

West Cumbria MRWS Partnership

PSE3 Evaluation

Final Report

Prepared for West Cumbria MRWS Partnership

By Wood Holmes

Ref: 4101

November 2012



Client: West Cumbria MRWS Partnership

Project Title: PSE3 Evaluation

Reference Number: 4101

Version: Final

**Confidentiality, copyright
and reproduction:**

This report is submitted by Wood Holmes to West Cumbria MRWS Partnership as part of ongoing work on the MRWS Evaluation process. It may not be used for any other purposes, reproduced in whole or in part, nor passed to any organisation or person without the specific permission in writing of Wood Holmes.

PREPARED BY

Name: Sam Cammiss

Position: Senior Consultant

Signature:



Date: June 2012

AGREED BY

Name: Stuart Smith

Position: CEO

Signature:

Date: November 2012

West Cumbria MRWS Partnership

PSE3 Evaluation

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Evaluation Approach	3
3	PSE3 Objectives & Programme	6
4	Summary of Outcomes	11
5	Discussion	13
6	Conclusions	21
7	Appendix 1: Review of PSE3 Subgroup	29
8	Appendix 2: Review of Consultation Pack	31
9	Appendix 3: Review of PSE3 Publicity Campaign	34
10	Appendix 4: Review of Public Drop-In Events	38
11	Appendix 5: Review of Stakeholder Briefing Activity	43
12	Appendix 6: Review of Intermediary Events	45
13	Appendix 7: Review of Public Consultation	47
14	Appendix 8: Review of Opinion Survey	52
15	Appendix 9: PSE3 Performance with Key Target Groups	55
16	Appendix 11: MRWS PSE Programme	62



1 Introduction

- 1.1 This evaluation report takes the MRWS Public and Stakeholder Engagement: Phase 3 (PSE3) programme as its focus.

PSE3 and MRWS

- 1.2 A requirement of the MRWS White Paper and central to operating the concept of voluntarism, the PSE3 programme is devised to engage, inform, and consult communities and stakeholder groups during Stage 3 of the site selection process¹.
- 1.3 The PSE3 programme has been preceded by PSE1 and PSE2: details of which are included in the Appendix.
- 1.4 Delivery of PSE3 has been overseen by the West Cumbria MRWS Partnership on behalf of the Decision-Making Bodies (DMBs).
- 1.5 The West Cumbria MRWS Partnership exists to inform the DMB decision on whether to participate in the next stage of the MRWS process in West Cumbria process.
- 1.6 In order to fulfil this role, the West Cumbria MRWS Partnership has pursued a Work Programme that frames their investigations in terms of 6 criteria:
- Criterion 1 – Safety, Security, Environment, and Planning
 - Criterion 2 – Geology
 - Criterion 3 – Community Benefits, and Impacts
 - Criterion 4 – Design, Engineering, and Inventory
 - Criterion 5 – Siting Process
 - Criterion 6 – How Public and Stakeholder Views Will be Used
- 1.7 The fundamental role of PSE3 is to communicate research and initial opinions reached with regards to each criterion and provide an opportunity for stakeholders to comment. Key terms for the PSE3 programme are outlined in the following²:

¹ As detailed in the MRWS White Paper: <http://mrws.decc.gov.uk/assets/decc/mrws/white-paper-final.pdf>

² Document: 15.3 Draft 5th March 2012 – 'Public and Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Round 3'. 3KQ and PSE Sub Group. Working Draft (accessed 18th May 2012).



The Partnership will be publishing its draft advice to the Principal Authorities and asking for feedback on it from stakeholder organisations and the public. PSE3 is about making the bulk of the Partnership's work accessible to interested members of the public, including the initial opinions formed. It is also about assessing the extent of support or otherwise for participation in the siting process without commitment.

1.8 An important distinction between the PSE3 and its precedents (PSEs 1 and 2) is the move in emphasis away from information gathering towards communication of the Partnership's emerging opinions on the criteria alongside stimulation and capture of public and stakeholder feedback on those opinions.

1.9 This emphasis is framed in terms of two key questions to be put to stakeholders and communities:

Key Question: PSE3 Consultation:

To what extent do you agree with the Partnership's initial opinions on [insert criterion name], and why?

Key Question: Opinion Survey:

Do you support or oppose the areas covered by [Allerdale/Copeland] borough council taking part in the search for somewhere to put a repository, without any commitment to have it?

1.10 An opportunity for consultees to raise additional, wider issues or concerns outside the bounds of the criteria-focussed inquiry accompanies these key questions.



2 Evaluation Approach

- 2.1 This section outlines the approach to evaluation of the performance and outcomes of the Public and Stakeholder Engagement Round 3 (PSE3) programme.

Overview

- 2.2 An evaluation pairing summative and formative elements has been implemented in order to provide support to the Partnership's decision making process 'in programme', together with a final 'end of programme' evaluation.

Formative Evaluation

- 2.3 Adopted as an aspect of evaluation good practice, the Partnership has sought to integrate recommendations emerging from the evaluation during the PSE3 delivery period.
- 2.4 With specific regard to PSE3, wood holmes have put forward various recommendations into the PSE3 design and delivery phases. The majority of these were adopted.
- 2.5 This report details occasions where this formative approach to evaluation has been adopted.

Summative Evaluation

- 2.6 The summative evaluation has sought to establish the efficiency and effectiveness of the PSE3 programme in achieving its objectives:
- 2.7 The objectives for the PSE3 programme are:
- Objective 1: Raise awareness and build understanding of the Partnership's work to date, and its initial opinions.
 - Objective 2: Understand any reasons for concern, and reasons for support or opposition to the Partnership's initial opinions.
 - Objective 3: Assess the extent of support or opposition to entering the siting process without commitment in the areas of Allerdale and Copeland.
 - Objective 4: Understand any wider issues from stakeholders and public.
- 2.8 The assessment of achievement against objectives is based on a collated review of recorded outcomes, direct observations, and stakeholder opinion.
- 2.9 The summative evaluation places particular emphasis on an exploration of:



- Strength and weakness in process and outcome.
- Efficiency and effectiveness of delivery.
- Potential improvements to efficiency and effectiveness.
- Lessons learnt

2.10 The evaluation commentary delivers a review of evidence, together with a qualitative assessment of the implication in terms of these evaluation themes. An effort to reflect the breadth of perspective is made throughout.

Research

2.11 A robust research programme underpins the evaluation, constituent parts of which are:

Partnership Oversight

2.12 During the PSE3 evaluation, wood holmes have, with the full cooperation of the Partnership, been granted free and unfettered access to observe all aspects of the PSE planning, management, and delivery processes.

2.13 With specific regard to PSE3, this level of access has included open access to all public and private meetings involving the Partnership and its Subgroups (including the PSE3 Subgroup). Attendance by wood holmes was not subject to scheduling or prior warning.

Event Attendance

2.14 With specific focus on PSE3 the evaluation team have attended all public events run by the Partnership and several public events run by Stakeholders in which Partnership representatives participated or in which the MRWS process was a focal issue.

2.15 At events, informal conversations with attendees, together with observation of presentations, discussions, and Q&A sessions, have been used to develop a picture of performance and outcomes.

2.16 In addition to attendance of events, area walks and informal public soundings have been employed in order to gain a fuller experience of local areas during the public events and publicity programme.

Document Review



2.17 A weight of documentary evidence has been accessed for the purposes of the evaluation. Key document resources include:

- Partnership project management documentation, reporting, and communiques
- Stakeholder commentary
- Press and media reporting and commentary
- Social media commentary

2.18 The wood holmes team have been copied into all Partnership correspondence; spanning discussion between Partnership members, discussion of draft documents, discussion pertaining to day-to-day project management, and dialogue with stakeholders (including coordination of FOI responses).

Stakeholder Consultations

2.19 Specific PSE3-focussed consultations have been carried out with key stakeholders representing key groups engaged in coordination, delivery, and audience roles.

2.20 Stakeholders have been asked to reflect upon efficiency and effectiveness of the PSE3 programme and its components. All stakeholders have been asked to consider strength, weakness, and potential improvement in processes and outcomes of PSE3.

2.21 A simple discussion guide has been employed to stimulate conversations as appropriate. All consultations were carried out in accordance with MRS and UK Evaluation Society guidelines. Anonymity in reporting has been maintained as a default in order to limit constraints on comment.



3 PSE3 Objectives & Programme

3.1 This section outlines the principal terms and structures of the Public and Stakeholder Engagement Round 3 (PSE3) programme.

PSE3 Objectives

3.2 The stated Objectives of the PSE3 programme are:

- *Objective 1: Raise awareness and build understanding of the Partnership's work to date, and its initial opinions.*
- *Objective 2: Understand any reasons for concern, and reasons for support or opposition to the Partnership's initial opinions.*
- *Objective 3: Assess the extent of support or opposition to entering the siting process without commitment in the areas of Allerdale and Copeland.*
- *Objective 4: Understand any wider issues from stakeholders and public.*

3.3 In addition to the specific programme objectives, PSE3 has been designed and delivered with reference to a higher tier of objectives for the PSE programme as a whole³:

- a) *Provide a mix of engagement opportunities to share information and ensure feedback from stakeholder organisations and disinterested members of the public.*
- b) *Identify the extent of support for a decision whether to participate or not, any issues of concern, and the reasons given for and against participation.*
- c) *Demonstrate the credibility of the Partnership's recommendations on whether to participate or not, including through demonstrating good practice in consultation.*
- d) *Produce a report setting out the approach taken to engagement, the activities undertaken, and the outcomes, including feedback on support, concerns and opposition.*

3.4 Again, this evaluation will seek to establish PSE3's contribution to the meeting of these Objectives.

³Interpreted by the Partnership from the MRWS White Paper – <http://mrws.decc.gov.uk/assets/decc/mrws/white-paper-final.pdf>



PSE3 Programme

3.5 The PSE3 programme spanning the November 2011 to May 2012 period is detailed in Document: 15.3 Draft 5th March 2012⁴ and summarised as follows:

ELEMENT	DETAIL
Consultation Pack	<p>A standardised information pack incorporating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overview Document (8 page) ▪ Summary DVD ▪ Full Consultation Document (detailing background, context, process, and initial opinions) ▪ Freepost Consultation Response Form
Publicity Campaign	<p>An awareness-raising programme featuring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Update and report press releases ▪ Media liaison/invitations (regional press, television, and radio) ▪ Multi-channel advertising campaign ▪ Advertorial purchase ▪ Maintenance of the Partnership website as a central news and information resource ▪ Social media (Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube)
Drop-In Events	<p>A programme of 12 Drop-In Events and 1 Webinar held across Cumbria during the consultation period (18/1/12-10/2/12) providing an opportunity for communities and stakeholders to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Collect Consultation Packs. ▪ View information stands pertaining to MRWS, the Partnership's work programme, and the Partnership's initial opinions. ▪ Submit consultation responses. ▪ Engage representatives of the Partnership and other associated authorities (e.g. DECC and NDA) on issues of detail. ▪ Attend facilitated Q&A sessions attended by Partnership representatives alongside representatives of NDA, DECC, ONR, and EA.
Briefing Activity	<p>Provision of tailored briefings for community and stakeholder groups including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mailing of the Overview Document to all West Cumbrian

⁴ Document: 15.3 Draft 5th March 2012 – 'Public and Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Round 3'. 3kQ and PSE Sub Group. Working Draft (accessed 18th May 2012).



