline public and stakeholder engagement programmes each relating to different financial scenarios – finalise overall process detailing specific methods and costings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-10:30am</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-12:30pm</td>
<td>Session 5 (working groups): Individual and group risk-benefit appraisals of the three proposed public and stakeholder engagement programmes and the overall MRWS process outlined by Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-1:30pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-2:30pm</td>
<td>Session 6 (plenary): Review of risk-benefit appraisals, final recommendations for managing and implementing the engagement programme, workshop evaluation, and close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1.3.3 The reporting process**

15. The deliberations of workshop participants were recorded on flip-charts, through various visual outputs, individual risk-benefit appraisal sheets, and on audio tape. All the materials have been drawn upon in this report to provide a full account of the workshop outputs that acknowledges areas of consensus and difference between participants. A draft version of this report was sent to all the workshop participants.
and the sponsors (Defra the Devolved Administrations of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland) for review. This final version has been amended in light of the comments and feedback received. When doing this the principle adhered to was exactly the same as the review process for the Participatory Methods Working Paper - i.e. ‘changes will only be made to the main body of the [report] where comments from a number of participants converge on specific points’\(^{13}\). Once these revisions had been made all materials (including feedback from the review process) were sent to the Independent Assessor for comment. The report was then finalised in view of the assessor’s comments and submitted to Government for publication. This final report will be handed on to CoRWM once it is established (which is expected to be in the Autumn of 2003).

1.3.4 The Independent Assessor

The workshop process, including the preliminary and reporting phases, has been overseen by an independent assessor – Professor Jim Skea, Director of the Policy Studies Institute in London. He acted as an observer over the two days of the workshop and was available to receive any views from participants throughout the process. His main role has been to comment on and ensure the comprehensiveness, fairness and accuracy of this final report, based on his observations of the process, the record of the workshop outputs, and participants’ feedback on the draft report. The independent assessor’s statement is included at the front of this report.

2 Principles that should guide the development and implementation of a programme of public and stakeholder engagement

17. This Section reports on Session 2 of the workshop, the objective of which was to develop principles that will guide and ensure effectiveness in the development and implementation of a programme of public and stakeholder engagement for the MRWS process. These principles took the form of criteria upon which the effectiveness or success of a particular proposed engagement programme could be assessed. In order to give shape to the exercise, participants were asked to think of criteria in the form “to what extent would the proposed engagement programme…..”. An example being: “to what extent does the engagement programme include everyone who should be included”. Participants developed criteria in six criterion working groups (see Appendix 2 for group membership), working for part of the time in pairs or threes, before coming back together in a full plenary to agree on final set of criteria. Appendix 3 provides details on the process and methodology by which criteria were developed in Session 2.

18. The criteria developed were not comprehensively employed in a formal or structured way in evaluating the three engagement programmes designed within the workshop. These criteria were in the mind of participants, however, and did receive material consideration both when scoping the proposed engagement programmes and appraising the risks and benefits associated with them, as shown in Section 3. Beyond the immediate needs of the workshop, the criteria presented below represent a resource that might be taken forward with the MRWS process and used by CoRWM to guide the implementation of the engagement programme and judge it’s success when it has been completed. The criteria defined in the plenary session, which represent clusters of sub-criteria from each of the six criterion working groups, are described in turn below.

2.1 Clarity
19. The criterion Clarity encompassed: to what extent would the engagement programme:
   - Provide clarity of scope and purpose
   - Produce a clear, coherent and usable output for the decision making process
   - Be fit for its purpose
   - Have clear objectives
   - Provide clarity about the key decision points and principles of engagement at the outset
   - Promote transparency about the process itself, so that everyone involved will be clear about the boundaries, responsibilities, opportunities, and impacts on decision making.

20. The overall design of the public participation process is likely to contain a number of different elements and to involve different actors at different stages. There is therefore potential for confusion about the aims and direction of the process. This criterion is about the degree to which the different proposals can deliver clarity about what is to happen, who is to be involved, in what way and what outputs are expected.
21. Other points made in groups concern the clarity of intent of the process. Participants suggested that clarity should include detail of the decision processes, including the way in which inputs would be taken into account, particularly where, as expected, there would be many different views. This might entail, for example, a commitment to explanations of decision routes and of the approach to divergent views. There was also a question of timetable: on the one hand decision points would need to be clearly set and on the other there should be clarity about the scope for flexibility in dealing with difficult matters that might need more time for resolution. This latter point is picked up to an extent in the criterion of Reflexivity/Adaptability. Within this criterion, it is a matter of clear capacity for this kind of flexibility in the process design.

2.2 Reflexivity and Adaptability
22. The criterion Reflexivity and Adaptability encompassed: to what extent would the process:

- Be revisable and flexible
- Be open to the expression of diverse views and ideas
- Assimilate lessons learnt during the process
- Adapt to the needs of different constituencies, allowing everyone to voice concerns
- Be appropriate to different audiences (i.e. not make assumptions about framing?)

23. The process will unfold in a changing environment; with new participants bringing new perspectives. There is the possibility that some process designs might make it difficult to make the adjustments necessary to incorporate new participants or, for example, to respond to changes in political direction. This criterion is about the flexibility of the design to adapt to new circumstances and changing participation, with the emergence of new voices and views.

24. The records of work in groups show that there is a concern that there may be pressure, through decision timetables on participants and this criterion also contains the idea that the process designs should be clear about the scope for revision of timetables should it prove necessary. To achieve this kind of flexibility there would presumably have to be procedures and definitions of what constituted necessity. Groups suggested that the degree to which the process could sustain the engagement of all parties “regardless of different positions on the future of nuclear power” would be a success criterion of the process. This is partly a question of adaptability and partly of openness.

2.3 Openness and Transparency
25. The criterion Openness and Transparency encompassed: to what extent would the engagement programme:

- Promote open access and accessibility in the selection of participants
- Be open, transparent and inclusive
- Display the principles of a democratic process
- Be informed by sufficient technical expertise (be open to the inclusion of technical expertise)
- Provide sufficient access to balanced information and knowledge.
26. It is generally accepted by stakeholders that the new process must be more open and transparent than previous exercises in public decision on radioactive waste management. However, there remains a spread of view about the meaning and operational manifestation of these principles. In particular there is concern that a complex process might be difficult to understand and might inadvertently limit access, for example, through expectations that participants will have a level of knowledge about machinery of Government. Participants at the workshop provided views on the translation of the principles into practice by setting out a number of elements of the criteria by which they would be assessed. This criterion, then, is about the degree to which the process can be open to all constituencies and open to all inputs of knowledge and expertise. It also contains the idea that openness must be seen. The criterion is therefore also about transparency, the ability to see what is going on within the process. For some participants, the ideas of openness and transparency were held to be close to the ideas of independence and of audit, emphasising procedures for independent scrutiny and provision for the independence of the process.

2.4 Legitimacy
27. The criterion *Legitimacy* encompassed: to what extent would the engagement programme:
   - Be legitimate and credible
   - Have visible influence over decision makers
   - Be accountable
   - Show that participants views are taken into account

28. Participants interpreted this cluster as a number of elements that together contribute to acceptance and recognition. The idea of legitimacy, formal recognition under law and informal acceptance that it is “correct” or “proper”, is linked to credibility, a public recognition that the process is fair and is likely to deliver its aims. There is also the idea that clear accountability is a part of legitimacy. Within groups, considerations of legitimacy included the idea that there should be ethical consideration in the process and that it should be seen to be “honest”. “Respect” was also mentioned as a consequence of a process that was demonstrably legitimate.

2.5 Learning
29. The criterion *Learning* encompassed: to what extent would the engagement programme:
   - Provide opportunities for learning by all participants
   - Enable interaction across experts, stakeholders, and the public
   - Build capacity to enable people to take part
   - Provide opportunities for institutional learning
   - Take account of comparable international processes
   - Contribute to social capacity to participate in future (public decision processes)
   - Maintain the focus and coherence of views of (different) groups
   - Promote convergence of views of the public and/or experts
   - Promote constructive deliberations (i.e. towards mutual or better understanding)

30. Many participants in the process are likely to be new to this kind of exercise. It is to be expected that they will require support if they are to participate effectively. This criterion is about the provisions for learning within the process. Workshop
participants saw two parts to this. One a formal process of discovery, finding and sharing facts, for example, and the other the development of mutual understandings between different constituencies, lay and expert. Overlaying these, participants saw a process of institutional and individual development, building capacity for the future. There are therefore aspects in this criterion of both the development of more knowledgeable participants and of social learning. Certain working groups considered that learning would involve considerable process iteration as knowledges and experience developed, and that the process design should allow for this. They also suggested a broader interpretation of this criterion to include the wider impact of the process on citizenship.

2.6 Representativness
31. The criterion Representativness encompassed: to what extent would the engagement programme:
- Include a representative section of the public and/or stakeholders
- Engage a broad spectrum of constituencies
- Allow integration between different groups, sectors and types of engagement

32. Another principle to which there is widespread commitment is that the process should be in some sense representative. Workshop participants considered that there were dimensions of scope (inclusion of a broad spectrum of constituencies, including the expert and the lay), and of the relationships between groups, which they expressed as integration. However, it was recognised that there are many different positions and that there would be issues about the degree to which individuals would feel able to delegate their interest to others. There are, therefore, links to openness and inclusiveness. This criterion, then, is about the outcome from the criteria of openness and inclusivity and is about the likelihood that the process design, with its provisions for openness and inclusivity, would deliver on expectations of representativness. The detail underlying this criterion was about the degree to which the fine scale texture within the range of views could be accommodated and about the process for selection of participants. It was recognised that there would have to be definitions to support the selection process and that these themselves should be open to scrutiny.

2.7 Inclusivity
33. The criterion Inclusivity encompassed: to what extent would the engagement programme:
- Account for the requirements of people unable to participate (including future generations)
- Represent the entire stakeholder and public spectrum

34. This criterion gives a further opportunity to assess the degree to which process designs can account for the full scope of people and groups that should be involved. It adds to the criterion of representativeness, which contains the idea that there would be those who wish to participate, by suggesting that there are other voices that should be included but that might either not be aware of the opportunity or be unable to seize it, because they are as yet unborn, for example. This criterion goes beyond the participation of the interested and is about the participation in the public process of all who may be affected by an eventual decision.
2.8 Efficiency
35. The criterion *Efficiency* encompassed: to what extent would the engagement programme:
- Ensure coherence and coordination between the different elements
- Represent value for money and fitness for purpose
- Have a clear and achievable timetable
- Use resources (time and money) efficiently
- Allow sufficient time and resources to achieve its objectives

36. If it seems likely that designs for public process will be complex or at least comprised of different parts then there will be questions of viability. This was seen by participants in terms not only of cost and effort, but also of coherence. This criterion is about the balance between due process and delivery to legislative timetables, between resources and outcomes and between finesse in design and manageability.

2.9 Additional Criteria
37. Participants also identified three further clusters of criteria, positioned as outliers on the map.

2.9.1 Trustworthiness
38. The criterion *Trustworthiness* encompassed: to what extent would the engagement programme:
- Engender trust
- Be seen to be independent, transparent and open to scrutiny

39. The decision process must be widely trusted. Participants were divided on the question of whether trust constitutes a criterion for assessing potential processes or whether it is an aim of the process. This matter was not resolved and this criterion, as it is expressed above, is about the likelihood that the particular design would produce wide trust in the process of decision.

2.9.2 Robustness
40. *Robustness* was suggested as the criterion that would allow assessment of the ability of the process to withstand pressure from shifting public agenda and the emerging debate on radioactive waste management. It contains elements of reflexivity, adaptability and efficiency (manageability).

2.9.3 Realism
41. The idea behind this suggested criterion was that expectation of the process would have to be realistic. *Realism* in this sense was about the possible and the practical, bounded by availability of public funds and the many other pressures on them. It contains elements of efficiency and clarity.

2.10 Key challenges for the process designers
42. The above criteria define some of the particular challenges faced by those faced with designing the engagement programme for the MRWS process. The process design should:
• Produce sufficient texture to allow for reflexivity, learning and inclusiveness without compromising clarity and efficiency.

• Come up with a process that, given the wide range of interested constituencies and individuals, is in some sense fully representative and brings together sufficient different voices without becoming unwieldy.

• Be seen to be legitimate and independent with sufficient provision for scrutiny to satisfy a high test for proper process.
3  Engagement programme designs and their associated risks and benefits

43. One of the central tasks, and key objectives, of the workshop was for participants to design three public and stakeholder engagement programmes for the MRWS policy options review stage, each relating to different financial scenarios. This Section reports on the provisional programme designs developed by each of the three consortium working groups in Sessions 3 and 4, and the risk-benefit appraisals of these programmes carried out by participants in Session 5. The membership of each consortium working group is given in Appendix 2. Details of the process and methodology by which programmes were designed and appraised are given in Appendix 3. The three engagement programmes are explained in turn, through:

• summarising the key features of the overall engagement strategy;
• providing a more detailed description of the programme design;
• and presenting an analysis of individual and group appraisals of the risks and benefits associated with each programme.

The Section concludes by drawing out common themes and differences between the three programmes, and considers emerging recommendations.

44. The task of designing a national level programme of engagement on the issue of radioactive waste management is substantial, complex and challenging. The three Programme designs presented in this Section were developed under considerable time constraints and in a context of diverging views (both in terms of principle and approach) that existed between some participants within consortium groups. They should therefore be regarded as initial first attempts at scoping the Programme of public and stakeholder engagement for the MRWS policy options review phase. While representing a significant contribution in taking forward the design of the engagement Programme, it will have to be further developed and refined before being implemented.

3.1  Public and stakeholder engagement programme design given a constrained budget scenario – Programme 1

45. Criteria groups 1 and 2 were brought together to form a consortium given the task of designing a programme of public and stakeholder engagement for the MRWS policy options review stage with a constrained budget of £300,000 per year over two years.

3.1.1  Key features of the overall engagement strategy

46. The key features of the overall engagement strategy for programme 1 on which the consortium reached broad consensus can be summarised as:

• A non-linear process where steps do not necessarily occur sequentially, but overlap, feed into each other, and often run in parallel.

• The inclusion of a ‘step 0’ that precedes all other steps in the engagement programme. This allows time and space for important planning and design tasks -
the focus of which involves setting up information and awareness strands to support the engagement programme throughout the 2 years of its operation.

- An emphasis in the engagement programme on the tasks of developing criteria, developing options, and assessing options. In the context of the engagement programme as a whole, most of the available resources and effort are channeled into these three steps.

- A highly interactive and integrated process, involving feedback and communication between different components of the engagement programme on the one hand and direct interaction between members of CoRWM, experts, stakeholders and the public, on the other.

- An emphasis on using existing knowledge and understanding, rather than ‘reinventing the wheel’, through a process of reviewing current research and knowledge about participation in radioactive waste management, and people’s perceptions of radioactive waste.

3.1.2 Description of engagement programme design

47. An overview of engagement programme 1 is given in Figure 3.1.2. This summarises the objectives and outputs of the programme at each step of the MRWS policy options review stage; the strategic budget and overall strategies for engagement; detail of the specific methods employed; and the associated costs of these methods. The nature of the two phases and six steps that the engagement programme is built around equate to the descriptions given in the mock tender document (see Appendix 4). Although there is a broad progression through the steps in the decision process, Consortium 1 emphasised that these steps do not necessarily proceed sequentially. There is considerable overlap between steps which is not represented in Figure 3.1.2, with many of the steps occurring simultaneously, as described below. Despite the non-linear nature of this step-wise process when applied to a process of public and stakeholder engagement, Consortium 1 designed a programme around the tasks associated with each step – clearly identifying the objectives, outputs, methods and costs of each.

48. The consortium made the following assumptions in scoping this engagement programme:
- the programme can draw upon press facilities and expertise in Defra and DAs;
- Defra and DAs pay for project management of the consultants doing the work.

Step 0

49. Consortium 1 highlighted the need for a step that preceded the formal step-wise decision process outlined by Government. Discussions centred around the need to have initial engagement to ensure that feelings, understandings, and concerns of the public and stakeholders were adequately expressed in how the problem was framed. Although considered to be best practice, it was clear that there was neither the budget nor time available for this. The group agreed to focus on the set-up of information and publicity mechanisms which was the other element seen to be important in this initial phase. This takes the form of a website, database and email newsletter to provide information, raise awareness (and allow feedback), in supporting the programme through-out. This initial phase also adds value by allowing time and
space for planning and refining the design of what is a significant programme of public and stakeholder engagement.
Figure 3.1.2. An overview of programme 1, a public and stakeholder engagement programme for the MRWS policy options review stage as designed by consortium 1 given a baseline budget of £300,000 per year over 2 years. (Engagement strategies are described in Appendix 4.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Engagement Strategy</th>
<th>Specific Methods</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 0    | Set up mechanisms for publicity & information provision. | Low % of total | (1) Information provision & Publicity. | • Website  
• Database  
• Email newsletter (to be developed as a community interested in the issue is built up). | • All methods =£50k (over 2 years, including moderator for interactive website) |
| 1    | Bring together existing research on radioactive waste and define the problem in a publicly legitimate way. | 3 review papers: public concerns; good engagement practice (including international); inventory of waste. | Low % of total | (6) Professional stakeholder deliberation. | • Inventory review group =£5K  
• Process review group: =£25K  
• Reports = £2k (inventory); £10k (good practice); £10k (public concerns) |
| Phase 1 | To identify criteria from national and locally based stakeholders. | Nationally and locally relevant criteria. | High % of total | (6, 5) Professional & local stakeholder deliberation; (4) Citizen deliberation (3) Consultation (targeting the public). | Stage strategy:  
• Stakeholder / public deliberative processes to collect criteria including: 10 groups for professional stakeholders (divided by interest); 15 region-based public groups; 15 groups for nuclear communities (each local group meets 2-3 times to devise criteria).  
• Report written and fed back to CoRWM.  
• Open meeting (at end of year 1 involving all previous participants and CoRWM, where final criteria agreed, and additional information requirements identified. | Stakeholder groups =£50K  
• Public groups & nuclear communities =£200K (incl. payment for participation & co-ordination)  
• CoRWM report meeting =£5K  
• National meeting involving all parties =£125k |
| 2    | To legitimate what counts as realistic options to be taken forward. | A relevant feasible options list. Public/stakeholder legitimisation for future process. | High % of total | (6) Professional & local stakeholder deliberation; (4) Citizen deliberation (3) Consultation (targeting the public). | For engagement strategies employed see Steps 1, 2 & 3 (Steps 4 & 5 are also part of steps 1, 2 & 3):  
• Information needs of stakeholders and public, and thoughts on process discussed in previous national meeting held at end Year 1.  
• Advisory group on process from Step 1 revisits the issue of process design in Step 4. | (see steps 1, 2 & 3) |
| 3    | To ensure the process used in step 3 is legitimate. | Agreed process to examine options and identified information needs. | Low % of total | For engagement strategies employed see Steps 1, 2 & 3 (Steps 4 & 5 are also part of steps 1, 2 & 3):  
• Information needs of stakeholders and public, and thoughts on process discussed in previous national meeting held at end Year 1.  
• Advisory group on process from Step 1 revisits the issue of process design in Step 4. | Total cost of stakeholder / public groups and open meeting =£200k |
| 4    | To find out information / research needs find (ongoing process but revisited at this stage). | Low % of total | (6,5,4) Professional / local stakeholder, & citizen deliberation. | Stakeholders, the public, & nuclear community groups are reformed to appraise options.  
• All parties brought back in to open meeting with CoRWM to make final decision. | Total cost = £682k |
| 5    | Integrated decision based on scientific and social issues. | High % of total | (6,5,4) Professional / local stakeholder, & citizen deliberation. | Stakeholders, the public, & nuclear community groups are reformed to appraise options.  
• All parties brought back in to open meeting with CoRWM to make final decision. | |
| 6    | | | | | |
Step 1

50. Some members of the consortium envisaged a ‘closed process’, using the results of previous research (technical and social) to define the inventory of waste to be considered in the process. Others argued that because this stage scopes the problem, it needs to be open to public scrutiny from the start. The consortium came to a compromise by agreeing on a stakeholder process that involved two working groups. One advisory group meets over one day to review and draw up the inventory in the form of a report. The other stakeholder advisory group reviews current knowledge of public concerns about radioactive waste, and provides advice on good engagement practice, in the form of two reports produced over a three-day process.