	<p>households (79,000 homes).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provision of briefing materials to 200 representatives of target stakeholder groups. ▪ Direct participation by Partnership representatives in briefings of target stakeholder groups. ▪ Multiple efforts to engage Environmental NGOs. ▪ Provision of briefing materials and support to Councillors at County/Borough/Parish level, and Neighbourhood forums ▪ Information drops in 398 public places (libraries, leisure centres, etc) ▪ Email of e-bulletins on a 6-week cycle to 1200 subscribers to the Partnership mailing list. ▪ Mailing of 4-page Newsletter to all West Cumbrian households (79,000 homes). ▪ Inclusion of a 6-page article in Your Cumbria (distributed to all Cumbrian homes) ▪ Briefings to Partnership organisations, constituents, and members by Partnership representatives.
Intermediary Events	Commission and facilitation of awareness-raising and discussion events directed towards target audiences taking the Consultation Document as their focus.
Consultation	An open public consultation based on structured capture and analysis of feedback on the Consultation Document through paper or web based submissions
Opinion Survey	Telephone survey spanning representative sample of Allerdale, Copeland, Rest of Cumbria focussing on respondent opinion on progression to Stage 4 (1,000 randomly selected persons for each of the 3 areas).

PSE3 Target Audiences

3.6 Within PSE3, specific stakeholder groups are identified for a targeted approach (reference: Document: 15.3 Draft 5th March 2012⁵):

GROUP	APPROACH
-------	----------

⁵ Document: 15.3 Draft 5th March 2012 – ‘Public and Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Round 3’. 3kQ and PSE Sub Group. Working Draft (accessed 18th May 2012).



<p>Young People</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Develop specialist support materials that are appropriate for children, mirroring the content of the consultation document but being complementary to lesson format.</i> ▪ <i>Contract Connexions or other intermediary to offer and run at least one discussion session with pupils in all secondary schools in West Cumbria, plus the Schools Council as appropriate.</i> ▪ <i>Provide specialist materials to all interested schools, including a small budget to help them run an off-curriculum day on MRWS, as appropriate.</i> ▪ <i>Contact all West Cumbrian primary schools encouraging them to publicise the consultation pack session with their parents/teachers.</i> ▪ <i>Publicise the Consultation Pack and materials to all Cumbrian schools.</i> ▪ <i>Depending on levels of interest and take-up, hold a closing event to bring the youth work together, potentially in liaison with the Schools Council and Connexions.</i>
<p>Parish Councils</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>CALC organise briefings for parishes, before PSE3 starts</i> ▪ <i>Sending a Partnership letter to Parish clerks:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ <i>West Cumbrian parishes: to include two hard-copy Consultation Packs with an offer of sending more packs, offer a face-to-face briefing, send posters to advertise their local community event</i> ➢ <i>Rest of Cumbrian parishes: to include update, announce PSE3 and how can find the consultation pack, offer of briefing, posters to publicise their local community event/s</i> ▪ <i>CALC providing updates to their regular District Association meetings</i> ▪ <i>CALC sending out E-bulletins to West Cumbrian clerks and councillors</i> ▪ <i>CALC sending out their Cumbrian circular, before and during PSE3</i> ▪ <i>CALC organizing a Parish Conference in West Cumbria, to which all Cumbrian parishes will be invited. Funding provided by Partnership.</i>
<p>Environmental NGOs</p>	<p><i>We have restated the offer to organise a bilateral meeting either before or during PSE3. This was made to FoE, Greenpeace and CORE in June 2011. They will also be formally invited to participate in the consultation.</i></p>
<p>Councillors</p>	<p><i>at Ensure that councillors have an opportunity to discuss the</i></p>



<p>County, Borough and Parish level</p>	<p><i>Partnership's work well before it concludes. Lead by individual organisations.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Allerdale BC</i> ▪ <i>Copeland BC</i> ▪ <i>Cumbria CC</i> ▪ <i>CALC</i>
<p>Neighbourhood Forums</p>	<p><i>Update the forums in West Cumbria on progress made since PSE2 by writing individually and directly to everyone on the Forum database, around 3000 people. In particular this written update would publicise the consultation pack as the main source of information, and the community events to attend if people wish to ask questions or discuss in more depth the Partnership's work.</i></p>
<p>Rest of Cumbria</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Media releases and updates countywide.</i> ▪ <i>Advertorials countywide.</i> ▪ <i>Hold at least one community event in Barrow, South Lakes, Eden and Carlisle.</i> ▪ <i>Market the Consultation Pack countywide.</i> ▪ <i>Via CALC, provide an MRWS update to all parishes in Cumbria.</i> ▪ <i>Partnership letter to all parishes in Cumbria updating them on the consultation (see parish section, above)</i> ▪ <i>Target publications that are countywide e.g. Your Cumbria. We do not propose sending an additional newsletter to all households in Cumbria.</i>



4 Summary of Outcomes

4.1 Between November 2011 and May 2012, the following activity has been delivered under the PSE3 programme:

THEME	SUMMARY DELIVERY
Consultation Pack	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3,250 full packs distributed. ▪ 135,000 overviews distributed.
Publicity Campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 11 announcement, update, and event-coverage press releases. ▪ Media liaison/invitations (focussed on regional press, television, and radio with some national extension). ▪ Multi-channel advertising campaign including billboard, poster, and flyer campaigns focussed at community facilities, meeting places, and street scenes, paired with communications support for 224 pieces of cross-media coverage (between the 3rd November 2011 to 23rd March 2012) ▪ 2 advertorials in Cumbrian press (one in November 2011 and one in January 2012) each estimated to have had a newspaper circulation of 126,449). ▪ Maintenance of the Partnership website as a central news and information resource. ▪ Update via social media – at consultation-close, Facebook page had 76,000 views for the consultation period and 220 likes, Twitter posting to 700 followers (Twitter now has 1,804 followers), and YouTube channel had 442 views. ▪ Facebook adverts targeting Cumbria residents (there were opportunities to view the adverts nearly 600,000 times. In total people clicked on the adverts to view the Facebook page or an item that was posted there over 1,100 times).
Drop-In Events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 12 community drop-in events with 804 attendees ▪ 1 Webinar with 130 live viewers
Briefing Activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mailing of the Overview Document to all West Cumbrian households at the beginning of the consultation period (79,000)



	<p>homes).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provision of briefing materials to 200 representatives of target stakeholder groups. ▪ Provision of funding and representation to the CALC conference (7th January 2012). ▪ Direct participation by Partnership representatives in briefings of target stakeholder groups. ▪ Multiple efforts to engage Environmental NGOs. ▪ Provision of briefing materials and support to Councillors at County/Borough/Parish level, and Neighbourhood forums ▪ Information drops in 398 public places (libraries, leisure centres, council buildings, etc) ▪ Email of e-bulletins on a 6-week cycle to 1200 subscribers to the Partnership mailing list (including January and March 2012). ▪ Mailing of 4-page Newsletter to all West Cumbrian households in late February 2012 (79,000 homes). ▪ Inclusion of a 6-page article in Your Cumbria (distributed to all Cumbrian homes February 2012) ▪ Briefings to Partnership organisations, constituents, and members by Partnership representatives. ▪ Targeted communications (x3) to all secondary schools in Cumbria between December 2011 and February 2012.
Intermediary Events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Total of 57 Events: Action with Communities in Cumbria (7), Cumbria CVS (5), Connexions (33), AWAZ Cumbria (1), Trades Hall Centre (9), South Lakes Youth Council (1), OutREACH (1)
Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1,410 responses representing 2,356 individuals received between 21/11/11-23/03/12
Opinion Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 4,262 responses between 08/03/12-16/05/12



5 Discussion

- 5.1 This section provides a discussion of PSE3 in the context of its objectives.
- 5.2 The discussion is framed by the question: **'Based on available evidence, to what extent did PSE3 achieve its objectives and what improvements could be made?'**
- 5.3 This discussion represents a qualitative exploration of evidence; balance has been sought throughout and an effort to represent the landscape of perspectives has been made.
- 5.4 The evidence base for this discussion is provided in the Appendices to this report; specifically, the recorded outcomes, direct observation, and stakeholder opinion concerning the key components of PSE3.

Performance against PSE3 Objectives

- 5.5 Performance against the stated objectives of PSE3 are summarised in turn below:

Objective 1: Raise awareness and build understanding of the Partnership's work to date, and its initial opinions.

- 5.6 The main approaches to awareness-raising deployed in PSE3 include: the Consultation Document, Community Drop-Ins, Other Briefing Activity (Stakeholder Briefings and Intermediary-lead Community Events), and the Publicity Campaign.
- 5.7 The Consultation Document is an accessible, clear, balanced, and thorough articulation of the Partnership's initial opinions and underlying reasoning. Alongside treatment of each of the six criteria, the Consultation Document outlines context and implication of this Consultation.
- 5.8 Understanding has been particularly aided by the level of contextualisation provided in the Consultation Document; in terms of the MRWS context, the evidence base, and alternative viewpoints.
- 5.9 Although still a lengthy document, the Consultation Document is considered a support to a reader's understanding of the Partnership's work and initial opinions; comparing well to other comparable consultations.
- 5.10 The challenge presented to the reader by the Consultation Document is noted; however, the evaluator considers a full account of this nature essential to the Consultation process.



- 5.11 Accessibility is extended to those not inclined to engage with the full Consultation Document via the DVD and Summary Document; each considered a valuable asset in building understanding across the audience.
- 5.12 The Community Drop-Ins, Stakeholder Briefings, and Community Events played a strong role in building understanding through dialogue; providing an opportunity for stakeholders and public to engage and discuss issues directly with representatives of the Partnership, DECC, the NDA, EA, and ONR.
- 5.13 Although barriers in terms of time, geography, and detail of content were minimised, event attendees appear to have been predominantly the 'informed, engaged'.
- 5.14 These events are considered to have played a valuable secondary role in terms of extending awareness through the stimulation of information flows through the peer networks of those directly engaged.
- 5.15 The Publicity Campaign presents an extensive multi-channel approach to awareness-raising, utilising online and offline media scoped at local, regional, and national geographies.
- 5.16 The prevailing opinion is that the Publicity Campaign was optimally structured, in terms of the methods employed, optimally timed across the year, and optimally scoped in terms of local, regional, and national focus.
- 5.17 The content of the Publicity Campaign is deemed to be informative and balanced; directing readers to further information and the means to record a response. No examples of coercion or manipulation are apparent in any Partnership publicity.
- 5.18 The example of the Partnership-sponsored advertorial demonstrates an effort to provide audiences with an opportunity to engage with alternative perspectives on risks and implications; an action considered to aid understanding and build capacity amongst those engaged to make an informed contribution.
- 5.19 Many observers have noted the inherent challenge faced by those seeking to raise awareness about the topic of nuclear waste disposal within Cumbria.
- The time horizons of any future MRWS stages place the issue outside the immediate priorities of many people.
 - The complexity of the topic, paired with the neutrality of communications from the Partnership has potentially lessened the 'story' value of press releases.
 - Due to regional history, nuclear news stories carry connotation and trigger automatic responses in the region.



- 5.20 With regard to the Publicity Campaign's service to building understanding, elements such as the Advertorials and mass-mailings of the Overview Document to West Cumbrian households emerge as strong efforts to communicate information capable of building understanding.
- 5.21 No significant modifications to the publicity campaign's methodology have been proposed other than the issue of scale (see below).
- 5.22 An emerging critique of the Consultation and Opinion Survey concerns perceptions of limited awareness amongst Cumbrians outside Allerdale and Copeland, and amongst wider reaches of the UK.
- 5.23 The Opinion Survey indicates good results with regard to awareness-raising in Allerdale and Copeland. However, outside these focal areas, an awareness of the consultation appears less concrete.
- 5.24 However, no proposals to divert the existing resource concentration from West Cumbria to wider reaches of Cumbria and the UK have been made either from within the Partnership or from representatives of the broader audience.
- 5.25 Proposals regarding potential improvement to the Publicity Campaign focus on increasing its scale to enhance reach within Cumbria and the UK through additional funding from Government.
- 5.26 A number of observers do query whether an enhanced volume and scale in the publicity campaign, facilitated by additional funding, could achieve greater awareness.
- 5.27 The evaluator considers saturation and fatigue to be risks associated with any such endeavour and urges against an assumption that greater awareness is directly proportional to greater scale; returns may be fairly expected to diminish.
- 5.28 Taken as a whole, the approach to awareness raising and building understanding is marked out by high quality information, the utilisation of multiple communication channels, and support for genuine two-way dialogue for those who sought it.
- 5.29 The evaluator notes the challenge for the Partnership in demonstrating receptivity to feedback outside the formal reporting schedule; this has led to some questions regarding the quality of the two-way dialogue during PSE3 amongst observers.
- 5.30 Within the bounds of funding constraints, no proposals are evident in terms of reshaping the approach. We are satisfied that all opportunities were realised within the bounds of available resource with regards to meeting the demands of Objective 1.



- 5.31 Whilst we found no evidence indicating critical gaps in the awareness raising campaign, the issue of budget is naturally an issue for any campaign achieving less than 100% issue-recognition amongst the consulted population. Most of those spoken to revealed broad satisfaction with the scale of the publicity campaign and a positive comparison with 'standard' consultation activity has been noted by Partnership and non-Partnership alike.
- 5.32 In addition, we would advise caution on drawing a simple linear relationship with budget and numbers engaged. Clearly, there are many other factors as to why individuals do not engage.
- 5.33 On this basis, and given the stage in the MRWS process that PSE3 occurred we find no basis upon which to propose additional resource.

Objective 2: Understand any reasons for concern, and reasons for support or opposition to the Partnership's initial opinions.

- 5.34 The principal approach serving development of this understanding was the Public Consultation and supporting Consultation Document.
- 5.35 The Consultation Document was well structured and thorough in its articulation of the Partnership's opinions with respect to the six criteria.
- 5.36 In this regard the Consultation Document provided consultees with an opportunity to submit responses on an opinion-by-opinion basis to the benefit of the Partnership's understanding of specific reasons for support or opposition.
- 5.37 Consultees were provided with ample scope to elaborate on their reasoning within the Consultation's questionnaire format and no restrictions were placed on the format of submissions where the questionnaire was not used (letter, email, postcard, etc).
- 5.38 This facility has resulted in a series of high-detail explorations of criteria from stakeholders and the public.
- 5.39 Representatives of the Partnership have commented on the extent to which Consultation responses were found to be high in quality, thorough in detail, and thought provoking across a broad array of topics.
- 5.40 The Partnership did provide abbreviated response formats in the form of tick box indications of support and comment slips for those not inclined to submit via other means. Within this subset of responses, the reasoning behind comments was less developed; in parts limited to a single checked box.
- 5.41 This abbreviated 'tick-box' Consultation response appears to have been a major factor in the invalid quantitative analyses of the consultation undertaken by stakeholders external to the Partnership; confusing subsequent interpretation of the



Opinion Survey results. On this basis the overall value of the abbreviated response format is questioned.

- 5.42 However, this strategy is deemed appropriate to the desire to maximise and facilitate responses of all kinds from all quarters, and is not viewed as detrimental to the Partnership's understanding of reasons for support or opposition.
- 5.43 In all, the Consultation represents a robust and reliable means by which the Partnership could access comment on initial opinions without restriction. The adoption of a qualitative approach has amplified the submission of reasoned responses to the benefit of understanding within the Partnership.
- 5.44 In support of the Consultation, the partnership established a range of platforms serving the capture of comment and feedback from stakeholders and the public. Key instruments include the Partnership-run Drop-In Community Events, Stakeholder Briefings, and Intermediary-lead Community discussion sessions.
- 5.45 Examples of detailed two-way discussions have been observed in each; serving to enhance the understanding of those Partnership members directly involved.
- 5.46 In addition, these discussions are considered to stimulate considered response via the Consultation; amplifying Partnership's access to, and engagement with, reasoned Consultation responses.
- 5.47 The evaluation notes the information resources deployed in support of the Consultation as an important factor in both stimulating responses and providing consultees with the means to structure views, without coercion, on the 'initial opinions' and 'criterion'.
- 5.48 The materials deployed in the publicity campaign, alongside information resources at events and the Consultation Pack itself, are all viewed as key to supporting consultees in developing and communicating their views with regard to the Partnership's initial opinions.
- 5.49 The communication of alternative perspectives has been facilitated by the Partnership through inclusion of multiple viewpoints in the evidence reviews of the Consultation Document, the Advertorials, and through a stand reserved for NGOs at the Community Drop-Ins.
- 5.50 Critique relevant to Objective 2 is limited. It is clear that a degree of concern exists in a significant proportion of the public with regard to how the Partnership will interpret the information gathered and how the understanding built will be utilised in advice to the DMBs.



- 5.51 In addition, a degree of frustration is apparent in some quarters with regards to the inability of some issues raised during the Consultation to precipitate immediate change in the Partnership's programme.
- 5.52 A key example concerns the belief that existing literature reveals Cumbrian geology presents no suitable host rock and MRWS Consultations in the region are rendered redundant as a result.
- 5.53 Both issues must be recognised and are important to the broader reflection on the MRWS process; however, in terms of an exploration of performance against Objective 2, the issues have little bearing.
- 5.54 The evaluation is satisfied that all opportunities were realised within the bounds of available resource with regards to meeting the demands of Objective 2.

Objective 3: Assess the extent of support or opposition to entering the siting process without commitment in the areas of Allerdale and Copeland.

- 5.55 The principal instrument serving this assessment with statistical validity is the Opinion Survey.
- 5.56 This evaluation finds the Opinion Survey a robust and reliable indicator of support or opposition to entering the siting process without commitment in the areas of Allerdale and Copeland.
- 5.57 The basis for this finding are the steps taken by the Partnership in development and execution of the survey methodology, specifically:
- Commission of external independent expertise in surveys and polls to advise on methodology and design
 - Open invitation for comment on the draft survey questionnaire
 - Commission of a reputable survey agency through open tender
- 5.58 With specific regard to the methodology of the Opinion Survey, critique focusses on geographical scope outside Allerdale and Copeland.
- 5.59 Although not dismissed, this critique does not have bearing on a strict reading of Objective 3 in the sense that Allerdale and Copeland were adequately sampled; both exceeding necessary sample sizes in terms of statistical confidence conventions.
- 5.60 We are satisfied that analysis and interpretation was conducted by a capable and non-partisan party (Ipsos Mori). Furthermore, no opportunity to manipulate the



analysis is apparent; the analysis, reporting, and utility of results being conducted in the public domain.

- 5.61 A critique on the issue of interpretation concerns the extent of prior awareness amongst surveyed populations and the impact that would have on the interpretation of the results.
- 5.62 The evaluation is satisfied that prior understanding⁶ of the Consultation was high amongst residents of Allerdale and Copeland (11% of those surveyed in Allerdale and 8% had 'never heard of the search for a potential site').
- 5.63 In addition, no case can be made to rule out the previously uninformed from this survey; information was provided during the survey without coercion, respondents were free to withdraw if unhappy, and democratic principle requires opportunities are extended to all regardless of prior judgements on their knowledge.
- 5.64 Again, this critique is cannot be dismissed but it is limited in terms of a strict reading of Objective 3.
- 5.65 The evaluation is satisfied that all opportunities were realised within the bounds of available resource with regards to meeting the demands of Objective 3.

Objective 4: Understand any wider issues from stakeholders and public.

- 5.66 Response to the Consultation has not been restricted in terms of the topic-focus and format of submissions. In reviewing submissions, Partnership representatives have commented on the breadth and depth of new information contributed.
- 5.67 We observed no bounds on submission of information to the Consultation.
- 5.68 In addition to the Consultation, the partnership has sought to engage with a broad range of stakeholder groups in two-way dialogue through multiple means; attendance of stakeholder events, briefing meetings, invitations to Drop-In discussions.
- 5.69 The evaluation believes all means within the bounds of resource were expended in engaging with stakeholder groups without selectivity. The Partnership responded to all meeting requests and sought meetings with key groups such as the NGOs.
- 5.70 Where approaches did not yield meetings, the Partnership sought alternative briefing; for example, representatives of the Partnership attended lectures by Prof.Smythe and Prof.Haszeldine.

⁶ Based on the Question: Q3. 'How much do you feel you know about this search in West Cumbria for a potential site for a deep underground disposal facility for higher activity radioactive waste?'



- 5.71 These inputs have been captured by a robust and flexible qualitative analysis process which has ensured the range of issues receive recognition in the Partnership's PSE3 report.
- 5.72 A critique regarding the Partnership's openness to issues from stakeholders and the public has emerged with regards to the Partnership's response to the debate surrounding the suitability of Cumbrian geology.
- 5.73 A number of opponents of the MRWS process have adopted the position that enough is known about Cumbrian geology to render search for suitable host rock redundant. The fact that this assertion has not resulted in an immediate cessation of the MRWS process in Cumbria is viewed by segments of the audience to be indicative of the Partnership's failure to be receptive to this issue.
- 5.74 Efforts to establish formal dialogue with key representatives of the position were largely rejected during the PSE3 programme. However, a fragmented dialogue was facilitated by the Partnership through conversations at Drop-In events, Q&A via email, and responses from the Partnership to press releases from representatives of the position.
- 5.75 Ultimately, the Consultation has registered a significant quantity of submissions focussed on this debate.
- 5.76 Overall, no specific fault can be found with regards to the Partnership's pursuit of understanding of this debate within the terms of MRWS Stage 3 and Criterion 2.
- 5.77 However, it is clear that the terms of reference for MRWS Stage 3 do not bear the capability to react to this debate in the manner desired by some observers; namely, cessation of the process in Cumbria or a review of the selection of GDF as the favoured UK waste disposal solution. This has led to criticism regarding the Partnership's receptiveness.
- 5.78 An important issue to engage with, this does not have bearing on an appraisal of performance against Objective 4; posing broader questions of the MRWS process as opposed to the Partnership's behaviour during PSE3.
- 5.79 Overall, the evaluation is satisfied that all opportunities were realised within the bounds of available resource with regards to meeting the demands of Objective 4.



6 Conclusions

6.1 Based on recorded outcomes, direct observations, and consultations with representatives of design, delivery, and audience, the following conclusions can be reached with regard to PSE3:

- Overall, PSE3 met its objectives efficiently and effectively within the bounds of assigned resource and the MRWS White Paper framework.
- PSE3 presents comprehensive and transparent attempt to raise awareness across a broad and diverse stakeholder landscape and engage communities in the work of the Partnership.
- PSE3 realised all opportunities within the bounds of assigned resource to maximise awareness, understanding, engagement, and feedback from stakeholders and communities. Informing and communicating detail on the consultation process, initial opinions, basis of opinions, and implication with clarity.
- The partnership made extensive attempts to inform and engage all members of society equally in accordance with the West Cumbria and Cumbria geographic scope.
- The Partnership has established an accessible, unrestricted feedback channel allowing multiple audiences regardless of standpoint or capability to state opinion on the criteria.
- The Partnership has sought to adapt to emerging points of emphasis and concern during PSE3 in order to maximise engagement and understanding amongst stakeholders and communities.
- The Partnership established a robust, reliable, and transparent system for analysis of consultation and survey feedback and its application to modify the Partnership's opinions.
- The Partnership established a means by which a robust, credible, and reliable statement can be made on support and opposition.
- The PSE3 report demonstrates modification of Partnership's initial opinions across the criteria as a result of feedback from stakeholders and communities.
- The PSE3 programme compares favourably with comparable engage-consult exercises in the UK, both in terms of performance and outcomes.