Steps 2 and 3

51. Defining criteria and identifying management options forms the main part of engagement programme 1. The consortium decided that steps 2 and 3 should be merged and subject to a 3 stage engagement strategy. This would entail:

- a deliberative process (involving 10 interest based stakeholder groups, 15 regionally based public groups, and 15 nuclear community groups);
- reporting and feedback to CoRWM;
- a large open meeting where all participants from the deliberative process come together with CoRWM to agree final criteria, options and information needs to be taken forward into phase 2.

It was acknowledged that a broad range of criteria were likely to be identified and there would need to be methods to reach consensus on which are most important. The group also felt that it is difficult and undesirable to separate options from implementation issues, and stressed that siting issues and issues of locality must be dealt with early on. The proposed process, therefore, highlights the importance of developing locally relevant criteria through capturing the views of existing nuclear communities, as well as possible future nuclear communities.

Steps 4 and 5

52. The consortium strongly felt that the need to devise the option appraisal process and identify information needs for option assessment should not be limited to phase 2 (as in the step-wise process outlined by Government, see Appendix 4). Both of these steps should start much earlier, be integrated with other steps, and essentially be ongoing from the start of the engagement programme. The agreed option appraisal process will be informed by the initial scoping work conducted by the process advisory group in Step 1, as well as the views of the public and stakeholders at the large open meeting at the end of Step 2/3. The process advisory group will then come back together in Step 4 and take on these views of the public and stakeholders in finalising the appraisal process. A similar process is envisaged for identifying information needs for option assessment (step 5). Initial information would be identified during initial scoping (step 1), and addressed by the public and stakeholders in the national meeting at the end of Step 2/3. It is important to have identified the information needs (both technical and non-technical) of participants by this point. The identified needs and existing knowledges build up during the process are then revisited in step 5 during a final review of information needs and provision before the options assessment begins.
Step 6
53. The actual task of option assessment represents the culmination of the engagement programme and therefore receives a substantial proportion of the resources and effort. The consortium agreed that options assessment would take the form of an integrated deliberative process involving the public, stakeholders, experts and CoRWM. The professional stakeholder, public and nuclear community groups from step 2/3 are reformed to appraise the options. All participants who have been involved in the process are then brought together in a large national open meeting with CoRWM, where the final decision on the management option(s) to be recommended for the long-term management of radioactive waste in the UK will be made.

3.1.3  Risk-benefit appraisal of the proposed engagement programme
54. During Session 5, members of Consortium 1 appraised the benefits and risks of their engagement programme design. The appraisal was conducted through individual written responses during a period of quiet reflection, followed by whole group discussion. This section presents the benefits and risks specific to the programme. Generic risks and benefits relating to the governments overall approach are described in Section 4, these will only be considered presently where they relate to specific aspects of programme 1.

The following analysis14 differentiates between benefits and risks identified:
A. by many individuals and in group discussion;
B. by many individuals;
C. by a few individuals and in group discussion;
D. by a few individuals.

These four levels broadly represent decreasing levels of consensus between participants in consortium group 1.

3.1.3.1 Benefits associated with Engagement Programme 1

A. Benefits identified by many individuals and in group discussion
   • **Seeks to be open and inclusive** – the programme attempts to include a wide range of participants (stakeholders, the public with regional variation, nuclear communities) and capture a diversity of views across the UK as well as in existing/possible nuclear communities.
   • **Develops CoRWM’s role and legitimacy** – clearly defines CoRWM’s role in the decision-making process and includes measures to increase its legitimacy (such as forming interactive relationships with participants in open meetings).

B. Benefits identified by many individuals
   • **Efficient use of limited budget / resources** – the proposed programme delivers within a limited budget to time and therefore (if effective) is efficient and demonstrates cost savings.

14 A number of different types of risk or benefit have been identified across responses (individual written responses and recorded group discussions) and the collective meaning of each type has been summarised.
C. Benefits identified by a few individuals and in group discussion
- A structured process that delivers - the programme follows a structured process to enable a political decision to be made.
- Continuity and learning – the programme ensures continuity through engaging the same stakeholders and public groups throughout the process which should promote social learning.
- Ensure public participation – the programme includes mechanisms to pay people to attend workshops (therefore encouraging fair engagement).

D. Benefits identified by a few individuals
- Openness and transparency - applies ideas of openness and transparency to an area of public policy making.
- Utilises and builds on experience of existing engagement processes – the programme includes explicit attempts to review existing engagement work in radioactive waste management and build reflexivity on existing experiences.
- Flexibility - the programme has flexibility built into it to respond to changing circumstances.

3.1.3.2 Risks associated with Engagement Programme 1

A. Risks identified by many individuals and in group discussion
- Lacks inclusiveness / representativeness: limited involvement of stakeholders – the process is very limited in the extent to which stakeholders are engaged.
- Lacks inclusiveness / representativeness: failure to provide events open to all – the programme targets small selected groups and fails to provide open processes to involve others who haven’t been targeted (legitimacy and transparency may be questioned as a result).
- Risks all in one big event – the programme adopts a high risk strategy by trying to reach a final decision in one big meeting involving all participants. Risks are particularly acute as: there is little opportunity (or funds) to resolve conflicts and reach consensus; participants not previously involved might be included in the final event; and CoRWM’s perspectives might be subject to substantial questioning and conflict.
- Failure to manage / account for wider framing issues – the programme does not provide space for wider issues raised in consultation exercises to go, and there is a risk that the process will be disrupted or hijacked by unforeseen events / issues.
- Inadequate resources / budget – under the given constrained budget the programme will not be able to: be truly open, transparent, flexible and responsive; facilitate effective communication and knowledge sharing; allow for a contingency plan (e.g. if consensus is not reached at each stage); and could lead to people feeling excluded in later stages.
B. Risks identified by many individuals
- **Inadequate information provision and identification of information needs** - information needs are inadequately met with limited mechanisms for responding to new information needs and identifying information requirements for options appraisal (or of legitimising output of information needs project – see section 8 and annex F of Defra (2003b), referenced in footnote 7, page 16).
- **Inadequate publicity and awareness raising** – the programme is weak on publicity, partly because of an insufficient budget allocation to this component, and partly because is it assumed Defra and DAs would provide support.
- **Lacks flexibility / no contingency fund** – the programme does have a contingency fund due to lack of budget. This is a significant risk as it is not able to respond to the changing context/circumstances and unforeseen outcomes emerging from the engagement process.
- **Failure to reach agreement / consensus** - the programme focuses on gathering and integrating the views of participants but does not provide specific mechanisms to reach consensus. There is a great risk that the final decision on the overall policy, options and criteria will be seriously hampered by the failure to reach agreement given the disparate views of various groups, regional differences and local concerns.

C. Risks identified by a few individuals and in group discussion
- **Lack of buy-in from Government** – the programme does not closely involve central Government, meaning there is a risk that the outputs and recommendations from the engagement programme may be ignored, or not fully taken into account.
- **Risks to credibility and legitimacy** – the whole process is dependent on the credibility of CoRWM and the contractors doing the work, not enough has been done in the programme to ensure the political credibility of the process.
- **Lacks quantitative component / verification** – the omission of quantitative verification of outputs from the in-depth qualitative engagement strategies might represent a challenge to the legitimacy of the process.

D. Risks identified by a few individuals
- **Deficiencies of programme design** – it is not clear how certain aspects of the programme will work (given the limited time within the workshop to design it).
- **Minimal deliberation/dialogue** – the programme contains limited ‘dialogic’ components.
- **Lacks transparency** – the programme lacks openness and transparency.
- **Existing nuclear community focus** – there is a risk involved in focusing on existing communities (and not possible nuclear communities) as obvious candidates.
- **Management / coordination** – the programme lacks continuity, with no provision for an overseeing role.
3.2 Public and stakeholder engagement programme design given a baseline budget scenario - Programme 2

55. Criteria groups 3 and 4 were brought together to form a consortium given the task of designing a programme of public and stakeholder engagement for the MRWS policy options review stage with an overall budget of £500,000 per year over two years.

3.2.1 Key features of overall engagement strategy

56. The consortium produced an engagement programme that contained the following elements:

- An overarching set of activities to raise awareness of issues and to provide information, with investments in information materials and media coverage; and with a significant youth dimension.

- A “pre-programme” stage to review the work to date on radioactive waste management, the arrangements for CoRWM, and CoRWM’s proposed work programme (i.e. the outline process structure for the MRWS policy options review stage and what it entails) with the aim of providing a commonly agreed state-of-the-art review and amending or validating CoRWM’s arrangements for the process.

- A framing phase, during which waste inventories and the selection criteria for appraising management options would be agreed.

- An appraisal phase during which a set of options would be produced for CoRWM, together with recommendations for public and stakeholder engagement in the next steps of the decision process.

3.2.2 Description of the engagement programme design

57. An overview of the public and stakeholder engagement programme designed by consortium 2 is given below in Figure 3.2.2. This summarises the objectives and outputs of the programme at each step of the MRWS policy options review stage, the strategic budget and overall strategies for engagement, along with detail of the specific methods employed and the associated costs of these methods. It appears from Figure 3.2.2 that the consortium designed a programme that exceeded the baseline budget (of £500,000 per year) and equated to the augmented budget (of £750,000 per year). When compared to Programmes 1 and 3 however (see Sections 3.1 and 3.3 respectively) it is clear that whereas Programme 2 funds media components out of the engagement programme budget, the other two programmes assume that media and public relations activities will be automatically provided by Defra and the DA’s and not have to come out of the given budget. If Programme 2 makes a similar assumption, with media costs (i.e. the development of materials (£100k) and media support (£300k) in Step 0) coming from a separate budget, it then broadly equates to the baseline budget (of £500,000 per year). In comparison
with Programmes 1 and 3 then, Programme 2 represents the baseline budget, as initially intended.

58. As the basis for an effective public engagement, consortium members believed that there would need to be a good level of public awareness of the issues. It was essential, consortium members considered, that there should be a well informed debate in the media at national and local levels and that this should be supported by good, clear information and by opportunities to learn about the issues. The methods the consortium decided upon to achieve this were of three kinds. There should be a media support capacity, working, for example, with the BBC to ensure that the issues of radioactive waste management were given a good airing and that programme makers, including news editors had a good supply of information and access to expertise. There should be support for local broadcast media, including local press, through provision of information and expertise. Thirdly, there should be a ‘youth support’ programme focused on the needs of the young, including a website and materials for schools and colleges. Resources would be needed throughout the Programme for development of materials and websites and for direct support to the media and institutions of education. The main resources required would be costs for organising and running focus groups.

59. The Consortium also saw the need for a further new element to precede Step 1, in which the model for the MRWS Programme itself would be considered and amended if necessary. The aim of this “pre-programme” activity would be to ensure on one hand that the Programme as it finally emerged had broad recognition and legitimacy and on the other that CoRWM would emerge with a better understanding of the concerns and interests of the public and stakeholders. It would also help CoRWM to take ownership of the process as a whole, building trust and establishing ground rules for relationships between CoRWM and the different stakeholders and public constituencies. The work in this Step 0 would be done through targeted consultations with four to five focus groups. The focus groups should be distributed amongst Devolved Administrations, with, perhaps two for England.

60. The Consortium saw the programme as comprising two parts or phases. The second phase would focus on the assessment of options and the first broadly on establishing the background to the assessment, including information about wastes and inventories, establishing assessment criteria and identifying options. Once the Consortium had considered the 6 Steps of the Government’s outline programme (see Appendix 4), it seemed that the public processes would work more effectively if there was a flow from the preparatory stages to the assessment stages and that Steps 3 and 4 should be reversed. This way all the work on criteria and methods of assessment precedes the assessment itself. The assessment then progresses logically from the identification of feasible options, through the gathering of information needed to assess this shortened list, to the appraisal itself.
**Figure 3.2.2.** An overview of programme 2, the public and stakeholder engagement programme for the MRWS policy options review stage as designed by consortium 2 given a baseline budget of £500,000 per year over 2 years. (Engagement strategies are described in Appendix 4.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Engagement Strategy</th>
<th>Specific Methods</th>
<th>Costings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overarching</strong></td>
<td>Raise public awareness.</td>
<td>Well informed public.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Education and information provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 0</strong></td>
<td>CoRWM to ‘meet’ the public / stakeholders to review, amend &amp; validate their arrangements for the process, the proposed programme and what it entails.</td>
<td>CoRWM’s proposed arrangements/programme amended, validated &amp; recognised as legitimate. CoRWM aware of different “voices” to be heard.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3, 2) Targeted consultation with the public and stakeholders</td>
<td>Revalidate CoRWM’s arrangements for the process and what it entails, ensure public legitimacy, and enhance CoRWM’s ownership of engagement process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td>Understand the wastes, &amp; the specific aspects of it, that concern the public / stakeholders. Clarify inventory, and information needs.</td>
<td>List of agreed waste categories to be included. Concerns listed. Legacy/New scenarios.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6/5/4) Integrating public and stakeholder opinions through deliberative processes. (2/1) Information / Consultation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td>Translate concerns into criteria. Brainstorm criteria &amp; define. Prioritise Criteria.</td>
<td>Criteria: negotiated, agreed, prioritised. Link to next step if some criteria are highly demanding / rigorous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4</strong></td>
<td>Identify pros and cons of potential options assessment processes (to include SEA, BPEO etc.). Agree who should conduct assessment.</td>
<td>Criteria that are reflexive and scaleable Process design: how should the assessment be done and by whom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As explained in para. 60, the consortium group deemed it necessary to switch around Steps 3 & 4 (from the order outlined by Government, see Appendix 4). This way all the work on criteria and methods of assessment (Phase 1) precedes options identification and assessment (Phase 2).
### Step 3
Identify options. Rule out infeasible options (on technical or political grounds).

A list of “potential” options for appraisal.

Aim to produce recommendations on realistic options with pros and cons and site selection criteria.

- Parallel groups: 1 Professional; 2 local / public.
- Deliberative process includes some “representatives” / delegates from Phase 1. Mix of statistical and interest representation.
- Full deliberative decision analysis over 6 months: Meeting 1 – all groups together; Meetings 2-4 – Individual groups; Final Meeting – all together.
- Web discussion forum
- Media – video of process
- CD ROM with interactive assessment
- Final Conference – 200 people to discuss report and recommendations.

### Step 5
Define requirements for information.

New quality of information with source attributions, checked and fuzzy where appropriate.

Parallel information and interactive assessment / discussion process.

- Deliberative process =£300k
- Site/overseas visits =£5k
- Web forum =£50k
- Video =£30k
- CD ROM =£50k
- Evaluation of process =£50k
- Final conference =£25k

### Step 6
Do appraisal with uncertainties captured and described.

Appraisal of options, including recommendations on further process. Options and site selection criteria.

Total cost’ = £149.5k

---

* As explained in para. 57, although this Programme exceeds the baseline budget the excess is almost entirely due to the extensive media component. If this programme assumes (as Programmes 1 & 3 do) that media and public relations activities will be externally funded it then broadly equates to the baseline budget (of £500,000 per year).
61. The first part of the programme, then, includes three elements. In the first of these, Step 1, an agreed inventory of the waste would be produced and a full set of the concerns of the public and stakeholders would be captured. Information needs would be scoped. This would entail a process to clarify the waste categories and holdings, to ensure that all the likely concerns of the participants in the Programme were understood and to define the information required by participants. In Step 2, the concerns of the stakeholders and public constituencies would be translated into assessment criteria. The Consortium envisaged that these Criteria would be negotiated and agreed and prioritised at this stage. The aim would be to produce a set of Criteria that were both adaptable to the emerging requirements of the assessment processes to be developed in the next step and geographically scaleable to take account of regional or territorial sensibilities.

62. The next step as defined by the Consortium was Step 4 (as outlined in the Government’s outline programme, Appendix 4). This involved the identification of potential assessment processes. These would include Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and the use of the concept of Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO). There would have to be clarity about the conduct of the process and who should be involved. The aim would be to produce a design for the assessment process. This would have to include criteria to be applied and it may at this stage be necessary to revisit criteria developed in Step 2.

63. For the first part of the Programme, Steps 1, 2 and 4, Consortium members considered that there would be a combination of processes. The overall strategy would be to integrate views of the public and stakeholders through a set of deliberative processes, allowing scope for social learning and for the widest expression of opinion. There should also be formal provision for discovering and sharing information and an active process of consultation. It would be important for the processes to reach beyond the interested stakeholder and public groups to the lay public and it was recognised that this would mean active recruitment to the processes and support for participants through information and learning opportunities.

64. The Consortium designed engagement methods for this part of the Programme that ran through all the steps and included four elements. A series of public and expert workshops would be held to share knowledge and capture concerns. There would also be a stakeholder panel, to include the widest possible range of expertise, for fact finding. To back these up and to extend the process beyond immediate participants, there would be a questionnaire survey and an information service by mail and phone. The criteria and assessment process would be developed in a Citizens’ Jury, which would be run in parallel with the information elements. Resources for this part of the Programme would be significant. The Public-Expert Workshops and the Citizens’ Jury were estimated to require a budget of £375,000 and the Stakeholder Panel £60,000. Reporting on the inventory, criteria and process, including a possible meeting to finalise, was estimated at £20,000. Other information elements were budgeted at £4,500.

65. Phase 2 of the Programme, as designed by the Consortium would cover the development of management options and an appraisal of them. It would aim to
produce a set of realistic management options with an appraisal of each, and provide recommendations for the implementation stage of the MRWS.

66. In the first step in this part of the programme, Step 3 (as outlined in the Government’s outline programme, Appendix 4), management options would be identified. From an initial comprehensive list of options, the infeasible would be eliminated to produce a set of options to be appraised further. The Consortium envisaged that the grounds for infeasibility would be both technical and political. The aim of Step 5 would be to ensure that all participants in the process had the information necessary to make an appraisal of the different management options. This would include a survey to determine information and research needs, and information collection to deliver the knowledge required. It was expected that this would be both hard and soft knowledge and would include a degree of “fuzziness”.