Development from PSE2

The interim evaluation of PSE2 revealed several points of emphasis for continued development in PSE3: they include:

- Optimisation of the publicity campaign in order to maximise reach
- Development of the range of engagement materials in support of understanding across diverse communities
- Maximisation of freedom in the format of consultation responses
- Development of opportunities for self-directed 'journeys' through the consultation process
- Enhanced contextualisation of information resources; including fit with the MRWS process, relationship with history (e.g. NIREX), alternative viewpoints in the evidence base, and implications of the consultation
- Maintenance of a structured approach to effective representation of consultation feedback
- Enhanced distinction between the GDF and existing nuclear facilities and programmes
- Development of the Drop-In events as a platform for community-lead discussion as opposed to presentation by the Partnership
- Continued use of non-textual media and non-traditional communication channels (e.g. social media) to maximise the diversity of reach

Based on the investigations and discussions carried out through this evaluation, PSE3 is considered to have effectively taken on board these points of emphasis.

Potential Improvement& Lessons Learned

- 6.2 Improvements to the PSE3 programme put forward by those consulted have been limited. However, the following areas have emerged.

Levels of Awareness

- 6.3 A common area of focus with regard to improvement concerns the level of awareness achieved by the publicity campaign across West Cumbria, Cumbria, and the UK.



- 6.4 Anecdotally, some observers have noted instances where members of the public, friends, or family have demonstrated no recognition of the Consultation or disregarded it as an issue specific to the nuclear sector.
- 6.5 The 24% of surveyed residents of the 'Rest of Cumbria' who had 'never heard' of the search for a potential site in the Opinion Survey has been employed to suggest weakness in the awareness-raising programme and any subsequent conclusions drawn from the Opinion Survey.
- 6.6 However, with 55% of the overall sample satisfied they knew at least a little about the issue, paired with the 81% of the overall sample demonstrating recognition of some kind, suggests a degree of efficacy in the awareness-raising process.
- 6.7 Given its budget, the form of the publicity campaign is broadly endorsed and no significant change is proposed. However, a belief that greater funds could fuel a publicity campaign larger in volume and geographical scope has been voiced. We would caution any assumption regarding a simple linear relationship between funding of a publicity campaign and the levels of awareness achieved.
- 6.8 It is clear that a greater UK-wide publicity campaign was possible, but lies outside the scope of the PSE3 objectives.
- 6.9 With regards to an enhanced scale of publicity in West Cumbria and Cumbria we consider that no obvious communication channel was neglected and see no obvious evidence to suggest that higher frequency of communication through these channels would increase awareness (or participation) amongst communities.
- 6.10 Furthermore, consultation response is considered large when benchmarked against other similar consult-engage events, levels of activity in community channels appear high, and no barriers were placed on the previously unaware engaging in the opinion survey.
- 6.11 On this basis, no improvements to the publicity campaign are proposed.

Terms of the Consultation

- 6.12 The evaluation has revealed a broad satisfaction with PSE3's achievements against its objectives. However, it must be acknowledged that this does not translate to universal satisfaction during PSE3.
- 6.13 It is clear that a significant portion of the stakeholder audience engaging with the MRWS programme are not satisfied with the terms of Stage 3 of the MRWS programme.
- 6.14 Frustrations have emerged with regards to perceived limitations in the Partnership's openness to:



- Challenges to the GDF as preferred technical option for UK nuclear waste disposal.
- Calls for detailed geological investigation prior to submission from the Partnership to the DMBs.

6.15 The Partnership has sought to integrate such concerns; most notably in their approach to the issue of Geology. However, bound by the framework set out in the MRWS White Paper, the Partnership's capability to address these issues in a desired manner has been limited.

6.16 Where appropriate, the Partnership has gone to lengths to contextualise perspectives within the MRWS process; signposting the optimal means by which positions of support and objection may be expressed for greatest impact.

6.17 However, frustrations endure over the inability of the Partnership to re-orientate PSE3 and MRWS to the preference of specific individuals and demonstrate immediate response.

6.18 Overall, however we can see no missed opportunity for the Partnership to address these concerns in the desired manner where it was in the Partnership's power or gift to do so.

NGO Engagement In PSE3

6.19 The NGOs (non-governmental organisations) adopting a broad opposition to the MRWS programme represent a key target for engagement during PSE3. However, formal engagement was limited. This has been raised by a number of observers as a focus for improvement.

6.20 We are satisfied that all efforts were made on the part of the Partnership to engage representatives of NGOs within the Partnership and within the consultation.

6.21 The Partnership has offered invitations to participate to the NGOs and provided an opportunity to present to the Partnership. These approaches have largely been rejected by the NGOs, although some presentations were undertaken at an early stage.

6.22 A substantial, unstructured dialogue undertaken between NGOs and the Partnership performed via email, paired with a small number of meetings early in the process, illustrate the willingness on the part of the Partnership to engage in open discussion.

6.23 On the specific matter of Geology, a perceived failure to grant Prof.Smythe a 45min slot for presentation to the Partnership has been used to characterise the Partnership



as reluctant to enter the debate. However, a 15min slot was offered and rejected by Prof.Smythe. The failure to compromise over this has caused much confusion.

- 6.24 However, the Partnership's subsequent attendance of community-lead lectures by Prof.Smythe, paired with commissioned reviews by DrDearlove⁷ and meeting the inspector from the NIREX Inquiry demonstrate effort to integrate this aspect into the Partnership programme.
- 6.25 Through conversations with representatives of the NGO position, we understands that a fundamental rejection of the terms of MRWS Stage 3 have resulted in there currently being no possibility of engagement beyond that already achieved.
- 6.26 Furthermore, an apparent expectation amongst NGOs that no influence could be pressed through participation in the Partnership appears to contrast with the experiences of Partnership members who do believe their participation has secured valuable outcomes for their constituents (examples being CALC, Cumbria Tourism, and NFU).
- 6.27 The substantial response from NGOs to the consultation effectively represents the NGO position within the consultation. In addition, an effort on the part of the Partnership to understand positions through NGO literature and events is acknowledged.
- 6.28 On this basis, no opportunity for improving the involvement of NGO's in PSE3 is apparent.However, it goes without saying that continual efforts should be made to engage all NGO's in the debate and process.
- 6.29 Further discussion on the role of NGO's in the wider Partnership process are contained in the Final Partnership Evaluation Document.

Quantification of the Consultation

- 6.30 The Consultation response and the Opinion Survey are considered a valuable resource that should be maintained in any future programmes of this nature.
- 6.31 However, it is clear that the Consultation's qualitative dataset derived from an unrepresentative, 'self-selecting' sample and has erroneously been employed by some observers as a statistically representative test of opinion.
- 6.32 We note that the open publication of this data has been necessary to rightly maintain transparency and no control can or should be applied to its application. Therefore,

⁷ Dr Jeremy Dearlove of FWS Consultants Ltd – an independent expert contracted by the Partnership to provide technical assistance on the topic of Geology



incorrect or different analysis of the same data sets should be expected and to a certain extent welcomed.

- 6.33 However, disparity between an erroneously quantified Consultation response and the Opinion Survey has been used to suggest gaming by a predisposed Partnership; potentially undermining confidence in the results of PSE3 amongst stakeholders and communities.
- 6.34 The evaluator believes the abbreviated 'tick-box' consultation response has played a significant role in driving this quantification behaviour.
- 6.35 Containing no qualitative insight, the tick-box data compels quantification. The evaluator questions the value this could have in the Partnership's analysis as it is an unrepresentative insight.
- 6.36 Although the 'tick-box' has facilitated some participation amongst the least inclined, it is on balance considered detrimental to PSE3 and its use should be considered carefully in any future iterations.

Broad Support Indicator

- 6.37 In addition to adopting a qualitative consultation alongside a quantitative opinion poll, the Partnership adopted the term "*Broad Support*" as an indicator that it would use to assess whether or not the community in West Cumbria wished to proceed with the MRWS process.
- 6.38 We view the adoption of this indicator as representing a fairly mature and sophisticated approach in assessing public sentiment. However, the indicator can be seen as problematic for several reasons.
- 6.39 Some participants to this evaluation were clear that the combination of opinion for and consultation data in aggregate **did not** reveal broad support for moving forward with the process, whilst others were firmly of the opinion that it **did** reveal broad support.
- 6.40 This highlights the often subjective interpretation required of qualitative data sets and how different perspectives on an argument can pick evidence from the qualitative data to support or refute a respective position.
- 6.41 In terms of quantitative evidence, the issue of opinion poll versus referendum was discussed several times at the Partnership. This was in response to questions from Partnership members as well as from the public.
- 6.42 Many people appeared to feel that opinion polls could be rigged or gamed in some way whereas a referendum would be a more binding and robust form of measure. Of course, as we see in many national and local elections, there are numerous issues



with referendum including: low turnouts, deciding on the format of the question to be asked, the prior understanding of the public, governance around campaigning to name just a few.

- 6.43 The Partnership seemed to take a pragmatic view with regard to this question taking into account the most appropriate form of quantitative data gathering given the stage in the MRWS process.
- 6.44 We suggest that this issue of 'accurately' gauging public opinion an intractable problem with no obvious satisfactory resolution. Many of the positions in the debate are already so entrenched that any opinion testing methodology which provides an answer contrary to that position will be dismissed and deconstructed.
- 6.45 The Partnership should be applauded for attempting a mature and sensible combination of data sources and for use of the 'broad support' indicator. However whether it added anything to the process except further disagreement is questionable.

Two-Way Dialogue

- 6.46 Opinion regarding the extent to which a genuine two-way dialogue occurred in PSE3 is mixed.
- 6.47 Some of those we have spoken to aired concerns that the format of the consultation, operating under the constraints of the Partnership's work programme and the terms of MRWS Stage 3, has the effect of limiting the extent of a two-way dialogue.
- 6.48 Specifically, the Partnership has had limited opportunities to formally demonstrate receptivity to feedback until the publication of PSE3 report. This issue of pacing appears to have disjointed the experience of a two-way dialogue for some.
- 6.49 In addition, the single cycle format of the consultation, in which a single statement from the Partnership yields a single response from stakeholders, is viewed by some to restrict dialogue to a simpler communication exercise.
- 6.50 However, responsiveness to the emerging debate was apparent within the Partnership; particularly with regards to Geology; with significant modifications to the Partnership's work programme attributed to feedback from stakeholders and communities on this matter.
- 6.51 For many, the Drop-In events present a highpoint in the two-way dialogue, but some still believed that the Partnership was unable to formally acknowledge impact of that dialogue on an effective timescale.
- 6.52 The evaluator believes that the Partnership's approach to dialogue represents an appropriate balance of resource and scale of consultation. Opportunity for two-way



dialogue has been provided to all; however, distribution has been mixed and naturally dependent on reciprocal input from the stakeholder or community.

- 6.53 Any future PSE activity may consider the opportunity to publish update reports during the programme, detailing interim findings, emerging issues, and emerging impacts on the Partnership's thinking. However, the burden this carries for the Partnership, paired with the complexity of managing this evolving message in the public domain, appears to restrict the practicality of this approach.
- 6.54 Overall, we are satisfied the PSE3 report carries the capability to adequately serve the dialogue, if contextualised within the PSE1, 2, 3 chain and the broader MRWS process.



7 Appendix 1: Review of PSE3 Subgroup

7.1 The PSE3 Subgroup was charged with coordination of PSE3 design and delivery on behalf of the Partnership. The PSE3 Subgroup was composed of:

- Rhuari Bennett 3KQ
- Richard Griffin, Allerdale Borough Council
- Ian Curwen, Copeland Borough Council
- Chris Shaw, Cumbria Association of Local Councils
- Kieran Barr, Cumbria County Council
- Fred Barker, Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum
- Paul Gardner, Osprey Communications

7.2 The Subgroup has convened on a regular basis since July 2009; meetings being held on a roughly monthly basis since through and beyond PSE3 (at the time of writing, the most recent date being 15th June 2012).

7.3 All PSE Subgroup meeting minutes are published on the Partnership website.

Discussion

Discussion of performance and outcomes with representatives drawn from across the landscape:

7.4 Those involved in the PSE Subgroup reflected on its performance and outcomes positively. The Subgroup was considered to have benefitted from its broad composition and developed fluid, effective working practices over the 2009-2012 period.

7.5 The learning process of Subgroup members over the 2009-2012 period emerges as a point of emphasis; driving a perceived improvement in efficiency and effectiveness of the Subgroup into PSE3.

7.6 All representatives of the Subgroup highlighted the performance of 3KQ in facilitating the group as a key factor in its effective functioning.

7.7 No specific improvement in the functioning of the PSE3 Subgroup was proposed by representatives of the Subgroup itself and no changes to decisions made were sought.



- 7.8 However, this group did acknowledge a significant burden of time required for effective operation. The potential for cycling of membership was considered a potential remedy, albeit one that could harm processes on established working relationships.
- 7.9 Those working with the Subgroup, such as those engaged in delivery of Drop-In Events, found communication to be clear and the PSE3 delivery plan to be coherent.
- 7.10 Representatives of the Partnership not seated on the Subgroup were satisfied with outputs from the Subgroup.
- 7.11 The planning and delivery infrastructure underpinning the PSE3 programme was considered to have been refined over preceding PSEs to result in a robust framework that could be translated to any future PSE activity.
- 7.12 The need for care was flagged when seeking to carry forward this infrastructure into any future PSE activity whilst providing opportunity to refresh the group members.
- 7.13 Overall, observers of the Subgroup saw its activity as fundamental to building a unified, coherent PSE3 programme; doubts were expressed over the potential for an efficient, effective programme to be built without such a coordinating body.



8 Appendix 2: Review of Consultation Pack

- 8.1 The Consultation Document (sometimes referred to as the 'ConDoc'), packaged within the Consultation Pack, represents the focal consultation document; detailing background, process, work programme, findings, initial opinions on the six criteria, and providing means for the wider public to respond.
- 8.2 A standardised Full Consultation Pack incorporated:
- Overview Document (8 page)
 - Summary DVD
 - Full Consultation Document (detailing background, context, process, and initial opinions)
 - Comment Slip
 - Freepost Consultation Response Form
 - Signposting for further information
- 8.3 During the PSE3 period, 3,250 Full Consultation Packs and 135,000 overview documents were distributed to stakeholders and communities during the consultation period⁸.

Discussion

Discussion of performance and outcomes with representatives drawn from across the landscape:

- 8.4 Amongst the majority of those consulted for the purposes of this evaluation, appraisals of the Consultation Document were very positive and were compared favourably to previous PSE materials and those of other consultations.
- 8.5 The Consultation Document was considered by all those consulted to have effectively communicated the findings of the Partnership's work programme. The document was additionally praised for its referencing, construction, clarity, and accessibility.
- 8.6 Respondents considered content to maintain a high standard of quality throughout and a focus on primary topics. Few proposals emerged with regard to modifications of the Consultation Document content.

⁸ Document Number 264: 3KQ. 2012. 'PSE Sub-Group meeting notes 16 March 2012'.



- 8.7 Proposals for improvements that were put forward focussed on what was considered an underplayed 'do nothing' scenario, restriction to the exploration of Geology, and limitations to the treatment of alternative waste disposal technologies.
- 8.8 It may be fair to suggest that such proposals reflect issues with the terms of consultation or scope of the Partnership's work programme rather than fault in the Consultation Document.
- 8.9 In this vein, a minority of respondents expressed some difficulty with the scoping of the PSE3 consultation and the questions put to the community; leading to critiques of the Consultation Document.
- 8.10 The Overview and DVD were considered to provide an essential support in their capacity to extend communication and consultation to audiences not inclined to address the Consultation Document as a whole.
- 8.11 The DVD was highlighted for praise by a number of those consulted on the basis of its content, clarity, tone, and production.
- 8.12 The Consultation Pack was considered a coherent unit; no proposals for changes to the format were made.
- 8.13 Appraisals of the Partnership's approach to drafting of the Consultation Document noted the openness of the process and the responsiveness of the Partnership to suggested edits.
- 8.14 The level of abbreviation of Overview and Summary materials emerged as a concern to some; however, all believed an effective compromise had been reached through the function of the Partnership.
- 8.15 Amongst those consulted, a minority of respondents suggested the process of drafting the Consultation Document had taken longer than necessary; pressurising the subsequent analysis and reporting phases.
- 8.16 In balance, the majority viewed the multiple iterations of the drafting process to be necessary to the production of a Consultation Document able to underpin a consultation of this nature.
- 8.17 All consulted acknowledged the weight of information that the Partnership sought to communicate to represent the primary challenge faced with regard to the Consultation Pack.
- 8.18 A majority of the consulted group believed the multiple reader experiences facilitated by the full and abbreviated resources, together with the multiple response formats were essential in supporting engagement with the material.



- 8.19 This opinion appeared to be largely based on personal appraisals of the range of response types and detail provided in the consultation feedback.
- 8.20 A minority of consultees expressed a degree of concern that the Consultation Document had invited criticism due to the Partnership's pursuit of some issues; elements of necessary forward thinking seen to carry the risk of perception as predisposition.
- 8.21 On this theme, one consultee highlighted the Siting Chapter as an example in which the level of forward thinking evident could have fuelled mistrust. However, this Chapter was considered essential to a credible consultation; any effort to mask such work deemed a deceit.
- 8.22 Comments on the presentation of the Consultation Document were limited. In general terms, the structure and presentation were praised by the consulted group; the look and feel considered supportive of the content's communication.
- 8.23 A minority queried whether a simpler page presentation could be achieved through restructuring of the text and repositioning of reference boxes.
- 8.24 However, concrete proposals on aesthetics were not put forward and personal difficulties acknowledged as reflective of personal taste.



9 Appendix 3: Review of PSE3 Publicity Campaign

- 9.1 The PSE3 programme integrated a broad ranging publicity campaign seeking to build awareness, build understanding, and motivate response amongst a broad audience.
- 9.2 The following activities were implemented by the Partnership:
- Announcement, update, and event-coverage press releases (x11).
 - Media liaison/invitations (focussed on regional press, television, and radio with some national extension).
 - Multi-channel advertising campaign.
 - Advertorial purchase in Cumbrian press (one in November 2011 and one in January 2012 each estimated to have had a newspaper circulation of 126,449 concentrated in Cumbria)
 - Maintenance of the Partnership website as a central news and information resource.
 - Update via social media (at consultation-close, Facebook page had 76,000 views for the consultation period and 220 likes, with Twitter posting to 700 followers)
 - Facebook advertisements targeting Cumbria residents (There were opportunities to view the adverts nearly 600,000 times. In total people clicked on the adverts to view the Facebook page or an item that was posted there over 1,100times).
- 9.3 The focus of this activity was provision of information regarding the consultation topics, provision of information regarding the consultation process, updates on activity, and flagging of key opportunities for participation, and highlighting of key dates.
- 9.4 Overall, there is estimated to be 224 separate pieces of media coverage between 3rd November 2011 and 23rd March 2012; including 125 items in newspapers, 84 online items, and 15 items on television and radio.

Discussion

Discussion of performance and outcomes with representatives drawn from across the landscape:



- 9.5 Appraisals of the PSE3 publicity campaign amongst the majority of stakeholders credited the variety of channels used in communication, the volume of communications, and the balance maintained throughout.
- 9.6 Those engaged in delivery of the PSE3 Publicitycampaign noted robust support from the Partnership and traction within local media.
- 9.7 Reflections on potential modifications of the campaign's approach were limited; broad satisfaction being expressed in terms of the methodology.
- 9.8 All respondents noted that questions regarding the extent of reach achieved by the campaign would endure. This is most evident with regards to the interpretation of figures regarding prior awareness of the consultation amongst those surveyed in the Opinion Survey.
- 9.9 These figures are used by a minority to suggest too few people had been reached by the PSE3 publicity campaign.
- 9.10 The majority believed all opportunities were realised in engaging with stakeholders and communities across West Cumbria within the bounds of financial and human resources.
- 9.11 A minority queried whether greater television advertisement could have been employed but acknowledged uncertainty over whether the expense could be justified. In addition, TV advertising was removed as an option during the Partnership's planning phase due to ASA Guidance on the use of this medium.
- 9.12 Several respondents focussed attention on the geography of coverage; suggesting neighbours of potential hosts, Cumbria as a whole, and the UK did not receive adequate emphasis in the awareness raising campaign.
- 9.13 However, this critique did acknowledge that such a campaign could not be drawn from the funding resource without detriment to principal targets; greater funding from Central Government was suggested.
- 9.14 Further, in balance a number of respondents cited the open accessibility of the website and its document store, together with the unrestricted consultation, in terms of the consultation's resource efficient approach to audiences outside Cumbria.
- 9.15 Finally, several believed further emphasis should be placed on the engagement of young people. This must be balanced with one respondent's view that the targeting of young people was too readily coercive in nature and should be removed from any future campaign.



- 9.16 All respondents noted the limitations of the ‘story’ in capturing attention and motivating responses from communities; representing a key challenge for the publicity campaign.
- 9.17 Characteristics of the consultation topic referenced as limiting penetration include:
- Translating the complexity and technicality of the issues being considered
 - Tracing the shifting nuance of the PSE1, 2, and 3 programmes
 - Maintaining novelty in the story across months/years
 - Bypassing general apathy and mistrust of local and national government
 - Maintaining interest amongst news and media channels
 - Breaking an established ‘tune out’ response to nuclear stories amongst many Cumbrians
 - Addressing assumptions on the issue’s relevance to individuals and an individual’s standing in the consultation
 - Breaking automated pro or con responses to ‘nuclear’ stories across communities
- 9.18 A number of respondents observed the evolution of the issue to represent a key challenge for the campaign; crediting the campaign with its focus on the consultation terms throughout.
- 9.19 Respondents noted a constant effort to correct characterisation of the consultation as a referendum on a GDF.
- 9.20 Conversations across the group revealed differences in the understanding of the campaign’s goals.
- 9.21 Representatives of the Partnership and those engaged in delivery clearly saw the objectives of the PSE3 publicity campaign to principally focus on raising awareness of the consultation, its activity, and the Partnership. In this regard, this group believed the publicity campaign had been successful.
- 9.22 However, a minority of respondents believed the campaign had not addressed aspects of detail. For example, one respondent believed the potential risks of a GDF had been underplayed in the campaign and several believed the issue of Geology had not received adequate coverage.
- 9.23 In this regard, a minority appeared to view the PSE3 publicity campaign as serving open debate; a role it was not intended to fulfil. In our view the role of the PSE3



publicity campaign was to raise awareness of the PSE3 consultation *not* to open up a press-mediated dialogue on the pros & cons of a GDF.

- 9.24 Respondents engaged in the delivery of the PSE3 publicity campaign highlighted an effort to reflect opposition voices in the campaign.
- 9.25 Efforts to balance the content of the PSE3 publicity campaign in the absence of NGO input were acknowledged by the majority. Future input from NGOs was proposed by a majority of respondents; the means by which this could be achieved were less clear.
- 9.26 A number of respondents believed the Partnership had been pushed, in publicity terms, towards characterisation as an advocate for a GDF through the actions of NGOs with opposition to a GDF. Identified drivers of this effect include the adversarial stance of NGOs, the refutations of NGO positions required from the Partnership (via FOI and invitation to comment), and the tradition of two-sided argument in news and media coverage.
- 9.27 Finally, the continuity of publicity was viewed as an essential feature of the campaign; the broken continuity across PSE1 and 2 was considered to present challenges in terms of the loss of momentum and the disorientating train of 'start', 'stop', and apparent 'repeat' in the programme.