67. The appraisal itself would be carried out in Step 6. The options would be considered using the processes and criteria developed in phase 1 of the Programme. At this stage it would be important to capture the full range of uncertainties and to describe them. The Consortium considered that there would be a series of parallel engagement processes running throughout this part of the Programme. There would be broadly three parallel groups, one professional and two local or public. The process would be deliberative, with involvement of some participants from phase 1 processes as representatives or delegates. It was envisaged that there would be a six-month timetable, with a series of meetings. The first meeting should include all groups with a further two to four meetings of individual groups. There would then be a final meeting of all groups to consider the form of the draft report. To provide backing and to extend the reach of this part of the programme, there would be a Web discussion forum and information products, including an interactive CD ROM. The overarching media element would be engaged to produce popular records of the process. A final Conference, involving about 200 people, would be held to agree the report and recommendations. The Consortium strongly recommended an evaluation of the process to ensure that the claims for legitimacy, balance and inclusiveness could be substantiated.

3.2.3 Risk-benefit appraisal of the proposed engagement programme

68. This section presents the benefits and risks associated with Programme 2 as identified by members of consortium 2, through individual written responses and whole group discussions in Session 5. Generic risks and benefits relating to the Government’s overall approach are described in Section 4 and will only be considered presently where they relate to specific aspects of Programme 2.

The following analysis differentiates between benefits or risks that are identified:
A. by many individuals and in group discussion;
B. by many individuals;
C. by a few individuals and in group discussion;
D. by a few individuals.

These four levels broadly represent decreasing levels of consensus between participants. It is worth noting that the criterion of inclusiveness appears both as a benefit and a risk. In the former case, the Programme seeks to engage groups
differentiated by socio-economic and demographic characteristics. However, the very targeted nature of this recruitment could be seen to reduce opportunities for the wider public to comment – hence the risk of exclusivity.

3.2.3.1 Benefits associated with Engagement Programme 2

A. Benefits identified by many individuals and in group discussion

- **Inclusiveness, openness and accessibility** – the programme is inclusive of a wide range of participants and open to the injection of diverse views.
- **Raises awareness and recognition of the process and radioactive waste management** – the programme has a strong media component. The involvement of the media is essential to raise the ‘background noise’ in order to build wide public recognition of the issues and the process being undertaken.
- **Ensures an informed debate through information needs identification and information provision** – the programme produces ‘clean’ information materials to inform all participants engaged in the process, and allows participants to buy in additional support/expertise if necessary.
- **Integrative and interactive process** – the programme seeks to integrate different components of the engagement programme (stakeholder/public/community) and the wider MRWS process (analytic/deliberative elements) through continual communication and feedback; while ensuring interaction and continuity between CoRWM, experts, stakeholders and the public at key points within the process.
- **Flexible, reflexive and responsive process** – the programme has built-in flexibility, allowing engagement processes to be adapted and re-designed in the face of programme outcomes (e.g. public framings/concerns) and changing circumstances.
- **Iterative evaluation and audit** – built-in checks and balances, and the evaluation of programme performance/impact at appropriate intervals throughout, ensures that the process stays on track (and helps ensure flexibility and responsiveness, above).
- **Structured, coherent, iterative process** – the programme offers a well structured, clearly defined and coherent process that provides clear and timely outputs for CoRWM to allow a political decision to be made.
- **Emphasises a range of options and doesn’t close off possibilities** – the programme promotes the concept of acceptable options as opposed to the single ‘best’ solution;

B. Benefits identified by many individuals

- **Dialogic (deliberation/dialogue)** – the programme goes beyond consultation to engage people through deliberation and dialogue in real decision elements.
- **Open and transparent** – the programme promotes and increases transparency, not least through information provision and awareness raising.
- **Reaches out to those voices not usually heard** – the programme specifically addresses issues of social inclusion and youth engagement.

D. Benefits identified by a few individuals

- **Learning** – the programme attempts to provide for broader social learning through interaction, especially after the initial steps in the process.
Focus on CoRWM’s role and credibility – the programme includes measures to enhance CoRWM’s role and credibility, such as illustrating independence (from Defra and DAs) through providing its own secretariat and media team.

Measures to ensure participation – the programme recognises the importance of supporting stakeholder and public participation through providing resources and payments to ensure participation, and provision for participants to communicate with their constituency/community.

3.2.3.2 Risks associated with Engagement Programme 2

A. Risks identified by many individuals and in group discussion

- Lacks inclusivity and openness – the programme is exclusive, focusing on small groups/surrogates, and lacks the opportunity for wider voluntary engagement in open events. It also fails to engage potential siting communities. As a result, it may struggle to reflect the possible diversity of views out there.

- Media risk – the programme invests a significant amount of resource and effort into the media component but makes many assumptions that may not turn out to be true. There is a risk that the media won’t buy into the project hampering the process and creating the (unforeseen) need to pay for publicity. The media might not ‘play the game’ because they are wary of information provided, or cautious of building relationships with the sponsors. Poor media handling could seriously compromise the coherence and clarity of the process.

- Limited budget / resources – the limited budget available means that: the engagement programme will not live up to expectations; may not be sufficiently robust; opportunities for programme evaluation (and thus opportunities for wider learning) are lost; and publicity needs might not be met.

- Not sufficiently joined up with existing engagement / governance structures – the programme does not sufficiently tap into existing engagement mechanisms and essential linkages with other areas of Government (e.g. DTI, NDA, regional assemblies, local Government) are not articulated.

- Risk of project management and coordination failure – the programme relies heavily on inputs from key external support staff, yet it is unclear as to who will co-ordinate the outputs from engagement processes. Consensus amongst “suppliers” or facilitators, and their continued support for the process, should not be assumed.

B. Risks identified by many individuals

- Poor information access and provision – the programme fails to ensure the provision of clear unbiased information that indicates the range of opinion; and may not provide sufficient access to technical and non-technical information/experts.

C. Risks identified by a few individuals and in group discussion

- Lacks representativeness – there is a risk that those who should participate do not do so and the programme will not be seen to be representative (e.g. 5 workshops/juries are not representative enough).
• *Does not allow for dealing with / managing wider framings* – the framing of the process will remain controversial, there is a risk that some other engagement process or nuclear event will discredit the programme.

• *Does not sufficiently integrate with implementation stage* – the programme fails sufficiently to integrate the options assessment process with the later implementation stage, meaning that impacted communities are likely to reject CoRWM’s recommendations / conclusions.

• *Legitimacy and independence of CoRWM* – the programme fails to indicate how CoRWM’s legitimacy and independence will be ensured.

• *Outputs not taken up* – The process may not produce a “usable” list for CoRWM, and outputs may be ignored by Government and/or CoRWM.

**D. Risks identified by a few individuals**

• *Lacks transparency* - the programme may not be sufficiently transparent in terms of its objectives and selection of participants.

• *Lacks international dimension* – the programme doesn’t account for, or draw on, the international dimension.

• *Assumes people will participate* – the programme doesn’t tackle volunteerism upfront and places high demands on stakeholders and other participants, meaning some may refuse to participate.

• *Lack of learning* - process design and facilitation fails to maximise opportunities for interaction and learning, and may not deliver 360 degree learning opportunities/outcomes required.

• *Over responsive* – the initial step 0 could turn previous plans on their head and it may demand that a completely new process has to be designed.

• *Lacks flexibility* - lacks flexibility in the face of process problems.

• *Fails to reach consensus*

### 3.3 Public and stakeholder engagement programme design given an augmented budget scenario – Programme 3

69. Criteria groups 5 and 6 were brought together to form the Consortium 3, who were given the task of designing a programme of public and stakeholder engagement for the MRWS policy options review stage with an overall budget of £750,000 per year. This section reports on: the overall engagement strategy developed in consortium subgroups and agreed by the consortium as a whole in Session 3; the more detailed aspects of the engagement programme design developed by the consortium as a whole in Session 4; and the risks and benefits associated with the programme both in terms of individual written responses and whole group discussions in Session 5.

#### 3.3.1 Key features of overall engagement strategy

70. The key features of the overall engagement strategy for programme 3 on which the consortium reached broad consensus can be summarised as:

• A mix of the full range of engagement strategies (strategies 1-6, as outlined in Appendix 4), including deep (intensive) stakeholder and public strands of
deliberation/dialogue that are supported by broader (more extensive) approaches to information provision, education and consultation.

- A focus on ensuring the legitimacy for CoRWM through various means including close, open, interactive and ongoing relationships with select groups of stakeholders and the public (as represented in Figure 3.3.1a), in the form of a core stakeholder group and a citizens’ scrutiny panel respectively. Major effort should be put into developing CoRWM’s role, coherence, brand and interactions with a range of parties prior to, and in the early steps of, the MRWS policy options review stage. In this sense, the consortium viewed CoRWM’s role, structure, management and relationships with others as being equally (if not more) important than individual methods of public and stakeholder engagement.

- An overall process design (as shown in Figure 3.3.1b) that emphasises integration and coordination, with an iterative flow of linkages and feedbacks, between decision-making (CoRWM and Ministers), and stakeholder and public components of the engagement programme. This might take the form of direct iteration between components, or the communication and feedback of outputs/outcomes of specific events between components. The consortium emphasised that the individual steps of the MRWS policy options review stage (as outlined in Appendix 4) should fit into this overall process, but should not dictate the shape of the engagement programme.

![Figure 3.3.1 (a). A Venn diagram depicting the relationship between CoRWM, stakeholder and public components of the engagement programme (the size of stakeholder and public components represent the level of budget committed to each).](image)

![Figure 3.3.1(b). The overall process of the engagement programme highlighting integration and feedbacks between CoRWM, stakeholder and public components at various steps throughout the MRWS policy options review stage.](image)

- Flexibility and responsiveness is key to ensuring the success of the engagement programme. The consortium highlighted the fact that detailed design of individual steps may depend on the outputs from preceding steps (this
especially applies to the options assessment phase of the MRWS policy options review stage), or the programme might have to respond to changing circumstances and events which cannot be fully known beforehand. Flexibility is built into the engagement programme in the form of a contingency fund set aside to ensure that process design is responsive to the changing situation.

- An overall budget distribution of roughly ¼ for the stakeholder strand and ¾ for the public strand of the engagement programme (as shown in Figure 3.3.1a), while acknowledging that the design of the programme might change slightly given contingencies. The relative importance and role of public and stakeholder components was the main area of disagreement and debate within the consortium, with an emerging consensus giving emphasis to engagement with the public.

### 3.3.2 Description of engagement programme design

71. An overview of engagement programme 3 is given below in Figure 3.3.2. This summarises the objectives of the programme at each step of the MRWS policy options review stage, the strategic budget and overall strategies for engagement, along with detail of the specific methods employed and the associated costs of these methods.

72. The consortium did not feel comfortable designing a programme of engagement strictly within and around the 6 steps of the MRWS policy options review stage described in the mock tender document (see Appendix 4). The group focused much more on the overall ‘process’ of engagement, as summarised by Figures 3.3.1 (a) and (b), and the key features outlined above. As a result, much less time was spent detailing how the methods of engagement contribute, and link into, the 6 steps outlined in the tender document – the assumption being that these steps should fit into the overall process of engagement rather than the other way round. The group chose to design a programme around the 2 phases rather than individual steps (although the engagement methods employed are essentially the same for each phase). Given this it was not deemed necessary to agree specific outputs relating to each step (although the group did outline objectives for each step, see Figure 3.3.2). Some members of Consortium 3 had serious reservations about the steps being undertaken sequentially and felt it should not be assumed that the steps will be undertaken in the given order. The need for a step 0 (to develop CoRWM relationships, information provision, awareness raising, media campaign) was discussed and emphasised, but omitted from final design due to insufficient funds.

**Professional stakeholder engagement and deliberation**

73. The consortium agreed that a core stakeholder group should be closely associated to CoRWM and work collaboratively and interactively throughout the MRWS policy options review stage, being involved in all steps. This core stakeholder group takes the form of an advisory group composed of selected representatives from stakeholder working groups, other components of the MRWS process in general and the engagement programme specifically. This should not be a large group. CoRWM should exercise a degree of ‘permeability’ to this core stakeholder group but retains its role as the ‘board’ of the MRWS process.
### Figure 3.3.2

An overview of Programme 3, the public and stakeholder engagement programme for the MRWS policy options review stage as designed by Consortium 3 given an augmented budget of £750,000 per year over 2 years. (Engagement strategies are described in Appendix 4.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Engagement Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Seek informed opinions.</td>
<td>Not recorded by group as a whole</td>
<td>Phase 1 Budget = 50% of total (with % set aside for contingency/flexibility fund)</td>
<td>Stakeholder deliberation – 1 Core/Coordination Group (working closely with CoRWM); 1-2 Technical Working Groups; 1 Process Working Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Awareness of the process and the issue of radioactive waste; informed engagement; wide involvement; define objectives &amp; criteria.</td>
<td>Not recorded by group as a whole</td>
<td>Stakeholder deliberation/dialogue (core / working groups) – throughout the project</td>
<td>Stakeholder deliberation – 1 Core/Coordination Group (working closely with CoRWM); 1-2 Technical Working Groups; 1 Process Working Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Awareness; scrutiny; review.</td>
<td>Not recorded by group as a whole</td>
<td>1 Public/citizen Scrutiny Panel (working closely with CoRWM)</td>
<td>1 Public/citizen Scrutiny Panel (working closely with CoRWM).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>Reaffirm criteria; awareness; agree process.</td>
<td>Not recorded by group as a whole</td>
<td>6 Deliberative workshops/panels (interactive processes that bring together citizens and specialists)</td>
<td>6 Deliberative workshops/panels (interactive processes that bring together citizens and specialists).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>Information; new inputs; scrutiny; review.</td>
<td>Not recorded by group as a whole</td>
<td>20 Focus groups (throughout UK, NCs and non-NCs)</td>
<td>20 Focus groups (throughout UK, NCs and non-NCs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6</td>
<td>Scrutiny; review.</td>
<td>Not recorded by group as a whole</td>
<td>Form an Assoc. of UK Nuclear Host Communities (representatives from the 33 existing sites in the UK)</td>
<td>Form an Assoc. of UK Nuclear Host Communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Methods</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder deliberation – 1 Core/Coordination Group (working closely with CoRWM); 1-2 Technical Working Groups; 1 Process Working Group.</td>
<td>Core + technical WGs = £60k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Public/citizen Scrutiny Panel (working closely with CoRWM).</td>
<td>Process WG = £40k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Deliberative workshops/panels (interactive processes that bring together citizens and specialists).</td>
<td>1 Scrutiny Panel = £40k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Focus groups (throughout UK, NCs and non-NCs).</td>
<td>6 Citizen panels = £200k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form an Assoc. of UK Nuclear Host Communities.</td>
<td>20 focus grps = £100k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Local Community Liaison Committees.</td>
<td>AUKNHC = £50k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open events / consultation mechanisms.</td>
<td>LCLC = £25k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness raising and information provision (leaflets, brochures, website, advertising, media events, etc.) including continuation of the schools website project.</td>
<td>Open consult = £50k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 general website.</td>
<td>Info/awareness = £60k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency/flexibility fund.</td>
<td>Website = £20k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder deliberation – 1 Core/Coordination Group (working closely with CoRWM); 1-2 Technical Working Groups; 1 Process Working Group.</td>
<td>Contingency = £105k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Public/citizen Scrutiny Panel (working closely with CoRWM).</td>
<td>Total cost = £1500k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Deliberative workshops/panels (interactive processes that bring together citizens and specialists).</td>
<td>1 general website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Focus groups (throughout UK, NCs and non-NCs).</td>
<td>Contingency/flexibility fund.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total cost:** £1500k
74. Linking directly into this core stakeholder group are stakeholder working groups (SWGs) which communicate with - but occupy a more peripheral role to in relation to CoRWM. The SWGs would focus on issues and tasks relating to specific steps in the MRWS process. The consortium identified the need for one (or maybe two) SWGs based around technical issues, with one SWG focusing on process issues. This latter would provide process design advice to CoRWM on various aspects of the engagement programme. The consortium felt strongly that any working group had to be part of the wider engagement programme, and thus organised, managed and facilitated by an independent body (e.g. a contractor) as in any potentially effective deliberation/dialogue process. The major issue here is that SWGs and the core stakeholder group have to be independent of CoRWM and Government; be transparent and accountable to those within and outside the engagement programme; and thus attempt to ensure the wider legitimacy of CoRWM and the MRWS process.

Citizen scrutiny panel
75. Members of the consortium disagreed about the position of stakeholders within the wider MRWS process and the extent to which stakeholders should influence/frame the engagement programme and its outputs and outcomes. Some argued for a stakeholder centred process (as implied by Figure 3.3.1b) where stakeholders assist in the framing of issues for public debate and interpret the outcomes of various forms of public engagement. A larger number of the group disagreed with this position, arguing that this would privilege stakeholders, to the detriment of public perspectives. They highlighted the dangers of CoRWM getting too close to stakeholders, arguing that this would become a small isolated clique who would not have wider relevance. This could undermine wider public legitimacy in the process. Given these arguments, the consortium agreed that Programme 3 should include a citizen advisory panel to fulfill a similar role to the core stakeholder group. It would review CoRWM’s work and provide recommendations on technical and process issues.

Nuclear communities
76. The consortium agreed that existing nuclear communities within the UK should be targeted and involved in the MRWS process through two specific forms of engagement. The first involves establishing the Association of UK Nuclear Host Communities (AUKNHC) that might take on the form of a similar association in Canada. The intention is to set up an initial group as part of the MRWS engagement programme with representatives from each nuclear community in the UK (see Figure 3.3.2) which would act as a standing group for the 2 years of the policy options review stage. This standing group would be represented on, and feed into, the core stakeholder group. AUKNHC should emerge from the initial two years of MRWS funding to sustain itself as an ongoing association in the longer-term. The consortium felt that another means of engaging nuclear communities should be

15 Certain members of the consortium were aware of discussions within Defra and the DAs of the possibility of (technical and process) working groups that exist within CoRWM’s official structure, essentially being an extension of CoRWM that meet intermittently and provide advice around specific issues. The consortium were concerned about these proposals and emphasised the difference between these Government proposed working groups (made up of people selected by Government and/or CoRWM, largely run by themselves, and chiefly accountable to CoRWM) and the SWGs they envisaged (which are made up of participants selected by key stakeholders, using an inclusive and representative selection procedure which is overseen by the independent body (e.g. a contractor) that is also charged with designing, managing and facilitating the SWGs).
included in the engagement programme through existing structures in the form of Local Community Liaison Committees (LCLC) which are already in place around nuclear sites. The intention is to provide financial support to develop this existing network to enhance its effectiveness (see Figure 3.3.2).

Public engagement
77. Consortium 3 committed the largest proportion of their available budget to engaging members of the public throughout the policy options review stage. The chosen public engagement strategies account for both national variations across the Devolved Administrations and variations between nuclear and non-nuclear communities. The group identified the need for a process of social research through focus groups in order to map the key issues and concerns held by members of the public. It was decided that this would involve 20 focus groups in phase 1 and 20 in phase 2. On top of the focus group process the consortium layered in a series of interactive deliberative panel processes that involve citizens and experts in an informed debate and provide recommendations to CoRWM. The group agreed that 6 panels would run across the UK and Devolved Administrations in phase 1 to develop criteria and a range of management options. A further 6 panels would run during phase 2 to provide recommendations on the assessment of management options.

Open consultation
78. The consortium group identified the need to include mechanisms that provide open access to involve anyone who’s interested and affected by the MRWS process. These will take the form of open events and consultations (such as consultation documents, consultation workshops, consultation website; public meetings; surgeries, phone lines, exhibitions, site visits). This component was identified late on during programme design and thus was not outlined in any detail, and was allocated less budget than if it had been considered earlier.

Education and information provision
79. Programme 3 includes a substantial process of awareness raising and information provision. This begins with a high profile launch supported by media events. Education and information provision continues throughout the policy options review stage in the form of leaflets, brochures, advertising, and a website. The consortium group emphasised the role of information provision in providing creative feedback between the different components of the engagement process, and between CoRWM and the engagement programme. The group also included the continuation of Defra’s existing schools website project in their programme, but assumed that the funding for this would be ongoing and would not have to come out of the programme budget. The importance of providing information which represents the range of expert and other views on radioactive waste management, from a range of sources (e.g. Government, regulators, industry, NGOs, academics), was also noted. It was recognised that this would require time and resources to achieve.

Contingency fund
80. As mentioned in Section 3.3.1 consortium group 3 felt very strongly about the need for flexibility to be build into the programme. Flexibility is to be built into the engagement programme in the form of a contingency fund of £105,000 set aside to ensure that process design is responsive to the changing situation. Programme 3 has essentially set up the constant engagement components - the contingency fund is for
additional components, or to enhance and increase aspects of existing components. The need for a contingency fund was considered near the end of the design process when most resources has been used up, and therefore deemed insufficient by the group.

3.3.3 Risk-benefit appraisal of the proposed engagement programme

81. This Section presents the benefits and risks identified by members of Consortium 3, through individual written responses and whole group discussions in Session 5, that are specific to the programme. Generic risks and benefits relating to the Government’s overall approach are described in Section 4, these will only be considered presently where they relate to specific aspects of Programme 3.

The following analysis (see footnote 14, p32) differentiates between benefits or risks that are identified:
A. by many individuals and in group discussion;
B. by many individuals;
C. by a few individuals and in group discussion;
D. by a few individuals.

These four levels broadly represent decreasing levels of consensus between participants.

3.3.3.1 Benefits associated with Engagement Programme 3

A. Benefits identified by many individuals and in group discussion

- Focus on the legitimacy of CoRWM and the engagement programmes a whole - the programme details explicit mechanisms and processes (e.g. the core stakeholder group and citizen scrutiny panel; highly interactive relationships between CoRWM and participants; emphasis on CoRWM’s role, leadership, relationships and brand) which will help to ensure the constant strengthening of CoRWM’s legitimacy.
- Flexibility, reflexivity and responsiveness of the process – the programme has built-in flexibility allowing it to change direction and respond to emerging needs, circumstances and outcomes. This is most significantly represented by the contingency fund that is set aside within the overall budget.
- Learning – iteration, feedback and interaction between various elements and participants within the programme will promote the learning of those involved, along with sponsors and decision makers

B. Benefits identified by many individuals

- Inclusiveness and openness - the programme is based on the ongoing inclusion of a wide variety of participants (including the public throughout each of the DAs, stakeholders, and existing nuclear communities) throughout the process and open to the injection of diverse views.
- Integration and interaction - the programme is based on an overall process that is integrative and interactive, providing structures to optimise interaction and exchange between CoRWM, experts, stakeholders, and the public.
• **Publicity and awareness raising** – the programme has a strong focus on information dissemination and awareness raising, which includes special mechanisms for targeting young people.

• **Information provision and feedback** – the programme provides access to balanced information and knowledge; recognises the need for appropriate information; and recognises the need to disseminate results between engagement components.

C. Benefits identified by a few individuals and in group discussion

• **Pluralistic approach / mix of methods** - the programme is robust and flexible as it adopts a pluralistic approach which doesn’t depend on one particular method or a single organisation for process design and facilitation.

D. Benefits identified by a few individuals

• **Openness in relation to possible outcomes and decisions** – the programme sets out a truly open minded process, committed to addressing rather than avoiding issues, which does not predetermine specific outcomes or decisions.

• **Budget** – the programme has sufficient budget to allow for a contingency fund (although this might not be enough and diverts resources away from other essential methods, see risks below) to ensure flexibility.

• **Transparency** - the programme creates transparency about assumptions that are informing the process at every stage.

• **Deliberation/dialogue** – the programme provides many opportunities for participants to contribute to decision making through deliberation and dialogue.

3.3.3.2 Risks associated with Engagement Programme 3

A. Risks identified by many individuals and in group discussion

• **Stakeholder focus / bias** – the central role of stakeholder deliberation within the programme means that less emphasis is given to wider engagement of the public and local communities. There is a risk that the process and its findings will be swamped by stakeholders, experts and the ‘usual suspects’. This fundamentally endangers wider legitimacy (CoRWM’s legitimacy is one of the main rationales for having a core stakeholder component in the first place).

• **The public are marginalised** – the programme does not pay enough attention to public strand, publicity and open access events. This may result in failure to ensure wider public legitimacy, and risk public anger and alienation.

• **Insufficient flexibility** – even though the programme provides for flexibility and responsiveness through a contingency fund this is not enough and an additional budget and further measures are needed to respond to unforeseen circumstances, contexts and outcomes.

• **Limited resources** – the proposed level of resource (budget and time) for the programme poses serious risks to its effectiveness and is not enough to find and resolve suitable solutions.. The budget only allows for half a process which may cause more harm than not doing it at all. Further budget flexibility is needed through an increased contingency fund as well as
emergency fund. The programme also lacks necessary resources for publicity and awareness raising.

- **Deficient programme design** – the programme lacks overall coherence and clarity in terms of objectives, delivery mechanisms, costs and phasing of activities.

### B. Risks identified by many individuals

- **Failure to reach consensus due to entrenched stakeholder positions** – there is a risk that the involvement of a diverse range of stakeholders in a central role could derail the process. Insufficient thought has been given to mechanisms to reach consensus, while specific disaffected stakeholder groups might choose to destabilise the process.

- **Handling outputs of the engagement process** – there might not be enough capacity within CoRWM itself to deal with and understand the outputs of engagement processes even if process experts are on CoRWM. Although the Programme identifies a process working group, more attention needs to be given to ways in which the large volumes of information will be assimilated and understood.

### C. Risks identified by a few individuals and in group discussion

- **Poor information provision** – the programme does not make enough provision for information and education, and dealing with the complexities of information provision given its highly technical nature and conflicting expert views.

- **Failure to engage stakeholders** – the programme emphasises stakeholder participation but stakeholder fatigue may be a problem; given the fact that their time is not paid for, and possible future events (e.g. new nuclear build).

- **Not joined-up** - the programme does not make any provision for linkages with other programmes/organisations. It would be risky if CoRWM was not joined up with other key organisations (e.g. Nirex, NDA) and did not explore possible synergies with other engagement processes.

### D. Risks identified by a few individuals

- **Lack of learning and feedback** – the programme does not provide sufficient attention for the learning/feedback from each step to be ‘made sense of’ and disseminated in order to engage the public in sufficient numbers and in sufficient depth to legitimise the programme.

- **Public won’t engage with the process** – the programme risks poor public uptake as it is difficult to see how the public will be energised and engaged.

- **Not effectively framed by the public** – the programme does not presently have enough methods of finding out what people want in order to allow the public and stakeholders to ‘frame’ the problem.

- **Disproportionate influence of vested interest groups** – central role of stakeholders presents the risk that CoRWM’s work will be restricted by specific interest groups, or the process will be hijacked by vested interests.

- **Focus on existing nuclear communities risks excluding non-nuclear** – the programme is biased towards (existing) nuclear communities and misses out on non-nuclear sites.
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- Transparency/accountability – it is not clear how different types of contribution will be taken into account (this will need to be tackled by building process credibility and showing how CoRWM operates).
- Management/coordination not considered - who will pull it all together in a meaningful way and who will scrutinise (evaluate) the process as it progresses.
- No provision for the management of wider framings – the programme does not address the management / acknowledgement of wider questions and framings (e.g. new build, the credibility of regulators, and failure of industry to adopt adequate measures).
- Implementation issues – the programme does not make allowances to integrate implementation/siting issues up front which will create problems during later stages.

3.4 Programme design conclusions: common themes and differences between the three programme designs

3.4.1 Engagement programme design
82. Overall the three consortium working groups designed engagement programmes for the MRWS policy options review stage in accordance with the framework outlined by Government 16, and broadly within the allocated budgets 17 and time constraints. Participants did find it necessary to revise aspects of this proposed framework and their advised changes are explained in Section 4.1.1, as well as within the programme designs outlined above. In drawing out recommendations for the engagement programme for the MRWS process it is useful to highlight convergence between the three programme designs in terms of:
- their process structure;
- their overall character;
- and how different engagement strategies and methods are designed and used within them.

3.4.1.1 The decision framework and process structure for the MRWS policy options review stage
83. The three programme designs see the six steps in the Government’s overall approach (as outlined in Appendix 4) as decision points that need to be met, or tasks that need to be carried out, during the 2 year duration of the policy options review stage. As long as these tasks are completed, and outputs of engagement processes are fed into necessary decision points in a timely manner, it does not matter when, or in which order, these tasks are undertaken.

16This outline process structure for the MRWS policy options review stage is explained in Defra (2003a) Participatory methods workshop: opening presentation, prepared for the Managing Radioactive Waste Safety Participatory Methods Workshop, 10-11th March 2003, Manchester, with further detail being provided in the mock tender document in Appendix 4.
17Programme 2 was designed over budget but, as explained in Section 3.2.2., when adopting the same assumptions as Programmes 1 and 3 (about media components being externally funded) it broadly equates to the given baseline budget (of £500,000 per year).
84. These decision points do not necessarily occur sequentially, nor in the order outlined in Appendix 4. All three programme designs generally agree, however, that the key phase 1 decision point (i.e. to agree on the waste management options and the criteria against which they will be assessed) should precede the key phase 2 decision point (i.e. to assess which management options should be taken forward to implementation).

85. If the process has to be limited to a duration of two years all consortium groups agree that the tasks contributing to the phase 1 and phase 2 decisions should take approximately one year each. It is important to note that consortium working groups did not clearly specify the timings of individual tasks or decision points, and (as highlighted in Section 4.1.5.2, and in the risk benefit appraisals above) some participants advised that 2 years was an inadequate time allowance to complete all the required tasks within.

86. In all three programmes the tasks to be undertaken, or decision points to be met, in the policy options review stage (the nature of which broadly equate to the steps outlined in Appendix 4) have been re-ordered, and taken to occur sequentially, in parallel, or with considerable integration and overlap between them.

87. The engagement programme for the MRWS policy options review stage should include a ‘Step 0’ to allow for important preparation and planning tasks, and to address framing issues. Step 0 was designed into engagement programmes 1 and 2, and was recommended by a number of participants in consortium group 3.

3.4.1.2 The overall shape and character of engagement programme design

88. The engagement programme for the MRWS policy options review stage must be flexible. All three designs see it as fundamental that provision for flexibility and iteration, in order to respond to the changing context and unforeseen outputs and outcomes of the MRWS process, is built into the engagement programme. The varying extent to which flexibility is built in to programme designs is partly due to budgetary constraints, with Programme 3 able to make the most significant provision in the form of a contingency fund. Participants also highlight the need for flexibility in terms of overall time constraints for the policy options review stage. This advice is not formally incorporated into programme designs, but is explained in Section 4.1.5.2.

89. In designing the engagement programme for the MRWS policy options review stage special account should be made to ensure the wider legitimacy of CoRWM. All three programmes make provision for CoRWM’s legitimacy through ensuring that it has a close, open, interactive and ongoing relationship with those participating in engagement processes. Programme 1 makes allowance for this through large-scale interactive events where CoRWM interacts with participants, whereas Programme 3 includes a core stakeholder group and a citizens’ scrutiny panel both operating close to CoRWM.
90. The engagement programme should be highly interactive ensuring direct interaction between members of CoRWM, experts, stakeholders and the public within specific engagement processes where appropriate.

91. The engagement programme should be a highly integrated and coordinated process, involving an iterative flow of linkages and feedbacks between decision-making (CoRWM and Ministers), stakeholder and public components of the engagement programme on the one hand, and close integration with the technical programme on the other. Integration might take the form of direct iteration between components, or the communication and feedback of outputs/outcomes of specific events between components.

92. In general, relative importance, in terms of strategic budget allocation, is assigned to the tasks of developing criteria, developing options and assessing options.

3.4.1.3 The design and use of engagement strategies and methods

93. The engagement programme should employ the full range of engagement strategies outlined in Appendix 4, including deep (intensive) stakeholder and public strands of deliberation/dialogue that are supported by broader (more extensive) approaches to information provision, education and consultation. All three engagement programmes employ a mix of methods, with each programme design including at least 5 of the 7 engagement strategies outlined in Appendix 4. Although only partially written into programme designs certain participants from all three consortia highlighted the importance of using existing engagement mechanisms and networks (engagement strategy 7, Appendix 4) to make the engagement process more efficient and effective. The engagement programme should make specific provision within its design to include members of the public, stakeholder groups, and nuclear communities.

94. The three programme designs highlight the overwhelming importance of qualitative methods of engaging stakeholders and the public in the MRWS process. Participants stress that this is due to the highly complex nature and character of the radioactive waste issue and how people relate to it.

95. Information provision, education, and awareness raising (engagement strategy 1, Appendix 4) supports these qualitative approaches, and should be initiated before, and continue throughout, the MRWS policy options review stage.

3.4.2 Risks and benefits

96. Detailed descriptions of the risks and benefits associated with each engagement programme have been developed in Sections 3.1.3, 3.2.3 and 3.3.3 through analysing individual and group appraisals offered by participants in Session 5 of the Workshop. One of the most striking, and perhaps surprising, things that stands out when reviewing the full range of appraisals across the three programmes is the close synergy between the risks/benefits identified and the eight criteria developed in Session 2 of the Workshop (as described in Section 2). Indeed, participants were asked to keep these in mind when conducting appraisals of programme designs, but
were not required to employ them in any formal sense. It appears that in appraising (and arguably when designing) the three engagement programmes participants have draw on their own tacit understandings of what defines successful or effective participation in an informal way. The emerging consensus of such understanding both within the literature and between practitioners has been played out within the workshop process. In this case workshop participants have drawn informally, perhaps sometimes unconsciously, on their own theoretical and conceptual knowledges and practically applied them to the MRWS case.

97. In drawing conclusions the appraisals of each programme have been synthesised, and the criterion that most closely relates to each individual risk/benefit has been identified. In the following pages this is summarised for the three programmes in terms of benefits in Tables 3.4.2 a, b & c, and risks in Tables 3.4.2 d, e & f. It is very clear from this analysis that the vast majority of risks/benefits directly relate to one of the eight criteria, and that each criterion closely fits the general meaning that was intended. There are only a few risks/benefits where there might be a slight disagreement or ambiguity as to which criterion it relates to. This overview allows us to identify general trends in risks and benefits across the three programmes, and draw out the key differences and similarities between them.

98. Drawing out the key distinctions and similarities in the performance of the three programme designs should tell us something about the budget that is needed to successfully carry out the engagement programme for the MRWS policy options review stage. When drawing such comparisons it is important to be aware of the complexities involved and that direct comparisons between the three programmes might tell us about things other than budget. The three programmes were designed by three different groups of people, each group with its own dynamics and degrees of consensus and difference. In addition, the three programmes have similarities (as outlined in Section 3.4.1) but are designed differently, all possessing novel and innovative aspects. So, in addition to budget, a direct comparison might tell us something about the groups that designed the programmes and specifics of the designs that they came up with. One other complication relates to the fact that Programme 2 was costed beyond the allocated ‘baseline’ budget. Even though, as is explained in Section 3.2.2, Programme 2 broadly equates to the given baseline budget (of £500,000 per year) when adopting the same assumptions as Programmes 1 and 3 (about media components being externally funded), it is difficult to know whether the explicit inclusion of an extensive media component influenced appraisals. While it has been argued that the three Programmes represent relative differences in financial resource, it is important to acknowledge the above complexities when drawing general conclusions about programme performance.