10 Appendix 4: Review of Public Drop-In Events

- 10.1 The Partnership directly facilitated 12 Drop-In events during the PSE3 period; focussing on dissemination of information pertaining to the consultation and supporting discussion within the community.
- 10.2 The PSE3 2012 Drop-In events calendar is outlined below, with an overview of attendance at each event:

LOCATION	DATE	ATTENDANCE
Millom, Network Centre	18/01/12	72
Whitehaven, Civic Hall	19/01/12	68
Gosforth, Village Hall	20/01/12	81
Kendall, Town Hall	23/01/12	78
Workington, Carnegie Arts Centre	24/01/12	79
Keswick, St Herbert's Centre	25/01/12	66
Penrith, Methodist Church	01/02/12	43
Carlisle, The Courts	02/02/12	55
Barrow, Dock Museum	07/02/12	21
Wigton, Market Hall	08/02/12	66
Egremont, Market Hall	09/02/12	71
Cockermouth, Kirkgate Centre	10/2/12	104
Webcast (6pm-8pm)	06/03/12	130 live viewers 920 post-event views
Total (excluding Webinar):		804
Average per Event (excluding Webcast):		67
Total (including Webinar live viewers)		934

- 10.3 All events ran between 1pm and 7pm with scheduled discussion sessions at 2pm, 4pm, and 6pm.



- 10.4 Events and the event calendar were advertised prior to the date: on the Partnership website, in local press and news⁹, at the event location (flyers and posters), in the consultation pack, and through signposting at PSE3 events.
- 10.5 Schools within walking distance of each event were invited to events with notice.
- 10.6 The drop-ins were manned by 3KQ hosts and representatives from the Partnership, DECC, NDA, ONR, EA, and DrDearlove. The room format was consistent; a round of stands and representatives corresponding to each criterion, together with an overall 'context' stand detailing process, parties, and purpose.
- 10.7 Materials from SOLD-DDC and NGOs were accommodated alongside Partnership stands.
- 10.8 Discussion sessions were led by representatives from the Partnership supported by the 3KQ facilitator.
- 10.9 Each discussion session began with a scripted introduction and overview to the process, parties, and purpose, before the floor was opened to a Q&A broadly structured according to the criteria.
- 10.10 Questions were fielded by Partnership representatives; attending representatives of DECC, NDA, EA, and ONR were invited to provide detail for specific questions. In addition, Dr Dearlove was invited to provide expert perspective on the topic of geology.

Interventions from the Formative Evaluation

- 10.11 A scheduled review with the 3KQ event delivery team following the first quarter of the events calendar resulted in minor modifications:
 - Greater visibility of on-street signage at event entrances.
 - Clarity in the Partnership introduction to discussion sessions on the matter of distinguishing the Partnership from DECC and NDA.
 - Diminution of DECC and NDA focus in the discussion session Q&A through a more prominent role of the facilitator.
- 10.12 These modifications were adopted immediately for the remainder of the calendar.

⁹ Examples: www.timesandstar.co.uk/west-cumbria-radioactive-waste-dump-discussion-1.922377?referrerPath=home and www.thewestmorlandgazette.co.uk/news/9476150.Cumbrian_residents_to_have_their_say_on_nuclear_waste_issues/



Discussion

Discussion of performance and outcomes with representatives drawn from across the landscape:

- 10.13 All consulted as part of this evaluation believed the Community Drop-In Events had been a valuable component of the PSE3 programme.
- 10.14 Particular praise for the events centred on the quality of information accessible via information stands, attending 'expert' representatives, attending Partnership representatives, and the Q&A discussions.
- 10.15 Those consulted highlighted a number of examples in which members of the public had been able to engage in great depth with attending representatives on specific details.
- 10.16 Those who had attended events noted good locations, welcoming atmosphere, and quality of the support-staff in signposting information.
- 10.17 All noted the role played by the facilitator during Q&As in maintaining order and balance; an independent facilitator considered a core necessity of any future activity.
- 10.18 On this basis, all believed the events were very useful for those attending.
- 10.19 Those engaged in delivery of events believed the experiences of PSE2 had learnt refinement and confidence to the delivery of PSE3 in terms of modifications to time and locations, paired with the fluidity of conversations regarding consultation details.
- 10.20 This group believed the consultation had advanced in complexity from PSE2 to PSE3 and the events were a key pillar of support for attendees wanting to maximise the impact of their response.
- 10.21 Opportunity to access was a key theme of the event schedule; reflected in the time, location, and the webcast. Several considered the webcast a necessary feature of any future activity primarily due to its role in supporting the completeness of engagement channels used.
- 10.22 With regards to Partnership representation at events, a majority of those consulted emphasised the importance of attendance by elected representatives; believing their presence satisfied questions of accountability being posed by event visitors.
- 10.23 However, inconsistency was noted in the briefing of some elected members and their willingness to engage in open discussions during Q&A sessions.
- 10.24 With regard to attending 'expert' representatives, consultees noted the attendance of DrDearlove, together with representatives of DECC, NDA, EA, and ONR, to



substantially enhance the credibility of the consultation process through their ability to field a diverse range of questions and demonstrate the extent of background work informing the consultation.

- 10.25 Those consulted specifically acknowledged the importance of DrDearlove's input to events due to the ubiquity of geology through Q&A sessions. A minority of consultees believed this had placed pressure on Prof.Dearlove as the face/voice of the Partnership's stance on Geology.
- 10.26 The NDA were praised for the depth of understanding of the issues, paired with a noted effort to balance their responses to questions and redirect back to the specifics of the consultation.
- 10.27 Overall, those engaged in delivery of the events believed the prior briefing sessions for Q&A panel members had been essential to the quality of the Q&A sessions; ensuring answers were balanced and took the consultation as their central theme. A distinction was drawn between these briefings and the 'media training' approach taken in PSE2.
- 10.28 A number consulted placed particular emphasis on maintaining attendance from elected members throughout the day following occasions in which representation from these individuals had declined.
- 10.29 Opinions diverged on levels of attendance; the majority believed the Drop-Ins were well attended for events of their kind and had shown higher numbers than their PSE2 counterparts.
- 10.30 However, a minority voiced concern that the events had not been well attended. When pushed on underlying factors, consultees of this opinion believed the topic and not the execution lay at the heart of event attendance.
- 10.31 The majority of consultees believed all opportunities to enhance event attendance had been realised within the bounds of allocated resource.
- 10.32 Conversations with those organising events identified a degree of unpredictability in the pattern of attendance over the course of a day (1pm-7pm); emphasising the need to maintain a broad window of opportunity across the day.
- 10.33 Reflecting on the 1pm-7pm timescale, event organisers observed difficulties for school attendance that might be addressed through earlier invitational events in future iterations.
- 10.34 A variety of opinions were put forward regarding the roles played by the Drop-In Events.



- 10.35 One respondent viewed events as an attempt to promote the GDF solution by interested parties and observed a degree of persuasion in the conversations held.
- 10.36 However, the majority viewed events as a single point of access to the PSE3 consultation at which an explanation of process was the focus; supporting the community in exploring issues and responding without coercion.
- 10.37 Despite concerns over attendance, all consultees believed the Community Drop-In Events served a role that could not be adequately served by alternative means
- 10.38 Naturally, all consulted acknowledged the service of events to the understanding of attendees. A minority of consultees believed that the provision of information to a limited, self-selecting group was the full extent of the value brought by events.
- 10.39 However, a number of those consulted sought to extend the vision of value to include the wider impact of events in terms of:
- Provision of information to be carried through the peer networks of attendees
 - Support for a diversity of conversations that could not be practically contained in a Consultation Document
 - A focal point for press and media coverage
 - Provision of a platform for face-to-face engagement
 - Live demonstration of a 'current' consultation process
 - Awareness raising amongst passers-by not touched by other means
- 10.40 Such benefits were considered to accompany appraisal on the basis of attendance alone.
- 10.41 Access to events was granted for parties in opposition to the MRWS programme in the form of an information stand. It was noted that NGO's and other campaigners maintained a regular presence at drop ins and had a variety of printed materials available.
- 10.42 Despite the lack of direct engagement in events, attendees did note the clear use of events by activists to voice opposition.



11 Appendix 5: Review of Stakeholder Briefing Activity

11.1 Provision of tailored briefings for community and stakeholder groups included:

- Mailing of the Overview Document to all West Cumbrian households at the beginning of the consultation period (79,000 homes).
- Provision of briefing materials to 200 representatives of target stakeholder groups.
- Direct participation by Partnership representatives in briefings of target stakeholder groups.
- Multiple efforts to engage Environmental NGOs.
- Provision of briefing materials and support to Councillors at County/Borough/Parish level, and neighbourhood forums (3,000 residents)
- Information drops in 398 public places (libraries, leisure centres, council buildings, etc)
- Email of e-bulletins on a 6-week cycle to 1200 subscribers to the Partnership mailing list (including January and March 2012).
- Mailing of 4-page Newsletter to all West Cumbrian households in late February 2012 (79,000 homes).
- Inclusion of a 6-page article in Your Cumbria (distributed to all Cumbrian homes February 2012)
- Briefings to Partnership organisations, constituents, and members by Partnership representatives.
- Targeted communications (x3) to all secondary schools in Cumbria between December 2011 and February 2012.

11.2 An example of groups implicated in this briefing activity includes:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| ▪ Britain's Energy Coast Business Cluster | ▪ Allerdale and Copeland Disability Association |
| ▪ Cumbria Association of Local Councils | |
| ▪ Cumbria Chief Executive's Group | ▪ Cumbria Land and Business Association |
| ▪ Cumbria Leadership Board | ▪ Cumbria Strategic |



- Friends of the Lake District
 - National Trust
 - Two union meetings at Sellafield
 - Workington Constituency Labour Party
- Partnership
- Gosforth Probus Club
 - Western Lake District Tourism Partnership

Discussion

Discussion of performance and outcomes with representatives drawn from across the landscape:

- 11.3 Respondents expressed a degree of satisfaction with the effort and outcomes with regard to this additional briefing activity; emphasising that uptake was wholly dependent on the inclination of stakeholders to engage/cooperate.
- 11.4 No proposals were made with regard to groups considered to be missing from the target list. However, a number of respondents expressed continued concern that NGOs remained isolated from the Partnership.
- 11.5 The majority of respondents with an opinion on these events believed such activity was critical to generating credibility and buy-in to the PSE3 consultation process across key stakeholder communities.
- 11.6 The efficiency of leveraging existing networks was recognised by all, albeit with a number reasserting the importance of Partnership-lead events such as the Drop-Ins.
- 11.7 The content of briefings was considered appropriate and considered the involvement of Partnership representatives in meetings with stakeholder groups to bring value to the briefing in terms of demonstrating commitment to a two-way dialogue.
- 11.8 For briefing activity not involving direct meetings, the DVD was identified as a particularly valuable asset for briefing purposes and the quality of its content was again emphasised. In this case 'quality' included clarity, balance, breadth, and depth of the information.
- 11.9 In addition, those consulted acknowledged the efforts of those engaged in delivery to develop tailored briefing materials for use by schools.