---

18 The left hand column provides an indication of the level of commitment that participants showed to each benefit/risk (i.e., A = benefits/risks identified by many individuals and in group discussion; B = benefits/risks identified by many individuals; C = benefits/risks identified by a few individuals and in group discussion; D = benefits/risks identified by a few individuals) and summarises the number of risks or benefits for each programme that fall into these categories of differing consensus.
Table 3.4.2(a). A summary of benefits associated with Programme 1, indicating the criterion that directly relates to each individual benefit and the degree of consensus associated with it. The shaded area indicates benefits around which a large degree of consensus existed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of consensus</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Benefit Description</th>
<th>Description of Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Inclusivity</td>
<td>Seeks to be open &amp; inclusive</td>
<td>The programme attempts to include a wide range of participants (stakeholders, the public with regional variation, nuclear communities) and capture a diversity of views across the UK as well as in existing/possible nuclear communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>Develops CoRWM’s role &amp; legitimacy</td>
<td>Clearly defines CoRWM’s role in the decision-making process and includes measures to increase its legitimacy (such as forming interactive relationships with participants in open meetings).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Efficient use of limited budget / resources</td>
<td>The proposed programme delivers within a limited budget to time and therefore (if effective) is efficient and demonstrates cost savings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>A structured process that delivers</td>
<td>The programme follows a structured process to enable a political decision to be made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Continuity &amp; learning</td>
<td>The programme ensures continuity through engaging the same stakeholders and public groups throughout the process which should promote social learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Inclusivity</td>
<td>Ensures public participation</td>
<td>The programme includes mechanisms to pay people to attend workshops (therefore encouraging fair engagement).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Openness &amp; transparency</td>
<td>Openness &amp; transparency</td>
<td>Applies ideas of openness and transparency to an area of public policy making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Utilises &amp; builds on experience of existing engagement processes</td>
<td>The programme includes explicit attempts to review existing engagement work in radioactive waste management and build reflexivity on existing experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Reflexivity &amp; adaptability</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>The programme has flexibility built into it to respond to changing circumstances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4.2(b). A summary of **benefits associated with Programme 2**, indicating the criterion that directly relates to each individual benefit and the degree of consensus associated with it. The shaded area indicates benefits around which a large degree of consensus existed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of consensus</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Description of Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Inclusivity</td>
<td>Inclusiveness, openness &amp; accessibility</td>
<td>The programme is inclusive of a wide range of participants (including the public in each of the DAs, stakeholders and affected and unaffected nuclear population) and diverse views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Raises awareness/recognition of the process &amp; radioactive waste issues</td>
<td>The programme has a strong media component. The involvement of the media is essential to raise the ‘background noise’ in order to build wide public recognition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Reflexivity &amp; adaptability</td>
<td>Informed debate through information needs identification &amp; provision</td>
<td>The programme produces ‘clean’ information materials to inform all participants engaged in the process, and allows participants to buy in additional support/expertise if necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Integrative &amp; interactive process</td>
<td>The programme seeks to integrate different components of the engagement programme and the wider MRWS process through continual communication and feedback; while ensuring interaction and continuity between CoRWM, experts, and stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Reflexivity &amp; adaptability</td>
<td>Flexible, reflexive &amp; responsive process</td>
<td>The programme has built-in flexibility, allowing engagement processes to be adapted and re-designed in the face programme outcomes and changing circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Iterative evaluation &amp; audit</td>
<td>Built-in checks and balances, and the evaluation programme performance/impact at appropriate intervals throughout, ensures that the process stays on track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>Structured, coherent, iterative process</td>
<td>The programme offers a well-structured, clearly defined and coherent process that provides clear and timely outputs for CoRWM to allow a political decision to be made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Reflexivity &amp; adaptability</td>
<td>Emphasises a range of options; does not close off possibilities</td>
<td>The programme promotes the concept of acceptable options as opposed to the single ‘best’ solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Dialogic (deliberation/dialogue)</td>
<td>The programme goes beyond consultation to engage people through deliberation and dialogue in real decision elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Openness &amp; transparency</td>
<td>Open &amp; transparent</td>
<td>The programme promotes and increases transparency, not least through information provision and awareness raising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Inclusivity</td>
<td>Reaches out to those voices not usually heard</td>
<td>The programme specifically addresses issues of social inclusion and youth engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>The programme attempts to provide for broader social learning through interaction, especially after the initial steps in the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>Focus on CoRWM’s role &amp;credibility</td>
<td>Programme includes measures to enhance CoRWM’s role and credibility, such as illustrating independence (from Defra and DAs) through providing its own secretariat and media team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Inclusivity</td>
<td>Measures to ensure participation</td>
<td>Programme recognises importance of supporting stakeholder and public participation through providing resources and payments to ensure participation, and provision for participants to communicate with their constituency/community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4.2(c). A summary of benefits associated with Programme 3, indicating the criterion that directly relates to each individual benefit and the degree of consensus associated with it. The shaded area indicates benefits around which a large degree of consensus existed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Consensus</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Description of benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>Focus on the legitimacy of CoRWM &amp; the engagement programme as a whole</td>
<td>The programme details explicit mechanisms and processes (e.g. the core stakeholder group and citizen scrutiny panel; highly interactive relationships between CoRWM and participants; emphasis on CoRWM’s role, leadership, relationships and brand) which will help to ensure the constant strengthening of CoRWM’s legitimacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Reflexivity &amp; adaptability</td>
<td>Flexibility, reflexivity &amp; responsiveness of the process</td>
<td>The programme has built-in flexibility allowing it to change direction and respond to changing needs, circumstances and outcomes. This is most significantly represented by the contingency fund that is set aside within the overall budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Iteration, feedback and interaction between various elements and participants within the programme will promote the learning of those involved, along with sponsors and decision makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Inclusivity</td>
<td>Inclusiveness &amp; openness</td>
<td>The programme is based on the ongoing inclusion of a wide variety of participants (including the public throughout each of the DAs, stakeholders, and existing nuclear communities) throughout the process and open to the injection of diverse views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Integration &amp; interaction</td>
<td>The programme is based on an overall process that is integrative and interactive providing structures to optimise for interaction between CoRWM, experts, stakeholders, and the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Publicity &amp; awareness raising</td>
<td>The programme has a strong focus on information dissemination and awareness raising, which includes special mechanisms for targeting of young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Openness &amp; transparency</td>
<td>Information provision &amp; feedback</td>
<td>The programme provide access to balanced information and knowledge; recognises the need for appropriate information; recognises the need to disseminate results and feedback between components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Reflexivity &amp; adaptability</td>
<td>Pluralistic approach / mix of methods</td>
<td>The programme is robust and flexible as it adopts a pluralistic approach which doesn’t depend on one particular method or organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Openness &amp; transparency</td>
<td>Openness in relation to possible outcomes &amp; decisions</td>
<td>The programme sets out a truly open minded process committed to addressing rather than avoiding issues, which does not pre-empt or attempt to justify specific outcomes or decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>The programme has sufficient budget to allow for a contingency fund (although this might not be enough and diverts resources away from other essential methods, see risks) to ensure flexibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>The programme creates transparency about assumptions that are informing the process at every stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Deliberation / dialogue</td>
<td>The programme provides many opportunities for participants to contribute to decision making through deliberation and dialogue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4.2(d). A summary of risks associated with Programme 1, indicating the criterion that directly relates to each individual risk and the degree of consensus associated with it. The shaded area indicates risks around which a large degree of consensus existed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Consensus</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Description of Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Inclusivity</td>
<td>Limited involvement of stakeholders</td>
<td>The programme is very limited in the extent to which stakeholders are engaged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Representativeness</td>
<td>Failure to provide events that are open to all</td>
<td>The programme targets small selected groups and fails to provide open processes to involve others who haven’t been targeted. (Legitimacy and transparency may be questioned as a result).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Reflexivity &amp; adaptability</td>
<td>Risks all in one big event</td>
<td>The programme adopts a high-risk strategy by trying to reach a final decision in one big meeting involving all participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Reflexivity &amp; adaptability</td>
<td>Failure to manage / account for wider framing issues</td>
<td>The programme does not provide space for wider issues raised in consultation exercises to go, and there is a risk that the process will be disrupted or hijacked by unforeseen events / issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Inadequate resources / budget</td>
<td>Under the given constrained budget the programme will not be able to: be truly open, transparent, flexible and responsive; allow for communication, knowledge sharing and contingencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Inadequate information provision &amp; identification of information needs</td>
<td>Information needs are inadequately met with limited mechanisms for responding to new information needs and identifying information requirements for options appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Openness &amp; transparency</td>
<td>Inadequate publicity &amp; awareness raising</td>
<td>The programme is weak on publicity, partly because of an insufficient budget allocation to this component, and partly because is it assumed Defra and DAs would provide support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Reflexivity &amp; adaptability</td>
<td>No contingency fund</td>
<td>The programme does not have a contingency fund due to lack of budget. Meaning the process is unable to respond to the changing context/circumstances and unforeseen outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Legitimacy &amp; clarity</td>
<td>Failure to reach agreement / consensus</td>
<td>The programme focuses on gathering and integrating the views of participants but does not provide specific mechanisms to reach consensus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>Lack of buy-in from Government because removed from process</td>
<td>The programme does not closely involve central Government throughout running which means they may ignore, or not fully take into account, the outputs from the engagement programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>Risks to credibility &amp; legitimacy</td>
<td>The whole process is dependent on the credibility of CoRWM and the contractors doing the work, not enough has been done in the programme to ensure the political credibility of the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Representativeness</td>
<td>Lacks quantitative component / verification</td>
<td>The omission of quantitative verification of outputs from the in-depth qualitative engagement strategies might represent a challenge to the legitimacy of the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>Deficiencies of programme design</td>
<td>It is not clear how certain aspects of the process will work (limited time within the workshop to design the programme).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Minimal deliberation/dialogue</td>
<td>The programme contains limited ‘dialogic’ components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Openness &amp; transparency</td>
<td>Lacks transparency</td>
<td>The programme lacks transparency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Representativeness</td>
<td>Existing nuclear community focus</td>
<td>There is a risk involved in focusing on existing communities (and not possible nuclear communities) as obvious candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>Management / coordination</td>
<td>Lacks continuity, one person overseeing the process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4.2(e). A summary of risks associated with Programme 2, indicating the criterion that directly relates to each individual risk and the degree of consensus associated with it. The shaded area indicates risks around which a large degree of consensus existed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of consensus</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Description of Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Inclusivity</td>
<td>Lacks inclusivity &amp; openness</td>
<td>The programme is exclusive, focusing on small groups/surrogates, and lacks the opportunity for wider voluntary engagement in open events. It also fails to engage potential siting communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Reflexivity &amp; adaptability</td>
<td>Media risks</td>
<td>The programme invests a significant amount of resource into the media component but makes assumptions that may not turn out to be true. There is a risk that the media won’t buy into the project. Poor media handling could seriously compromise the coherence and clarity of the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Limited budget &amp; resources</td>
<td>The limited budget available means that: the engagement programme will not live up to expectations; may not be sufficiently robust; opportunities for programme evaluation (and thus and opportunities for wider learning) are lost; and publicity needs might not be met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Clarity/Representativeness</td>
<td>Not sufficiently joined up with existing governance structures</td>
<td>The programme does not sufficiently tap into existing engagement mechanisms and articulate linkages with over areas of Government (e.g. DTI, NDA, regional assemblies, local Government).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>Risk of project management &amp; coordination failure</td>
<td>The programme relies on inputs from key external support staff, yet it is unclear as to who will coordinate output of engagement processes, consensus amongst “suppliers” cannot be assumed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Openness &amp; transparency</td>
<td>Poor information access &amp; provision</td>
<td>The programme fails to ensure the provision of clear unbiased information that indicates the range of opinion; and may not provide sufficient access to information/experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Representativeness</td>
<td>Lacks representativeness</td>
<td>There is a risk that those who should participate do not do so and the programme will not be seen to be representative (e.g. 5 workshops/juries are not representative enough)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Reflexivity &amp; adaptability</td>
<td>Does not allow for dealing with/ managing wider framings</td>
<td>The framing of the process will remain controversial, there is a risk that some other engagement process or nuclear event will discredit the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>Does not sufficiently integrate with implementation stage</td>
<td>The programme fails sufficiently to integrate options assessment with later implementation phase(s), meaning that impacted communities are likely to reject CoRWM’s recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>CoRWM legitimacy &amp; independence</td>
<td>The programme fails to indicate how CoRWM’s legitimacy and independence will be ensured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>Outputs not taken up</td>
<td>Outputs from the programme may not produce a “usable” list for CoRWM and may be ignored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>Lacks transparency</td>
<td>The programme lacks transparency in participation selection; objectives may not be clear to people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Lacks international dimension</td>
<td>The programme doesn’t account for, or draw on, the international dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Inclusivity</td>
<td>Assumes people will participate</td>
<td>The programme doesn’t tackle voluntarism upfront and places high demands on stakeholders and other participants, meaning some may refuse to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Lost opportunities for learning</td>
<td>Process design and facilitation fails to maximise opportunities for interaction and learning, and may not deliver 360 degree learning opportunities/outcomes required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Reflexivity &amp; adaptability</td>
<td>Over responsive</td>
<td>The initial ‘PO’ step may turn previous plans on their head, and demand a new process design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lacks flexibility</td>
<td>Lacks flexibility in face of process problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>Fails to reach consensus</td>
<td>Fails to reach consensus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.4.2(f).

A summary of **risks associated with Programme 3**, indicating the criterion that directly relates to each individual risk and the degree of consensus associated with it. The shaded area indicates risks around which a large degree of consensus existed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of consensus</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Description of Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Representativeness</td>
<td>Stakeholder focus / bias</td>
<td>The central role of stakeholder deliberation means that less emphasis is given to wider engagement of the public and local communities, endangering wider legitimacy of the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>The public are marginalised</td>
<td>The programme does not pay enough attention to public strand, publicity and open access events. This may result in failure to ensure wider public legitimacy, and risk public anger and alienation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Reflexivity &amp; adaptability</td>
<td>Insufficient flexibility</td>
<td>Even though the programme provides a contingency fund, additional budget and further measures are needed to respond to unforeseen circumstances, contexts and outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Limited resources</td>
<td>The proposed level of resource (budget and time) for the programme poses serious risks to its effectiveness. The budget only allows for half a process which may do more harm than not doing it at all, and budget flexibility is needed through an increased contingency fund and emergency fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>Deficient programme design</td>
<td>The programme lacks overall coherence, and clarity in terms of objectives, the problems/need, delivery mechanisms, costs and phasing of activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>Failure to reach consensus due to entrenched stakeholder positions</td>
<td>Insufficient thought has been given to mechanisms to reach consensus, while specific disaffected stakeholder groups might choose to destabilise the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Handling outputs of the engagement process</td>
<td>There might not be enough capacity within CoRWM to deal with the outputs of engagement processes, more attention needs to be given to the assimilation and understanding of such information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Poor information provision</td>
<td>Not enough provision for information/education, &amp; dealing with complexities of information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Inclusivity</td>
<td>Failure to engage stakeholders</td>
<td>The programme emphasises stakeholder participation but stakeholder fatigue may be a problem; the fact that their time is not paid for, and possible future events (e.g. new nuclear build).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Openness &amp; transparency</td>
<td>Not joined-up</td>
<td>It is risky if CoRWM was not joined up with other key organisations (e.g. Nirex, NDA) and did not explore possible synergies with other engagement processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Lack of learning &amp; feedback</td>
<td>Lack of attention to learning/feedback from each step to be ‘made sense of’, disseminated and engaged with in sufficient depth to legitimise the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Inclusivity</td>
<td>Public won’t engage with the process</td>
<td>The programme risks poor public uptake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Inclusivity</td>
<td>Not effectively framed by the public</td>
<td>The programme does not adequately allow for the public and stakeholders to ‘frame’ the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Representativeness</td>
<td>Disproportionate influence of vested interest groups</td>
<td>Central role of stakeholders presents the risk that CoRWM’s work will be restricted by specific interest groups, or the process being hijacked by vested interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Representativeness</td>
<td>Focus on existing nuclear communities</td>
<td>The programme is biased towards (existing) nuclear communities and misses out on non-nuclear sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>Transparency / accountability</td>
<td>It is not clear how different types of contribution will be taken into account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>Ignores management / coordination</td>
<td>Management, coordination, and evaluation of the programme has not been considered sufficiently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>Implementation issues</td>
<td>The programme does not make allowances for integrating implementation/siting issues up front.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>Reflexivity &amp; adaptability</td>
<td>No provision for management of wider framings</td>
<td>The programme does not address the management of wider questions and framings (e.g. new build, the credibility of regulators, and failure of industry to adopt adequate measures).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
99. In order to directly compare how the three programme designs performed in the appraisal process the total number of benefits and risks, and the number of consensual benefits and risks, associated with each programme are summarised in Table 3.4.2. The major distinction between the programmes is the poorer performance of Programme 1 in comparison to Programmes 2 and 3. The appraisal of Programme 1 offered the least benefits in total (9) and least benefits (3) about which there was a majority agreement, while highlighting the largest number of consensual risks. Although the total number of risks for Programme 1 equate with that of the other Programmes it is clear the risks far out weigh the benefits. The other key observation from Table 3.4.2. is that the performances of Programmes 2 and 3 are almost exactly equal in the appraisal process, the only real distinction being that Programme 2 offers more consensual benefits (11) than Programme 3 (which offers 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme 1</th>
<th>Programme 2</th>
<th>Programme 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constrained budget £300,000pa</td>
<td>Baseline budget £500,000pa</td>
<td>Augmented budget £750,000pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9 (7)</td>
<td>17 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by majority</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>9 (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4.2. A comparison of risk-benefit appraisals across the three programme designs, showing the total number of risks/benefits each programme was assessed as offering, and the number of risks/benefits over which there was a high degree of consensus between participants. (The number of criteria used to informally appraise each given range of benefits/risks is shown in brackets.)

100. Looking more closely at the content of these risks and benefits uncovers reservations about the effectiveness of Programme 1. Of the 3 consensual benefits (Table 3.4.2(a)), one stresses that an advantage of the programme is that it gets the job done on a limited budget. The risks associated with Programme 1 (Table 3.4.2(d)) suggest that this might not be the case. The main point here is that most of the risks that the majority of participants agreed are what could be termed ‘critical risks’ – i.e. individual risks that could be solely accountable for the programme failing - through not being able to provide key components in process design (e.g. a stakeholder component), failing to do things that should be done (e.g. provide open events and account for wider framings), or doing things inadequately (e.g. information provision). Importantly, one of the main reasons given for such omission, failure, and inadequacy, is a lack of budget. Although the programme contains some good design features and innovative aspects, it would appear that budgetary constraints have limited the range and quantity of essential features, leading to critical risks.
101. The content of the appraisals for Programmes 2 and 3 (Tables 3.4.2 (b) & (c) for benefits, Tables 3.4.2 (e) & (f) for risks) show that benefits are more numerous and consensual, highlighting aspects of good process (particularly learning, reflexivity/adaptability, inclusiveness and openness/transparency), while in general the risks associated with these two programmes are less critical than Programme 1. Risks associated with Programmes 2 and 3 focus less on what is not there, or the lack of range/quantity of design features, and are more about specific differences in the design of what is there. For example, there was widespread agreement that Programme 3 offers risks of a ‘stakeholder bias’ and not sufficiently focusing on the public. These risks are not about key constituencies being excluded from the process. They are more to do with the degree to which the process should focus on those that are already included (in actual fact, 75% of the budget was committed to the public strand of the Programme). Similarly, a consensual risk of ‘insufficient flexibility’ is highlighted, even though flexibility is already built into programme design - the risk is that more flexibility is needed. The majority of participants in Programme 2 identified risks associated with a comprehensive media programme, and ‘poor information access and provision’ – again risks associated with things that are already in place but that could be done differently or better.

102. Programme 2 and 3 risks, then, focus on deficiencies or biases in essential features that are already in place. They are more about tweaking existing design elements than critical omissions. This is not to say that there are no critical risks embedded in Programmes 2 and 3, in fact Programme 2 has more critical risks (e.g. focus on small groups and lacks wider engagement through open events, lacks representativeness) than Programme 3. On the whole though risks for Programmes 2 and 3 are less critical than for Programme 1.

103. As is clear from the above analysis it is only possible to draw very general conclusions from the risk-benefit appraisals. Programme 1 offers limited benefits and has a number of critical risks. Programmes 2 and 3 perform better, and in many respects equally well. Although complexities of consortium group composition and variations in programme design mean that direct budgetary recommendations should be treated with caution, within the confines of the design and appraisal task there is sufficient evidence to suggest that the Programme 1 budget is not enough, and that an acceptable budget might be somewhere between the baseline (of £500,000 per annum) and the augmented budget (of £750,000 per annum). It has to be stressed however that this only applies within the confines of the appraisal task when drawing relative differences between the three given budgets. There is, however, significant evidence that the budget should be more than this (in absolute terms). A key indication is that according to the appraisals of a majority of participants, all three programmes suffer from risks resulting from limited budget and resources (see ‘Efficiency’ criterion, Tables 3.4.2 d, e & f), posing serious risks to programme effectiveness. Beyond this, although participants did work within budgetary constraints in the context of the design and appraisal task, when providing constructive advice to Government on their overall approach (see Section 4.1.6) the majority of those attending the workshop have more general concerns that the preliminary budgets suggested are not adequate.

104. The key message from this is that although Programmes 2 and 3 might carry less risk, a programme run at a budget somewhere towards that of Programme 3 will
still present a number of risks, a few of which might be critical risks. There is an indication that providing more resource than this could limit these risks further (for example increased budgetary flexibility stands to reduce risks further in Programme 3). However, it is not possible from the appraisals conducted within the Workshop to ascertain whether a critical threshold (between increasing resource, decreasing risk, and increasing benefits say) exists, or whether it is possible to identify where this threshold lies. A not so helpful response is that this will become clear after the engagement programme has been completed. A more constructive piece of advice, and one that participants stressed throughout the workshop, is that we will have a better idea of critical budgetary needs as the programme unfolds, hence the fundamental need for ongoing evaluation and budgetary flexibility.

105. Perhaps a more significant realisation from this analysis is that, while assuming that an appropriate level of funding for the engagement programme can be agreed, whatever the budget allocated to it there will always be residual risks. This realisation is supported by the fact that, in addition to budgetary risks, certain risks are common to all three programme designs, including:

- Risks relating to management and coordination of the engagement programme;
- Risks associated with the failure to manage wider framings;
- Risks to credibility and legitimacy of the programme, particularly in relation to CoRWM;
- The risk that the outputs from the engagement programme will not be handled effectively;
- The risk that the engagement programme is not sufficiently joined up with other engagement initiatives and governance structures;
- Deficiencies in the handling, management and provision of information, and access to information/expertise within the process.

106. In each case these common risks relate directly to each of the three programmes but also overlap with, and are supplemented by, a number of generic risks that participants identify as being associated with the Government’s overall approach in Section 4.2. A clear feature of these residual and generic risks is that they depend, to varying degrees, on structural, institutional and contextual factors that lie beyond immediate social processes that can be dealt with and managed by programme design. It is clear from this that the success of the engagement programme depends as much on the quality of its management, co-ordination and facilitation, and the ongoing ‘performance’ of the institutions that it is embedded within, as the effectiveness of the process design in itself. It is fundamentally important, then, that generic and residual risks are clearly identified and managed both prior to, and throughout, the engagement programme of the MRWS policy options review stage.
4 Interim advice in developing the Government’s overall approach for the MRWS process

107. Although a key focus of the workshop was to work with the framework for the Managing Radioactive Waste Safety process set out by Government to scope possible programmes of engagement and the principles that should guide them, the workshop also represented an important opportunity for participants to discuss the Government’s proposed approach more generally and offer advice to help take the MRWS process forward.

108. As noted in Section 1.1, the UK Government outlined the overall approach for the MRWS process in July 2002, including the decision to establish CoRWM, in response to previous rounds of consultation. The opening presentation of the workshop and accompanying paper distributed during the preparatory phase further developed this proposed approach, providing more detail on the outline structure for the policy options review stage and role of CoRWM. Additional description of the outline structure was provided in the mock tender document used in Sessions 3 and 4 (see Appendix 4).

109. Although this latest proposed approach foreseen by Ministers and presented in workshop materials was well developed, the Sponsor clearly stated in the opening plenary session that it was preliminary, representing their latest thinking, and was open to revision and further development. In part then, the workshop provided an opportunity for participants to provide early feedback on the robustness of this overall approach that had been developed in the light of previous consultations. It allowed valuable space for participants to provide constructive advice on how the overall MRWS process should be shaped and taken forward, thus contributing to ongoing Government thinking and the thinking of CoRWM once it is established.

110. Participants showed general support for the MRWS process with some welcoming the novel nature of the initiative, particularly the emphasis on public and stakeholder engagement, and the commitment that Government has made to it. Participants were in overall agreement with the proposed tasks to be carried out and the decisions to be made within the policy option review stage. Feedback and advice from participants on how the overall approach of the MRWS process should be taken forward was recorded:

- in plenary discussions at the beginning and end of the workshop (Sessions 1 and 6);
- in discussions in the three consortium working groups (in Session 4);
- through individual written responses during a period of quiet reflection (in Session 4);
- on flip-charts throughout every session of the workshop.

111. This Section reports on this feedback and advice offered by participants in relation to the Government’s overall approach (Section 4.1), and goes on to identify the generic risks that might be associated with this broad framework in Section 4.2.

---

4.1 Interim advice on the Government’s overall approach

112. Participants discussed the Government’s overall approach and offered feedback in relation to ten different themes. The first six themes directly relate to the six challenges or requirements for participants as set out by the Sponsor in the opening presentation of the workshop 20. A number of participants also offered feedback around four additional themes which had been identified in the preliminary phase of the workshop process and highlighted in the Participatory Methods Working paper 21. These ten themes will be described in turn. Where appropriate the level of feedback is quantified and attributed to its source (plenary discussion; discussion in consortium working groups 1, 2 or 3; the number of individual written responses from groups 1, 2 or 3) to highlight the degree of consensus and difference that exists between workshop participants.

4.1.1 Choosing the right combination of engagement methods in relation to the step-wise MRWS process framework

113. This theme directly relates to the Sponsor’s first challenge/requirement: ‘What combination of available methods can best be used at which stages in the decision-making process to engage the public and stakeholder groups within the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely process framework set out by Ministers?’ Here ‘stages’ refer to the Government’s step-wise decision process for the MRWS policy options review stage, which includes:

- *scoping* radioactive waste management options which involves: defining the inventory of wastes, developing assessment criteria, identifying options, and deciding on options to be assessed;
- *options assessment* which involves: choosing the method of assessment, meeting information needs, producing an initial draft assessment, and producing the final options assessment report;
- the provision of *recommendations* to Ministers on the option(s) to be used for the long-term management of the UK’s radioactive waste (by CoRWM).

This outline process structure for the policy options review stage is described in more detail in the mock tender document (see Appendix 4) and outlined in background papers to the workshop (see footnote 20 below and volume 2 of this report).

114. Almost all participants (8, 6 and 9 individuals from consortium working groups 1, 2 and 3 respectively 22; discussion in groups 1, 2 and 3; and plenary discussion) provided strong advice and held an overwhelming degree of consensus when discussing the step-wise MRWS process outlined by the Sponsor. Participants did not necessarily question the types of decisions that have to be made throughout

---

22 The total number of participants providing written responses from consortium working groups 1, 2 and 3 was 11, 13 and 15 respectively. Appendix 2 provides details of the participants in each consortium working group, and who facilitated them.
the policy options review stage. Rather, consensus existed around the view that the process as currently outlined appears to be too 'linear', and gives the impression of steps in the process progressing in a sequential or chronological manner. Even though the Sponsor stressed that current formulation is preliminary and open to change, participants warned that if the policy options review stage of the MRWS process were to be linear and bounded by discrete steps this would pose unnecessary constraints and thus mitigate against creativity in process design, and the flexibility and responsiveness that needs to be built into an effective engagement programme. The main message coming from participants was that any future attempt to simply match methods to pre-given steps would not be the best way to design effective engagement processes.

115. There is a sense that participants regarded the outline structure for the MRWS process as being overly framed by the scientific/technical work programme, as noted in consortium working group 3 and later discussed in the final plenary:

‘Defra and the Devolved Administrations face an inherently political problem but they are trying to come up with a technical solution to this problem [in that] the step-wise decision-making framework offered appears to be technically framed. [This] does not meet the need for a politically sound process’ (flip-chart recording, consortium working group 3).

116. It appears from the advice offered by participants that the step-wise process needs further development and revision. It might be that there is a need for a more equitable relationship, with CoRWM’s work programme being built around the engagement process just as much as the technical process. This would give a slightly different step-wise process with different challenges associated with each step. Throughout the workshop, participants provided advice on the ways in which the step-wise process for the MRWS policy options review stage should be shaped and (re)formed, or how specific steps might be changed and reorganised. The main areas of agreement in this regard have been incorporated into the three programme designs described in Section 3.

117. The overall message is that steps might be more productively seen as tasks that can run in parallel, being grouped together as appropriate, with iterations, interactions and feedbacks between them. This can be thought of as a flow of overlapping and simultaneous activities feeding into the overall objectives of the MRWS process. Specific engagement processes can then run across steps and may continue throughout the duration of the policy options review stage.

118. A few participants (in discussion in consortium working groups 2 and 3; and single individual responses from groups 1 and 2) cautioned restraint by highlighting the benefits of the stepwise outline structure as currently formulated. These mirrored the Sponsor’s rationale – i.e. that the process is clearly defined, logical, and promotes transparency in order to enable political decisions to be made. Clearly, the challenge is one of balance. The overall framework of MRWS policy options review stage should not constrain and undermine the effectiveness of engagement by being overly technical or linear in nature. Nor should it be so unstructured and self-organising that it fails to support the real political decisions that have to be made.
4.1.2 Ensuring the exchange of knowledge and information

119. This theme directly relates to the Sponsor’s second challenge/requirement: ‘How can the public and representative group debate best be integrated with the corresponding ‘expert’ debate during the course of the ‘Managing Radioactive Waste Safely’ process?’ Participants were in strong agreement that integration and exchange of knowledge and information is fundamental to the success of the engagement programme of the MRWS policy options review stage. This includes integration and exchange between the ‘expert’/technical components of the MRWS process and the public debate, as well as integration and feedback between components (e.g. stakeholder and public processes) of the engagement programme itself. This theme was expressed when considering principles to guide the engagement programme (Section 2). It was also addressed in programme designs (Section 3). The issue featured more predominantly in the benefit-risk appraisals (Section 3), highlighting the challenge of achieving real integration and exchange of knowledge in large scale, science-intensive policy processes.

This theme received a very limited response from participants when offering feedback about the Government’s overall approach (being raised in discussion in consortium working group 3; and by 1, 4 and 1 individuals from groups 1, 2 and 3 respectively). Apart from reiterating the importance of integration and exchange of knowledge and information, what responses there were questioned what was meant by ‘expert’ in this context. This needs to be clearly defined. Are stakeholders and members of the public involved in the ‘public debate’ experts? If we are talking about technical experts, where does the technical expertise and knowledge lie? The process also has to acknowledge and account for the multiple and competing expert views that exist in relation to radioactive waste management issues.

4.1.3 Scaling up to a full UK perspective

120. This theme directly relates to the Sponsor’s third challenge/requirement: ‘How can one best scale up views that will potentially have to be canvassed from a limited number of studies involving limited numbers of respondents to a position that can be said to be representative of the whole of the UK?’ Again, this theme did not receive a large response from participants when offering feedback on the Government’s overall approach (being raised in discussion in consortium working group 3; and by 1, 9 and 3 individuals from groups 1, 2 and 3 respectively). There was broad consensus between those who did comment, however.

121. The participants fully agreed that the scaling issue is a massive process challenge. The scaling up of views ‘to be representative of the whole of the UK’ was deemed either not to be possible or to be unrealistic by most of those raising this issue. People’s ‘views’ vary greatly throughout the UK and, indeed, the concept of ‘the UK as a whole’ is more problematic since devolution. Comments also related to definitions of ‘representativeness’. A few participants commented on the statistical requirement of representativeness in arguing that such a quantitative definition is not relevant in the context of the MRWS process. As highlighted and comprehensively justified in the final plenary, the three programme designs (Section 3) are almost exclusively based on qualitative approaches. Qualitative approaches cannot be wholly representative of the UK population in a statistical sense, but they can give an
informed viewpoint of a subset or cross-section of the public. The challenge is to establish what is critical within these viewpoints. This brings into focus the need for an adequate budget to meet this challenge.

4.1.4 The views of existing nuclear communities
122. This theme directly relates to the Sponsor’s fourth challenge/requirement: ‘How is the “existing nuclear community” perceived and how could its views best be drawn upon without unbalancing the policy formulation process?’ As the engagement programmes (Section 3) show, there was clear agreement among all participants that existing nuclear communities should be included in the MRWS process. Programmes 1 and 3 include special mechanisms for involving nuclear communities and outline how this could be done.

123. A number of participants offered feedback on the issue of nuclear communities when discussing the Government’s overall approach (including 5 individuals from consortium working groups 1, 2 and 3 respectively; in group 3 discussion; and in plenary discussions). For those who did comment, there were markedly divergent views, although all agreed that nuclear communities are not a homogeneous group. A few argued that the existing nuclear communities are one legitimate group of stakeholders but that their views should not have more weight than other groups. A few others addressed the more generic question of siting in relation to the existing communities; arguing they should be involved at the earliest stage of consultation to avoid potential disruption later in the process. Siting questions are as much an issue as establishing waste inventories, participants argued, and should be up front in the consultation process. A few other participants argued that early generic site identification could allow nuclear communities to mobilise against the process; and this would compromise attempts to develop a national view.

124. Most of the participants offering feedback on this theme highlighted definitional problems surrounding ‘nuclear communities’ - it is extremely important to be very clear what is meant in this context. Of those raising definitional issues some suggested that there might be a problem focusing on ‘existing’ nuclear communities as obvious candidates. It is actually more complex than this, for instance:

‘The issues around operating sites are different from those a waste site would face, and most existing sites are not candidates for waste sites’ (individual participant’s written response, consortium working group 2).

4.1.5 Maintaining focus
125. This theme directly relates to the Sponsor’s fifth challenge/requirement: ‘How are expressions of wider views and concerns best managed, given the need to maintain focus on the core programme needs and timings identified by Ministers?’ A substantial number of participants (7, 6 and 8 individuals from consortium working groups 1, 2 and 3 respectively; discussion in groups 1 and 2; and in plenary discussion) offered advice on this point. Workshop responses were based around two themes.
4.1.5.1 The need to manage wider framings

126. The need to manage wider framings in the MRWS process was commented on throughout the workshop process (by 1, 2 and 4 individuals from consortium working groups 1, 2 and 3 respectively; discussion in groups 1 and 2; and in plenary discussion), with most participants being highly sympathetic with the problem that CoRWM will face. There is a need to maintain focus and get the job done but the issue of wider framings held by participants is absolutely critical. If not dealt with properly, it could undermine the whole process.

127. Some workshop participants drew on experiences of recent engagement processes to highlight the issue of new nuclear build as a key concern. The public do not tend to see the radioactive waste issue as divorced from the prospect of new nuclear build. In addition, certain stakeholders might interpret efforts to seek a solution to the radioactive waste problem as a strategy to make way for a new nuclear programme. Any attempt to separate the issue of waste and new build is likely to cause fundamental disputes. The issue of the inventory of wastes to be considered in the MRWS process is also seen as problematic, especially since the decision to exclude most LLW has already been made by Ministers. The public do not necessarily distinguish between different categories of radioactive waste and may demand a more comprehensive approach. Great care and consideration will have to be taken in clearly explaining the rationale for excluding certain wastes from the process. The credibility of science regulators, and failure of industry to adopt adequate measures (conditioning, for example) may also lead the debate into different areas.

128. Although participants stress that the need to manage wider framings is absolutely critical, they do not provide much guidance on how this should be done. One suggestion is to learn from existing processes (e.g. the ISOLUS consultation) where wider framings have been managed. A few participants were more demanding. Rather than bounding wider public and stakeholder framings, they argued that the only effective way to manage the issue is to comprehensively explore the concerns held by the public and stakeholders at the start of the process, and actively respond to these findings in shaping the MRWS policy options review stage as it progresses.

4.1.5.2 Time constraints

129. The time constraints relating to the Sponsor’s requirement to maintain focus was subject to stronger, more directed advice from participants (including 6, 4 and 4 individuals from consortium working groups 1, 2 and 3 respectively; discussion in group 2; and in plenary discussions). There was complete consensus from participants that the MRWS process as currently formulated does not allow enough time to undertake the engagement programme effectively. The timescale is seen to be unrealistic and presents a significant risk that the programme will not be completed.

130. Reasons identified by participants for allowing more time for the engagement programme of the MRWS policy options review stage include:
- inflexibility over the timetable could derail the whole process as it threatens reflexivity, adaptability, inclusively, trust, respect and legitimacy;
insufficient time allowances will inspire public objection and undermine credibility in the process because it suggests the Government does not want authentic public and stakeholder involvement;

timings as currently defined leave inadequate space for planning and setting-up the engagement programme;

timings as currently defined are not sufficient to find and resolve suitable solutions;

the formulation of questions to put to the public and the process for provision of legitimate information will take time which has not been allowed for;

the complexity and technical nature of the issue means that participants need more time to become informed, develop understandings and have the opportunity to learn effectively;

iteration and flexibility take time;

the task in hand is huge and operates at a very large scale.

131. One solution would be to allow CoRWM some timetable flexibility of around one year or so. This time would not have to be taken but would be build into the process as a contingency to respond to the needs of participants, emerging outcomes and unforeseen events. As with the step-wise process, the challenge is getting the balance right. There have to be contingencies and a degree of flexibility to allow critical problems to be dealt with, but these should still allow for timely decisions to be made and not delay the process unnecessarily.

4.1.6 Resource constraints

132. This theme directly relates to the Sponsor’s sixth challenge/requirement: Given budgetary constraints, the resource plan for the programme of engagement should match the programme budget. What could be achieved with a baseline financial allocation of £500,000 per year over two years, a constrained budget of £300,000 per year over two years, and an augmented budget of £750,000 per year over two years. The Sponsor’s requirement that programmes be designed within budgetary constraints was also subject to strong advice from participants (including 7, 10 and 9 individuals from consortium working groups 1, 2 and 3 respectively; discussion in groups 1, 2 and 3; and in plenary discussions). Almost all workshop participants commented on this element of the Government’s overall approach and were in complete agreement. The proposed budgets are not adequate for the task. This view was expressed by participants from each of the three consortium working groups, including consortium 3 who were given the highest level budget to work with.

133. Specific risks associated with budgetary constraints in relation to each of the three programme designs are detailed in the benefit-risk appraisals in Section 3. When considering the Government’s overall approach, the justifications given by participants as to why the three proposed budgets are inadequate were as follows:

- it is not possible to ensure political credibility at this level of funding; more money is needed if the process is to be adequately open, transparent, flexible, and responsive;

- proposed budgets will fail to find and resolve suitable solutions;
they do not allow budget flexibility/contingencies to be built into programme design. This could mean failure to respond to changing context, circumstances and programme outcomes, jeopardising the entire process;

the expectations of participants will be raised to a level that cannot be met, leading to people feeling excluded and alienated in the later stages;

proposed budgets only allow half a process, which may be more risky than not doing it at all.

134. In providing advice on this theme, some participants chose to illustrate the inadequacy of the proposed budgets by putting the cost of public and stakeholder engagement in context, both in terms of the overall cost if the MRWS process failed (estimated at more than £500 million by consortium 3); and the overall cost of developing and implementing the solution to the UK’s radioactive waste problem (estimated to be billions of pounds by an individual participant from consortium 1).