12 Appendix 6: Review of Intermediary Events

12.1 As part of the PSE3 engagement activity, the Partnership has sought to facilitate community discussions implemented via intermediaries. Events of this kind delivered within the PSE3 programme are summarised as follows:

INTERMEDIARY	Focal Target	OUTCOME
Action With Communities In Cumbria (ACT)	Rural Communities	7 Events 75 Attendees
Cumbria Farmers Network	Farming Community	0 Events Members voiced satisfaction with existing briefing provision
Cumbria CVS	Voluntary Sector	5 Events 41 Attendees
Connexions	Young People	33 Events 561 Attendees
AWAZ Cumbria	Bangladeshi Community	1 Event 11 Attendees
Trades Hall Centre	Unemployed People	9 Events 48 Attendees
South Lakes Youth Council	Young People	1 Event
OutREACH Cumbria	LGBT	1 Event

12.2 The nature of groups engaged through these events is illustrated by the following list of attendance:

- 1st Seaton Scout Group
- Allerdale Young Carers Project
- Aspatria Dreamscheme (Youth Club)
- Aspatria Rural Partnership
- Caldew School
- Cockermouth School
- Millom Community Group
- Millom School
- Moorclose Knit 'n' Natter Group
- North East Copeland Cluster Group
- Parton Youth Club
- Phoenix Youth Group
- Queen Katherine
- Stepping Stones
- Teen Mums
- West Cumbria Carers Group (Beckermest)
- West Cumbria Older Person's Forum
- West Cumbria Trades Hall Centre (9 Groups)
- Whitehaven Bangladeshi Welfare



- | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| ▪ Cumbria Starting Point | ▪ School | ▪ Association |
| ▪ Dearham Youth Project | ▪ Shackles Off Youth Group | ▪ Whitehaven Harbour Youth Project |
| ▪ Distington Club for Young People | ▪ Silloth Locality Group | ▪ Wigton Youth Station (2 Groups) |
| ▪ Howgate Cluster Group | ▪ Solway School Years 9 to 11 | ▪ Workington 6th Form Centre (8 Groups) |
| ▪ Kirkgate Youth Theatre Group | ▪ South Copeland Tourism Group | ▪ Workington Zebras Rugby Club (2 Groups) |
| ▪ Lakes College West Cumbria | ▪ St Benedict's School 6th Form (4 Groups) | ▪ Young Cumbria Youth Group Woodhouse |
| ▪ Melbreak Communities | | |

Discussion

Discussion of performance and outcomes with representatives drawn from across the landscape:

- 12.3 Respondents expressed a degree of satisfaction with the effort and outcomes with regard to this activity.
- 12.4 The events were viewed as a valuable complement to the PSE3 programme; leveraging existing community networks not readily accessed by other engagement activity.
- 12.5 A degree of concern was expressed with regard to the extent to which these events lead to further engagement with the PSE3 consultation amongst attendees; however, in-event support for attendees to complete consultation responses is noted.
- 12.6 Engagement with community groups delivered learning outcomes that are readily invested into any future programme of this kind; including experience of the working practices, capacity, and support needs of specific groups.
- 12.7 Examples include the delivery infrastructure developed to support coordination of the Connexions events with local schools. In addition, experiences of working with groups such as AWAZ have lead to deeper understanding of their specific requirements; such as the availability for attendance of women's group.



13 Appendix 7: Review of Public Consultation

13.1 The Public Consultation sought feedback from stakeholders and communities on the Partnership's initial opinions outlined in the Consultation Pack. Feedback was facilitated through questionnaires and comment slips, no restrictions were placed on letter and email submissions.

13.2 The types of submission enabled during the consultation include:

- *Online submissions through a system accessible from the Partnership's website.*
- *Paper response forms, received through the Partnership's freepost address or filled in at Community Events.*
- *Electronic response forms, received through the Partnership's contact email address.*
- *Comments slips, received through the Partnership's freepost address or filled in at Community Events and other events.*
- *Letters and emails confirmed by the sender to be a formal consultation response*

13.3 The public consultation returned the following headline figures with regards to response numbers:

ASPECT	METRIC	VALUE
Totals	Total number of responses:	1,410
	Estimated number of individuals represented by the response total	2,356 ¹⁰
Representation	On behalf of an organisation or group	158
	On behalf of an individual or family	1,155
	Undeclared	97
Type	Questionnaire submissions (postal, email, and online)	698
	Comment slip submissions	480

¹⁰Based on additions for responses submitted on behalf of organisations and groups.



	Freehand letter and email submissions	191
	Postcard submissions	32
	Individual school pupils responses (11-18) ¹¹	57
	Other	2
Geography	Allerdale	514
	Copeland	517
	Rest of Cumbria	242
	Rest of UK	88
	Outside UK	4
	Undeclared	19

- 13.4 Submissions were assigned a unique reference ID and logged within the central consultation response database.
- 13.5 The consultation database was then subject to a staged analysis process, detailed by the Partnership:

The formal consultation part of PSE3 was designed to collect qualitative information. In terms of reporting this means looking at what was said and how strongly this came across rather than assessing absolute numbers.

Submissions to the formal consultation were analysed by systematically identifying themes, issues and concerns for each response to each question. 3KQ acted as a neutral third party overseeing the analysis process and authoring this report, and there were also several layers of audit from the Partnership itself.

The Partnership then developed a response to each issue, with the emphasis again being placed primarily on what was said rather than how many people said it, in line with its overall approach to gauging public and stakeholder support.

¹¹ One response summing in-school survey of sample size: 225



Discussion

Discussion of performance and outcomes with representatives drawn from across the landscape:

- 13.6 The majority believed the number of responses to the consultations was high, based on experiences of other consultations in the region. Those reading the response number as high went on to propose this confirmed the efficacy of the awareness raising programme.
- 13.7 However, a significant minority believed response numbers were low in terms of the size of the population being represented and raised concern over the extent of awareness in the region. This concern was amplified by some who interpreted low levels of awareness from the Opinion Survey.
- 13.8 It is important to note that, despite disagreement over the Consultation's success in generating responses, no respondent believed response numbers could be significantly increased within the bounds of PSE3's resource.
- 13.9 A majority reflected on the bounds placed on 'reach' by the fundamentally limited power of the waste disposal issue to compete with other priorities occupying the minds of communities.
- 13.10 Representatives of the Partnership believed the responses were a valuable resource that expanded thinking on key issues and would be reflected in subsequent advice. A number emphasised the quality of responses, the depth of thinking demonstrated, and the number of 'fresh ideas' brought by consultation responses.
- 13.11 Partnership representatives were confident that the consultation response was and would impact thinking within the Partnership and would be reflected in the advice provided to DMBs.
- 13.12 A majority believed that a consultation of this nature was contextually disposed to motivate responses detailing critiques or opposition more than responses of support.
- 13.13 However, a number of respondents sought to limit characterisation of 'pro' and 'con' views; preferring to recognise the equal value of all comment. In this regard, the consultation was viewed as an effort to extend thinking as opposed to ballot.
- 13.14 A minority did express a degree of frustration with blanket dismissals when contrasted with the utility of constructive critiques. However, such variability in response was considered an acceptable feature of a necessarily unrestricted consultation.
- 13.15 A small minority believed an analysis of consultation responses reveals a weighting towards broad opposition to a GDF and progression of the MRWS process.



- 13.16 The use of a quantitative assessment of this kind to draw such conclusions was considered by the majority to be invalid and threatened to disregard the detail provided in responses. However, this consultation was not deemed particularly susceptible to such misinterpretation and no proposals were put forward for improvement on this matter.
- 13.17 The weight of this qualitative information resource was considered to bring a heavy burden of analysis by all. However, this burden was considered an unavoidable consequence of a consultation of this nature.
- 13.18 No respondent ventured proposals to simplify or add quantifiable elements; significant value being placed on the breadth, depth, and diversity of consultation responses.
- 13.19 Respondents believed processes for collection, collation, analysis, and checking of the responses were robust and well managed. Partnership representatives noted the necessary emphasis that had been placed on devising an open, credible, and effective analysis process.
- 13.20 During discussions, many respondents reflected on dominant issues communicated through the consultation: Geology and Mistrust.
- 13.21 A majority of respondents believed that, within the bounds of the work programme, the issue of Geology had been effectively handled and resulted in responses that would be reflected in the Partnership's advice to DMBs.
- 13.22 A scheduled follow-up with the Geological Society of London is cited by some as reflective of the Partnership's response to community concerns raised over Geology.
- 13.23 However, a significant minority of respondents believed a two-way dialogue on specifics of Geology did not take place despite opportunity to do so. Those of this opinion commonly referenced as evidence a failed negotiation regarding time allotted to Prof. Smythe for a presentation to the Partnership.
- 13.24 Many respondents voiced concern that a preoccupation with Geology potentially threatened the broader remit of the consultation and the Partnership was right not to allow over-emphasis of any one issue.
- 13.25 Regardless of the individual's position, the majority of respondents believed the consultation responses had captured the Geology debate and had thus served its purpose; providing detail translated through to advice provided to DMBs.



- 13.26 With regard to the issue of Mistrust, respondents noted a particular concern amongst consultation responses focussing on the right to withdraw and specific features of the siting process.
- 13.27 The majority believed Mistrust reflected a broader trend in the relationship between politicians and society that was, to a great extent, non-specific to the issue of waste disposal.
- 13.28 A number believed a broad lack of trust derived from expectations regarding the partiality of the Partnership based on the nuclear history of the region.
- 13.29 However, a majority of respondents believe the Partnership exhausted all powers in its gift to address the issue of Mistrust.
- 13.30 A majority of respondents expressed confidence in the Partnership's handling of the consultation data and its collation. However, concerns were expressed with regards to how differences in interpretation of the qualitative analyses could be effectively resolved.
- 13.31 It should be noted that a small number of respondents believed appraisal of the consultation process could only be made following reflection on the utility of consultation responses in the final advice submitted by the Partnership and specifically the utility of opposition sentiment.
- 13.32 In this regard, respondents broadly endorsed the manner by which information had been collected through the consultation, but reserved judgement on its utility.



14 Appendix 8: Review of Opinion Survey

- 14.1 An Opinion Survey sought to deliver a statistically representative test of opinion across Allerdale, Copeland, and the rest of Cumbria.
- 14.2 The Partnership commissioned two independent experts on polling to provide additional advice on the survey script and methodology.
- 14.3 A draft questionnaire was published for public comment between 6th-20th February 2012; the Partnership publishing a summary of responses to issues raised online.
- 14.4 The Survey was carried out by Ipsos Mori between 8th March and 16th May 2012.
- 14.5 A total of 4,262 responses were recorded; 1,452 in Allerdale, 1,412 in Copeland, and 1,398 in Rest of Cumbria. Response rates were high for a study of this kind, averaging 45.6% overall.
- 14.6 Ipsos Mori's own analysis reveals a typical demographic pattern in the responses in terms of an under-representation of young people relative to the area population and an over-representation of older people relative to the area population. This outcome reflects the preference for involvement in the survey as opposed to defect in the methodology and has been addressed in analysis through weighting.
- 14.7 The results of the opinion survey were announced at the 22nd May Partnership meeting alongside a presentation from the polling company Ipsos MORI.

Discussion

Discussion of performance and outcomes with representatives drawn from across the landscape:

- 14.8 The majority of respondents voiced strong support for the Opinion Survey in terms of its role played within the PSE3 programme.
- 14.9 Many respondents highlighted the extreme lengths that had been taken by the Partnership in developing a robust methodology.
- 14.10 Specifically, the use of independent experts and public comment in the development of the survey was considered valuable in cementing credibility; a number noting changes to the survey in response to issues raised.
- 14.11 The high response rate was considered to validate the publicity campaign by a number of respondents.