135. A clear recommendation coming from a number of participants in all three consortium groups is that rather than imposing a fixed budget and designing an engagement programme within this constraint, there needs to be more flexibility in the way that budgets are allocated. The budget should be appropriate to the needs and objectives of the engagement programme (which might change as the programme progresses) while remaining cost-effective. This advice is illustrated in quotes from individual participants from the three consortium working groups who argue:

‘The budget should not drive the process. This has to be right, so the budget should not be the prime constraint’ (individual participant’s written response, consortium 1).

‘This is an investment in getting a multi billion pound programme right. It’s worth looking at it the other way around: plan the required resources then set a budget to match and work within it’ (individual participant’s written response, consortium 2).

‘The programme budget should be set to match the needs of the process to deliver its objectives’ (individual participant’s written response, consortium 3).

If the level of resource cannot, for political or other reasons, meet the objectives of the engagement programme as initially defined, then it will be necessary for CoRWM to re-assess the objectives of the engagement programme in the light of these resource constraints.

In addition to the above, four additional themes were raised by a number of workshop participants:

• CoRWM’s role, structure and legitimacy;
• Implementation and siting issues;
• Management and co-ordination of the engagement programme;
• Decision response and feedback.

4.1.7 CoRWM’s role, structure and legitimacy

136. A key area of advice discussed by participants throughout the workshop (8, 4 and 8 individuals from consortium working groups 1, 2 and 3 respectively;
discussions in groups 1, 2 and 3) was the subject of CoRWM’s role, structure and position in the MRWS process. Participants were directly responding to the approach to the MRWS process outlined by Ministers\textsuperscript{23}, and further detail provided in the opening presentation to the workshop and accompanying paper\textsuperscript{24}, which outlined that CoRWM will be an independent body set up to oversee the process and provide recommendations to Ministers who will then make the final decisions. It was clearly stated that CoRWM’s role will be to make judgements and give clear recommendations based on the available evidence. Rather than being a ‘facilitator’, allowing stakeholders and the public to arrive collectively at their own judgements which are then put to Ministers, CoRWM will provide recommendations to Ministers based on its own interpretations of outputs from the engagement programme.

137. Throughout the workshop, participants were unanimous in their view that the design of wider institutional and decision-making structures, and the role, position and behaviour of CoRWM within them, is fundamental to ensuring the credibility and legitimacy of the MRWS process and its outcomes. It is possible that such comments were amplified by uncertainty or lack of information about the institutional design aspects of the MRWS process. A few participants expressed a view that decisions over CoRWM’s structure, remit, and terms of reference seemed to have been made in an uninclusive way and that existing arrangements have not been made clear. However, one aim of the workshop was to communicate these issues and to take forward plans and ideas relating to them. In addition, it was made clear in the opening plenary that final decisions on CoRWM’s role and structure had not been made and were partly open to revision. In retrospect, certain concerns over the role of CoRWM might have been avoided by providing details of CoRWM’s code of practice and terms of reference to participants. This information was made public shortly after the workshop in advertisements to recruit committee members. Participants’ advice in relation to this theme centred around three key areas.

4.1.7.1 CoRWM’s role and position

138. When considering CoRWM’s role and position in relation to the proposed engagement programme and the MRWS process, some participants (4, 3 and 3 individuals from consortium working groups 1, 2 and 3 respectively; discussions in groups 1, 2 and 3) argued that:

- there is a risk of CoRWM failing to demonstrate its independence from Government, Defra and the Devolved Administrations. The outputs of CoRWM have to be (and have to be seen to be) independent of Government influence;
- once appointed CoRWM needs to make its own decisions, establish its own legitimacy, and lead the engagement programme. Ministers should allow enough scope for this and not restrict CoRWM’s terms of reference too much;
- CoRWM’s role might be thought too dominant (e.g. CoRWM conducts the options assessment and puts it out for consultation). It needs to be more participant centred with CoRWM as the guardian/facilitator, if wider stakeholder and public confidence is to be secured;
- the role of CoRWM, its involvement in the engagement programme and relationship with participants, has to be defined and made explicit.

\textsuperscript{23} As outlined in the letter from the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs to MPs on 29\textsuperscript{th} July 2002 (http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/radioactivity/waste/pdf/radwaste_sofs-letter.pdf).

4.1.7.2 CoRWM’s composition, skills and capabilities

139. A small number of participants (3 and 2 individuals from consortium working groups 1 and 3 respectively; discussions in groups 1 and 3) offered advice on the make-up of CoRMW and how this could impact on the success of the engagement programme, including:

- the need for the appointment process to be transparent and for the competencies of members of CoRWM to be clearly demonstrable;
- whether CoRWM will have the necessary skills and capabilities to handle, understand, and make judgements on the basis of the outputs from the engagement programme. Significant process expertise capacity will be required within CoRWM to assess both the content and quality of information coming from the engagement programme.

4.1.7.3 CoRWM’s institutional relationships

140. A few participants (1 and 3 individuals from consortium working groups 2 and 3 respectively; discussions in group 3) offered advice on CoRWM’s relationship with other agencies. They noted that it would be risky if CoRWM was not joined up with other Government departments and agencies (e.g. DTI, DTLR) and other key organisations (e.g. Nirex, the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority).

4.1.8 Implementation and siting issues

141. In the opening presentation of the workshop, the Sponsor stated that ‘the initial aim of the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely programme is to identify the generic long-term management policy that should be adopted. It is not intended that the option assessment stage of the work should address specific facility siting issues, although it could raise generic siting issues relating to the choice of policy’. A limited number of participants (one individual from consortium working groups 1 and 2 respectively; discussion in group 2; and plenary discussion) offered advice on implementation and siting issues. In addition to ‘generic siting issues’, questions of locality and implementation need to be in the policy options review stage rather than being left until the implementation stage of the MRWS process. The former and latter stages of the MRWS process might be thought insufficiently integrated under the existing aims identified by Ministers.

142. If siting issues are left until the implementation stage, these participants suggested that impacted communities might reject or mistrust CoRWM’s recommendations. The options chosen could lack political credibility. In addition, it might be very difficult in practice strictly to separate management option and siting issues. Participants highlighted that introducing siting issues in the policy options review stage would make engagement more dynamic. One participant noted that this might be facilitated by bringing information on all potential sites into the process (e.g. early during Phase 2) to encourage debate and engagement. It is important to note that very few participants voiced these views. It is therefore difficult to know whether this means the majority of workshop participants agreed with the UK Government and Devolved Administrations’ existing aims outlined above.
4.1.9 Management and co-ordination of the engagement programme
143. This theme relates closely to one raised in the Participatory Methods Working Paper: ‘How will the various components of the public and stakeholder engagement programme be coordinated and managed, and who will undertake this role (CoRWM, Defra, a main contractor, an inclusive process steering group made up of process experts, or another party)?’. A very small number of participants offered feedback around this theme (in plenary discussion; discussion in consortium working group 2; and a single individual from group 1). One participant asked whether the tender for contractors will be a single specification for the whole engagement programme or a number of tenders relating to specific engagement strategies or methods. Another individual responded that the latter would allow for a more flexible process which could adapt to change. There is a need for a dedicated project manager to ensure that all separate parts of the engagement programme are integrated with outputs from one stage fed into the next. It was not clear whether such a coordination role would be based within Defra and the DAs, or elsewhere.

4.1.10 Decision response and feedback
144. This theme relates to two that were raised in the Participatory Methods Working Paper: the decision making link (i.e. how outputs from the engagement programme will be used in decision making); and the need to provide evidence and feedback to the public and stakeholders on what decisions have been made and how their input has been considered in decision making. Participants commenting on this theme (2, 3 and 2 individuals from consortium working groups 1, 2 and 3 respectively; discussion in groups 1, 2 and 3; and in plenary discussion) expressed concern about the risk that Government and/or CoRWM could fail either to take account of or respond to the outputs of the engagement programme. They advised that if stakeholders and the public feel that their contribution is being ignored, or are unable to see how their input has been used in decision making, the legitimacy of the process would be undermined. CoRWM should, therefore, be encouraged to provide feedback to participants on how their views have been taken into account. Further, it would be beneficial if Ministers publish reasons for their final decisions and explain how CoRWM’s recommendations have been weighted in the light of other factors.

4.2 Generic risks associated with any given programme of engagement
145. When conducting risk-benefit appraisals of individual programme designs (see Section 3) participants also outlined the generic risks that might be associated with any given programme no matter how it is designed. These are essentially things that relate to the Government’s overall approach that could go wrong and will have to be carefully managed. Generic risks can be summarised as:

- The risk of poor project management and coordination of the engagement programme. This is especially apparent given the considerable scale of the programme, the heavy reliance on key external support staff, and the risk that there might be a lack of consensus or coherence amongst those conducting the work (‘suppliers’, contractors, facilitators).

- The risk that the engagement programme is poorly designed and facilitated. This partly relates to management and coordination.
• The **novel nature of this engagement process**, in that the public and stakeholders have not been involved to this extent before in such a complex national level issue, means risks and uncertainties about what will happen are high.

• The **risk of non-participation** as a result of factors such as stakeholder fatigue, stakeholder suspicion about hidden agendas and interests, and public disinterest in the issue.

• **Media risks** including the possibilities that the media will not buy into or express interest in the issue of radioactive waste, that CoRWM lose control of the media, or that media handling is poor.

• The risk that a **disaffected stakeholder group** might destabilise the process and undermine its legitimacy.

• The risk that **wider issues and interests** could hijack the process.

• The risk of **public distrust of Government and regulators**.

• The risk of **delay and procrastination**.

• Risk that **failure or public resentment** will jeopardise future national level engagement processes run by Government, or future processes in the area of radioactive waste.
Appendix 1. MRWS Participatory Methods Workshop participants

The finalised list of Workshop participants

* Indicates participants that were unable to attend the workshop, but were involved in the preliminary and reporting phases of the workshop process.

Helen Ashley    The Environment Council
Elizabeth Atherton   UK Nirex Ltd.
Fred Barker    Independent Nuclear Policy Analyst
Andy Blowers   Open University
Judith Brooke   COI Communications
George Brownless   Health and Safety Laboratory
Gregg Butler    Sustainable Environment Policy Project
David Collier   Greenstreet Berman Ltd
Helen Costa*  Department of Trade & Industry
Rob Edwards*   New Scientist
Deirdre Elrick*   Scottish Council Foundation
Martyn Evans*  Scottish Consumer Council
Tony Free*   British Energy
Nuala Gormley  Social Research Unit, Scottish Executive
Elizabeth Gray  SEERAD Radioactive Waste Team, Scottish Executive
Robin Grove-White IEPPP, University of Lancaster
Richard Harris   RJH Associates
Alan Hedges    Social Research Consultant
Bill Hepburn   Highland Council
John Hetherington Cumbria County Council
Brain Hooper  Ministry of Defence
Melanie Howard The Future Foundation
Jane Hunt   IEPPP, University of Lancaster
Robert Jackson Department of Environment Food and Rural Affairs
Gary Kass  Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology
Matthew Keep Scottish Environmental Protection Agency
John Kelly    Market Research Services
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ray Kemp*</td>
<td>Galson Sciences Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart Kemp*</td>
<td>Nuclear Free Local Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Ledgerwood</td>
<td>Department of Environment, Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Mann</td>
<td>Scotland Against Nuclear Dumping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace McGlynn</td>
<td>British Nuclear Fuels Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Nesbitt</td>
<td>Department of Environment Food and Rural Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Orr</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Patrick</td>
<td>Home Planet, BBC Radio 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Petts</td>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Plater</td>
<td>David Plater &amp; Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Richardson</td>
<td>Enviros Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Roche</td>
<td>Greenpeace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Scott</td>
<td>Department of Environment Food and Rural Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Selby</td>
<td>Liabilities Management Unit, Department of Trade &amp; Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Hough</td>
<td>Liabilities Management Unit, Department of Trade &amp; Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Selwyn</td>
<td>UKCEED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Simmons</td>
<td>Centre for Environmental Risk, University of East Anglia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Taylor</td>
<td>UK Atomic Energy Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Templar</td>
<td>Welsh Assembly Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Webler</td>
<td>Antioch New England Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Western</td>
<td>Friends of the Earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian White</td>
<td>Copeland Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Wilkinson</td>
<td>Wilkinson Environmental Consulting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Independent Assessor**

- Jim Skea: Policy Studies Institute
Facilitation Team

Lead facilitator
Jacquie Burgess  Environment and Society Research Unit, UCL

Facilitators
Darren Bhattachary  Office for Public Management
Jason Chilvers  Environment and Society Research Unit, UCL
Judy Clark  Environment and Society Research Unit, UCL
John Murlis  Environment and Society Research Unit, UCL
Kate Studd  Environment and Society Research Unit, UCL

Administration Team
Claire Herdman  Department of Environment Food and Rural Affairs
Katherine Mondon  Department of Environment Food and Rural Affairs
Archna Patel  Department of Environment Food and Rural Affairs
Appendix 2. MRWS Participatory Methods Workshop participant group membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consortium 1</th>
<th>Consortium 2</th>
<th>Consortium 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Group 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Group 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Ashley</td>
<td>Fred Barker</td>
<td>David Collier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Brooke</td>
<td>George Brownless</td>
<td>Nuala Gormley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg Butler</td>
<td>Jane Hunt</td>
<td>Gary Kass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Howard</td>
<td>Brian Hooper</td>
<td>Grace McGlynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Richardson</td>
<td>Robert Jackson</td>
<td>Nick Patrick*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Webler</td>
<td>Pete Wilkinson</td>
<td>Judith Petts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian White</td>
<td>Andy Blowers*</td>
<td>Adam Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Group 5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Group 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Simmons</td>
<td>Elizabeth Atherton</td>
<td>Alan Hedges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hetherington</td>
<td>Robin Grove White</td>
<td>John Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Hough</td>
<td>Richard Harris</td>
<td>Carolyn Nesbitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Keep</td>
<td>Bill Hepburn</td>
<td>Paula Orr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loraine Mann</td>
<td>Ken Ledgerwood</td>
<td>Jonathan Selwyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Selby</td>
<td>David Plater</td>
<td>Robert Templar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Taylor</td>
<td>Pete Roche</td>
<td>Rachel Western</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Facilitator:**
- Consortium 1: Kate Studd
- Consortium 2: Darren Bhattachary
- Consortium 3: John Murlis
- Consortium 4: Jacqui Burgess
- Consortium 5: Jason Chilvers
- Consortium 6: Judy Clark

*Participated on the second day only.*
Appendix 3. An overview of the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely Participatory Methods Workshop process

Session 1: Opening presentations and overview of workshop process
(12-1pm, Day 1; plenary)

Objective
To inform participants of the Government’s foreseen approach to the MRWS process and the possible role of PSE within it, introduce the workshop process and its objectives, and openly discuss these issues.

Process
Full plenary session (1 hour) chaired by Professor John Murlis, which involved:
- A welcome and opening presentation by Robert Jackson (Defra) followed by a question and answer session.
- An overview of workshop process by Jacqui Burgess (ESRU, UCL), which outlined the workshop objectives, expected outputs, ground rules and way of working, followed by a question and answer session.

Output
The main output from Session 1 was tape recorded feedback from participants on the Government’s overall approach and the workshop process.

Session 2: Development and agreement of effectiveness criteria for the engagement programme of the MRWS policy options review stage
(2-4pm, Day 1; six criterion working groups, pairs/threes, and plenary)

Objective
To map the range of principles or criteria that define the effectiveness of a public and stakeholder engagement programme for the MRWS policy options review stage, and agree on and clearly define a maximum of 8 criteria that faithfully represent the total range of criteria developed.

Process
Criterion working groups (1 hour 20 minutes):
- Participants formed into 6 pre-selected criteria working groups with one facilitator assigned to each (see Appendix 2 for group membership and facilitators) and were introduced to each other and the task.
- Within each criterion working group participants broke into pairs or threes to think about, discuss, and the write down on post-it notes, the criteria that they collectively felt were important to them.
- Working groups were brought back together to cluster the criteria developed in pairs/threes using a visual mapping approach. Criteria were placed in turn on a large wall mapping space (similar criteria were placed close together, dissimilar criteria far apart) and groupings of criteria were then identified. A new wording was agreed for each group of criteria (that encompassed the meaning of all criteria being replaced by it), written on a different coloured post-it note, and taken forward to the plenary session.

Plenary (40 minutes)
- After a short break all 6 criteria working groups came together in a plenary session and undertook a large visual mapping exercise using the same approach, where the criteria
put forward from each working group were mapped, 8 clusters were identified, and a collective meaning for each agreed.

**Output**

Agreement from all participants of 8 criteria that define the effectiveness of the MRWS engagement programme and its outcomes, supported by a visual record of criteria maps from working groups and the plenary which show how these criteria were derived and trace all the sub-criteria that relate to them.

**Sessions 3 & 4: Design three outline engagement programmes each relating to different financial scenarios**

(4:30-6:30pm, Day 1 & 8:30-10am, Day 2; three consortium working groups and plenary)

**Objective**

To design three programmes of public and stakeholder engagement for the MRWS policy options review stage, each adhering to one of three different financial scenarios.

**Process**

Participants formed into three consortium working groups, each convened by two facilitators (see Appendix 2 for group membership and facilitators) and designed an engagement programme according to one of three different financial scenarios:

- Consortium working group 1 designed an engagement programme based on a **constrained** yearly budget of £300,000 per year for 2 years.
- Consortium working group 2 designed an engagement programme based on a **baseline** yearly budget of £500,000 per year for 2 years.
- Consortium working group 3 designed an engagement programme based on an **augmented** yearly budget of £750,000 per year for 2 years.

The design task was laid out in a mock tender document which each participant received in their information packs at the beginning of the workshop. Each working group played the role of a consortium of process designers given the task of scoping a proposed engagement programme for the MRWS policy options review stage. The tender document (which is reproduced in Appendix 4) introduced the task, outlined the Government’s overall approach, provided more detail on the proposed outline structure of the policy options review stage, and provided information on the possible range of engagement methods that might be employed along with their unit costs.

The three consortia spent time in break-out working groups conducting specific aspects of the design task, and in facilitated whole group discussion. There was a significant degree of flexibility and freedom in how the task was undertaken as long as: a programme was designed within the time allowed (three and a half hours); and presented a visual output that related in some way to a programme design matrix (which set out a series of elements in relation to the Government’s outline structure for the MRWS process, as shown in Figures 3.1.2, 3.2.2, and 3.3.2; in Section 3). Consortia were open to revise and reform this overall process structure, and to ignore or transform aspects of the matrix accordingly. Participants were also encouraged to be creative and represent their designs in alternative ways that suited them (such as process or flow diagrams).

The main purpose of Session 3 (2 hours) was to agree on the overall strategy, process and objectives of each engagement programme design. The three consortia each gave a progress report and summary of their design to the workshop in a full plenary at end of session 3. The purpose of Session 4 (1.5 hours) was to finalise the overall process design by detailing
specific methods and costings. In practice these tasks overlapped somewhat between the two sessions.

**Output**
Three programmes of engagement for the MRWS policy options review stage designed according to different levels of resource, including visual records of the programme designs, flip-chart records of discussions on process design, and an audio recording of plenary discussions.