- 14.12 It is apparent that a minority of respondents viewed the Opinion Survey as a referendum on the GDF; suggesting variation in the perception of the Survey and its role.
- 14.13 However, the majority of respondents were satisfied that the interpretation of outputs from the survey did not require significant accompanying briefing.
- 14.14 A number of respondents reflected on the dual qualitative-quantitative resource that had been delivered to the Partnership through the PSE3 programme.
- 14.15 All respondents saw the Opinion Survey as a vital complement to the consultation responses.
- 14.16 The majority believed the extent and quality of this resource demonstrated broad success of the PSE3 programme. The challenge of analysis, interpretation, and communication was acknowledged, but confidence in the systems aligned to each was voiced.
- 14.17 A minority considered the apparent discrepancies between consultation responses and opinion survey to pose problems for observers in terms of reconciling the two. One discrepancy is apparent in the mapping of responses to the consultation against the survey findings; hinging on use of the consultation responses as a quantifiable record.
- 14.18 In this vein, some respondents note the application of the consultation as a statistically representative record demonstrating broad dismissal of MRWS and any GDF despite the invalidity of this approach. However, no proposals were put forward with regard to controlling the application of consultation data; a preference for the maintenance of freedoms in use of information being expressed by all respondents.
- 14.19 A majority of respondents believed that the survey could not be substantively challenged on the basis of methodology or execution.
- 14.20 A number of respondents expressed a degree of concern with regards to the geographical scope of the Opinion Survey, believing wider communities had standing in the consultation. However, a necessary focus on West Cumbria was acknowledged by all.
- 14.21 A minority of respondents expressed concern with regards to a perceived low level of awareness evident in replies to the Opinion Survey. However, this opinion is balanced by a majority observing a high level of awareness in Allerdale and Copeland.





15 Appendix 9: PSE3 Performance with Key Target Groups

- 15.1 This section of the report reviews the performance and outcomes of PSE3 with specific regard for the 'Key Target' groups specified in PSE3 planning literature.
- 15.2 Activity discussed in this section is a collation of activity reviewed above, reframed with regard to the 'Key Target'.

Councillors at County, Borough, and Parish level

- 15.3 Beyond material via the publicity campaign and broader PSE3 programme, Councillors received specific briefings via Partnership representatives of Allerdale Borough Council, Copeland Borough Council, Cumbria County Council, and CALC.
- 15.4 No issues were raised with regards to the briefing received by Councillors in Cumbria during the PSE3 programme and no improvements are proposed.

Cumbrian Residents

- 15.5 Cumbrian residents received extensive material via the publicity campaign and broader PSE3 programme.
- 15.6 Apparent highlights in the PSE3 programme's effort to inform and engage Cumbrian residents include:
- Mailing of the Overview Document to all West Cumbrian households at the beginning of the consultation period (79,000 homes).
 - Provision of briefing materials and support to neighbourhood forums (3,000 residents)
 - Mailing of 4-page Newsletter to all West Cumbrian households in late February 2012 (79,000 homes).
 - Inclusion of a 6-page article in Your Cumbria (distributed to all Cumbrian homes February 2012)
- 15.7 No specific proposals for improvement of the briefing of Cumbrian residents within the bounds of the budget and the six criteria have been identified.
- 15.8 However, concerns regarding the complexity of the topic have been voiced, albeit without concrete recommendations regarding modification of the consultation materials.



15.9 A number of respondents have raised the possibility of extended community discussion events such as those held during the Drop-Ins. However, it is clear that such events draw a specific cross-section of the audience and alternative routes to engage with the material must be maintained.

Young People

15.10 A principal approach to young people has focussed on school communities; reviewed as follows:

SCHOOL	DETAILS	PARTICIPANTS
Netherhall School, Maryport	Attended Workington Drop-In and utilising Consultation pack	~20
Settlebeck School, Sedburgh	Attended Kendal Drop-In and utilising Consultation pack	~5
St Benedict's School, Whitehaven	Attended Whitehaven Drop-In and utilising Consultation pack	~12
Nelson Thomlinson School, Wigton	Attended Wigton Drop-In and utilising Consultation pack	~15
William Howard School, Brampton	Attended Carlisle Drop-In and utilising Consultation pack	~25
West Lakes Academy	Utilising Consultation Pack with Upper 6 th Form Group	~15
The Queen Katherine School, Kendal	and utilising Consultation pack (GSCE Geography and School Council)	~40
South Lakes Youth Council	Session planned for 14 th March	~20
Solway Community Technology College	Liaison with local neighbourhood forum	Unknown
South Lakes Youth Council	A Youth Council session taking the MRWS consultation as its focus	Unknown
Connexions	33 sessions with young people	561
Any	News Report Competition	40
Any	Tailored schools briefing and learning materials	Unknown

15.11 As a result, a total of 58 submissions were received from school pupils (11-18). This included collective submissions; including one response from each Connexions event



and one response representing views gathered during a school survey of 225 individuals¹².

- 15.12 Those engaged in delivery of the PSE3 programme found schools consistently difficult to engage; often relying on internal communication networks through individual schools.
- 15.13 This difficulty was further reflected by the under-representation of younger people in the opinion survey sample.
- 15.14 Approaches to schools within walking distance of Drop-Ins revealed some success in terms of attendance. Resulting attendance appeared to be encouraged by the offer of expenses and the scheduling of Q&As more closely aligned to the school day.
- 15.15 Particular success was seen with the structure of engagement and coordination of the Connexions events; implicating the work of a dedicated team member in fixing events. The Connexions events are seen to have benefitted from the network linkage and insight provided by this partner.
- 15.16 Where school events were run, particular value was placed on the DVD briefing and tailored information materials.
- 15.17 Although not contributing a huge weight of numbers to the engagement activity, the social media strand of the publicity campaign appears to have played a necessary role with regards to younger audiences. During PSE3, 73% of those reached were aged 34 or under and 60% of likes were by people under 34.
- 15.18 The PSE3 programme is considered to have finessed the approach towards school engagement and a degree of satisfaction with resulting engagement is clear. With regards to future activity, specific suggestions include:
- Efforts to engage with a Geography A-Level module on nuclear power planning
 - Recognition of constraints placed on schools by the school calendar and day
 - Exploration of a central schools conference to replace the resource intensive schools engagement process
- 15.19 It should be noted that one respondent expressed a degree of discomfort with the targeting of young people; viewing the approach to this audience as unnecessary and coercive.

¹² Document Number 264: 3KQ. 2012. 'PSE Sub-Group meeting notes 16 March 2012'.



Environmental NGOs

15.20 Efforts to engage specific NGOs with an explicit opposition position to the MRWS process within the PSE3 programme included:

ACTION	RESPONSE
Partnership letter to Greenpeace, FoE, and CORE offering bilateral meeting before or during PSE3 (09/06/11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reply from NGOs: Doc 199 ▪ Response to reply: Doc 202
Partnership email invitation to participate in consultation sent to Greenpeace, FoE, and CORE alongside all stakeholders (12/11/11).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No direct reply ▪ Consultation responses received from NGOs
Partnership letter to GP, FoE, CORE, and RAFL inviting them to present to the Partnership during PSE3 (01/12/11) ¹³	
Partnership letter to Don't Dump Cumbria upon their establishment inviting discussion of their aims, structure, and membership (Early 2012).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Refused 'it would serve no useful purpose'
NGOs provided with opportunity to distribute leaflets and man a stand at PSE3 community events (each PSE3 Drop-In)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Attendance
Column outlining NGO perspective included within the newsletter and advertorials	
Partnership invitation to Greenpeace and FoE to participate in the Webcast	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No reply ▪ Partnership recruited Pete Wilkinson to represent NGO position
Partnership invitation to all stakeholders to comment on the draft opinion survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comments received from Greenpeace and CORE

Discussion

¹³Doc 248



15.21 Reasons for non-engagement of NGOs with the Partnership are summarised as follows:

- NGOs believe there is no merit in engaging in a process in which only geological disposal is being considered. Without an opportunity to explore selection of the disposal method, NGO participation was never achievable.
- NGOs believe that Cumbria has endured undue pressure to secure a GDF during the time only one expression of interest had been voiced. Proposed inducements are considered to intensify this pressure.
- NGOs believe that international best-practice dictates search for suitable geology first and voluntarism second; a sequence not followed by MRWS and demonstrating a disregard for safety.
- NGOs believe the process has shown a disregard for the primacy of geology and a failure to adequately refute the conclusions of Nirex.
- NGOs have doubts on the partiality and history of dominant Partnership members; believing past statements and present action demonstrates predisposition in the DMB decision.
- NGOs believe the Partnership is unbalanced and dominated by partial authorities in the form of Allerdale and Copeland. The failure of the Partnership to achieve balance in its composition is viewed as evidence of comfort with predisposition.
- NGOs believe the opinion survey does not demonstrate broad support due to the levels of previously unaware respondents; the Partnership's alternate interpretation is considered as evidence of intransigence.

15.22 The nature of the NGO position on the topic of geological disposal and on the Partnership appears to preclude any involvement in PSE3; an observation that is endorsed by CORE.

15.23 As such, no recommendations can be made with regard to engagement of NGOs in PSE3.

15.24 However, the NGOs have made comment on PSE3 performance and outcomes; these have been integrated within preceding reviews.

15.25 Recommendations are limited in respect of proposals for improvement to the Consultation Pack, Opinion Survey, and Drop-In events.

15.26 A degree of focus is placed on communication of results from the consultation and opinion survey in which the interpretation of results oppose the interpretation of the



Partnership. However, no proposals are ventured with regard to remedy of this issue (other than revision on the part of the Partnership).

- 15.27 Reach and awareness emerge as pressing issues in the NGO's critique; exploration of which suggests NGOs favour additional resource to extend geographic scope as opposed to modification to the PSE3 programme.
- 15.28 Throughout this aspect of the conversation, 'fault' is found most readily with regard to fundamentals in the terms under which the MRWS process is operating and a perceived partiality in the Partnership.
- 15.29 Particular attention is placed on perceived flaws in the debate surrounding Geology; the failure by the Partnership to grant Prof. Smythe a 45min presentation at a Partnership event viewed as proof that a two-way dialogue was restricted to serve pro-GDF interest.
- 15.30 The opinion of some observers that such actions reflected an effort to limit undue emphasis on Geology and turn the consultation away from a referendum on Geology were rejected.
- 15.31 Reflection on these findings presents little with specific regard to an evaluation of PSE3.

Parishes

- 15.32 A significant actor in the engagement of Parishes came in the form of CALC; actively represented on the Partnership taking the lead on dissemination to, and representation of, the Parishes.
- 15.33 The CALC conference (7th January 2012) presents a highlight in this dissemination; a well-attended meeting of parish representatives in which detailed discussion of the process, consultation, the Partnership's initial options, and the CALC position statement was supported.
- 15.34 The subsequent level of parish submission to the consultation and reasoned views encoded within present strong evidence of effective engagement of the parishes. Furthermore, CALC representatives believed parish officials were provided with sufficient briefing to engage in discussion with local communities.
- 15.35 Discussions with CALC representatives revealed satisfaction in the resource and approach applied to informing and consulting parishes. In addition, CALC's position on the Partnership is considered to have enhanced the voice of the parishes during PSE3.





16 Appendix 11: MRWS PSE Programme

16.1 As of June 2012, the Public and Stakeholder Engagement (PSE) programme has completed three distinct phases:

PHASE	DATES	OBJECTIVES
1	11/2009 – 03/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build the understanding of stakeholder organisations and public. ▪ Seek input from stakeholder organisations on the Partnership's: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Work Programme. ➤ Terms of Reference. ➤ Criteria. ➤ PSE Plan. ▪ Understand issues raised by stakeholders and public. ▪ Provide a response to comments where possible and adapt activity accordingly.
2	11/2010 – 02/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build the understanding of stakeholder organisations and public. ▪ Understand stakeholder organisation and public views on the BGS report. ▪ Seek input from stakeholder organisations on the Partnership's: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Criteria. ➤ PSE Plan. ▪ Understand stakeholder and public issues and information needs. ▪ Provide a response to comments where possible and adapt activity accordingly
3	11/ 2011 – 05/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to build the understanding of stakeholder organisations + public. ▪ Assess extent of support or otherwise for participation. ▪ Understand reasons for support or opposition. ▪ Understand any conditionality and limits to support. ▪ Understand any additional stakeholder and public issues. ▪ Provide a response to comments where possible and



		adapt activity accordingly.
--	--	-----------------------------



Floor 2, Suite 22, 7-15 Pink Lane,
Newcastle, NE1 5DW
+44 (0) 191 211 2999
www.woodholmes.com