**Session 5: Individual and group risk-benefit appraisals of the three proposed engagement programmes and advice on the Government’s overall approach for the MRWS process**
(10:30-12:30pm; three consortium working groups, individual participants)

**Objective**
For each consortium to appraise the risks and benefits of the engagement programme that they designed, and to offer feedback and advice on the overall approach to the MRWS process outlined by Government, both as individuals and a group as a whole.

**Process**

**Individual written responses (30 minutes)**
- Individual participants in each of the three consortium working groups spent a period of quiet reflection: (a) considering the risks and benefits of the engagement programme that they had designed; and (b) providing feedback and advice on the overall approach to the MRWS process outlined by Government, responding to the 6 key challenges outlined by Defra in the opening presentation (Session 1) and highlighted in the tender document (see Appendix 4). Participants each recorded their views in writing on an response form.

**Group discussion (1 hour 30 minutes)**
- Once participants were satisfied that their responses had been adequately recorded on individual response forms they came back together in facilitated group discussion to deliberate the issues they had considered individually, discussing the Government’s overall approach first, and then the risk-benefit appraisal.

**Output**
Individual and group risk-benefit appraisals of the engagement programmes designed by each consortia, and individual and group feedback and advice on the overall approach to the MRWS process outlined by Government (both recorded on response forms and flipcharts).

**Session 6: Review of risk-benefit appraisals, final recommendations for managing and implementing the engagement programme, workshop evaluation, and close**
(1:30-2:30pm; plenary)

**Objective**
To review risk-benefit appraisals and consider final recommendations for managing and implementing the engagement programme for the MRWS policy options review stage, as well as providing participants with the opportunity to evaluate the MRWS Participatory Methods Workshop process.

**Process**
The three consortium working groups were brought together in a plenary (for 1 hour), and an individual representative from each consortium working group provided a brief overview of
their programme design and the risks and benefits associated with it. The plenary considered
risks and benefits of the programme as a whole, before moving onto a more open discussion
on the management and implementation of the engagement programme and the
Government’s overall approach. Participants presented questions to Defra to which Robert
Jackson (Defra) responded before giving a final address. Participants also had the
opportunity to feedback on the workshop process through plenary discussion, as well as
undertaking a brief evaluation of the workshop process by filling in an assessment form.

Output
Tape recorded whole group discussion of the risks and benefits of the programme as a
whole, the management and implementation of the engagement programme, and the
Government’s overall approach, along with individual evaluations of the effectiveness of the
MRWS Participatory Methods Workshop process.
Appendix 4. Mock Tender Document

Managing Radioactive Waste Safely

Invitation to Submit a Process Design for a Programme of Public and Stakeholder Engagement

UK Government Ministers and Ministers of Devolved Administrations have announced that there will be a new process for managing radioactive waste. A new body, the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM) will be set up to oversee the process. It is important that there is widespread confidence in the decision eventually taken and Ministers have announced that stakeholders and public will be closely engaged.

It is envisaged that the public and stakeholder engagement will take place in the first two phases of the new process, each lasting 1 year. The two phases and the steps within them are, in summary, as follows:

**Phase 1 Framing the Assessment**
- Step 1: Produce inventory of wastes to be covered
- Step 2: Develop criteria for assessing management options
- Step 3: Identify options and shortlist those with most chance of success

**Phase 2 Assessment of Short-listed Options**
- Step 4: Decide on assessment process for shortlist
- Step 5: Define and assemble information required for assessment
- Step 6: Assessment of options

In the new process as a whole, these will be followed by a third phase in which CoRWM will report to Ministers.

A more complete description of the first two Phases and the Steps within them is given in Annex 1.

You are invited to design a programme of work to implement Minister’s commitment to public and stakeholder engagement within a budget to be announced. It is expected that a mixture of engagement strategies will be employed in the programme, matched, for example, to the steps in Phase 1 and Phase 2. Annex 2 describes a number of options.

The programme sponsors have set the following requirements for the process:

- The methods of public and stakeholder engagement should be carefully chosen to match the steps in the process, as summarised above
- The views of the public and stakeholder groups should be capable of scaling to achieve a perspective representative of the UK as a whole
• Views of “existing nuclear communities” should be incorporated without distorting the process

• There should be integration between the debate within the public and stakeholder groups and the corresponding expert debate

• The focus on the core objectives and timetable should be maintained

• The resource plan should match the programme budget.

A set of critical success criteria for the steps in the process and the process as a whole, developed in session 2, will be used to assess the performance of the programme you have designed.

In order to provide comparability in costing the elements of the programme, estimates of current cost levels are provided in Annex 3 for guidance. These estimated costs are provided for guidance and it is expected that respondents will wish to use their own experience in assessing overall costs.

You will be invited to present your proposal to a Client Panel, who will examine your proposal to ensure a good fit to the Sponsor’s requirements and to the budget set. The members of the Panel will be available to assist you during the formulation of your proposal and will also provide guidance to you in ensuring that the design you have developed meets the budgetary requirements.

Annex 1 Phases and Steps envisaged for the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely process

Phase 1 - Framing the assessment

Step 1 - Agreeing on the wastes that have to be managed.

Objective - To set out exactly what materials will have to be considered when options and criteria are being drawn up. This acknowledges that we have radioactive materials that are currently considered a potential resource and yet may come to be regarded as a waste in the foreseeable future, over the next 100 years, and therefore may require long term management as waste.

Output - A list of all the potential waste materials that CoRWM will consider during its work.

Step 2 - Developing criteria

Objective - To prepare a common framework for assessing management options against each other, based on the full range of factors, including risk, economics and social aspects. It is expected these criteria will be wide ranging to reflect all potential risks, appropriate stakeholder and public concerns.
Output - The full list of criteria with the rationale for their inclusion.

Step 3 - Identifying options and short-listing options with most chance of success

Objective – (a) To cover all potential ways of dealing with radioactive waste in the long term, including those that have been identified in previous studies that might be researched by CoRWM in future and (b) to remove from the options list those that will be judged to be very unlikely to be used, taking into account the criteria developed in Step 2.

Output - A full list of possible options, with descriptions, and a short-list of more realistic options, with rationale for excluded options.

Phase 2 – Assessment of Short-listed Options

Step 4 - Decide on assessment process for short-list

Objective - To devise a logical and agreed process using the criteria developed in Step 2, to enable the remaining options to assessed against each other.

Output - A description of the assessment process.

Step 5 - Define and assemble information for the assessment

Objective - To ensure that all information required to undertake the assessment process is available.

Note: The precise manner and point at which assembly of information for relevant option evaluation will commence will be for CoRWM to decide.

Output - A summary or assembly of all information necessary to undertake the assessment.

Step 6 - Assessment of options

Objective - to employ the process identified in Step 4 and information from Step 5, with the options identified in Step 3, to produce an assessment of these options.

Output - A report showing the options ranked in order of their chances of success.

It is envisaged that there will two parts to this step: an initial assessment, put to broad public consultation and a final assessment taking responses from the public consultation into account.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Strategy</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Education & Information Provision                     | At distance communication of information and educational material to individual members of the public and stakeholders with no feedback mechanism. Main purpose is to raise awareness and increase understanding. Equally applicable to local through to national scale levels. On its own informing is a form of engagement but not participation. Information provision often provides essential support to other forms of consultation and participation however. | • Leaflets, brochures, information pack, video, newsletters  
• Exhibitions/displays (non-staffed)  
• Advertising  
• Media (TV, Radio, Newspapers)  
• Internet (information provision) |
| 2. Consultation (predominantly open to all)               | Various approaches to providing information and receiving feedback that are potentially open to all types of participant (i.e. professional and local stakeholders, and the public). Engagement can either be at distance or face-face (with individuals or groups) and tends to be in the form of one-off events or initiatives. Face-to-face approaches are limited to the local scale (but can be reach national coverage if repeated), where as at distance approaches can cover all scales from national through to local. | • Site visits  
• Exhibitions/displays (staffed)  
• Open House  
• Public Meeting  
• Surgeries  
• Consultation Workshops  
• Consultation Document  
• Internet (information/feedback)  
• Free telephone line (automated or staffed)  
• Teleconferencing  
• Public inquiry |
| 3. Consultation (targeting the public / citizens)         | Citizens are targeted through statistically representative samples to take part in quantitative surveys to test ‘public opinion’, or are recruited to participate in qualitative approaches based on shared demographic features. Quantitative surveys can be at distance allowing wide national coverage, but lack in-depth reasoned responses. In-depth qualitative approaches allow face-face individual or group deliberation and thus tend to be locally situated (but can reach national coverage through multiple processes throughout the country). These methods can be used in front-end framing to benchmark public opinion and underlying values, issues and concerns; or employed to gauge responses to developments or proposals as the decision process evolves. The researcher provides the link to the decision maker in the form of a report. | • Questionnaire Survey (postal, web)  
• Telephone Survey  
• Interview Survey  
• Focus Groups  
• Discussion Groups  
• Deliberative Opinion Poll |
| 4. Deliberation / Dialogue (Groups of citizens & specialists) | Innovative deliberative approaches that engage citizens, often recruited to be representative of the wider public, in panels over extended periods of responsive information provision, considering issues, and providing recommendations to decision makers. Citizens | • Research Panels  
• Interactive Panels  
• Citizens’ Juries (Citizens’ Panels (Planning Cells, etc.)  
• Consensus Conference |
interact with specialists (or experts) at various points throughout the process – available methods differ in the degree and nature of this interaction and thus the extent of mutual learning and capacity building between panellists and specialists. Some methods have been developed for national level policy, while others are only established at local geographic scales (but have the potential to be scaled up).

5. Deliberation / Dialogue (Groups of predominantly local stakeholders)

Methods that seek to engage (predominantly) local stakeholders, selected to represent the interests of others or as surrogates of the ‘general public’, over extended periods in group deliberation and dialogue. Participants identify local issues and concerns, set priorities and agree on recommendations for action. Some approaches involve stakeholders in framing and actively engaging in technical-analytic aspects of decision processes (e.g. Joint Fact Finding; Participatory Research), while others involve local stakeholders in the evaluation and prioritisation of policy options. In most cases participants form interactive relationships with decision makers and specialists.

- Deliberative Mapping
- Community Advisory Committees (CACs)
- Planning for Real
- Visioning
- Workshops
- Stakeholder Dialogue
- Joint Fact Finding (and other forms of collaborative analysis)
- Stakeholder Decision Analysis
- Participatory Research / Participatory Appraisal
- Internet Dialogue

6. Deliberation / Dialogue (Groups of predominantly professional stakeholders)

Approaches that seek to engage (predominantly) professional stakeholders, selected to represent the interests of others, over extended periods in group deliberation and dialogue. The most common approaches for this strategy are Stakeholder Workshops and Stakeholder Dialogue. This strategy also includes approaches that involve stakeholders in framing and actively engaging in technical-analytic aspects of decision processes, and/or the evaluation and prioritisation of policy options. Participants predominantly draw on their own information and specialist knowledges. In most approaches participants form interactive relationships with decision makers and specialists. This strategy might also include techniques that seek to identify areas of consensus and difference on issues or proposals between groups of professional stakeholders at distance.

- Workshops
- Stakeholder Dialogue
- Joint Fact Finding (and other forms of collaborative analysis)
- Stakeholder Decision Analysis
- Multi-criteria Decision Analysis
- Internet dialogue
- Delphi process

7. Existing engagement processes initiated & carried out by others

Existing engagement structures already in place at the local authority, regional and national levels could be used to engage the public and/or stakeholders in radioactive waste issues. The nature of processes would depend on existing structures, meaning limited control over who participates and how. It might be necessary to provide funds and resources to assist those undertaking engagement processes.

- Local Agenda 21 processes
- Regional sustainable development frameworks
- Community planning networks
- Scottish Civic Forum
Annex 3 Costing for methods of public and stakeholder engagement in radioactive waste management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Strategy</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Unit Costs</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Education &amp; Information Provision</strong></td>
<td>Leaflets, brochures, information pack, video, newsletters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exhibitions/displays (non-staffed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media (TV, Radio, Newspapers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Consultation (predominantly open to all)</strong></td>
<td>Site visits</td>
<td>£1000</td>
<td>1 day visit, 10-20 participants, 1 person to act as guide (includes admin and set up costs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exhibitions/displays (staffed)</td>
<td>£2000</td>
<td>1 day duration, includes travel and basic display costs, 1 person to staff display (excludes venue hire).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open House</td>
<td>£1000</td>
<td>Daily rate, including admin costs and staff on hand to answer questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
<td>£3000</td>
<td>One 2 hour meeting, advertising and information provision, admin &amp; set up costs, 2 facilitators, venue hire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation Workshops</td>
<td>£5k-7k</td>
<td>One day workshop, 4 facilitators, 40 participants, recruitment and travel costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation Document</td>
<td>£20k</td>
<td>National level consultation, 2 months duration, production, printing, communication (via web, post), collation and analysis of responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internet (information/feedback)</td>
<td>£15k</td>
<td>1 month rolling web consultation, including set up and maintenance costs, and analysis of responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free telephone line (automated)</td>
<td>£500</td>
<td>2 week period (used in conjunction with other consultation methods).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free telephone line (staffed)</td>
<td>£1500</td>
<td>2 week period (used in conjunction with other consultation methods).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Consultation (targeting the public / citizens)</strong></td>
<td>Questionnaire Survey</td>
<td>£15k</td>
<td>1000 responses, quota sampling using market research techniques, National coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone Survey</td>
<td>£12-15k</td>
<td>1000 responses, stratified quota sampling, National coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Survey</td>
<td>£25k</td>
<td>1000 responses, semi-structured interviews, National coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>£4k</td>
<td>Per group, includes recruitment costs and payment of participants, 1 facilitator (1 day preparation, 1 day facilitation, 1 day analysis), and venue hire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deliberative Opinion Poll</td>
<td>£80k</td>
<td>Recruitment of 250-600 respondents and attitude survey. Smaller groups ran by 4 facilitators, travel, and venue costs. Includes final survey, and associated reporting costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 Unit costs may also need to include: Professional group recruitment costs: £3-5K per cohort; Additional consultant costs (e.g. project management): £500 per day
## 4. Deliberation / Dialogue (Groups of citizens & specialists)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Panels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Panels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens’ Juries (Citizens’ Panels (Planning Cells, etc.))</td>
<td>£20-30k</td>
<td>16 participants, 4-5 day process, 2 facilitators, recruitment of participants and expert witnesses, venue hire, report production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus Conference</td>
<td>£100-125k</td>
<td>16 participants, introductory weekend workshop, information provision, 3-4 day conference, 1-2 facilitators, venue hire, reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberative Mapping</td>
<td>£125k</td>
<td>4 citizen panels each meeting 6 times for 2 hours over 3 months, reflexive information provision, 5 facilitators, 1 specialist panel (interviews), 1 citizen-specialist workshop, website, reporting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 5. Deliberation / Dialogue (Groups of predominantly local stakeholders)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Advisory Committees (CACs)</td>
<td>£40k</td>
<td>Groups of 16 people, 3 regular meetings of 2-3 hours duration for 6 months, information provision, 2 facilitators, venue hire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for Real</td>
<td>£8k</td>
<td>1 day event, includes venue, 4 facilitators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visioning</td>
<td>£5k</td>
<td>1 two hour event, 10 participants, 2 facilitators, recruitment and venue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>£6k</td>
<td>One-off 3 hour workshop, including 16-20 participants, 3 facilitators, recruitment, venue (additional coordination/management costs for repeat workshops).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Dialogue</td>
<td>£10k</td>
<td>1 month of rolling programme, including 1 facilitated meeting/workshop, 2-4 facilitators, and associated process management and design costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Decision Analysis</td>
<td>£30k</td>
<td>4 workshops over a 3 month period, stakeholder analysis and recruitment, 30 professional stakeholders, 4 facilitators (process design, management and facilitation), reporting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 6. Deliberation / Dialogue (Groups of predominantly professional stakeholders)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>£10k</td>
<td>One off 3 hour workshop, including 16-20 participants, 3 facilitators, recruitment and venue (additional coordination/management costs for repeat workshops).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Dialogue</td>
<td>£15k</td>
<td>1 month of rolling programme, including 1 facilitated meeting/workshop, 2-3 facilitators, and associated process management and design costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Fact Finding (and other forms of collaborative analysis)</td>
<td>£40k</td>
<td>4 meetings (three in initial 3 month period and after fact-finding is complete), 15-20 participants, technical liaison, 2 facilitators, process design and management (does not include the cost of technical fact-finding work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-criteria mapping</td>
<td>£25k</td>
<td>20 interviews with 20 participants, wrap-up workshop, reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Dialogue</td>
<td>£20k</td>
<td>1 month dialogue, structured dialogue website, including: set up, maintenance, collation and management of responses, analysis and reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi process</td>
<td>£15k</td>
<td>Per 100 respondents, included in an iterative process over 2 months, reporting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 7. Engagement processes initiated by others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Agenda 21 processes</td>
<td>(Dependent on type of existing process and relationship with those conducting them, likely to include liaison costs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional SD frameworks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community planning networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Civic Forum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5. Workshop Evaluation

Every workshop participant was given an evaluation form in their packs at the beginning of the workshop. Participants were asked to complete their forms at the end of the workshop. 26 participants, out of the 43 attending the workshop, responded in total. Participant evaluations of different aspects of the workshop were recorded quantitatively through an attribute score placed on a scale ranging from 1 to 5, supported by written comments which captured qualitative judgements about the process. The evaluation centred around three aspects:
1. Objectives of the Workshop process
2. Effectiveness of the Workshop process
3. Practical arrangements for the Workshop

Quantitative responses in relation to these three aspects are summarised in turn below.

1. Objectives of the Workshop process

Question 1(a). Prior to the workshop, what did you think of the chances of its objectives being met?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. All very unlikely to be met</th>
<th>2. Only some likely to be attainable</th>
<th>3. Unsure but worth a try</th>
<th>4. Mostly achievable</th>
<th>5. All likely to be achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Average = 4.2

Question 1(b). In your view, to what extent have the objectives of the workshop been met?

|---------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|

Average = 3.1
2. Effectiveness of the Workshop process

Question 2(b). How would you rate the effectiveness or success of the workshop process overall?

Question 2(a) ‘How would you rate the effectiveness or success of the following parts of the workshop process - the preliminary phase and each individual session (1 through to 6)’?

A summary table of the responses to question 2(a) showing the average, highest and lowest scores for the effectiveness of each component of the workshop process (the attribute scale is the same as for question 2(a)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop component</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary phase</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1 - 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 - 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 - 4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Practical Arrangements for the Workshop

*Question 3(a). How did you rate the choice of Manchester for the workshop?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Question 3(b). What did you think of the facilities in terms of what was needed to run the meeting?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Question 3(c). Regarding the administrative arrangements:*

*Was there sufficient notice of the meeting?*
- Yes = 26
- No = 0

*Were the papers received in adequate time for you to consider them?*
- Yes = 24
- No = 1
- No answer = 1